

Trans-Deconstruction : Theory On Monism

By Dr. Pramod Ambadasrao Pawar :

New Trends, Turns and Twists In Literary Theory



Neda Fatehi Rad* (Corresponding Author)
Assistant Professor of TEFL
Department of English Language,
Kerman Branch,
Islamic Azad University, Kerman, Iran
nedafatehi@yahoo.com



Azar Bagheri Masoudzadeh
Ph.D. in TEFL
Department of English Language,
Qeshm Branch,
Islamic Azad University, Qeshm, Iran
azar.bagheri000@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Trans-deconstruction relies on the study of the ideas of transcendentalism and the way it reflects in the literary works of art. Trans-deconstruction theory analyzes the world and the word as the key facets of in the explanation of the text. Deconstruction gives birth to Trans-deconstruction as the reader tries an incessant struggle in finding a singular meaning out of the multiplicity of meanings. The present paper views deconstruction approach and provides a critique on Trans- deconstruction focusing on theory of Monism. This work is an attempt to understand the theory of Trans-deconstruction which is a movement following Poststructuralism and Deconstruction. The paper also regards the comparison of the theory with post-Structuralism.

KEYWORDS

Deconstruction, Trans-deconstruction, Monism Theory, Structuralists

RESEARCH PAPER

Introduction

Deconstruction is an approach to understanding the relationship between text and meaning. It was originated by the philosopher Derrida (1930–2004), who defined the term variously throughout his career. In its simplest form it can be regarded as a criticism of Platonism and the idea of true forms, or essences, which take precedence over appearances. Deconstruction instead places the emphasis on appearance, or suggests, at least, that essence is to be found in appearance. Derrida would say that the difference is "undecidable", in that it cannot be discerned in everyday experiences. Deconstruction argues that language, especially ideal concepts such as truth and justice, is irreducibly complex, unstable, or impossible to determine. In the 1980s it designated more loosely a range of radical theoretical enterprises in diverse areas of the humanities and social sciences. Deconstruction was sometimes used pejoratively to suggest nihilism and frivolous skepticism. In popular usage the term has come to mean a critical dismantling of tradition and traditional modes of thought.

In all the fields it influenced, deconstruction called attention to rhetorical and performative aspects of language use, and it encouraged scholars to consider not only what a text says but also the relationship and potential conflict between what a text says and what it "does." In various disciplines, deconstruction also prompted an exploration of fundamental oppositions and critical terms and a reexamination of ultimate goals. Most generally, deconstruction joined with other strands of post structural and postmodern thinking to inspire a suspicion of established intellectual categories and a skepticism about the possibility of objectivity. Consequently, its diffusion was met with a sizeable body of opposition. Some philosophers, especially those in the Anglo-American tradition, dismissed it as obscurantist wordplay whose major claims, when intelligible, were either trivial or false. Others accused it of being ahistorical and apolitical. Still others regarded it as a nihilistic endorsement of radical epistemic relativism. Despite such attacks, deconstruction has had an enormous impact on a variety of intellectual enterprises.

Trans-deconstruction is not merely a philosophical or transcendental analysis of the text, but a ubiquitous analysis of the textual super consciousness undermining the multiplicity and open-endedness of the text. Its reading process is like breathing in what the text is truly said. It is the critical reading against the text itself along with deeper consideration of textual conscious, unconscious and super-conscious nature centering on the singularity for all the diversified discourses at the end. On the whole, its process of reading wears the crown of the center which is often fixed and functional after every analysis of the text. The center in the text is always identified and remains justified forever for every reader. Trans-deconstruction is not a simple reconstruction of the deconstructive readings, but a major focus on the singularity of textual super-consciousness in-built in the text for all the discourses in human sciences. In this theory, the binary opposition never makes the difference of privileged and sub-ordinate meanings and postpones them. In fact, all the discourses are uniformly settled down with the justified conclusions made by the eminent critics of the text. According to Dr. Pawar, Trans-deconstruction is not a method, a critique, analysis or dismantling of the text, but to pursue the singularity out of multiple meanings of the text. It deals with the theory of Monism as a strong reaction to the nature of language, the production of meaning and the relationship between literature and many discourses that structure human experience and its histories.

Monists accept that the internal and international legal systems form a unity. Both national legal rules and international rules that a state has accepted, for example by way of a

treaty, determine whether actions are legal or illegal. The monist stated, a distinction between international law in the form of treaties, and other international law, e.g., customary international law or jus cogens, is made; such stated may thus be partly monist and partly dualist. In a pure monist state, international law does not need to be translated into national law. It is simply incorporated and has effect automatically in national or domestic laws. The act of ratifying an international treaty immediately incorporates the law into national law; and customary international law is treated as part of national law as well. International law can be directly applied by a national judge, and can be directly invoked by citizens, just as if it were national law. A judge can declare a national rule invalid if it contradicts international rules because, in some states, international rules have priority.

The sign of deconstruction“ produces an effect of dissemination as any text would do according to Derrida, but also exemplifies this textual function, the reason being that it includes sign and deconstruction. Derrida’s critique of the notion of the sign, which is addressed to any sign whatsoever, affects par excellence the expression sign and the terms that he introduced to substitute for it, which are the key-concepts of deconstruction, among them the very name "deconstruction". In a sense, deconstruction is an effect of the semiotic, in the same way as dissemination. A practical consequence of the deconstruction of the sign is that one cannot use the term with full philosophical commitment in this context; it must be a provisional use, a use under erasure. Assuming this and many other Derridean precautions, which will be clarified in the course of my thesis, let us attempt to expound some of the meanings of the sign of deconstruction.

Structuralists, as bearers of a new theory and proud of it - they actually evangelize the beginning of a new science - have introduced neologisms and have re-defined most of the terms they use. They are very careful to stress that their terms are not to be assigned metaphysical associations carried over from previous usages. Inheriting a positive Enlightenment spirit, they value highly conscious innovation, the moment of epistemic rupture. As Derrida rightly observes, structuralism, as a theoretical move, needs the assumption of a rupture, a disruption. This does not mean that structuralism does not take time and history into account. It just means that one can describe what is peculiar to the structural organization only by not taking into account, in the moment of this description. By Derrida’s own admission, the term "deconstruction" demonstrates the double relationship of the Derridean project to structuralism. What he denies is that the choice of the term was intended to express a relationship to this particular movement. Deconstruction seemed to be going in the same direction since the word signified a certain attention to structures which themselves were neither simply ideas, nor forms, nor syntheses, nor systems. To deconstruct was also a structuralist gesture or in any case a gesture that assumed a certain need for the structuralist problematic. But it was also an anti-structuralist gesture, and its fortune rests in part on this ambiguity. Structures were to be undone, decomposed, desedimented. So the term deconstruction seems to simultaneously be indebted to structuralism and opposed to structuralism; precisely in the way of the Derridean project, which it ended by naming. According to Derrida, the happy coincidence was read as intentional, which directed him to include it in his definition thereafter. Deconstruction has implicitly embraced a moral principle, although its embrace is perhaps closer to the surface than that of post-structuralism. Post-structuralism and many other post discourses share a substantial research focus with Habermas and the Frankfurt School on language. But, whereas for Habermas, language is, at least potentially, a vehicle for transcending ideologies and engaging in a free and equal exchange of communicative reason in an ideal speech situation, for post-structuralist-influenced critical pedagogy, language is a socially shaped resource, steeped in culturally and historically sedimented attitudes, values, and assumptions, which precedes and exceeds any single individual. It is these coagulations of social meaning that comprise discourse, in the

sense of “ways of being in the world, or forms of life which integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes and social identities” (Gee, 1996); and it is these discourses that, in post-structuralist theory, produce, or become constitutive of, social reality. Moreover, rather than regarding language as providing a transparent mirror of nature (Rorty, 1979), where words simply and clearly represent objects or concepts, post-structuralism, in common with its forebear, structuralism, sees meaning as deriving from differences within the linguistic system, so that dog means not cat or not horse, sacred means not profane, with the consequence that words or concepts are always defined in relation to other words.

For post-structuralism, meaning is always partial and provisional, emerging as it does from an endless process of difference and deferral within the linguistic system, rather than from direct reference to the real world. This linguistic turn has significant implications for key educational notions of truth, progress, and emancipation: post-structuralism's claim “that all truths are textual, that the way we see the world is always already “infected by language” (MacLure, 2003, p. 4), means that language becomes both constitutive and –critically for education – a site of contestation, since there is no unproblematic one-to-one match between language and reality. Hence, the meaning and implications of terms like democracy and freedom invite and merit ongoing debate and negotiation, rather than being settled and simply requiring transmission to future generations. Both post-structuralists and deconstructionists seek to create a space for protecting that which does not fall easily into the traditional forms of moral discourse. But they seek not only to offer their own protection, they want us, their audience, to offer our own protection (recognition, respect, etc.). In that sense, there are universal prescriptive nascent in their work. These prescriptives are different in the two approaches, however.

Post-structuralism is concerned about the historical emergence of what Foucault has called “normalization”. Normalization is the process by which people are classified as more or less normal relative to a chosen category or activity; moreover, a classification of abnormal is held to constitute justification for intervening in order to make a person more normal. The distinction between the normal and the abnormal works differently from the distinction between the permitted and the forbidden. The latter distinction is binary; intervention is called for only when one has crossed a clear line between the permitted and the forbidden. The former distinction is gradational; one is more or less normal and more or less abnormal. Thus, on the latter distinction, intervention is almost always justified, and the area in which one is left alone can become small indeed. Post-structuralist reluctance to embrace a principle like anti-representationalism can be seen, ironically, as a way of trying to act in accordance with it.

The late twentieth-century diffusion of post-structuralism resulted in the profound destabilizing of old certainties that had once underpinned academic thought and practice across the humanities and social sciences. In human geography, as in other academic arenas, the emergence of doubts about the existence of a world filled with naturally given and enduring meanings that could be unlocked, as well as of new understandings of knowledge as inescapably partial and power-laden, produced what is referred to as a crisis of representation“. Despite the negative connotations of this expression, the emergence of geographical anxieties about representation provided a stimulus for intellectual creativity that encouraged the development of new theoretical, methodological, and thematic directions in social and cultural geography. These new directions were guided by the argument that representations are never mirror-images of reality, but instead are always the product of diverse and ever-shifting contexts, and hence are never innocent, unbiased, or divorced from the realm of power and politics. Such concerns have been shared by academics in a range of other disciplines that include art history, literary criticism, cultural studies, and anthropology, and human geographers have both drawn on and contributed to work in these other

disciplines. Despite the absence of clearly defined disciplinary boundaries, geographical approaches are nevertheless distinguished by a particularly pronounced interest in exploring the politics of representation through the prism of geographical concepts such as space, place, and landscape. As the work of post-structuralists is mainly concerned with challenging the aims and motives of existing theories and discourses, it is perhaps more accurate to think of post-structuralism in the field of international politics as a *method* or *tool of analysis*. This is particularly because, as it is examined throughout this essay, post-structuralism generally does not seek to present a specific worldview of its own. In other words, it is only by looking at how post-structuralists engage in providing critique over other viewpoints that we can really begin to understand how they think. As Michel Foucault argued, post-structuralist critique only exists in relation to something other than itself.

Conclusion

With an emphasis on multiplicity of meanings, and by coining the word Trans-deconstruction, Dr. Pawar explores the notions of stability, singularity and fixed center based on the theory of Monism. It is a challenging book that offers new insight into construction and de construction interpretations. Trans-deconstruction believes in the existence of a single reality, absolute meaning and questions all the stereotypical notions of multiplicity of meaning and non-centered text. The universe is shown through a different angle and surely will be the subject of many future debates. Deconstruction discusses the problems of the boundary of text, describing the way the text overruns the limits assigned to it. Pawar mainly focuses on the reading experience. In this way, he redefines the text and discusses the fixed center and asserts that all the meaning ultimately merges into one meaning. He rescues the reader from searching for endless multiple meaning. He however, shares some common ideas on the issues of text interpretation, intertextuality as well as the boundary of text.

WORKS CITED

- Blair, B.M. (2011). Revisiting the “Third Debate” (Part I)”, *Review of International Studies*, 37 (2), 2011, pp. 825-854.
- Bleiker, R., & Chou, M. (2010). „Nietzsche’s Style: On Language, Knowledge and Power in International Relations” in Cerwyn Moore, Chris Farrands (Eds.), *International Relations Theory and Philosophy: Interpretive dialogues* (United Kingdom: Routledge), pp. 8-19.
- Butler, J. (2001). *What is Critique? An Essay on Foucault’s Virtue*, at <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0806/butler/en/> [accessed 27 December 2016].
- Culler, Jonathan D. (1982). *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism After Structuralism* (Cornell University Press), p. 86.
- Dvetak, R. (2013). *Post-structuralism in Theories of International Relations*, Scott Burchill et al (eds.), (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), p. 188.
- Edkins, Jenny & Zehfuss, Maja (2005). „Generalising the international”, *Review of International Studies*, 31, 2011, p. 463.
- Frost, M. (2016). ‘*Language and Power: Post-Structuralist Approaches to International Relations*’, lecture delivered at King’s College London (5 December 2016).
- Foucault, M. (1997). *What is Critique?* in *The Politics of Truth*. Sylvère Lotringer and Lysa Hochroth (eds.) (New York: Semiotext).
- Merlingen, M. (2013). *Is Poststructuralism a Useful IR Theory? What About Its Relationship to Historical Materialism?*
- Pawar, Pramod, A. (2021). *Trans-deconstruction: Theory on Monism*, Cameroon: Nyaa Publishers.
- Uller, J. D. (1982). *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism After Structuralism* (Cornell University Press), p. 86.
- Valverde, M. (2011) „Law Versus History”, p. 139.