

The Conceptual Analysis of Philosophy of Co-existence

Tulsī Prajñā
46 (183-184)
ISSN : 0974-8857

Dr. Samani Shashi Prajñā*

Abstract

The co-existence of opposing pairs can be seen in each and every entity all over the world. The doctrine of *Anekānta* was newly nomenclatured by Acharya Mahāprajña (1990-2019) as the philosophy of Co-existence. I pondered upon the world of affairs, found series of pairs in every individual object of knowledge and came with the conclusion that the very essence of any substance is in its own the other. Everything is in pairs. The existence of co-opposites is a self-proven axiom. It is very nature of the object to possess the co-opposites simultaneously. It is proved that the co-opposites do not cancel each other but reinforce each other. So an humble endeavour is made to highlight the binary non-opposing attributes of the entity as found in the *anekāntic* conversation between the Mahāvīra and the Gautam and with many more disciples in canonical literature. Along with that even in the scientific world of experiments, in western logical world, in our parts of the body and in the world of experience also the philosophy of co-existence seems to be functional.

Key words

Anekānta (Multi-dimensional Perspective), *Syādvāda* (Linguistic Expression of *Anekāntic* Truth), Reality (Substance), *Naya* (Acceptance of one standpoint without negating the other standpoints)

*Dr. Samani Shashi Prajñā, Associate Prof. Deptt.of Jainology & Comparative Religion & Philosophy, Jain Vishva Bharati Institute, Rajasthan.Ladnun-341306

Introduction

Anekānta took birth on the basis of inter-dependence of two *nayas* i.e. substantial and modal viewpoint. *Syādvāda* expresses that very inter-dependence. *Anekānta* has two aspects: permanent and temporary, existence and non-existence, general and particular, one and many, expressible and inexpressible. In this case, *śāśvata* and *aśāśvata*, in ordinary or commonsense knowledge, refer to one logical subject. We do not start with a sort of Cartesian dualism. To do so would be to raise the dust and then complaining the invisibility. It is the *jīva-ajīva* independent existence that appears as the subject, which is logical and epistemological. Now how could this one subject be attributed with the contradictory predicates, *sāśvata* and *asāśvata*? Jain thinkers say that in the phenomenological world of objects, the law of contradiction as law of either thought or things cannot be sustained. Object can only differ from each other. So, no *logical* predicate or epistemological attribute can exclude the other by applying a law of contradiction and excluded middle. So a humble endeavour is made in this article to highlight the binary non-opposing attributes of the entity as found in the *anekāntic* conversation between the Mahāvīra and the Gautam and with many more disciples in canonical literature. Along with that even in the scientific world of experiments, in western logical world, in our parts of the body and in the world of experience also the philosophy of co-existence seems to be functional.

In this context, the absolute view regarding the substance and mode is not reasonable, as both are inter-related to each other. To regard one as true and another as untrue is as meaningless as to breathe without air. Substance is the uniting force through which paradoxical nature of the Reality merges into unity. Contrary to it, mode is the dividing force through which unity of Reality undergoes change and diversity. The interdependence and co-existence of substance and mode implies that mode is nothing but the changing property of a substance. When a substance passes through one condition to another and from one moment to another, without losing its essence, it is recognized as mode.¹ This is confirmed by Umāsvāti in *Sabhāsya Tattvārthādhigam Sūtrā*, which says an entity is a single whole and it has the dual aspect of change and permanence. The *SBT*, then discusses the law of contradiction and shows the absence of any opposition between permanence and impermanence, existence and non-existence as attributes of the same entity. What unites these aspects is proved through *syādvāda*.

Three fundamental Laws in the World of Logic

Contradictoriness works only in the formal logic and in the mind of a common man. What works in nature, is the law of complementary. The law of contradiction is in vogue now-a-days. Ācārya Hemacandra answering to the problem of contradiction states, 'No contradiction, when conditioned by difference of conditions. It is repeatedly asserted that existence and non-existence are always determinate. Existence is determined by the specific nature or individuality of the subject (*svarūpa*) and non-existence is in its turn determined by the nature or individuality of things which are different from the subject (*pararūpa*)'.² Thus it proves that the combination of opposites involves no contradiction. Jaina logicians firmly believe that the three contradictions namely, *sahanavasthāna virodha*, *vadhyaghātaka virodha*, *pratibandhya-pratibandhaka virodha*³ are widely accepted by almost all the philosophical systems do not apply to the doctrine of non-absolutism. Opposition (*virodha*), according to Jain Philosophy, none of which can be shown to obtain between being and non-being and so forth. Let us briefly explain the three types of contradictions in the logical world of philosophy.

1. *Vadhyaghātaka Virodha*

The first type of oppositional relation is represented by the relation of destruction, which obtains between the destroyable and the destroyer. For example, between snake and mongoose, or fire and water. The destruction in such cases is possible only when two co-existent positive fact come together into collision and the one overpowers the other. There is not such destruction between being and non-being as the two, according to the opponents itself, they do not co-exist in a common substratum even for a moment. If, however, the two are admitted to co-exist in a common substratum, none would destroy the other, because both are equally powerful on account of their independent and equally powerful origin.

2. *Sahanavasthāna Virodha*

The second type is represented by the relation of non-co-existence, which obtains between characteristics originating at different moments of time. For example, between greenness and yellowness of the selfsame mango at different moments of its existence. Yellowness in this context can only succeed greenness and can never co-exist with it. This type of opposition also

does not hold good between being and non-being. Non-being cannot inherit the locus of being, because the locus of being has ceased to exist along with the cessation of being. And non-being without a locus is as un-understandable as square-circle. So it becomes clear that pure being and pure non-being has many logical difficulties.

3. *Pratibandhya-pratibandhaka Virodha*

The third type of oppositional relation is represented by the relation of obstruction, which obtains between the obstructed and the obstructor. For example, the conjunction of a fruit with its stalk obstructs the gravitation of the fruit towards the earth. This type of opposition also is not possible between being and non-being. Being is not an obstruct or of non-being, because the existence of being does not obstruct the existence of non-being. We have already seen how the object of our experience is a synthesis of being and non-being. None of these three types of opposition can be discovered in the assertion of opposing attributes in the substratum. Contradiction or opposition, infact arises when there is mere conjunction and no real synthesis, but the Jain doctrine of *anekānta*, emphasizes on the opposites which occur without mutual separation and not contrary to it.

Ācārya Mahāprajñā remarks that there is no contradiction between the positum and the negatum. This is the implication or pre-supposition of the doctrine of conditional dialectics (*syādvāda*). It would be relevant to quote Mahāvīra Raj Galera's contention that Mahāprajñā has stipulated a few postulates in order to expand his 'Philosophy of opposites' or co-existence.⁴

- i. Co-opposites represent two mutually different directions.
- ii. Existence of co-opposites is a self-proven axiom. It is the very nature of every object to possess the co-opposites simultaneously.
- iii. Co-opposites do not cancel each other but reinforce each other.

There exists a definite co-ordination even in absolute conflict. Conversely, there exists conflict in apparent cases of harmony. This is the very basis of co-existent evolution. Mahāprajñā has established the practical utility of above postulates which can be put to good use in resolving our everyday conflicts of life. The duality of apparently contrary attributes enjoys mutual concomitance. It is on this finding that the doctrine of co-existence as a synthesis of infinite number of such dualities is established.⁵

Anekāntic Dialogues in Jaina Canonical Literature

The Jaina philosophers has shown being and non-being as simultaneously true nature of a Reality and hence we cannot agree to the law of contradiction. Absolute being and absolute non-being are certainly exclusive of each other. But this is not the case with the concrete being which alone is real according to Jaina Philosophers. The field of application of the law of contradiction, therefore, should be ascertained by the observation of concrete cases in the real world. Nathmal Tatiā says, "Our experience is thus the sole determinant of contradiction and no abstract logical formulas can give an insight into the nature of the concrete things of the world. Contradiction or opposition, infact arises when there is mere conjunction and no real synthesis but the Jain doctrine of *anekānta*, emphasizes on the opposites which occur without mutual separation and not contrary to it ". *Anekāntavāda* as a doctrine, may find its germs here in the question and answer of the master and the disciple.

The understanding of truth has been man's eternal quest. What is truth? What is Reality? What is its nature, this question is asked by Gautama to *tīrthaṅkara Mahāvīra*.

Gautama : What is truth?⁶

Mahāvīra : To be created is the essence, creation (*utpāda*) is the truth.

He began to analyze this statement. If, to be created were the truth, then creation would go on endlessly. The population would multiply to such an extent that there would not be even space for living beings and one would get mixed with other beings due to lack of space. Substances would merge into other substances and there would be no space for any new creation. Then there would be a problem. Having thus not understood, this answer pertaining to creation (*utpāda*), Gautama asked again, what is truth? Mahāvīra replied, to be destroyed (*vyaya*) is the truth. Again he began to critically analyze the statement to be created and to be destroyed is the truth. Once born and then dead, what else is left? The answer was still unclear to him. He asked yet again, what is truth? Lord answered; to be eternal (*dhrauvya*) is the truth. Gautama's mind now focus itself. To be created, destroyed, and to remain in existence, this is the three-fold truth. Then he reflected upon this three- fold truth deeply and attained to the conclusion that truth is the conflict between the eternal and non-eternal.

Now Gautama fell into trouble, how to explain the truth, which is eternal and non-eternal by nature. How to explain the multi-faceted truth through language is the first problem. This problem was being solved by the Mahāvīra, the preceptor, by implementing minimum two *nayas* for explaining the nature of Reality i.e. transcendental *naya* and conventional *naya*. *Athire pallotai no thire pallotai*.⁷, it means from the transcendental point of view, Reality is eternal and from the conventional point of view Reality undergoes change. Now Gautam understood the basic concept of Reality. Different thinkers have presented the different aspects of truth in their own way. The *Vedānta* philosophy has explained the problem from the three standpoints, namely, the ultimate, the empirical and the apparent. The *Brāhmaṇa* is the ultimate truth, while the sensuous world has only empirical validity. The cognition of the ‘will-o’ the wisp’ and dream is pure appearance. In *Hīnayāna* Buddhism the truth is of two fold, viz. ultimate and the conventional.

*arthakriyā sāmārthaṃ yat tadatra paramārtha sat,
anyat samvṛtisat proktaṃ, te svasamanyalaksane.*

It means the self nature (momentariness) of the objects is the ultimate truth on account of its being a product of the intellectual function of exclusion. So different thinkers have presented the different aspects of truth in their own way. The *Vedānta* philosophy rejected the modes as unreal, while accepting the substance alone as ultimately true. The Buddhist on the other hand, reject the substance as imaginary by accepting the Reality of the modes. According to Jain logic, both the substance and the modes are ultimately true. We have experienced that change presupposes the persistence of an underlying permanence. So permanence is to be accounted as an element in a real together with the change. But change means, the cessation of a previous mode or attribute and the coming into being of a new mode. The affirmation of the triple characteristics has therefore, nothing paradoxical about it, like a Cartesian dualism.

The word ‘*anekānta*’ was not used by Mahāvīra and does not appear in the *agamas*. Siddhasena Divākara may have been the first Jain ācārya to use this word.⁸ Take, for the instance, in next sections, Mahāvīra’s responses to the questions posed by Indrabhūti Gautama, one of the twelve *gaṇadharās* and the principal disciples of Mahāvīra, Jayantī, a devotee, inquisitive *śrāvikā*

(lay-women) and sister of king *atānīka*, and Somila, a dedicated and learned *śrāvaka* (lay-man).

The substance present itself when our thinking is synthetic, losing all its modes and when our approach is analytical, the modes become prominent at the cost of the substance. In the formative period of *anekānta*, some principles of logical concomitance were discovered and that constituted an epoch-making achievement of that age. They are as follows:

Co-existence of the Permanent and the Impermanent

The first axiom of *anekānta* or non-absolutism is the concomitance of the permanent and the impermanent, the truth of one is verified by the truth of the other. The *anekāntic* dialogue goes as,

Gautama : Is the soul permanent or impermanent?

Mahāvīra : The soul is permanent as well as impermanent.

From the substantial point of view, soul neither originates nor perishes, so it is permanent. From the conventional point of view, the modes of knowledge and intuition of consciousness (soul) originates and perishes. In case of matter also Mahāvīra said that from the above mentioned two *nayas*, matter is also permanent and impermanent both.⁹

Gautama understood the nature of two basic Realities namely, *jīva* and *ajīva*. So the right worldview towards the life and world of affairs aroused in him. He began to apply this formula of two fold perspectives and began to think whether the unstable changes or the stable changes. He wanted to solve this problem that origination and cessation occurs in the modes or in permanent nature of the substance. Where the change does occurs and what makes the Reality to be permanent. In the quest of the truth, he had a series of conversations with the Mahāvīra regarding axiomatic nature of Reality.

The *anekāntic* dialogue are illustrations, which throws light on the Philosophy of co-existence.

Co-existence of One and Many

Somila : O Lord! Are you one or many?

Lord: "I am one, in respect of substance, O Somila. However, in respect of knowledge and intuition, I am two. In respect of parts (constituents of a substance), I am immutable, eternal and unchanging. I am many, in respect of the ever-changing phases of my consciousness."¹⁰

The nature of the substance and modes entails the relationship of one and many, universal and particular, permanent and impermanent. The substance is one while the modes are many. The substance stands for the universal and modes for the particular. The substance is eternal, while the modes are changeable.

Co-existence of the Speakable and Unspeakable

A substance is possessed of an infinite number of attributes. It is, however, not possible to express in language those infinite number of attributes taking place every moment. Besides, our span of life and also the range of language have their own limitations. A substance is unspeakable on account of this infinitude of the aspects of a thing.¹¹ Only one attribute can be spoken of, in one moment and many in many moments, but never all during a stretch of time. A thing is thus speakable with reference to only a limited number of its attributes.

Co-existence of Slumber State and Awakening State

Lord Mahāvīra himself explained many a problem by means of this method of division. Once Jayantī asked the Lord, which was better between the states of slumber and awakening? O Jayantī!¹² For some souls, the slumber state is commendable, but for others, awakening is wholesome.

Why is it so, O Lord!?

The exclusive assertion of the wholesomeness of slumber or awakening would be an absolutistic answer, which was not approved by Lord Mahāvīra and he explained all the questions by means of divisions of issues avoiding exclusiveness. The empirical world is known as logically speaking, through subject and predicates; metaphysically speaking, subjects having attributes.

Co-existence of Auspicious and Inauspicious Renunciation

Gautama : If one says, I have renounced to commit violence to all *prāṇa* (two to four sensed beings i.e. mobiles), *bhuta* (one sensed beings i.e. plants etc. or immobiles), *sattva* (all first four immobile living beings), *jīva* (five sensed beings). Then, is such renouncement auspicious or inauspicious? Mahāvīra : In some context, it is auspicious and in other, inauspicious.

Gautama : Lord! What is the reason behind this statement?¹³

Mahāvīra : The person who is ignorant and can't differentiate between soul and non-soul, mobile and immobile beings, such persons restrain is inauspicious restrain. Such persons don't speak truth. But on the other hand, who has discretion between soul and non-soul, mobile and immobile brings, such persons restrain is auspicious restrain and such person always speaks truth.

Similarly, we have numerous dialogues regarding the problem, whether it is good to be weak or good to be strong?¹⁴ Whether the souls are mobile or immobile? Whether the souls are powerful or powerless? Whether the body is identical with soul or different? So on and so forth. All the replies of Mahāvīra were given in *anekāntic* style.

Philosophy of Co-existence of Pairs in the World of Experience

Change and permanence is the nature of Reality. *Anekānta* accepts the co-existence of both the opposites as a fact. Nothing in this world is without limits. Everything has its limits. There is a need for equanimity. Loss and gain, both are to be accepted. It is the norm of life that if there is gain, there will also be loss and vice-versa or the other way round. The two are not distanced; they are mutually connected and go together. Gain is linked to loss and loss to gain. The two are one. The difference is only in time and space. There is no distance between happiness and sorrow. There is no distance between life and death. They both go together. Sometimes one feels happy and life seems bright and sometimes one feels sad and life seems miserable. It is a single chain. The wheels bring in water, empty it and return. The Wheels full of water and empty of water keep coming and going. They work together. New para Life and death work together. There is no second that belongs entirely to life or entirely to death. The first second of life is also the first second of death. Death is not an event, which takes place after 70-80 years. It can take place even in the first second. With the first second of birth, the event of death also takes place. The one, who does not die in the first second will become immortal, he will never die. The one who is not born in the first second cannot be created in the next. Every object experiences birth every second. Creation and destruction go hand in hand. One cannot find even one man who has been only praised, never condemned or always condemned and never praised. Both go together. The balance is maintained.

The problem arises when one doesn't identify oneself with the problem. If there is emotional distance from the problem, then one will be able to maintain one's equanimity in tough situations. This is a good way to tackle the problems. But man is strange. They want gain, but not loss, they want joy, but not sorrow, they want life, but not ready to accept death and wish to be praised, never condemnation. They then forget the universal rule. In this dualistic world, nothing comes alone. Everything is in pairs. Man is ignorant. He wants to break the order of *anekāntic* nature of Reality and wants only a single dimension and through such one-sided perspective, one cannot lead a life of equanimity.

Now we will proceed towards the detailed implications of Philosophy of Co-existence. The Philosophy of co-existence as propounded by Mahāprajñā has its roots in the Jain *āgam*-s. *Thāṇam*, *Nandī* and *Daśavaikālika Sūtras* have the description of opposite couplets in plenty. Some of them are as follows: *dharmāstikāya-adharmāstikāya, loka-aloka, bandha-moksha, puṇya-pāpa, āshrava-saṃvara, jiva-ajiva, trus-sthāvar, dharmā-adharma, vedanā-nirjarā* etc.¹⁵ Similar seven pairs are mentioned in *Nandī Sūtra* of 'shrut gyan'.¹⁶ In the *Daśavaikālika Sūtra*,¹⁷ the four key emotions, Anger, Ego, deceit and Greed are prominently discussed. The *Sūtra* states that these emotions co-exist with the contrasting feelings. Anger can be diluted by forgiveness and Ego with humility. It is deceit with straight-forwardness and greed by equanimity. Greed can be overcome is that the opposites coexist.

Opposing Pairs in Our Body

There is co-existence of opposing pairs in our body too. In our body there are billions of cells. Every second, five crore cells are being destroyed and new five crore cells are being created. This co-existence is continual. If the cells did not die, then the body would become useless. If new cells were not created, then the body would break down. When both the activities co-exist, then the body lives on. Likewise, in our body exhalation and inhalation both co-exist, then the body lives on. There are two centres in our body: the *gyan kendra* or the centre of wisdom and the *Kām Kendra* or the centre of passion. Both of them are opposites. The centre of passion weighs down the consciousness. The centre of wisdom raises the level of the consciousness. One is upward moving and the other is downward moving, the consciousness

is in opposition to each other. Life rests on these two movements.¹⁸ There are two types of nerves, sensory and motor nerves, right hemisphere and left hemisphere, sympathetic and parasympathetic nervous system (in *āyurveda-idā nādi* and *pingalā nādi*) works with full co-operation.

In science, there are two centres referred to as glands. One is the pineal-pituitary gland and the other the gonads. The pineal and the pituitary are centers that promote wisdom. Gonads promote passions. Our consciousness depends on the functioning of the pineal and the pituitary. When the secretions of the pineal and pituitary reach gonads, then passions are inflamed. But when these secretions change, then the action of the hypothalamus changes and there begins the growth of wisdom. Both the opposing themes are built within our physical system. Opposing forces are acting in the creation of the body, in the creation of nature, and in the creation of electricity too. In the world of electricity, both the negative and the positive energies work together. If there were only the positive and no negative, then no electricity would be produced. It is compulsory for both the positive and the negative to exist for electricity to be produced. Thus our entire existence is characterized by opposing pairs.

Abstract Pairs in Jaina Philosophy

It is quiet relevant to quote the series of pairs as mentioned in the book, 'Anekantvada through Paintings', to highlight the very nature of objective world having the opposing pairs together . They are as follows:

1. *Pratyakśha* : *Paroksa* (Direct and Indirect)
2. *Rūpa* : *Arūpa* (Form and Formless)
3. *Śatru* : *Mitra* (Friend : Foe)
4. *Śiti* : *Aśiti* (Black : White)
5. *Janma* : *Marāṇa* (Life : Death)
6. *Adhyātma* : *Laukika Dharma* (Spiritual : Mundane Customs)
7. *Śaraṇa* : *Āśaraṇa* (Shelter and Shelterlessness)
8. *Samyama* : *Asamyama* (Restraint and Unrestraint)
9. *Lipta* : *Nirlipta* (Attached : Detached)
10. *Harṣa* : *Viṣāda* (Enjoyment : Misery)
11. *Dharma* : *Adharma* (Violence : Non-violence)
12. *Śuci* : *Aśuci* (Beauty : Non-beauty)

13. *Kendra* : *Paridhi* (Centre : Circumference)
14. *Yukta* : *Mukta* (Coalesced : Liberated)
15. *Śuddha* : *Ásuddha* (Pure : Impure)
16. *Antah* : *Bāhya* (Internal : External)
17. *Sukha* : *Dukha* (Happiness and Sorrow)
18. *Śītala* : *Uṣṇa* (Coolness : Brightness)
19. *Kṛṣṇa* : *Śukla* (Waning Moon : Waxing Moon)
20. *Antarmukhi* : *Bahirmukhi* (inwardly Drawn : Outwardly Drawn)
21. *Gati* : *Āgati* (Movement : Non-movement)
22. *Jīva* : *Ajīva* (Living : Non-living)
23. *Sāpekṣa* : *Nirpekṣa* (Relatedness : Unrelatedness)
24. *Praṣṇa* : *Uttara* (Question : Answer)
25. *Svarga* : *Naraka* (Heaven : Hell)
26. *Sacela* : *Acela* (Attired : Unattired)
27. *Bandhana* : *Mukti* (Bondage : Liberation)
28. *Abhāva* : *Ananta* (Absence : Fullness)
29. *Khaṇḍana* : *Mandana* (Refuting : Establishing)
30. *Padārtha* : *Ātmā* (Matter : Soul)¹⁹

It is a common question in the minds of many that the assertion of *anekānta*, as both being and non-being is self-contradictory. In our day-to-day experience we don't perceive these two opposing ideas in one and the same time. But the above mentioned examples of co-existence of opposing pairs proves that they are real nature of the subject or the object.

The Philosophy of Co-existence and its Conceptual Analysis

The doctrine of *anekānta* forms the corner-stone of Jain philosophical thinking. According to the Jains, we find a multiplicity of reals in the world and each object of knowledge is found to be endowed with infinite characteristics. The infinite number of characteristics, though appear to be mutually contradictory, are, in fact, the inalienable part of a real. As a matter of fact, a Reality is an integrated whole of infinite qualities or attributes. They do certainly, say the Jains, co-exist in the same object. This co-existence of mutually opposed characteristics should be accepted as a Reality. This is the intrinsic nature of the Reality. If we deny this, then there arise various sorts

of complications and confusions, which lead to conflicts, strifes and tensions. Seeing widely differing theories in the same subject one is apt to get confused, hardly knowing which of them represents the correct position. Here *anekāntavāda* comes to our aid and rescue, and provides an amicable solution to controversies.

Ken Wilber says that one can notice that all spatial and directional dimensions have opposites : up vs. down, Inside vs. outside, high vs. low, long vs. short, north vs. south, big vs. small, here vs. there, top vs. bottom, left vs. right etc. All the things we consider serious and important are one pole of a pair of opposites: good vs. evil, life vs. death, pleasure vs. pain, freedom vs. bondage. So also our social and aesthetic values are always put in terms of opposites: success vs. failure, beautiful vs. ugly, strong vs. weak, intelligent vs. stupid. Even our highest abstractions rest on opposites. Logic, for instance, is concerned with the true vs. false, epistemology, with appearance vs. Reality, massive collection of opposites. It is certainly true that some of the things which we call opposites appear to co-exist in nature.²⁰ Modern physics, in short proclaims that Reality can only be considered a union of opposites. In Von Bert Alanffy's phrase, '*anekānta*' is nothing but, complimentary aspects of the two opposites, one and the same Reality. When we acknowledge of the two opposites but ignore their inner unity, we see that the opposites are just two different names for one process.²¹ The theory of *anekānta* means acceptance of co-existence of all events or opposite *pariyāyas*, in historical narrative.²² Galera rightly says that life and universe is nothing but a delicate balance of opposing forces, conflicting particles, contrasting energies and divergent view-points, no adjective, no verb exists in this entire world, which doesnot have an antonym. Without the pairing opposite the world will lose its meaning.²³

Contemporary science also tells us that if there is a universe, there has to be an anti-universe. If there is a particle, there has to be an anti-particle too. If there is an atom, there is an anti-atom also. If there is substance, there is anti-substance too. Every object is connected to its opposite object. In the quest for anti-particles, scientists have used micro-instruments as tools. A micro instrument was invented which could measure the subtle changes taking place in the 15th billion part of one second. Then the anti-particle was found. Today it is more than established that without the anti-particle, the particle would have no existence. It is mandatory for both to exist. Ācārya

Mahāprajñā says, “The basic principle of *anekānta* is the acceptance of the existence of opposition. *Anekānta* is built on this.²⁴ Truth is multifaceted and hence there are many aspects of it and many angles to observe it.²⁵”

Conclusion

Thus our entire existence is characterized by opposing pairs. It is a common question in the minds of many that the assertion of *anekānta* as both being and non-being is self contradictory. In our day-to-day experience we perceive these two opposing ideas one and at the same time. The above mentioned examples of co-existence of opposing pairs proves that they are real nature of the subject or the object. Co-existence of opposing qualities don't oppose each other but are compliment and supportive to one another, We must not only learn to tolerate our differences, we must welcome them as the richness and diversity, which can lead us to true intelligence as rightly said by Albert Einstein. Co-existence implies tolerance and freedom of thought. Both tolerance and freedom of thought are meaningless if we try to enforce our likes, ideas, life-style and principles and all on others. Beauty will lose all its charms and meaning, if all plants, trees and flowers look alike. The combined principle of *satyam* (truth), *shivam* (benefaction), *sundaram* (beauty) adheres in the the principle of unity in diversity and diversity in unity. It is only the above harmony which forms the basis of co-existence. We see others through the stereotype mindset. Empathy makes us to know that the other is not an object, but a breathing, thinking, feeling subject like ourselves.

References

1. *Pañṇavaṇā Vr̥tti, Patra*, 254.
2. *Pramāṇa Mīmāṃsā* of Hemachandra. Ed. Sukhalalji Sanghavi and others, Saraswati Oriental Series No. 1. Ahmedabad : Saraswati Pustak Bhandar. 2nd edn. 1989, p. 12.
3. Mahāprajñā, *Ekānta Mai Anekānta : Anekānta Mai Ekānta*. Ed. Sādhvi Vishruta Vibha. Delhi : Jain Vishva Bharati. 2006, pp. 224-225.
4. Mahaveer Raj Galera, *Jain Studies and Science*, Ladnun : Jain Vishva Bharati Institute. 2009, p. 38
5. Ācārya Mahāprajñā *New Dimensions In Jaina Logic* Ladnun: Jain Vishva Bharati. 1984, p. 72.

6. Mahāprajña, Ācārya *Anekānta : The Third Eye*, pp. 2-3.
7. *Bhagavaī* Ed. Ācārya Mahāprajña.Ladnun : Jain Vishva Bharati.1997, 2.1.2.
8. Ācārya Mahāprajña *Anekānta : Reflections and Clarifications* Ladnun : Jain Vishva Bharati Institute.2001, p. 9.
9. *Bhagavaī*, op.cit., verse 7.2.58-59.
10. *Bhagavaī*, op.cit., 18.10.219-220.
11. *Viśeṣāvaśyaka Bhāṣya* of Jinabhadra Gaṇī.Ed. Dalsukha Malvaniya and Becharadasji, Lal Bhai Dalpatabhai.Ahmedabad : Bhārtīya Samskṛti Vidyāmandir.Vol.-I, 1968, verse 450; Mahāprajña.*Anekānta : Views & Issues*, op.cit., p. 44.
12. *Bhagavaī*, op.cit., 12.2.53.
13. *Bhagavaī*, op.cit.,7.2.27.
14. *Bhagavaī*, op.cit., 12.2.55.
15. *Thānam*, Ed. Muni Nathmal, JVBI, Ladnun, 1976, 2.1
16. *Nandī Sūtra*, Ed. Mahāprajña. With Prākṛt Text, Sanskṛt Renderings, Hindi Translation, Comparative Notes and Various Appendixes.Ladnun : Jaina Vishva Bharati,1997, Sūtra ,4.55.
17. *Daśvaiāliyam*, Ed. Muni Nathmal.With Prākṛt Text, Sanskṛt Renderings, Hindi Translation and Critical Annotations, Ladnun : Jain Vishva Bharati.1975, Sūtra , 8.37.
18. Mahāprajña, *Anekānta: The Third Eye*, op.cit., P. 6.
19. Manju Nahata. *Anekantvada Through Paintings*. Delhi : Motilal Banarasidass. 2012, pp.17-19.
20. Ken Wilber. *No Boundry : Eastern and Western Approaches to Personal Growth* Boston : Shambhala, 2001, p. 16.
21. Ken Wilber *No Boundry*, op.cit., p. 23.
22. Mahāprajña. *Ekānta Mai Anekānta : Anekānta Mai Ekānta*. Ed. Sādhvi Vishruta Vibha.Delhi : Jaina Vishva Bharati.2006 p.214.
23. Mahaveer Raj Galera. *Jain Vidyā Aur Vigyān* Ed. Sādhvi Rajeemati, Samani Mangalprajna.Ladnun : Jain Vishva Bharati Institute.2005p,35.
24. Mahāprajña *Anekānta : The Third Eye*, op.cit., p. 9.
25. *Sanmati Tarka* of Siddhasena, Ed. Sukhalal Sanghavi and Pandit Becardasji, Ahmedabad : L.D. Institute of Indology, 2000, 3. 47.