

RESEARCH ARTICLE



ISSN

INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA

2395-2636 (Print); 2321-3108 (online)

IDENTITY AT LOSS; *CENTRE, DECENTERED*

MOJTABA MOHAMMADI

M.A Graduate

Mohammadi_m1990@yahoo.com



ABSTRACT

Amidst the systemic life of human, the lost cause, brought about by the industrialization and the broke of two world wars, construed in the eternal disillusionment of the entire humanity. No longer could a defined self be maintained so far as there is no definite text; meaning or what not. The center Longley held to be there, no longer functions. Any attempt to maintain logos, a center or an infinite being is wrought and is doomed to Nothingness.

Modern project, a total failure, or yet to be fulfilled according to Haubermars, was paved by toiling of Descartes's Ergo nom est., and Kant the moralist, Burke the anesthetist and above all Hegel. The death knell of the failure of project was heard by the world wars and seemingly razed to dust by the French Deconstructionist and post-structuralist. No center accordingly could be maintained, *différance*, the present yet absent is the central keystone for the current study.

Key Words: Center/Decentered - *différance* - Identity- Logos- Modernism- The System

©KY PUBLICATIONS

INTRODUCTION

I think, therefore I am. Even Rene Descartes, after the abscission of the ties and the strings of universe of a god as a puppeteer wouldn't have thought his so called logical formula would turn wrought within three centuries. The total sum of the Hegelian project of modern man following Kant as the harbinger was not an exception along with Pascal's modern theological doctrines and Feuerbach's epistemology of religio-medici was bilious When Marx, Nietzsche, Freud and Darwin; the founding circle of Discursivity, would even they themselves be panic stricken by the rapid, wild and incessant growth of change in culture and the advent of mushroom-like technology.

Each and every means of technological production is intended to be mass produced and consequently claims to be a boon in the mass life. Not long ago the president of Ethiopia was

condemned by United Nations and then put on a trial due to his recklessness for not cooperating with a private institute which was presumably helping to prevent and cure HIV. The striking point was the president's response; due to the lack of sufficient money, we cannot help and cure the infected ones, the only thing we can do is to prevent the remaining to be infected. Very unsympathetic an answer this is but the point is science, with its former claim of easing human life, bringing salvation to the mass, turned out to be a means of production, something to be bought and sold. So the Ethiopian president's response was humanistic and egalitarian indeed. Because it was not he who was responsible and to be blamed but the very institute which claimed to be of any help was the true axis of evil, what the institute was about, was to sell its drugs out in a market system.

Let's be less skeptic, not to think of the Capitalists system which in order to maintain its existence and to reinvigorate its means of production must reproduce its each and every basic means of production. A virus is to be made so that an epidemic could break out, therefore its anti-virus could be the answer. So, governmental propaganda of stabilizing the plethora of population and making profit is a probable alternative which we here, try to neglect.

Here of paramount significance is human and the sum total of them in an interactive commune, society. What about society as a collective of individuals and a body of a seeming unifying self? The foretold, imminent bedlam, to be optimistic of not seeing its debris even now, is an ongoing part of all sciences, be it humanities or experimental sciences. The identity of a self, a subject and the entire commune is to be taken care of here.

Why does a society need an identity? If it does at all. What about the identity of a subject and the very process of subject formation? Is a subject, a unifying self who in amalgamation of other subjects, form a unifying society in the process of social contract?

1. System, De-systemized:

"Wild, dark times are rumbling toward us, and the prophet who wishes to write a new apocalypse will have to invent entirely new beasts, and beasts so terrible that the ancient animal symbols of St. John will seem like cooing doves and cupids in comparison."

These are the sentences written by the German poet Henrich Heine in 1842, whose radical political views put him on a lifetime exile. What was he so worried about?

1.1. Capitalism/ the System as such:

"I worked at a factory owned by Germans, at coal pits owned by Frenchmen, and at a chemical plant owned by Belgians. There I discovered something about capitalists. They are all alike, whatever the nationality. All they wanted from me was the most work for the least money that kept me alive. So I became a communist." Boldly but

simply put, what the capitalism as a system of minorities exploiting the mass requires for its survival.

Giannina Braschi in her philosophical fiction, *United States of bananas* refers to capitalism as:

The United States is the Darwinist capital of the capitalist world. A head afraid is a head haunted. A head haunted is a head hunted. Run for your life. Run from the guillotine to a head hunter who saves your head and raises your salary — so you'll be caught in the red of the fish-market buying gadgets to distract your fragile imagination that is cut in the red market of blood—running and escaping — running again — changing your resume to update the fear you feel of being unemployed tomorrow — in the streets — and from there to welfare — and from there to begging.

Flicking through the pages of history would unanimously indicate the fierce struggle of human as a species whose difference from its surrounding, being a subject, a perceiver who can by the utilization of the nature, produce means that goes beyond its basic, seeming forms so that could help it understand the world as both a macrocosm and microcosm, both from within itself and from without. Left alone, only finding itself analogous to its counterparts and through an unknown, never directly mentioned pact, first tried to survive then to pinpoint its existence in the macrocosm, then its inner world though the sequence is itself controversial. Who am I? One might wonder. Our ancestor were not an exception vis-à-vis. Long departed to provide food for their family and their bondsman, our primitive forefathers were awed and flabbergasted in finding themselves around a fire at nights wondering about the dark shining sky above them and the darkness which surrounded them. Experiencing the cyclical life the nature, blossoming in spring, ripeness in summer, degeneration in fall, and symbolic death in fierce deadly coldness of winter, and the resuming of the same cycle ad-infinitum. They internalized the cyclical time and alongside the space of their living as being born, grow, faint, dies, and the story starts ab-ovo all along. Who creates, then destructs, then re-creates

and so on? A simple deduction would be like, a human is created through its parents, and therefore this seemingly vast universe out there should have one. The most striking example of an almighty was the mother Earth all by itself as both nurturing and nourishing its children. Once the plants were aggravated and the tribe was fed, they were thankful of earth, sky with its gratuitous rain for the growth, the sun for its warmth. Our forefathers were not disgraceful after all. They were thankful due to the fact, though left alone, they were still alive. Who would be so generous after all? The nature one could say. It was internalized that if they are good beings, showing respect and grace, they would have enough rain, and ripened food to make their survival easier. Sometime things didn't add up after all. Tens of hundreds died of famine. Who was to blame now? Mother earth? Of course, not. According to E. Burke Object of Sublime which was developed in his *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (1756):

"Beauty may be accentuated by light, but either intense light or darkness (the absence of light) is sublime to the degree that it can obliterate the sight of an object. The imagination is moved to awe and instilled with a degree of horror by what is "dark, uncertain, and confused." [5] While the relationship of the sublime and the beautiful is one of mutual exclusiveness, either one can produce pleasure. The sublime may inspire horror, but one receives pleasure in knowing that the perception is a fiction."

Who would dare then to blame the big Other, the one not known; only shown through our own explanations, perception, bulky enough seeming to be understood by us, however are all the matter of further debates about its veracity and mendacity, we, who are fully dependent? Kant suggest: "The wish to talk to God is absurd. We cannot talk to one we cannot comprehend and we cannot comprehend God; we can only believe in Him." (1775).

After long worshiping of the natural causes, our modern explanations for extraordinary events happening back then, and making sacrifices and

tribute to them, the tribal community felt the need the God in person. That made little sense to primitives, of the god whom they could not see its presence right before their eyes. The idolized spirit, the god-in-person, the son was hand-made by the tribe to be with them all day long, not just praise them once in a while, but to receive blessing and bliss all through. Freud in his *Totem and Taboo* mentions a totem as: "What is a totem: It is as a rule an animal (whether edible and harmless or dangerous and feared) and more rarely a plant or a natural phenomenon (such as rain or water), which stands in a peculiar relation to the whole clan." Then he adds: "In the first place, the totem is the common ancestor of the clan; at the same time it is their guardian spirit and helper, which sends them oracles and, if dangerous to others, recognizes and spares its own children."

The idolized God, god-in-person, could first and foremost be of keeping and maintenance of tribal values, the persistence of behaviorism among the bondsman, to keep them in charged for the good of all. Therefore a communal system was founded. Apart from the will to power and power relation and ideological apparatus made by the big Other, the chief in command, one cares to name, which is of further discussion, un-announcedly the tribesman were to fulfill the need of the system which now seemed inevitable, in this case the tribunal requiem, to integrate the congruency of the tribe doctrines and Gods ones. No one was to transgress the limitations, or the taboos. Freud succinctly suggests:

Anyone who has violated a taboo becomes taboo himself because he possesses the dangerous quality of tempting others to follow his example: why should he be allowed to do what is forbidden to others? Thus he is truly contagious in that every example encourages imitation, and for that reason he himself must be shunned. [] But a person who has not violated any taboo may yet be permanently or temporarily taboo because he is in a state which arouses the quality of arousing forbidden desires in others and of awakening a conflict of ambivalence in them... The king or chief

arouses envy on account of his privileges: everyone, perhaps, would like to be a king. Dead men, new-born (page 87) babies and women menstruating or in labor stimulate desires by their special helplessness; a man who has just reached maturity stimulates them by the promise of new enjoyments. For that reason all of these persons and all of these states are taboo, since temptation must be resisted.

Therefore the unable-bodied human who was not courageous enough to stand up to the gods, be it nature, natural causes, the idolized gods whatsoever, would finally put the blame on someone else for the misfortunes at hands. The scapegoat, or the one to blame, was whatever, whoever, at any cost broke the taboos and became a taboo itself which is to be shunned in order not to be punished by the Gods/other(s). As means of making up for the blasphemy or discretion, an animal mostly domestic one, or a human, was sacrificed to pacify the wrath of Gods of any forms. "Because the Systems Age is teleologically oriented, it is preoccupied with systems that are goal-seeking or purposeful, that is, systems that can display choice of either means or ends, or both. It is interested in purely mechanical systems only." Thus finding the final cause of catastrophe would do.

The passage of time prized human complexity both at the level of means of production and its morality, ethnicity, identity, boldly said. Human could create meanings, re-create them, and destroy them all. His identity was formed by the discourses which got more complex as the generations passed by. The values presented by the system, community made ones, were promoted, degraded, and demolished sometime, either by the community or by the amalgamation of values following an interaction with other communities, whether through wars, or peace-making marriages between them.

What is a system one might ask then? According to Thomas Hobbes definition of the system in his major work Leviathan:

Systems... resemble the similar parts or muscles of a body natural. By systemes; I understand any numbers of men joyned in

one Interest, or one Businesse. Of which, some are Regular, and some Irregular. Regular are those, where one Man, or Assembly of men, is constituted Representative of the whole number. All other are Irregular. Of Systemes subordinate, some are Politicall, and some Private. Politicall (otherwise Called Bodies Politique, and Persons In Law,) are those, which are made by authority from the Sovereign Power of the Common-wealth. Private, are those, which are constituted by Subjects amongst themselves, or by authoritie from a stranger. For no authority derived from forraign power, within the Dominion of another, is Publique there, but Private.

And of Private Systemes, some are Lawfull; some Unlawfull: Lawfull, are those which are allowed by the Common-wealth: all other are Unlawfull. Irregular Systemes, are those which having no Representative, consist only in concourse of People; which if not forbidden by the Common-wealth, nor made on evill designe, (such as are conflux of People to markets, or shews, or any other harmelesse end,) are Lawfull. But when the Intention is evill, or (if the number be considerable) unknown, they are Unlawfull.

... And this is all I shall say concerning Systemes, and Assemblies of People, which may be compared (as I said,) to the Similar parts of mans Body; such as be Lawfull, to the Muscles; such as are Unlawfull, to Wens, Biles, and Apostemes, engendred by the unnaturall conflux of evill humours.

Likewise the intra-personal system as such was formed by our ancestors. Discipline was one of the stickiest pre-requisition. What was the hidden glue to ordain the community as one? Fear one might assume. The story of fearing the One, whether a God, deities, chiefs in command ad-infinitem, has been prevalent and eye-catching at least through our last three millenniums. A few examples will do. The followings are examples of Abrahamic religions which are of majority even today:

"Fear only two: God, and the man who has no fear of God.

The only God-ordained fear is the fear of God, and if we fear Him, we don't have to fear anyone or anything else.

The fear of God is described as the beginning of knowledge (Proverbs (1:7)). Finally, when everything has been heard, fear God and keep His commands for this is the whole of human condition: God judges every deed, even secret ones, to see if it is good or bad."

God is the beauty, the sublime, the infinite etc. Edmund Burke the first philosopher who considered both Beautiful and Sublime to be exclusive. God, deities whatever as an infinite object of sublime which are impossible to be grasped by the finite subject, is described by Burke as following:

"Beauty may be accentuated by light, but either intense light or darkness (the absence of light) is sublime to the degree that it can obliterate the sight of an object. The imagination is moved to awe and instilled with a degree of horror by what is "dark, uncertain, and confused." While the relationship of the sublime and the beautiful is one of mutual exclusiveness, either one can produce pleasure. The sublime may inspire horror, but one receives pleasure in knowing that the perception is a fiction."

Schopenhauer in his opus *the world as will and representation* furthers the topic as:

"Feeling of Beauty – Light is reflected off a flower. (Pleasure from a mere perception of an object that cannot hurt observer).

Weakest Feeling of Sublime – Light reflected off stones. (Pleasure from beholding objects that pose no threat, yet themselves are devoid of life).

Weaker Feeling of Sublime – Endless desert with no movement. (Pleasure from seeing objects that could not sustain the life of the observer).

Sublime – Turbulent Nature. (Pleasure from perceiving objects that threaten to hurt or destroy observer).

Full Feeling of Sublime – Overpowering turbulent Nature. (Pleasure from beholding very violent, destructive objects).

Fullest Feeling of Sublime – Immensity of Universe's extent or duration. (Pleasure from knowledge of observer's nothingness and oneness with Nature)."

Seems perplexing enough, how God, the Almighty as such is compared to the System? A Creator, could only be the creator when it is part of its own creations, the system it has made. A creator out of the realm its creation could not claim its creation at all. Even if the system works only perfectly, the system is self-contained, without a need for its creator. It would become its own creator. But if the God wants its share from its creation, there is no way left for it to be a part of it, its presence or what not. The enigmatic, challenging *Parmenides* by Plato could be of help to lay the grounds. The polemical, difficult second part of the dialogue consists of three Hypothesis which goes as follow:

Hypothesis n. 1: If it is one. The one cannot be made up of parts and cannot be a single part, because a part must be section of a whole, in order to be different from many. So it has not a beginning, a center or an end thus it cannot be spherical or linear. Since the one cannot be touched because has got no parts, it is neither anywhere nor into itself, because it would be many. Therefore the one cannot move and cannot dematerialize in order to reappear in another place. The one must be itself and cannot be different from it. The one does not take part in the flowing of time so it is imperishable.

Hypothesis n. 2: If the one is. The one is, it must be and it is part of the being. The one is part of the being and vice versa. The being is a part of the one, the one is a whole that is a group of sections. The one does not participate of the being, so it must be a single part. The being is unlimited and is contained in everything, big or small it is. So, since the one is part of the being, it is divided in as many parts as the being, thus it is unfinished. The parts are themselves sections of a whole, the whole is delimited confirming the presence of

a beginning, a centre, and an end. Therefore, since the centre is itself at the same distance from the beginning and the end, the one must have a form: linear either spherical or mixed. If the whole is into some of its parts, it will be the plus into the minus, and different from itself. The one is also elsewhere, it is stationary and in movement at the same time.

Hypothesis n. 3: If the one is not. If the one is not it participates of everything different from him, so everything is partially one. Similarity, dissimilarity, bigness, equality and smallness belong to it since the one is similar to itself but dissimilar to anything that is, but it can be big or small as regards dissimilarity and equal as concerns similarity. So the one participates of the non-being and also of the being because you can think of it. Therefore the one becomes and perishes and, since it participates of the non-being, stays. The one removes from itself the contraries so that it is unnameable, not disputable, not knowable or sensible or showable. The other things appear one and many, limited and unlimited, similar and dissimilar, the same and completely different, in movement and stationary, and neither the first nor the latter thing since they are different from the one and other things. Eventually they are not. So if the one is not, the being is not."

Samsara or the eternal cycle of life with nirvana standing by, which is the ultimate release from the suffering of the cycle, is another measure of the same issue, propelled by Buddha. An eternal cycle of life as a system, while Nirvana as the freed one, of this cycle, is at direct, mutual contact with it. The system is in dire need of Nirvana for its existence, Nirvana in exact same direness of the System to be. Neither could be without the other. A seemingly bigger System consisting of cyclical system-Nirvana of which comprise both. The diegetic cyclical system in need of the seemingly Extra-Diegetic Nirvana, which make a new system in a bigger framework, The systems within System, The System itself being within other forms of Systems as such metaphysically speaking.

What is now to be grounded is the most pernicious but seemingly handy of all systems which has gained privileges in at least the last hundred year, the language system. "Language is the house of the truth of Being", Heidegger said. Communicative in nature, if one be intrepid enough to say so, we feel the need of communication so bad. At least we could claim so as far as this thesis is going on and read. "The limit of my language means the limits of my world" Wittgenstein said. As early as 20th century, the work of linguists Ferdinand Saussure made great change in our perception. No more, words represented the things they tried to signify. Sign which consists of signifier and signified. With the help of phonology he could distinguish the relation between signs. It was not a relation of that kind anyway, more defining them by their difference. The reason why 'Bar' is bar is due to its not being 'Far' or 'Tar'. Jacques Derrida commented on Saussure:

Although Saussure recognized the necessity of putting the phonic substance between brackets ("What is essential in language, we shall see, is foreign to the phonic character of the linguistic sign" [p. 21]. "In its essence it [the linguistic signifier] is not at all phonic" [p. 164]), Saussure, for essential, and essentially metaphysical, reasons had to privilege speech, everything that links the sign to phone. He also speaks of the "natural link" between thought and voice, meaning and sound (p. 46). He even speaks of "thought-sound" (p. 156). I have attempted elsewhere to show what is traditional in such a gesture, and to what necessities it submits. In any event, it winds up contradicting the most interesting critical motive of the Course, making of linguistics the regulatory model, the "pattern" for a general semiology of which it was to be, by all rights and theoretically, only a part. The theme of the arbitrary, thus, is turned away from its most fruitful paths (formalization) toward a hierarchizing teleology:... One finds exactly the same gesture and the same concepts in Hegel. The contradiction between these two

moments of the Course is also marked by Saussure's recognizing elsewhere that "it is not spoken language that is natural to man, but the faculty of constituting a language, that is, a system of distinct signs ...," that is, the possibility of the code and of articulation, independent of any substance, for example, phonic substance.

What later on Jacques Derrida called the ever play of chains of signifier is the infinite, ongoing process of signification. Bar is not bar as a signified, but chains of never ending more signifiers. Heidegger here could be of great help again: "Man acts as if he were the shaper and master of language, while in fact language remains the master of man". Following Heidegger, Derrida coinage word *Différance*, defined by him as following fortifies the maestro of language as the self-contained system over man, not man's masteries':

Différance is the systematic play of differences, of the traces of differences, of the spacing by means of which elements are related to each other. This spacing is the simultaneously active and passive (the a of différence indicates this indecision as concerns activity and passivity, that which cannot be governed by or distributed between the terms of this opposition) production of the intervals without which the "full" terms would not signify, would not function. (21).[] "the a of Différance also recalls that spacing is temporization, the detour and postponement by means of which intuition, perception, consummation - in a word, the relationship to the present, the reference to a present reality, to a being - are always deferred. Deferred by virtue of the very principle of difference which holds that an element functions and signifies, takes on or conveys meaning, only by referring to another past or future element in an economy of traces. This economic aspect of différence, which brings into play a certain not conscious calculation in a field of forces, is inseparable from the more narrowly semiotic aspect of différence. (28)[] At the point at which the

concept of différence, and the chain attached to it, intervenes, all the conceptual oppositions of metaphysics (signifier/signified; sensible/intelligible; writing/speech; passivity/activity; etc.)- to the extent that they ultimately refer to the presence of something present (for example, in the form of the identity of the subject who is present for all his operations, present beneath every accident or event, self-present in its "living speech," in its enunciations, in the present objects and acts of its language, etc.)- become non pertinent. They all amount, at one moment or another, to a subordination of the movement of différence in favor of the presence of a value or a meaning supposedly antecedent to différence, more original than it, exceeding and governing it in the last analysis. This is still the presence of what we called above the "transcendental signified. (29)

It is as if man cannot ever illustrate, and ground the foundations of language itself, it is foolish enough to utilize language to illustrate language. It is like the self-reflection of consciousness. To talk about consciousness is to talk about nothing at all, at least in Hegelian Logic, lest Plato doesn't bear grudge. The Aporia or a deadlock is what we get to at last. The Definitions of the term aporia have varied. Accordingly:

The Oxford English Dictionary includes two forms of the word: the adjective, "aporetic" which it defines as "to be at a loss," "impassable," and "inclined to doubt, or to raise objections"; and the noun form "aporia," which it defines as the "state of the aporetic" and "a perplexity or difficulty." The dictionary entry also includes two early textual uses, which both refer to the term's rhetorical (rather than philosophical) usage.

In George Puttenham's *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589) aporia is "the Doubtful, [so] called...because often we will seem to caste perils, and make doubts of things when by a plaine manner of speech we might affirm

or deny [them]." In another reference from 1657, J. Smith's *Mystical Rhetoric*, the term becomes "a figure whereby the speaker sheweth that he doubteth, either where to begin for the multitude of matters, or what to do or say in some strange or ambiguous thing" (OED). Herbert Weir Smyth's *Greek Grammar* (1956) also focuses on the rhetorical usage by defining *aporia* as "an artifice by which a speaker feigns doubts as to where he shall begin or end or what he shall do or say" (674).

More modern sources, perhaps because they come after the advent of post-structuralism, have chosen to omit the rhetorical usage of the term. In William Harmon's *A Handbook to Literature*, for example, *aporia* is identified as "a difficulty, impasse, or point of doubt and indecision" while also noting that critics such as Derrida have employed the term to "indicate a point of undecidability, which locates the site at which the text most obviously undermines its own rhetorical structure, dismantles, or deconstructs itself" (39). Wolfreys in his essay "Trauma, Testimony, and Criticism" characterizes trauma as *aporia*, a wound with unending trail. Valiur Rahaman in his book *Interpretations: Essays in Literary Theory* (2011) explained *aporia* as a creative force in both the artist and his art. It is, for him, an edgeless edge of the text or a work of art.

In this respect, it needs to be pointed out that all of deconstruction's reversals (*arche-writing* included) are partly captured by the edifice that they seek to overthrow. For Derrida, "one always inhabits, and all the more when one does not suspect it" (OG 24), and it is important to recognize that the mere reversal of an existing metaphysical opposition might not also challenge the governing framework and presuppositions that are attempting to be reversed (WD 280). Deconstruction hence cannot rest content with merely prioritizing writing over speech, but must also accomplish the second major aspect of deconstruction's dual strategies, that

being to corrupt and contaminate the opposition itself.

Derrida must highlight that the categories that sustain and safeguard any dualism are always already disrupted and displaced. To effect this second aspect of deconstruction's strategic intents, Derrida usually coins a new term, or reworks an old one, to permanently disrupt the structure into which he has intervened - examples of this include his discussion of the *pharmakon* in Plato (drug or tincture, salutary or maleficent), and the supplement in Rousseau.. To phrase the problem in slightly different terms, Derrida's argument is that in examining a binary opposition, deconstruction manages to expose a trace. This is not a trace of the oppositions that have since been deconstructed - on the contrary, the trace is a rupture within metaphysics, a pattern of incongruities where the metaphysical rubs up against the non-metaphysical, that it is deconstruction's job to juxtapose as best as it can. The trace does not appear as such (OG 65), but the logic of its path in a text can be mimed by a deconstructive intervention and hence brought to the fore.

Any interpretation is a misinterpretation by itself. No longer could the critique make its way in the texts to find the proper meaning available. Meaning would be intra-textual, maintaining no reference outside the context. No God-given, pre-given meaning struggling to transcend itself anymore, only intra-human-text. The unspoken pacts comprising a community, the phonemic system of language, seemingly self-contained; at least we cannot talk about language by language itself, all in all, are systems not directly drawn by its members. It's more like talking about gnosis in general when we are still caught in its unlimited limitations. What is gnosis, language, humanity, existence etcetera? Challenging it is not only for us living in the age of "instrumental reason" as Marcuse calls so, but for our forefathers biting dust in their graves. How could we possibly ever talk about language when we are in it, it is in us, both comingled? Horrific as it may seem that a red rose is only red and may arouse romantic aura to us not to an animal eating it instead of praising it. Yes, that's aestheticism that only we as human can live by, and

that's the popping lame answer to it. Beauty could not bear in the object due to the fact that a work of art for instance could be interpreted and seen quite differently sec by sec by the viewer coming across with it. Anyone could have a different response to an object of art due to the fact that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. Funny it seems, as a systemic-bound being, even aestheticism changes by the blink of an eye. A certain person living in a certain cultural, historical, social, psychological background could highlight or find a new aspect of the certain object. As long humanity exists and is to come, there could be possibly seemingly new interpretations and over-interpretations vis a vis.

Invention of texts had seen its swan song by the decline of the ancient Greeks. What followed onward was interpretations and over-interpretations, anti-thesis to a thesis, compromising to a synthesis which itself appeared to be thesis of another anti-thesis and ad-infinitum. The system in debate is then, itself a neophyte of the synthesis of the former thesis and anti-thesis, of self and other, human and god per se.

2. Enlightenment and The Modernity

Renascence or the age of enlightenment known today as the age of reason was the waking call for human's long lost consciousness of its existence by putting its trust in the almighty, the logos, being out there beyond our understanding far to fetch only to be believed with total obedience. After three centuries of ignorance, as being called the dark ages, not to mention before that, the social, philosophical, economical changes occurred which transformed their center of trust from being up in nowhere to down to the earth. It was impossible without the help of ancient philosophy to be interpreted from Romans and Greeks notably Aristotle as the leading character whose ideas paved the way and Descartes the French philosopher, who with his utterance of "I think, therefore I am" located the logos in humanity as the producer of meaning which is capable of reasoning.

Thereof called enlightenment, or as the Buddhist tradition which Buddha or the enlighten who is being given the *bliss* as in Joseph Campbell's terminology, so after the dark ages of ignorance which blindly led humanity to total void finally was

deformed and presented as the age of reason which gradually led to the outgrowth of human conditions in seemingly all social and technological development which its claim was the means to boon life.

Modernity simply put in Pound's term, to "make it new", was the present which the age of reason endowed us with. Modernity came true after the industrialization and French revolution which seemed yet another jostle to raze the remaining ashes of old system of thought. Things seemed to be getting better but it backlashed. The feudal and aristocratic system of the state was shattered and gave its way to capitalism. Rich got richer and poor got poorer. Instead of working for the monopolized aristocrat now it was time for the bourgeois to harness the mass and take their revenge on them. How it all came about? - One might ask. French revolution was the zenith of abomination of mass toward their monarch, the sense to emancipate to get away with their subjugation. Modern project never was completed, it neither boom nor progressed as it promised. Things worsened in the early 20th century when the Germans direly desired the Reich to be back again. The imperial tendency of other superpowers of Europe be it Britain and Spain and France as the harbinger, gave rise to another nation yearning to possess and to dominate and compete in the industrial ages which required working men and material to produce goods to be consumed, any cause whether Queen Victoria's imperial motto of bringing down the barbarous and domesticate them for Christianity to Hitler's Arianity and nationalism to utilize the herd to get the most out of the antebellum. The loss of faith in God and churches as its representatives and the instigating words of Nietzsche Marx Freud and Darwin following their predecessors put the stamp of approval for the margined states to have their share back from the imperialist powers. Two world wars were the turning point for the post-war thinkers who were thoroughly aghast and awed by the so-called human being capable of reasoning as the rational subject who is in full control of himself and his environment, they all turned on its head.

We are being indoctrinated to think rationally, prized as a feature of modernity. Thereof

we are seemingly ahead of our ancestor whom we didn't dare to question things and as the result it seems we needed to preserve it. Through the complex matrix of social activity accentuated by modernity and its doctrines not only wasn't the pursuit of knowledge was stagnant, it through "social rationalization" led the mass and their supervisors as the government or The State to come up with new gizmos and ideas in tandem with the material at hands, let's call it spirit of their age . Modernized ideas, created new and more complex problems to be dealt with concomitantly because the old concerning problems, whether being answered or not, at least were not as keen as they use to seem to be at their birth through the course of history. One of the concerns which the *Philosophe* were accosted was the nature of the society and sociality and social controls which Rousseau puts it in clear diction as being " social contract" which indicates the agreed and mostly prone dis-agreed social pact between the individuals and the state.

Growth of population and the dire need of food and health care and the growth of capitalism and its need for work labors, with low payments and high profits for the capitalists vibrated the whole social structure at both posts. As a result the mass which couldn't bear the conditions gradually were outraged to capsize the whole system, which 1917 Bolshevik revolution was a stamp of approval pursuing the Marx's clarifications of state strategies of ideology and false consciousness and alienation of the mass accordingly. At the same time the capitalists were to choose new ilk of monitoring and controlling systems to act both as a pacifier and infiltrating fear by punishment of any sorts to maintain their stability. Maximillian Robespierre, the Jacobin disciple, and the harbinger of low-lets-revolt was the first to breach its fundamentals by executing thousands even his own comrade, Stalin and Stalinism being more modernized one.

According to *the catholic encyclopedia* definition of anarchism; this is seemingly at odds with Catholicism seemingly well-wrought system of thought, as: "Anarchy means an absence of law. Sociologically it is the modern theory which proposes to do away with all existing forms of government and to organize a society which will

exercise all its functions without any controlling or directive authority."

3. Identity and Logos de-centered

Where there is no center, no logos so that the meaning maker machine could function apropos, personal identity is out of question. We are according to Derrida: "The end of man (as a factual anthropological limit) is announced to thought from the vantage of the end of man (as a determined opening or the infinity of a telos). Man is that which is in relation to his end, in the fundamentally equivocal sense of the word. Since always."

This sense of presence, ontic knowledge of self is postponed as Derrida's *différance* tale tellingly demonstrates this indecisiveness, absence of a complete total self:

- 1) *Différance* is the systematic play of differences, of the traces of differences, of the spacing by means of which elements are related to each other. This spacing is the simultaneously active and passive (the *a* of *différance* indicates this indecision as concerns activity and passivity, that which cannot be governed by or distributed between the terms of this opposition) production of the intervals without which the "full" terms would not signify, would not function.
- 2) "the *a* of *différance* also recalls that spacing is temporization, the detour and postponement by means of which intuition, perception, consummation - in a word, the relationship to the present, the reference to a present reality, to a being - are always deferred. Deferred by virtue of the very principle of difference which holds that an element functions and signifies, takes on or conveys meaning, only by referring to another past or future element in an economy of traces. This economic aspect of *différance*, which brings into play a certain not conscious calculation in a field of forces, is inseparable from the more narrowly semiotic aspect of *différance*.

Further on, Derrida continues to delineate the center as:

It has always been thought that the centre, which is by definition unique, constituted that very thing within a structure which while governing the structure, escapes structurality. This is why classical thought concerning structure could say that the centre is, paradoxically, within the structure and outside it. The centre is the centre of the totality, and yet, since the centre does not belong to the totality (is not part of the totality), the totality has its centre elsewhere. The centre is not the centre.

(Derrida 1978: 279)

This is provocative enough to argue the total absence of an imminent ontic object of identity. What is a white evil, a slippery never at hand and always already there but not feasible is what Derrida argues about the metaphysics of presence:

Différance is "what makes possible the presentation of the being-present . . . [and it] is never offered to the present" .Perhaps the temporization of essence of the reference in the discussion of différance should be understood as "reserving itself, not exposing itself" . Derrida explains that in its every presentation "[reference] would be exposed to disappearing as disappearance. [Reference] would risk appearing: disappearing".

Identity first a social and foremost a systemic lingual phenomenon, according to Clarke "Language is, therefore, not an inert object, but a teleological system, that teleology being a social teleology" is nothing more than:

Langue is the intersubjective expression of a subjective intention. Both phenomenology and those in the Prague Linguistic Circle agree on the point that language and culture are objective systems of symbols without any meaning in themselves. Language is simply an objective instrument for the purpose of communication. For phenomenologists, the meaning of any symbol within a language system is determined by those who are active in the communicative world. The particular meaning of any symbol

disappears immediately if it is isolated from those subjects

who gave this same symbol its expressive value. For phenomenologists, "language is not an object but a 'gesture' by which the subject signifies the world" (Clarke 1981: 176). However, while the Prague Linguistic Circle does adopt phenomenological insight into language, it takes langue as a subject intention. They do not take this notion to its limit. They see langue as the performative activity of those who use it. Instead of arguing that langue is the expression of inter subjectivity, they argue that linguistics is an intentional object whose structure is an expression of its function as an instrument of human communication.

In the age which all are disillusioned following the world wars and rapid degeneration of meaning due to the downfall of former icons as such and the monitoring and controlling of the individual through the mass produced gizmos and the banality of the Real and outgrowth of technology alongside the outburst of population and the need to feed them, Saramago wittily enough in his 1997 *All the names* wrote: "You know the name you are given. You don't know the name you have."

In the age which all are disillusioned following the world wars and rapid degeneration of meaning due to the downfall of former icons as such and the monitoring and controlling of the individual through the mass produced gizmos and the banality of the Real and outgrowth of technology alongside the outburst of population and the need to feed them.

Conclusion

"The crowd, in fact, is composed of individuals; it must therefore be in every man's power to become what he is, an individual. From becoming an individual no one, no one at all, is excluded, except he who excludes himself by becoming a crowd. To become a crowd, to collect a crowd about one, is on the contrary to affirm the distinctions of human life. The most well-meaning person who talks about these distinctions can easily offend an individual. But then it is not the crowd which possesses power, influence, reputé, and

mastery over men, but it is the invidious distinctions of human life which despotically ignore the single individual as the weak and impotent, which in a temporal and worldly interest ignore the eternal truth- the single individual."

Whether an individual's consciousness forms the self as a subject or is formed by the collective consciousness, or unconsciousness, the extra textuality is out of question. This is the very text that is of importance. Intertextuality is itself a matter of investigation. The unreality of the Real, Baudilardian hyper reality, swings back and forth as long as the search for an infinite or even finite meaning is a priority. This is not I but an amalgamation of I's which operates within multi-layered human consciousness. This is not a definite I which thinks and controls but the sum total of culture, society and personal experiences which works out. One might dare to say this is a life of others as long as there is no fixed I which we are living. We are not alone. That is a fact otherwise we would not need a self which stands in front of the other selves. Ironically the other is welcome as long as my virtual reality, Lacanian symbolic reality, is not trespassed by an alien; not I.

Reference

- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology* (pp. 220-511). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Freud, S. (1955). *Totem and taboo* (p. 3). London: Hogarth Press.
- _____. (1955). *Totem and taboo* (p. 38). London: Hogarth Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time* (p. 46). New York: Harper.
- Heinrich Heine, in Lutetia; or, Paris. From the Augsburg Gazette, 12, VII (1842)
- Jean Baudrillard, "Utopia Achieved" in America (1986), trans. Chris Turner, (1988), p. 95.
- Lacan, J. 2004. The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis. London: Karnac.
- "Of Grammatology", tr. by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Johns Hopkins University Press. Baltimore, 1976. From Paris to Prague: A Critique of Structuralist and Poststructuralist Thought. London: Verso, p. 220

Schopenhauer, A., & Payne, E. F. (1966). *The world as will and representation*. New York: Dover Publications.

Kierkegaard, S. (n.d.). *Either/ Or*. Place of publication not identified: Princeton University Press.

Thomas Hobbes (1651). "22. Of systemes subject, politicall, and private" in: *Leviathan*. part (The Project Gutenberg E Book of Leviathan, by Thomas Hobbes).