

## Chapter I

### Rationality, Non-rationality and Irrationality

In the philosophy of 18th century rationalism is a method of inquiry that regards reason as the chief source and test of knowledge and in contrast to empiricism, tends to discountenance sensory experiences. It holds that, because reality itself has an inherently rational structure, there are truths—especially in logic and mathematics as well as in ethics and metaphysics—that the intellectuals can go directly. In ethics, rationalism relies on a natural light, and in theology it replaces supernatural revelation with reason. Rationalism in general is a theory or practice which claims to be based on rational principles. For Spinoza an idea "is one and the same thing with its object" because it is an intelligible expression mathematically mediated (qtd. in Randall 438). For Spinoza, knowledge is a system of ideas logically ordered. Human mind reflects the logical structure of the universe connected with the province of reason whose connection with the natural universe is clear and structural. In practical context, rationality is the adaptation of means for an end which is not to be confused with selfishness. It is possible to be rational in the pursuit of altruistic ends. A logical argument is sometimes described as rational if it is logically valid. However, rationality is a much broader term than logic, as it includes uncertain but sensible arguments based on probability, expectation, personal experience and the like, whereas logic deals principally with probable facts and demonstrably valid relations between them. The adjective 'rational' is used to characterize both agents and specific beliefs. In both cases rationality can be contrasted with either non-rationality or irrationality. A being who is capable of being rational but who regularly violates the principles of rational assessment is irrational.

Reason begins with Pythagorean tradition claims that what is real must have a definable form. Things are in virtue of their forms. The classification of moral concepts is the first step to any improvement in practice. For Plato, geometry is the model of science. It is believed that even God geometricizes the mode of knowing. Aristotle invents the science of logic. For him man is pre-eminently a rational animal.

Plotinus and Neo-Platonists are persuaded that logical knowledge alone is inadequate. Neo-Platonism presents a more organic view and stocks logical process on the certainty, and the attempt to ground philosophy in science becomes more popular with the growth of natural science which are actually engaged in emphasizing the frontiers of knowledge through observation and experimental verification. Though the methodology of science studies processes by which beliefs grow and thoughts evolve, its actual interest is more in the grammar of discovery than in life itself. The latter by its very nature sets limits to logical expositions.

The first exponent of this rationalism in modern times was 17th century philosopher Rene Descartes, with whom modern European philosophy takes a new direction. For him truth means definite and distinct methodology. Whatever can be expressed in mathematical form is clear and distinct. Jostin Gaarder comments, "Yes Descartes was a mathematician; he is considered the father of analytical geometry, and he made important contributions to the science of algebra. Descartes wanted to use the 'mathematical method' even for philosophizing" (197).

Descartes sets forth a system of universal notion of reason, which is derived from a consideration of certain fundamental logical and mathematical relationships. For Spinoza, even ethics should be treated by the geometrical method. Spinoza went even further and declared that the order and connection of ideas is the same as order

and connection of things, that a perfectly rational system of ideas is the order of nature; it is both fact and theoretical system. Fuller puts reason in these words:

We must be guided by certain axioms. Like the laws of self-contradiction and excluded middle, the principle of sufficient reason and the assumption that the nature of the real is rational and conversely, that reason is the test of truth. (74)

For Leibniz they were certain innate ideas implanted by God in the mind of every soul. He also focused that with sufficient intelligence one could see every fact in the world which gets entailed by each other. Joad puts Leibniz' reason in this way:

Thus, it is necessary that the sufficient reason which has no more need of another reason should be found outside the series of contingent things in a substance which is the cause of the contingent things-that is, in a necessary being carrying in itself the reason of its existence; otherwise there would still be no sufficient reason at which one could end. Now this last reason of things is called God. (110)

This way Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz believed that the unaided reason can itself discover certain basic truths and building logically upon them, erect a complete system of metaphysics. They believe that they could enunciate the set of principles which define the universal form of reality and which make the world intelligible.

Kant's logic of synthesis postulates an intelligible world as a foundation of ethics. Actually Kant believes that reason can be a true means for emancipation. Reason liberates us from our ignorance and superstition and guides us towards freedom. Whenever there is reason, there is solution to the problem of life. Kant says, "Enlightenment is man's release from his self-incurred tutelage" (154). This view of the world as a complete rational system was developed with unexampled

thoroughness by Hegel, who is the outstanding rationalist of history. His model in explaining the world, however, is not a mathematical system but an organism or mind, whose parts are so interrelated that none of them can be understood except through their relation to the whole. In Hegel, logic ceases to be a mere theory of thought, but becomes an account of reality. It is an abstract representation of an actual process by which the absolute spirit reveals itself as the universe in the different forms which the universe assumes to human consciousness, nature, history, society, art and religion. What is rational is real and vice versa. Fuller writes Hegel's reason in following manner:

The absolute idea is once and for all made manifestation the highest plane of its self-expression. Pure reason by pure reasoning has wholly laid bare its own essence, and since thought and existence are identical has in so doing revealed the essence of the real. (336)

Hegel's concept of history as the manifestation of spirit in the three fold moments of thesis, antithesis and synthesis is an intellectual scheme, which gives reason a supreme place in the world history of knowledge has led the realistic thinkers to devote their major energies to the precise formulation of specialised problems. Broadly, similar rationalistic system were developed in England by F.H. Bradley and in America Josiah Royce.

The major character, Yossarian and his various situations make morality as a counter to governmental use of authority and power in a military bureaucracy. Yossarian, a soldier in World War II, and his squadron's fate are placed in the hands of a group of leaders who are willing to sacrifice their men's lives for personal gain in the form of recognition. In the authoritative use of bureaucracy the men are led into futile situations. By use of bureaucracy rule they not only discard logic, but also has

no regards for its defenders. How Colonel Cathcart logic can be circumvented in order to force Yossarian and his squadron to suffer through numerous personal situation and remain at war in a sort of bureaucratic military entrapment. He makes such policies that require men to fly eighty missions before sent home and thereby jeopardizes their lives. Seeing all these situations, Yossarian uses the illogical laws of their war bureaucracy to his advantage in order to survive and he discounts *Catch-22* by opting for a different way out of war. He deserts his unit and goes to Sweden, a neutral country and rejects the military bureaucracy. By this *Catch-22* a contradictory condition of circular reasoning that holds its sufferer in its irrational environment and benefits only those who have made the law. This way state becomes irrational violating its regulation in illogical way. The representative of state Colonel Cathcart raises a number of missions to entrap the army for his promotion. Similar way, Yossarian becomes irrational with out giving attention to his moral duty and questioning the oath of nationality. Yossarian makes different pretentions, sometimes being a patient in hospital and going to Doc Daneeka to ask leave for home.

Book *Catch-22* is a novel that tells the story of Captain Joseph Yossarian, a member of a US Army bomber pilots stationed in the Mediterranean island of Pianosa. The central character is Yossarian who rebels against the dangerous and insane, bureaucratically structured war trying to escape home for his life. His commander, Colonel Cathcart makes it impossible by constantly raising the number of missions men have to fly before they leave in order to boost his prestige within the army. His personal ambitions override any concern for the men under his command. The title *Catch-22* refers to the logical contradiction which occur in bureaucratic structures. In this case, *Catch-22* for Yossarian is that the number of missions he must fly is always raised before he reaches the limit. A Doc Daneeka explains to him, he

can only be grounded if he is crazy, but if he asks to be let out of the army or if he acts crazily, then he is obviously not crazy. This would be the sane act of a man who wants to get out of an insane situation. Doc Daneeka explains to Yossarian the fearful beauty of the catches:

Sure there's a catch," Doc Daneeka replied "*Catch-22*. Anyone who wants to get out of combat duty isn't really crazy." There was only one catch and that was *Catch-22*, which specified that a concern for one's own safety in the face of dangers that were real and immediate was the process of a rational mind .... "That's some catch, that *Catch-22*," he observed. "It's the best there is," .... (55)

In this way, the circular reasoning of *Catch-22* creates a no-win situation.

Yossarian is not crazy; his only goal is to stay alive.

Throughout the novel in *Catch-22* Yossarian tries to impose his own sense of order on chaos and irrationality of the war. He needs predictability and the assurance that he has a degree of control over events so that he can make appropriate choice to get what he wants. Intellectually, he accepts that circumstances are beyond his control, and that unpredictable events will interfere with his plans and frustrate him. His emotional response is driven by fear and doubt. The greatest obstacle, and his main source of frustration, is *Catch-22*. Yossarian does not want any mission to fly so Major Major argues with Yossarian saying that he would like to see their country lose? But Yossarian replies:

We won't lose. We've got more men, more money and more material. There are ten million men in uniform who could replace me. Some people are getting killed and a lot more are making money and having fun. Let somebody else get killed. (113)

In this way Yossarian sees war as meaningless and wants to get out from it. This act of rational response makes him irrational who does not obey rules and regulation of the state.

Near the end of the novel Yossarian recalls his attempt to save Snowden, his friend and fellow crewman Yossarian fights to save Snowden at first unaware of his massive injuries. Yossarian moral core is in danger of destruction, just as Snowden's guts already blown away. Yossarian tried to help Snowden by applying a tourniquet because it was the only thing he knew how to do. Yossarian decides to return to the hospital because it was the only place where he took rest without getting of flying bombing missions. Yossarian persists out of some strong cause problem for the powers that be when he returns to his base.

Finally, Yossarian decides to run away from the war because the military bureaucracy is ready to plot and lie against him just to continue the war effort. Major Danby asks Yossarian to think of his country. But Yossarian says he is in more danger than the country is. Yossarian takes this action after so many of his friends have died in the war. He is rejecting the status of being vegetable and re-establishes his identity as a human being. Although he may indeed be caught and punished by the military bureaucracy, the individual has triumphed against the institution because he is no longer afraid of the punishment that the institution uses against such behaviour. This rational search of individuality makes Yossarian as an irrational character in the novel.

Here, the present research is concerned on the novel *Catch-22* indicating irrationality in both state and its resistance. Why does the protagonist struggle to escape from his responsibility? Why does Colonel Cathcart, the representative of the state raise number of missions against the army in the war? On the basis of these

questions we can say that there is irrationality in both state and its resistance. This research provides answers of these questions. Yossarian, protagonist of the novel tries to escape from his responsibility on different pretensions. His focus is gone on life and individuality rather than nationality. These all problems are created by Colonel Cathcart who raises unending missions upon innocent army for his self promotion on the basis of rational rules but these rules are irrational within system. To prove this hypothesis the primary source will be the text itself. To prove irrationality, rationalism will be my tool for research. In the process of analyzing the text, all available supportive materials will be incorporated. Apart from these, some important terms like system, rule, logic and rationality will be used to prove this thesis. To prove hypothesis, the activities of protagonist and representative of state Colonel Cathcart's role will be center of focus including other minor characters, business person, doctors etc.

To prove irrationality, rationalism is an important tool to interpret the novel. Therefore it is planned to assign first chapter in giving introduction. Then second chapter will be rationalism as a theoretical tool. The third chapter will be devoted to textual analysis on the basis of theoretical perspective and final chapter will be conclusion.

### **Literature Review**

Joseph Heller's *Catch-22* has been criticized from many perspectives since its publication in 1961. The major trends of study, in terms of *Catch-22* are black humour, social satire and antiwar novel.

In this regard, Victor A. Hamer focuses on misadventures of Yossarian. Hamer says:



Heller Joseph is an American novelist who established his reputation with the comic novel *Catch-22*. The title describes the accumulated absurdities that characterize many complex organizations. The novel is set during World War II and describes the misadventures of Yossarian, an ability to maneuver with an illogical military system. (177)

In above lines, A. Hamer comments on *Catch-22* as a comic satirical novel during the Second World War and describes the misadventures of Yossarian who does not fight for nation rather he wants to escape from illogical war.

Likewise, Malcolm Bradbury focuses illogicalities of war in which men lose their lives without reason. In his own words, "*Catch-22* is a novel ostensibly about American flyers in Italy during the Second World War as a set of illogicalities and conspiracies where battles were fought and lives lost for no intelligible reason" (199).

Similarly, David Seed analyzes *Catch-22* as a satirical novel and writes the novel criticizing the pretensions rhetoric of war and the rash public values of American society. He says, "He situates Heller's work in what he describes a gap between political rhetoric and national reality and analyzes *Catch-22* with special attention to Heller's satirical gaze, which is focused closely on the public values of American life" (112).

Melvin Seiden comments the novel in a different way, focusing upon the hero. He comments as, "*Catch-22* is completely unpatriotic and thrives on the Falstaffin proposition that it is better to be alive coward than a dead hero" (409). In this way, Melvin observes protagonist as an anti-hero who wants to remain coward. Hero wants to escape from war, but soldier should fight for the nation, he is not a general people. In this way, he proves himself an irrational hero.

Julian Mitchell observes the novel having modern epic quality and tries to compare it with Iliad in the following manner, "*Catch-22* is, in fact, surrealist Iliad, with a lunatic high command Mitchell instead of gods and a coward for a coward hero ..." (301).

Likewise, Robert Brustein, in his "The Logic of Survival in a lunatic world" has commented on the novel as based on an unconventional but utterly convincing internal logic. For him, it is a triumph of Mr. Heller's skill that is so quickly able to persuade us (1) the most lunatic are the most logical, and (2) that it is our conventional standards which lack any logical consistency. Brustein further insists:

This gives the reader an effect of surrealist dislocation, full of complicated reversals, swift transitions, abrupt shifts in chronological time, and manipulated identities ... as if all human kind was determined by a mad and merciless mechanism. (13)

Thus, Brustein has viewed the situation of mankind ruled by a merciless system. Man's dislocated existence in this system suggest his pathetic condition. Moreover, he is totally trapped in the maze of complicated reversals and abrupt shift that symbolically represent the illogical and irrationality of the human world.

Despite all these multiplicity of interpretations, the present research will be confined to view the novel as a play of irrational law, struggles between state and its resistance, both are concerned about their own selfish interest. In order to prove this, the second chapter will be centered on rationalism as a theoretical aspect.

## Chapter II

### Rationalism: A Historical Perspective

Rationalism is the philosophical view that regards reason as the chief source and test of knowledge. Holding that reality itself has an inherently logical structure, the Rationalists assert that a class of truth exists that the intellect can grasp directly. There are, according to Rationalists, certain rational principles especially in logic and mathematics, and even in ethics and metaphysics that are so fundamental that to deny them is to fall into contradiction. The Rationalist's confidence in reason and proof tends, therefore, to detract him from his respect for other ways of knowing. In stressing the existence of a 'natural light', Rationalism has also been the rival of system claiming esoteric knowledge whether from mystical experience, revelation, or intuition, and has been opposed to various forms of irrationalism that tend to stress the biological, the unconscious, or the existential at the expense of rational.

Rationalism is as a way of knowing, the method of establishing propositions by reason, or deduction, usually involving premises stating general ideas or principles. A priori method opposed to intuition and empiricism. Pure mathematics is the prime example of rationalism. Rationalism begins with epistemological Rationalism in ancient philosophies. The first western philosopher to stress rationalist insight was Pythagoras, a shadowy figure of the 6th century BC. He is a mathematician, and discovered that the square on the hypotenuse of right angled triangle is equal to the sum of the squares on the other two sides. Pythagoras held that harmonies reflected the ultimate nature of reality in octave. Regarding Pythagoras view John Lewis writes in his book *History of Philosophy*, "He was a scientist. He discovered that the earth was a sphere. He also discovered that the pitch of notes is determined by the

proportionate lengths of the vibrating string, so that a string of half the length of another one gives note exactly an octave higher” (24).

Pythagoras was fascinated by numbers. “*Thing were numbers*” (24) that the cosmos was a harmony of divine perfection exemplified by the relation between numbers.

Pythagoras was also a mystic. He regarded mathematics as spiritual discipline leading to the discovery of abstract general truths. These exist on a higher and more spiritual level than mere facts and so the spirit is elevated to this higher sphere by mathematical study. Was it not Bertrand Russell who said “Mathematics is I believe, the chief source of the belief in eternal and exact truth, as well as in a supersensible intelligible world” (24)?

Pythagoras stood for a loftier view of the soul than was characteristic of the scientific wing of Greek thinkers later Plato followed him. “The Pythagorean wanted to save the soul, to purify it, and as we shall see this was also the chief motive of Socrates and Plato, who derived much of their teaching from Pythagoras” (25).

Plato was influenced by Socrates and some how also by Pythagoras. As Bruce Lincoln shows in his book, *Theorizing Myth, Narrative, Ideology and Scholarship*; when the myths of Homer and Hesiod gave way to the logos to Heraclitus and Plato, it was regarded as a move from “Symbolic to rational discourse, anthropomorphism to abstraction, and religion to philosophy” (3). Plato took logos to mean rational discussion, whereas mythos to mean false story and condemned poets as liars. Lincoln puts the whole process in a nutshell:

... Plato’s dismissive attitude toward myth prevailed through the Enlightenment and produced the master narrative of the entity that calls itself “Western Civilization”. This is the creation of myth that

makes all good things come from Greece and thematizes the transition “from mythos to logos” as the paradigm of the dynamism, progress, science and rationality that are supposed to characterize and distinguish Europe for ever after Interestingly (an anachronistically) enough, these ideals that the story traces to Athens may also be understood as the aspects of capitalism that, in common opinion are most appealing and least problematic. (209-10)

Plato believed that every thing we see around us in nature is tangible, only through reason we can get true knowledge of things. In *Shophie's World* Gaarder puts Plato's view thus:

We can never have true knowledge of anything that is in constant state of change: we can only have opinions about things that belong to the world of the senses tangible things. We can only have true knowledge of things that can be understood with our reasons. (73)

Plato viewed that human being possesses two basic elements: one is instinct and other is reason and between these man should choose reason. John Lewis puts it in the book *History of Philosophy* in following way:

For in every man are the baser elements of iron and copper, the instinctive side, and, on the other hand, the element of gold, the rational side. Now just as the wise should rule the city so should reason rule the passions. Man's task is to secure justice and temperance in himself; that is to say, the harmonising of the conflicting elements in the personality under the guidance of reason. (44)

Plato explained that the general law or theory is not observed but it is discovered by reason. John Lewis puts this view in this way, “Thus the main task of

reason is to seek for those principles or general ideas which give us unity, intelligibility and reality. We may then use the universal to explain the more particular" (44).

Plato restricted the poet from his ideal world, their activity leads men away from truth. This whole thing Hazard Adams writes in this way:

The poet, restricted to imitating the realm of appearances, makes only copies of copies, and his creation is thus twice removed from reality.

Furthermore, he is probably possessed by a madness and not in control of himself when he writes. Since the Poet's activity leads men away from truth. (10)

Plato's successor Aristotle conceived of the work of reason in much the same way, though he did not view the ideas as independent. Regarding this view Jostein puts, "Thing that are in the human soul were purely reflections of natural objects. So nature is the real world" (91).

Aristotle was a realist so nature is the real world for him. Things are found in this real world but unlike Plato's ideal world. Aristotle believed that we have an innate power of reason from which we can grasp any truth. Fuller puts Aristotle's reasons in this way:

Again, just as sensation extracts their sensible qualities from things, so reason absorbs their abstract, intelligible forms. And just as the sense organ is potentially all the qualities it can become in the process of perceiving, so the intellect is potentially inscribed with all the forms that can be actualized in the process of knowledge, much as space is potentially inscribed with all geometrical figure. Since reason is capable of grasping any truth, it is therefore potentially all truth - i.e.

the whole system of intelligible forms that constitute the structure of the universe. (191)

Aristotle's chief contribution to Rationalism lay in his syllogistic logic, regarded as the chief instrument of rational explanation. Man explains particular facts by bringing them under general principles. Fuller puts this whole thing in this way:

But our troubles are only beginning. We habitually join our statements by such words as "hence", and "therefore", and so run on from thought to thought, developing our argument and pursuing lines of reasoning. In so doing, however, we frequently make statements based upon long and complicated trains of thought and lives of reasoning from which, in making our final assertions, we have dropped, for the sake of brevity and convenience, the intermediate steps leading from the subject to the predicate. For example, if I assert that "Socrates is mortal," I have really argued as follows: "Socrates is a man; all men are mortal; therefore Socrates is mortal". Otherwise I could not have asserted the predicate of the subject with any certainty. (202)

But, just as Aristotle overtopped to tremendously all other pupils of Plato, so the disciples of Ammounis, the reviver of Plato, were all overtopped by Plotinus, by some critics regarded as an even greater metaphysician than Plato and Aristotle themselves. We come now to a movement that is distinctly and consciously Platonic and Aristotelian in its inspiration, and that considers itself the reconciler of these two philosophies and the exponent of their true meaning. This movement is Neo-Platonism.

## **Rationalism in Modern Age**

The Age of Reason or the Enlightenment is generally taken to be the period of stretching from the peace of Utrecht (1713) to the French Revolution (1789). The period was preceded by a cultural and intellectual revolution that took place and which was closely related to the scientific advancement in physics and astronomy on the one hand and the achievement in thought by men like Francis Bacon and Rene Descartes on the other. However Descartes is considered the father of 17th century rationalism. The conflict between rationalism and mysticism dates back many centuries. In his book *An Intellectual History of Modern Europe*, Roland Stomberg states:

Dialectical movement has manifested itself abundantly in western history. In Greek philosophy, Thales was matched against Pythagoras, Plato against Aristotle, the materialists and skeptics against both; Christianity fused with Greek Philosophy in a higher synthesis. In the Middle Ages, Peter Abelard ranged his rational philosophy against St. Bernard's might existential faith, while Aquinas, who synthesized these two, was in true negated by Ockham. We come to the time when protestantism reacted against Catholicism and the revival of numerous ancient philosophies during the Renaissance, gave to modern European man a fantastically rich menu of intellectual dishes. If we discern one basic tension or polarity beneath all the others, it would be one that opposed the scientific, rationally oriented, and intellectually sophisticated tradition of Greek philosophical thought to the fervent, "Committed", ethically - oriented faith of Christianity. (7)



Men like Copernicus, Kepler and Galileo had important implications for philosophy. Galileo wanted to make physical nature subject to mathematical, quantitative treatment. To this end, he suggested that physical nature should be reduced to mechanical proposition, exactly calculable. With the progress of science, mechanistic picture of the world was soon replaced by an organic one. By 17th century this mechanistic view was well established. Human beings were detached from physical nature and regarded it as a machine whose laws could serve them. It made a sharp distinction between mind and matter. The chief 17th century thinker to bring this change was Rene Descartes, who reconstructed a universe from his famous formula "I think therefore I am". (*Theories of Knowledge* 106). He introduced skepticism as the basic principle in rational investigation. According to Descartes reason is the source of true knowledge. Knowledge is given by the clear vision of intellect or reason only. Descartes calls this intuition. He says:

By intuition I understand, not the fluctuating testimony of the senses, nor the misreading judgment that proceeds from the blundering construction of imagination, but the conception which an unclouded and attentive mind gives us to readily and distinctly that we are wholly freed from doubt about that which we understand. Intuition is undoubting conception of an unclouded and attentive mind, and springs from the light of reason alone. (43)

Descartes was further conformed by his reflection on geometry and can reach knowledge through reason alone. Regarding this view Ray puts:

Those long chains of perfectly simple and easy reasoning by means of which geometers are accustomed to carry out their most difficult demonstrations had led me to fancy that everything that can fall under

human knowledge forms a similar sequence; and that so long as we avoid accepting as true what is not so, and always preserve the right order for deduction of one thing from another, there can be nothing too remote to be reached in the end, or too well hidden to be discovered ....  
(106)

Descartes mentioned that man is naturally inclined to follow the good and his reason is naturally directed towards the truth. The democratically provided liberty makes a person oppose to the established norms and values. So, a rationally conscious person always proves the judgment to be self-evident and completely free without any indifference. Descartes mentioned that external physical world exist due to reason which is given by God. He says:

My senses testify to its existence, since I cannot control them at will and refer them to an external object or cause. Their immediate cause cannot be God, since god is revealed as an incorporeal mind or spirit. It cannot be myself, since in the that my sensation come from without; and deception is something of which God, being perfect, is by definition incapable. Therefore, an external physical world exists. To be sure, my senses deceive me as to its nature; but God, in giving me my reasons, has endowed me with the means of seeing through that deception and figuring out the true nature of the physical order. (61)

According to Descartes the means to exercise of reasonable human mind becomes quiet perfectly successful to think about its objects accurately and distinctly. Alburey puts Descartes view this way:

But what pleased me most, in this method which I was determined to follow, was that I was certain by its means to exercise my reason in all

thing; if not perfectly, at least as well as was in my power. I felt that, in making use of it, my mind would gradually accustom itself to think about its objects more accurate and distinctly. (27)

After Descartes, Malabranche tried to synthesize religion and reason. Then comes Spinoza who displaced the dualism of Descartes with an assertion of the unity of God and man, mind and matter in a pantheistic universe. According to Nussbaum:

Spinoza was impossible for a Manichean Europe. For the Europeans, the meaning of Existences, the reality of man, the reality of nature, the reality of God depended upon the dualism which Descartes maintained. Thus it was the “good drunken” Spinoza was rejected by the Europeans of his time and of the succeeding generation as an atheist and accepted only by later generation for whom the world was ceasing to have meaning and a God... By rejecting Spinoza and retaining Descartes, Europe could keep its God while it unmade and remade it’s material world at will. (5-6)

Above lines reassert that Descartes was able to find out the dualism but Spinoza was unable to support this claim for which he was rejected by his contemporary Europeans and the succeeding generation.

Spinoza sets out to show what reason prescribes to us, which effects agree with the rules of human reason. Taking this view of Spinoza Don Garrett writes in his book *The Cambridge Companion to Spinoza*:

Science reason demands nothing contrary to nature, it demands that everyone love himself, seek his own advantage, what is really useful to him, want what will really lead man to a greater perfection, and absolutely, that everyone should strive to preserve his own being as far

as he can. This, indeed is as necessarily true as that the whole is greater than its part. (276)

Spinoza focuses that human beings agree in nature to the extent that they are guided by reason, Spinoza says, “For human reason, as reason, is the same in all, and aims at the same thing namely, knowledge or understanding. Understanding, moreover, is a good that can be shared by all without diminishing anyone’s enjoyment of it” (277).

In fact, Spinoza holds that nothing is more useful to a human being than another person who is guided by reason and seeks from their own self-interest.

In contrast, to the extent that human beings are not guided by reason, but are instead subject to passions, they are contrary in nature. Spinoza states:

This is so even when the passions themselves seem similar (i.e., passionate love for the same person, prize, or reputation), since being subject to passion is a negation of power, rather than a positive source of agreement in nature. Moreover, individuals subject to such passions come into conflict not through their similarity, but through their difference. (277)

Spinoza stresses that among behaviours, seeking to repay hate, anger, or disdain with love and nobility is in accordance with reason, as is the policy of following the greater two goods or lesser evil for the more distant future. More generally, any behavior leading to harmless pleasure is good. Spinoza says in this way:

Nothing forbids our pleasure except a savage and sad superstition ....  
To use things, therefore, and take pleasure in them as for as possible - not, of course, to the point where we are disgusted with them, for there

is no pleasure in that - this is the part of a wise man. It is the part of a wise man, I say, to refresh and restore himself in moderation with pleasant food and drink with scents, with the beauty of green plants, with decoration, music, sports the theater, and other things of this kind, which anyone can use without injury to another. (278)

Spinoza asserts that a free man seeks, through the guidance of reason, to join in cooperative action with others, and honesty is necessary to make genuine cooperation possible; honesty is therefore also a virtue. Accordingly, any failure of honesty may be ascribed to an individual's lack of freedom, inability to be completely guided by reason and lack of virtue. Yet it seems good to act deceptively to preserve his being. Spinoza says:

If a free man, insofar as he is free, did anything by deception, he would do it from the dictate of reason (for so for only do we call him free). And so it would be a virtue to act deceptively, and hence (by the same proposition), every one would be better advised to act deceptively to preserve his being i.e.,(as is known through itself), men would be better advised to agree only in words and be contrary to one another in fact. But this is absurd. Therefore, a free man, etc. (292)

Spinoza explicitly considers the choice between death and deputation in following way:

Suppose someone now asks: what if a man could save himself from the present danger of death by treachery? Would not the principle of preserving his own being recommend, without qualification, that he be treacherous? . . . If reason should recommend that, it would recommend it to all men. And so reason would recommend, without

qualification, that men should make agreements to join force and to have common laws only be deception- that is, that really they should have no common laws. This is absurd. (293)

Reason cannot recommend treachery without qualification in such a case, for reason always recommends most highly that human being join forces through cooperation.

Leibniz stood in eighteenth-century Germany for the scientific ideal, as Newton in England and France; and like Newton, Leibniz differed greatly from other thinker. He was taken as advocating the same rationalism the same making of rational and deductive science out of everything. Leibniz believed that the reality of the physical world consists in fixed order of relations, in the rational linking of phenomena. Regarding this view Randall puts in his book *The Career of Philosophy*:

And the linking of phenomena which guarantees the truths of fact with regard to the sensible thing outside us is verified by means of the truths of reason as the appearance of optics are explained by geometry. . . for the rest it is true that provided the phenomena are ordered it does not matter whether we call them dreams or not, since experience shows we are not deceived in the measures we take with phenomena when they are taken in accord with the truths of reason. (47)

Leibniz emphasized that the truth of sensible things is justified by reason. As he says:

The truth of sensible things is justified by their connection, which depends on intellectual truths founded on reason, and on constant observation of the sensible things themselves, even when their reason are not apparent. And as these reason and observations give us the

means of judging the future with regard to our interests, and as success follows our reasonable judgment, we can neither ask nor have a greater certainty about this objects. (47)

According to Leibniz knowledge of necessary and eternal truth is that which distinguishes us from animal and gives us Reason. This faculty of knowledge is called rational mind. Leibniz emphasized that to find real fact and true proposition sufficient reason is essential; which sometime can be unknown. He also stressed on two types of truths: reason and fact.

Immanuel Kant is a great philosopher of Enlightenment period. According to Kant moral obligation seems like a voice from something deeper, something behind our ordinary experience. As moral beings, we have the duty to be determined by a deeper principle. This law is both universal and necessary, and hence, it is prescribed by reason alone. Regarding this view Randall puts in his book *The Career of Philosophy* this way:

An action that is done from duty gets its moral value, not from the object which it is intended to secure, but from the maxim by which it is determined.... For the will stands as it were at the parting of the ways, between its a priori principle, which is formal, and its a posteriori material motive. (150)

Kant's focus is that only rational being has the faculty of reason which is based on the idea of law. Freedom is complete determination by reason. Free action is rational action as opposed to action dictated by impulse and desire. Kant says:

Everything in nature acts in conformity with law. Only a rational being has the faculty of acting in conformity with the idea of law, or from principles; only a rational beings, in other words, has a will. And as

with out reason actions cannot proceed from laws, will is simply practical reason. (152)

According to Kant, will is the causality of living being so they are rational. Reason is free from all external influences. So the will of rational being must be regarded itself free. Kant puts:

The will is the causality of living beings in so far as they are rational. Freedom is that causality in so far as it can be regarded as efficient without being determined to activity by any cause other than itself. Natural necessity is the property of all non-rational being to be determined to activity by some cause external to themselves.... Reason must therefore regard itself as the author of its principles of action, and as independent of all external influences. Hence, as practical reason, or as the will of a rational being, it must be regarded by itself as free. (152)

Kant stands tradition of rational freedom; his conception is very close to Spinoza's. Man is in bondage when his acts are determined by desire and passion from without, by inadequate knowledge; man is free when they are determined by the reason that constitutes his own nature and unites it with the whole universe as an integral member. Kant says:

For a rational being is conscious that in his will, or as he is in himself, he belongs in the sphere of action to an intelligible order of things, although he is also aware that, in so far as he belongs to the world of sense, his will, like other efficient causes, is necessarily subject to the laws of causality.... Nor does the moral law present things to our consciousness as nominal, but it puts us in possession of a fact which



nothing in the whole sensible world, nothing that comes within the range of theoretical reason in its widest use, can possibly explain.

(154)

Kant mentions that subjective purposiveness is judged by aesthetically where as objective purposiveness is judged by understanding the reason. Subjective judgment is teleological for Kant. Kant puts in this way:

Thus we can regard natural beauty as the presentation of the concept of the formal or merely subjective purposiveness, and natural purposes as the presentation of the concept of a real objective purposiveness. The former of these we judge by Taste, aesthetically, the latter by understanding and reason, logically. On this is based the division of the Critique of judgment into the critiques of aesthetical and of teleological judgment. (167)

For the sake of society and morality, Kant asserted, people are reasonably justified in believing God, even though they could never know for sure whether they are real or not. Philosophically reason as equipment is determined by the three problems: God, soul, freedom. These problems refer to the case when our will is free Kant mentions in his book *Critique of Pure Reason*:

The whole equipment of reason, in the discipline which may be entitled pure philosophy, is in fact determined with a view to the three problems (God, soul, freedom). These, however, themselves in turn refer us yet further, namely, to the problem *What we Ought to do*, if the will is free, if there is a God and a future world. As this concern our attitude to the supreme end, it is evident that the ultimate intention of

nature in her wise provision for us has indeed, in the constitution of our reason, been directed to moral interests alone. (632-33)

According to Kant the presupposition of God, soul, freedom was then a practical concern. Kant explains that morality itself constitutes a system. In intelligible world we find that ruler and reason compels us to admit such ruler. Kant puts:

Morality, by itself, constitutes a system. Happiness, however, does not do so, save in so far as it is distributed in exact proportion to morality. But this is possible only in the intelligible world, under a wise author and ruler. Such a together with life in such a world, which we must regard as a future world, reason finds itself constrained to assume; otherwise it would have to regard the moral laws as empty figments of the brain, since without this postulate the necessary consequence which it self connects with these laws could not follow. (639)

Kant puts pure reason as necessary in practical point of view to find the ground of the connection. The reason always tries to seek for the logical and practical ground on which it can stand as self-evident. The moral world always demands this reason. Kant puts these ideas:

It is, therefore, only in the ideal of the supreme original good that pure reason can find the ground of this connection, which is necessary from the practical point of view, between the two elements of supreme derivative good—the ground, namely, of an intelligible, that is moral world. (639)

With Hegel, enlightenment's advocacy for reason reaches its zenith. He regards reason as spirit manifested in both substance and matter. He tries to interpret

reason in terms of historical process. Human history is, for Hegel, nothing but a rational principle that unfolds a process. Reason embodies our very essence of being.

Hegel writes in his book *History as the Self-Realization of the Spirit*:

... Reason is the sovereign of the world; that the history of the world, therefore, presents us with a rational process. Reason... is Substance, as well as Infinite Power; its own infinite Material underlying all the natural and spiritual life which it originates, as also the *Infinite Form*—that which sets this Material in motion .... Reason is the substance of the Universe; viz. that by which and in which all reality has its being and subsistence ... it is the infinite Energy of the Universe; since reason is not so powerless as to be incapable of producing anything but a mere ideas, a mere intention .... It is *the infinite complex of things*, their Essence and Truth .... That this “Idea” or “Reason” is the *True*, the *Eternal*, the absolutely *Powerful* essence; that it reveals itself in the world .... (457)

Hegel, hence, conceives Reason as Truth or Essence. He holds that reason is embodied in the structure of the universe and governs conditions of material things and their activities. Reason is self-governed and autonomous entity that operates freely in every cause and effect in nature. It manifests as the spirit in the nature and moves towards the higher realization of its manifested objects.

The reason or spirit has its ultimate goal in freedom. Freedom is the essence of the spirit. Spirit is self-contained existential entity. Spirit is unity with its center in itself. Everything that is matter or (unreason) consists many parts which strives in self-destructive way to reach to the point of unity. It has its unity outside itself

therefore moves towards that unity to merge with when it no longer reaches the point of unity, it loses its properties of matter or unreason. Hegel says:

... the essence of spirit i.e. freedom ... spirit is also endowed with freedom ... all the qualities of spirit exist only through freedom: that all are but means for attaining freedom ... freedom is the sole truth of spirit ... spirit ... habits center in itself ... it exists in and with itself ... Spirit is self contained existence .... (457-58)

Hegel terms the “self contained existence of spirit” as the “self consciousness” that matter comes in a certain stage of its development (458). Spirit knows nothing other than itself. It appreciates its own nature. ‘Universal History’ is the exhibition of the spirit in its self-consciousness. The essential nature of freedom is moving gradually towards self-consciousness and human history unfolds that self realization.

Hegel states:

But for spirit, the highest attainment is self-knowledge, an advance not only to the intuition, but to the thought .... This is must and is also destined to accomplish; but the accomplishment is at the same time its dissolution, and the rise of another, spirit, another world historical people, another epoch of Universal History. This transition and connection leads us to the connection of the whole... which we have now to consider more closely and of which we have to give a representation. History in general is therefore the development of spirit in time .... (460)

Thus spirit develops itself through historical events. The spirit is ‘self-contained’ entity, it is realized through “phenomenon of history” (172). One can witness with his/her own eyes how world spirit presents itself in history. Roy T.

Mathews and F. Dewitt Plat sum up, “Thus history is created by the world spirit, and at the same time the world spirit reaches self-awareness through the unfolding of historical events” (170). Spirit unfolds and ‘erects’ its monument in the phenomenon world. Hegel views:

The very essence of spirit is activity; it realizes its potentiality makes itself its own deed its work and thus it becomes an object itself; contemplates itself as an objective existence. Thus is it with the spirit of a people : it is a spirit having strictly defined characteristics, which erects itself into an objective world, that exists and persists in a particular religious form of worship, customs, constitution and political laws in the whole complex of its institutions—in the events and transactions that make up its history. (461)

People and their institutions may ‘perish’; they meet natural death but the spirit continues in being rather it advances to the higher and new purpose. It will be a new order and a new nation spirit in human history. For instance, German Imperial cities, the German Imperial Constitution and German People of Imperial era met a violent death but German National Spirit never dies. It is eternal and immutable substance. Hegel says:

It is not of the nature of the all pervading spirit to die this merely natural death; it does not simply sink into the senile life of mere custom, but as being a national spirit belonging to universal history attains to the consciousness of what its work is; it attains to a conception of itself. (462)

Hegel further clarifies the eternal nature of the spirit, which transcends death: “Spirit ... is the transcending of immediate, simple, unreflected existence, the negation

of that existence, and the returning into itself. We may compare it with the seed; for with this the plant begins, yet it is also the results of the plant's entire life ... spirit is immortal, with it there is no past, no future, but an essential now" (464).

The Enlightenment gave way to the romantic movement, which was a reaction to the rigorous classicism of the previous age. It also marked a change in value and sensibilities. Reason has termed everything away from it as irrational. But irrational is closely linked with emotions, imagination, fancy, desire etc. which is sharply contrast to rationalism. Then the wind of revolution against unreason comes to Schopenhauer and Kierkegaard Schopenhauer shows how all-pervasive will is a governing principle of the world embodied in the very structure of the universe. Kierkegaard goes against the logical conformity of Christianity. For him, truth is individual intuition not logically validated entity. Hence, he means obviously that individual conviction, emotion, feeling and intuitive judgment must be the basis of the truth. Then later come Nietzsche, Heidegger and Freud who are sharply contrasted with Rationalists. In this way we see rationality and irrationality are two different views in philosophy. They are strongly contrasted with each other.

### Chapter III

#### Violation of Rationality in *Catch-22*

The novel *Catch-22* represents the story about the American Air Force based at Pianosa during World War II is as much as battle with itself as with anyone else. It is an irrational, sometimes nightmarish world in which one's superior officers constitute a greater threat to one's life and sanity than the enemy and where demonstrating one's patriotism may demand not only the signing of interminable and meaningless loyalty oaths, but also the consumption of chocolate-covered cotton. In this novel irrationality is presented from a viewpoint which itself is a rational perspective detached and judicious-defining 'absurdity', 'sanity' and 'morality' should be feasible enough. This theory mainly applies in terms of authoritative institutions like military, hospital, business and some other minor characters as well. Similarly Yossarian also seems irrational not following rules of nation in terms of self-live. His irrationality is different from those persons who have authoritative power. In Yossarian's view point war becomes meaningless because they use war for their personal sake rather than nation itself. This way Yossarian makes his own way of rationalization in the novel *Catch-22*. These all things are proved by textual point of view. First of all begins from minor characters like Clevinger. In the officers' club, Yossarian claims that everyone is trying to kill him, but Clevinger and others merely dismiss Yossarian as being crazy. Clevinger argues that everyone is trying to kill everyone else, so there is nothing important about Yossarian being killed. "They're trying to kill everyone" (25). From this statement Clevinger makes his own type of rationalization about the live of Yossarian. Clevinger is the represent, the defender of authoritative person indoctrinated that their irrationality is part of life. He simply argues that war is impersonal and everyone has to become used to it. Yossarian, on

the other hand represent the individual who protest against such mass destruction for his own live.

In a similar way, Havermeyer also comes to stand for the brainless human being who has been converted into a war machine. Havermeyer cares nothing about his own life or his mind and readily accedes to all the demands made by his superiors. He takes a disgusting pleasure in shooting field mice with a 0.45. "Havermeyer fired a shot at a mouse that brought Hungry Joe bolting out at him barefoot, ranting at the top of his screechy voice and emptying his own 0.45" (40). This irrational act only shows how war and death can destroy people's rational sensitivity and caring for each other. More than this, the superiors are fond of the quality of Havermeyer because such character can be easily used without difficulty. So they advise Yossarian to be like Havermeyer, "Why don't you just smile and make the best of it? Be like Havermeyer" (38). In this way Havermeyer makes no rational judgment about what is wrong and right; he simply accepts his superior advice.

Likewise, Doc Daneeka comes to represent the ineffective doctor, whose only interests are improving his financial and personal situation rather than caring patients. He is not only useless as a healthcare provider; he also fails to provide his patients with the emotional empathy and compassion they need. Despite Yossarian's pleas for help, Doc Daneeka ignores him with the strange *Catch-22* argument. "Sure there's a catch," Doc Daneeka replied *Catch-22*. Anyone who wants to get out of combat duty isn't really crazy" (55).

Here Doc Daneeka proposes the notion of rationalization rule *Catch-22* as a means of justifying the never-ending process of the men having to fly missions. If the men are really crazy, then they will want to fly the missions, regardless of whether or not they want to be killed. If they do not want to fly the missions, then they are sane



and must fly them. This type of irrational rule expresses. Doc Daneeka's refusal to help Yossarian giving to leave him from the war.

Similarly, Piltchard and Wren, the pair represents the do-gooders who obediently and blissfully follow the authoritative orders without rational judgment:

Captain Piltchard and Captain? Wren, the inoffensive joint squadron operations officers, were both mild, soft spoken men of less than middle height who enjoyed flying combat missions and begged nothing more of life and Colonel Catchcart than the opportunity to continue flying them. (155)

Thus Wren and Piltchard represent irrational characters who never question their own life, they simply follow whatever Colonel Catchcart orders them.

Likewise Chief White Halfoat, who is constantly intoxicating himself, represent the victim who is unable to deal with the horror of the war and simply is killing himself by drinking to death. "Chief White Halfoat pour whiskey carefully into three empty shampoo bottles and store them away in the musette bag he was packing" (360). This shows chief white Halfoat's lack of rational arguments towards his superior and not able to adjust according to situation. On the other hand Yossarian comes to represent the human being who constantly raises rational argument towards his superiors for his self identity.

Similarly, McWatt is a new pilot of Yossarian who flies only a few inches from the ground. Once McWatt is singing so buoyantly that he cannot hear Yossarian over the intercom. Yossarian threatens to choke McWatt to death if he does not move the plane up. When McWatt and Yossarian converse immediately afterwards, McWatt's pathetic demise exemplifies the dangers of becoming a person who has lost all his powers of rational judgment for various situations and independent thinking to

such a point that he now acts without discretion and even insanely. Let's see talk between Yossarian and McWatt:

"I guess I never really believed you."

"Aren't you never afraid?"

"May be I ought to be."

"Not even on the missions?"

"I guess I just don't have brains enough."(344)

McWatt, thus says he has no brain. The sole cause of McWatt's irrational behaviour is war. He only knows flying plane and giving live into war. This way war becomes game to play with lives of the people.

Another character in the novel Aarfy, the amiable lead navigator. He tends to get lost, whether it be flying a combat mission or meeting a girl. Aarfy also tries to ingratiate himself to Nately's father, who is very wealthy, by befriending Nately. Despite his materialistic eye, he is stupidly oblivious to the dangers of war. Aarfy rapes and kills an innocent Italian girl. He makes pleasure of a woman without having to pay for it, which he is willing to fulfill without regard to human life. When Yossarian is wounded in the thigh, Aarfy keeps on asking what is going on, "I lost my balls! Aarfy, I lost my balls!" Aarfy, help me, "he pleaded almost weeping." "I'm hit! I'm hit!" Aarfy turned slowly with a blind, quizzical grin. "What?" (299) This shows Aarfy's lack of rational response towards other people. He is feigning this just to see Yossarian in pain.

Similarly, the medical establishment is also doing irrational activity, despite their extensive medical testing and knowledge, the doctors fails to realize that the men are faking their illnesses. They have been trained such that they can only recognize certain types of diseases, such as jaundice and the fake illnesses that do not fit a

known category bewilders them. Their methods of treatment are irrational. The encased man is fed with his own urine. They keep on giving Yossarian a daily pill, hoping he will either get well or become jaundiced. The stupidity of the doctors is exposed when the ill educated Taxen proves that everyone in the ward except the C.I.D. man is a hypochondriac and sends them back to the front. "In less than ten days, the Taxen drove everybody in the ward back to duty-every body but the C.I.D. man, who had caught cold from the fighter captain and come down with pneumonia" (24). These lines make clear lack of rational treatment of doctors, they are only pretending being doctors.

In another case the doctors are unable to diagnose the strange disease of Yossarian when Yossarian begins to claim he sees everything twice. The doctors diagnose him with meningitis, although they admit they really do not know what is wrong with him. Then, the doctor announces to Yossarian that the relatives of the dead man, Giusoppe, have arrived to see their dying child. He orders Yossarian to pretend to be the dead man to pacify the grieving family. When Yossarian protests against being an impostor, the doctor threatens to expose that Yossarian is only pretending to have a liver condition. Then Yossarian decides to take part in the doctor's scheme to save his own life from unending war. The doctor says, "I have a proposition for you. You let them come in and look you over for a few minutes and I won't tell anyone you've been lying about your liver symptoms" (192). This shows that doctors' role is irrational and useless. They just receive credit for this rather than breaking the truth to them, he takes pleasure in deceiving the family.

In the novel, Milo Minderbinder is a manipulative black market entrepreneur, the squadron's mess officer. Milo is the representative of moral insanity of the contemporary regimented business society. War is profitable to private industry, and

Milo has no desire to see it end. Milo is inspired when he discovers that Yossarian's friends are selling fruit on the black market. Yossarian gives these all fruits to his friends because he wants to remain sick enough to protect himself from the war. He does not remain back to collaborate with the Germans to defend a bridge against an American attack for his business purpose. Milo arranges another contract with the Germans to bomb his own outfit base:

Milo cursed himself hourly for his monumental greed and stupidity in purchasing the entire Egyptian cotton crop, but a contract was a contract and had to be honored, and one night, after a sumptuous evening meal, all Milo's fighters and bombers took off, joined in formation directly overhead and began dropping bombs on the group. He had landed another contract with the Germans, this time to bomb his own outfit. (267)

From this, Milo is able to commit this cold-blooded atrocity with a clear conscience for his irrational business activity. By this, Milo and Yossarian are seen quite contrastive character, Yossarian deceives others to protect himself from danger while Milo is to capitalize off others. Yossarian respects human life and will, at any cost protect it, whereas Milo will be willing to peruse the money trail at any cost.

Likewise, the rapid growth of Milo and his syndicate depends upon the greed of the officers, who are more interested in eating delicious food than winning the war. Through his business transactions, Milo has converted his economic power into political power. Milo slowly gains control of the world without noticing anyone. Milo is the major of Palermo, he has manipulated the market so Palermo is now the world's third largest Scotch exporter. Milo holds positions of power, including Malta and Oran. From Cairo, Milo purchases an entire crop of Egyptian cotten. The abuse of

power and selfish interest are seen when Milo replaces the label with his own name M and M Enterprises form the slogan written on the airplanes such as Courage and Truth. These are written in words:

The planes were decorated with flamboyant squadron emblems illustrating such laudable ideals as courage, Might, Justice, Truth, Liberty, Love, Honor and Patriotism that were painted out at once by Milo's mechanics with a double coat of flat white and replaced in garish purple with the stenciled name M and M Enterprises, Fine, Fruits and produce. (263)

This act of Milo proves that money not ideals, run the war. Milo's falseness of the principle is indicated by the falsity of the title "M and M" of the syndicate. Since "and" in "M and M" has been inserted by Milo to avoid the impression that the operation is that of a single individual.

Similarly, Lieutenant Scheisskopf is a brainless commander who gives orders to his men who does not care for his own wife but concerns his promotion winning parades. He uses the Action Board inquiry as a personal vendetta against Clevinger. Here the logic and concept of due process are violated. Rather than being charged with a crime and then having evidence presented against him, Lieutenant Scheisskopf decides to create false testimony in an attempt to make up a crime so Clevinger can be punished. Irrationality of Scheisskopf's inquisition is seen in the following way:

"Then we'll go on. What did you say to Yossarian?"

"I said to him, sir, that you couldn't find me guilty of the offense with which I am charged, and still be faithful to the cause of ..."

"Of what? You're mumbling"

"Stop mumbling."

"Yes, sir."

"And, mumble 'sir' when you do."

"Metcalf, you bastard!"

"Yes, sir, mumbled Clevinger. Of justice sir. That you couldn't find."

"Justice? The Colonel was astounded."

"What is justice?" (89)

This shows, Clevinger indeed confronts irrational world, in which understanding his response, instead goes on asking new question on the basis of rationalizing rule of *Catch-22*. Clevinger wants justice but it is not possible in the world ruled by *Catch-22*.

In the novel Colonel Catchcart is represented as a self-paradoxical man whose goal in life is to become a general. He measures his progress relatives to others and consequently has mixed feelings about being a Colonel at thirtysix. Eventually, Colonel Catchcart becomes so desperate to be a general that he decides to utilize religious practices to fulfill his goal. In this case, the Saturday Evening Post incident mocks the use of religion during war. Rather than praying on behalf of the Christian ideals of brotherhood and love, the men seem to be asking god to save their lives. As Colonel Catchcart points out, the perching is fairly useless in the time of mass destruction. And what is necessary is the economical practical prayer. In times of war, religion does not provide ideals but instead, for Colonel Catchcart, a chance to gain publicity and fame. Colonel Catchcart asks for a prayer for a tighter bombs pattern to please General Peckem. Colonel's tighter bomb pattern view is revealed in the following manner:

Your job is to lead us in prayer, and from now on you're going to lead us in a prayer for a tighter bomb pattern before every mission. Is that

clear? I think a tighter bomb pattern is something really worth praying for. It will be a feather in all our caps with General Peckem. General Peckem feels it makes a much nicer aerial photograph when the bombs explode close together. (203)

This makes clear that tighter bomb pattern is for photograph but it is not anything else. Colonel has a very limited view on human life. He prides himself such irrational act of tighter bomb pattern. He lacks kindness and mercilessly increases the number of required missions, in a mad effort to become a general.

Unimportant episodes such as the plum tomato episode and the Washington Irving signature on the letters and Major Major's correspondence will become extremely critical when Chaplain is grilled by Colonels Catchcart and Korn. Once Colonel Catchcart offers a plum tomato to the Chaplain and later accuses him of stealing it. Chaplain defends himself against it but it becomes useless because it is irrational world ruled by *Catch-22*. The issue of plum tomato stealing is seen in the following manner:

"That's fine, then. It's just as well you didn't laugh before. I wouldn't have given you the plum tomatoes anyway. Corporal Whitcomb tells me you took a plum tomato when you were in here this morning."

"This morning? But, sir! You gave it to me."

"I didn't say I didn't give it to you, did I?"

I merely said you took it. I don't see why you've got such a guilty conscience if you really didn't steal it. Did I give it to you?"

"Yes, sir. I swear you did." (292)

It is clear that the inquisition of the Chaplain ultimately symbolizes the irrationality and cruelty of the authority upon innocent people. Here, dangers logic of

*Catch-22* prevails over simple reason. The other important aspect is the character of Corporal Whitcomb, who is the foil to the Chaplain. Corporal Whitcomb, like other officers, seeks to win the good graces of his superiors by falsifying evidence against his hated superior, the Chaplain and seeks to earn the gratitude of his superiors to be promoted.

Colonel Catchcart enjoys volunteering his men for the most dangerous missions. When Yossarian goes to ask Doc Daneeka to ground him, saying that Colonel Catchcart is disobeying the rules by demanding more than the required number of missions. Yossarian discovers just before his departure that Colonel Catchcart has again increased the number of missions, this time to fifty-five. Colonel Catchcart is in trouble for failing to destroy the bridge at Ferrara for an entire week. He blames Yossarian, who took evasive action on the first round and it was Yossarian who hit the bridge on the second try. Colonels Catchcart and Korn also try to cover up Yossarian's evasive action by promoting him to captain and giving him a medal, "All right," Colonel Catchcart decided "We'll give him a medal for being brave enough to go around over the target twice. And we'll make him a captain, too" (149). Rather than sensible punishing Yossarian for his evasive action, Colonels Catchcart and Korn decide to award him a medal so they won't be caught. This way they make their very own rational rule to trap human being.

Colonel Catchcart becomes upset at just seeing the name of Yossarian. He begins to think how it reminds him to communists and fascists, how un-American it is, "It was like *Seditious* and *insidious* too, and like *socialist*, *suspicious*, *fascist* and *communist*" (220). This shows the eccentricity and cruelty of the military bureaucracy. Colonel's angry reaction at seeing Yossarian's name reflects the



prevalent mood among other officers. His assumption on Yossarian is a foreign name, that he is a traitor represents lack of equal rational respect towards other persons.

Likewise, Colonel Korn and Colonel Catchcart's views are some how similar. They both want human destruction in the name of war. Just as Colonel Korn feels that the enemy brought their misery upon themselves and thus troops should not feel guilty about bombing them, Colonel Catchcart feels that the troops have brought their misery upon themselves and must fly whatever number of missions he requires. Including Yossarian and other friend do not want to destroy tiny mountain village of Italy for roadblock to delay German reinforcements at a time. Yossarian says it's a cruel work but Colonel Korn replies to Yossarian, "Would it be any less cruel to let those two German divisions down to fight with our troops? American lives are at stake, too, you know would you rather see American blood spilled" (337)?

This planned mission to bomb small village highlights the empty and irrational fanfare of military operations. Colonel Korn uses the rational rule of *Catch-22* to trap Yossarian for mission to save lives of Americans.

Moreover, the officers have no consideration for the lives of innocent civilian. Colonel Catchcart is more interested in getting tight bomb formation to look good rather than achieving any real meaningful military action. "Colonel Catchcart wants to come out of this with a good clean aerial photograph he be ashamed to send through channel" (338). This statement makes itself clear that irrational and self-centered activity of Colonel Catchcart only underscores the waste of human life for those who are fighting and the officers' desire to be promoted, no matter what the cost.

Similar way, when Colonel Catchcart find out that Doc Daneeka is dead, he increases the number of missions to seventy. In fact, Doc Daneeka has been dead

emotionally, not physically. The military bureaucracy believes on its own paperwork and completely disregards any contradictory evidence. It is seen in following extract:

"It's true, sir," said one of the enlisted men.

"The records show that you went up in McWatt's plane to collect some flight time. You didn't come down in a parachute, so you must have been killed in the crash." (352)

This type of rationalization without full evidence makes clear, irrationality within itself beaucracy rule.

Likewise, Colonels Catchcart and Korn appear to have a multiple plan strategy. At first, they try to bully Yossarian into flying more missions. When this fails, they try to persuade him to fight, asking for him to be a good patriot, to fight on their behalf. After many insults are passed back and forth, they offer Yossarian a deal. While they cannot let the other men go home, they offer to bribe him to return home with saying a word. If he does not give in, though, they will court martial him either way. They ask Yossarian to fight for their promotion, "Won't you fight for your country?" Colonel Korn demanded, emulating Colonel Catchcart's harsh, self-righteous tone. "Won't you give up your life for Colonel Catchcart and me?" (433) Above lines show that war is not for country but it is for two persons Colonels Catchcart and Korn. They ask Yossarian live for their promotion. Using rational rule they want to trap Yossarian to fulfill their self-irrational desire. This way war becomes like a game to achieve their goal in cost of innocent people.

Yossarian, the protagonist in the novel *Catch-22*, is suppressed by the inescapable and irrational rule of *Catch-22* in meaningless world. He is more sufferer than Chaplain and Clevinger within bureaucracy rule. He tries to escape from trap of *Catch-22* world and constantly struggles with his superiors for his live. This rational

search of self-identity makes him irrational in the novel. Yossarian does different pretensions and one of them is to stay and spend the duration of war in the hospital faking different illnesses. It is clearly seen in the following lines:

Yossarian was in the hospital with a pain in his liver that fell just short of being jaundice. The doctors were puzzled by the fact that it wasn't quite jaundice .... Actually, the pain in his liver had gone away, but Yossarian didn't say anything and the doctors never suspected. He had made up his mind to spend the rest of the war in the hospital. (15)

Here hospital represents a superficial heaven for Yossarian where he could spend a safe live for a short period, since no one expects him to do anything. Being in hospital is better than going into battle field, this sort of thinking makes him irrational though he is planning his own way of rational thinking to get out from the war. There are usually not nearly as many death rates inside the hospital as Yossarian has seen outside the hospital. He is much aware of this fact that, "there was a much lower death rate inside the hospital than outside the hospital, and a much healthier death rate" (175). The people are much healthier in the hospital than in the battle field, and the death rate is much lower. This type of thinking makes Yossarian irrational.

As the men in the hospital talk about illness, they come to realize that disease and death randomly choose their victims without any regard to the justice. The same lack of fair treatment arises when Yossarian approaches to Doc Daneeka and demands to be grounded. This is clearly seen in following abstract:

But they don't say you have to go home. And regulations do say you have to obey every order. That's the catch. Even if the Colonel were disobeying a Twenty-Seventh Air force order by making you fly more missions, you'd still have to fly them, or you'd be guilty of disobeying

an order of his. And then Twenty-Seventh Air Force Headquarters would really jump on you. (67-68)

Doc Daneeka's this statement makes Yossarian impossible to be grounded. He becomes like White soldier who is tossed into the war and, in the process, is deprived of his spirit and identity and transformed in to a hollow, dead soldier. Similar way, Yossarian is also ignored by right to go home, even when he finishes his mission in time. Colonel Catchcart always uses illogical rule of *Catch-22* to trap him in the war.

Yossarian discovers the hospital as a haven when he tries to avoid the war by claiming he has abdominal problems. To remain in hospital Yossarian claims that he sees everything twice. When this problem is solved then he declares that he sees everything only one, "I see everything one!" he cried quickly" (191). This behavior of Yossarian makes him irrational because he wants to get away from his responsibility not to fight for his own country.

Yossarian comes out with the dead bodies of Snowden and the young tail gunner. Snowden is dying. Doc Daneeka also finds Yossarian naked, warps him up, and gives him shots and pills to put him to sleep. When Yossarian wakes up, he refuses to wear his uniform and walks around naked. Yossarian tells that Milo responsible for the tail gunner's death Snowden. Milo asks Yossarian, why he is naked, "why aren't you wearing clothes, Yossarian?" "I don't want to" (228).

This nakedness of Yossarian symbolizes his lack of rational respect towards uniform. He hates army uniform because he wants freedom for his self-identity. He does not think other persons in the war and his own country for his personal desire. This thinking of individuality makes him irrational.

When Yossarian was wounded in the thigh, McWatt assists Yossarian and gives him morphine to reduce the pain. When Yossarian wakes up in the ward, he

does not see Dunbar but instead Second Lieutenant Anthony T. Fortiori. Dunbar arrives and chases out the intruder. He invites Yossarian to sleep in Warrant Officer Lumley's bed, but Yossarian feels sick in there when he attempts to leave, Nurse Cramer orders him to go back at once. She says his body belongs to the government, "It certainly is not your leg." Nurse Cramer retorted. "That leg belongs to the US government" (302). This statement of Nurse Cramer makes clear that Yossarian has no right what he wants to do. He must follow orders of the US government. The US government has invested a lot of money to make him an airplane pilot, and he has no right to disobey the doctor's orders. Even his leg belongs to the US government.

When Yossarian discovers Colonel Catchcart's increase of the missions to fifty-five, he infuriatingly declares that he will not fly and will go to see Major Major. Yossarian asks to Major Major that he does not want to fly more missions. But he insists that Yossarian must follow Colonel Catchcart's orders. Major Major questions morality of Yossarian, would he like to see their country lose? Yossarian points out that:

We won't lose. We've got more men, more money and more material. There are ten million men in uniform who could replace me. Some people are getting killed and a lot more are making money and having fun. Let somebody else get killed. (113)

Here Yossarian uses his own rational generalization about war and becomes irrational by violating the professional rules. Men are making money and taking war as a game. So he wants to get away from his responsibility, making somebody else to be killed in the war. Yossarian's consciousness of his life makes him irresponsible from his duty.

Once Yossarian grabs Nurse Duckett bosom, Major Sanderson the psychiatrist comes to investigate him. Yossarian engages in another subterfuge to try to get out flying missions. He succeeds in convincing the doctor that he is crazy. He agrees to send Yossarian, but instead sends the actual Fortiori home. Then infuriated Yossarian goes to Doc Daneeka and explains the situation to obtain leave from him. But Doc Daneeka cruelly says that if the crazy people do not fly the missions, who will? This is seen in following lines:

"So?" Yossarian was puzzled by Doc Daneeka's inability to comprehend. "Don't you see what that means? Now you can take me off combat duty and send me home. They're not going to send a cray man out to be killed, are they?"

"Who else will go?" (315)

Here Yossarian again fails his aim from leaving out combat duty. This way Yossarian constantly uses his rationalization to get out from the war but fails doing so.

Yossarian tells Dobbs that he wants to kill Colonel Catchcart, but Dobbs refuses to help because he now has enough missions. Yossarian points out the futility of the situation, but Dobbs still refuses, "All right," he said. "Let's kill Colonel Catchcart. We'll do it together." "Are you crazy or something?" Shouted Dobbs. "Why should I want to kill Colonel Catchcart" (316)? In above lines Yossarian becomes extremely irrational. To fulfill his self desire he wants to kill even Colonel Catchcart.

Yossarian goes to the beach and indulges himself in feeling Nurse Duckett. His constant need to enjoy and touch her body represents his desire for any physical relief from the physical and mental torment he suffers from the war and his memories of Snowden's death. But he discovers the dead body of Orr in water. He also discovers

the dead body of Nately when Milo makes or accepts deal of Colonel Catchcart. When Milo asks Colonel Catchcart to leave for Yossarian, Colonel Catchcart says every body should be treated fairly. This view of Colonel Catchcart is seen in the following lines, "Oh, no Milo," Colonel Catchcart clucked sententiously, shocked by the suggestion. "We must never play favourites. We must always treat every man alike" (386). This view of Colonel Catchcart makes impossible for Yossarian to leave the battlefield.

In protest, Yossarian marches backwards and refuses to fly any more missions. Colonel Korn decides to send Yossarian to Rome for a few days to try to soothe him. However, when Yossarian tells Nately's whore about Nately's death, she tries to kill Yossarian with a potato peeler. Yossarian never becomes safe either in Rome or in Pianosa. Everywhere his life becomes a risk so again he returns Pianosa and is then trapped in war. He has the courage for revolt so he constantly struggles with his superiors for his life. He also has some kindness towards other people like kid sister, Snowden, Orr, Nately etc. To search kid sister, Yossarian persuades Milo to take him back in Rome. When they arrive in Rome, the place is in ruins, and old woman tells Yossarian that everyone has been driven away because of *Catch-22*. Yossarian asks where the little girl is, and the woman replies she is also gone. Then the police arrests Yossarian for being in Rome without a pass and they take him to Colonel Catchcart and Korn who tell Yossarian that they are sending him home, "We are sending you home" (430). Here again Yossarian fails in his plans to search kid sister in Rome when he was brought back in front of Colonels Catchcart and Korn.

Of course, letting Yossarian go home means that there is *Catch-22*. Colonel Korn correctly points out that they cannot let him go home because he has already flown the appropriate number of missions, "After all, we can't simply send you home

for refusing to fly more missions and keep the rest of the men here, can we? That would hardly be fair to them" (43).

Colonels Catchcart and Korn ask Yossarian to fly more missions for their promotion. They offer deal with him and he accepts it. But Yossarian confides to Chaplain that he is actually not going to accept the deal and was just pretending. This view of Yossarian clearly seen in following abstract, "I'm breaking the agreement. I did it in a moment of weakness, Yossarian wisecracked with glum irony. "I was trying to save my life" (451).

Here Yossarian touches upon a critical moral issue: at what cost should a person give up himself for justice? In other words, when should practicality yield to ideals? Yossarian can achieve his practical endpoint and save his life by agreeing to the deal. On the other hand, the argument, that this continual increase of missions is unjust, will be defeated.

Major Danby tells Yossarian that the deal is working out. Yossarian replies that he was going to renege the deal. He points out that Yossarian will be court-martialled. Yossarian tells Major Danby that the official report says that he was stabbed by a Nazi assassin—so he can't be court-martialled. Major Dandy replied that another official report says he was stabbed because of black market operations, and the officials can choose whichever one they find most appropriate Yossarian says that the military bureaucracy is ready to plot and lie against him just to continue the war effort. Yossarian decides to run away. Major Danby urges Yossarian to think of his country. Yossarian says he is in more danger than the country is, "Your country doesn't need your help any more," Yossarian reasoned without antagonism (455). This individual standpoint of Yossarian, it does matter who dies for country. Yossarian uses rational rule to save his live.



Yossarian refuses to succumb to the deal, especially after so many of his friends have died in the war. Suddenly he decides to flee to Sweden without anyone suspecting him. Yossarian then declares he will run away. Yossarian jumps, "Yossarian jumped. Nately's whore was hiding just outside the door. The knife came down, missing him by inches, and he took off" (463). His final reaction makes him irrational in the novel. Being an army of the nation, he does not care for national morality, rather behaves as a general person and flies away from his responsibilities. So he is a coward hero who constantly refuses to fly missions for his nation.

## Chapter IV

### Conclusion

The novel *Catch-22* presents irrational institutions like armies, hospital, big business including some other minor characters. Different people take it differently for their own view. Most of the people, except Yossarian take it as a 'game'. So war is different in Yossarian's viewpoint. He constantly resists against Colonel Cathcart's raised missions to save his life.

Some characters like Orr who shares tent with Yossarian, practices crashing every missions and takes it as a 'game' in the cost of life. Doc Daneeka-depressed, dies figuratively (dies on paper, so he is considered dead); doctor for the squadron; self-pitying hypochondriac; refuses to ground Yossarian because Doc is selfish. Snowden-soldier who dies in Yossarian's plane; while Yossarian was treating him for minor leg wounds. Later he is seen feeding his own urine and waste by doctors. Havermeyer, comes to stand for the brainless human being who cares nothing about his own life and accepts all the demands made by his superiors. Piltchard and Wren who obediently follow the authoritative orders without rational judgment. Clevinger is another character who simply argues that everyone is trying to kill everyone else, so there is nothing important about Yossarian being killed. Mc Watt is the pilot of Yossarian who flies only inches from the ground and does not hear Yossarian over the intercom. Aarfy is an amiable navigator who gets lost whether flying in missions or meeting a girl.

Similarly, Milo Minderbinder-mess officer, leader of the syndicate (black market, underground business dealings), is irrational whose aim is to give the men the best meals in the world; will do not just any thing for a profit, even bombs his own squadron. Doctors of the hospital also appear irrational when they do not diagnose

real problems of Yossarian, they say whatever they know sometimes jaundice, split personalities, crazy, meningitis etc.

In the novel, *Catch-22* is a military term that is confusing and difficult to describe. It is a mysterious regulation that is in essence a circular argument. This catch keeps Yossarian in the war to uphold superior's power. Using this rule of *Catch-22* Colonels Cathcart and Korn make their armies constant in missions whatever in cost. Yossarian is not exception from this rule. Colonel Cathcart constantly raises number of missions in the cost of Yossarian's life for his self promotion. Colonel Cathcart's irrationality appears when he is more interested in getting tight bomb formation to look good in photograph rather than achieving any real meaningful action. He accuses Chaplain's trivial issues like stealing plumtomato and signature of Washington Irving.

Yossarian, on the other hand, army of nation constantly refuses the rule of the state sometimes being in the hospital, going to ask Doc Daneek for leave and being in Rome. Finally, Yossarian violates the rule of the nation fleeing to Switzerland from his responsibility for the sake of his personal life. Yossarian takes this action when he finds secret of Colonels Cathcart and Korn to be promoted to generals. This action of Yossarian's irrationality seems positive though it is good for his personal life but it is harmful for the nation. He does not care for the morality of nation and rather questions the oath of nation.

## Works Cited

- Adams, Hazard. Ed. "Plato." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1962: 10-48.
- Bradbury, Malcolm. *The Modern American Novel*. Chicago: Regnery, 1994.
- Brustein, Robert. "The Logic of Survival in a Lunatic World." *Critique* 13 (1961): 13-21.
- Castell, Alburey and Donald M. Borchert. *An Introduction to Modern Philosophy*. London: Macmillan, 1983.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Civilization and its Discontents." *Readings in the Western Humanities*. Vol. II. Fourth Edition. Eds. Roy T. Matthews and F. Dewitt Platt. New York: McGraw Hill Higher Education, 2001: 212-14.
- Fuller, B.A.G. *A History of Philosophy*. Calcutta: Oxford, 1969.
- Gaarder, Jostein. *Sophie's World*. Great Britain: Phoenix, 1996.
- Hamer, A. Victor. *World Book Millennium*. Chicago: Oxford, 2000.
- Heller, Joseph. *Catch-22*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994.
- Joad, C.E.M. *Guide to Philosophy*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1941.
- Kant, Immanuel. "What is Enlightenment?" *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Ed. Leroy Jearle. Florida: Florida State University Press, 1992: 197-201.
- - -. *Critique of Pure Reason*. London: Macmillan, 1956.
- Lewis, John. *History of Philosophy*. London: The English Universities Press, 1962.
- Lincoln Bruce. *Theorizing Myth: Narrative, Ideology and Scholarship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Matthews, T. Roy and F. Dweitt Platt. *The Western Humanities*. 4th Edition. New York: McGraw Hill, 2001.
- Mitchell, Julian. "Catch-22 and the Iliad." *Spectator* 15 (1962): 309.

- Nussbaum, Fredrick L. *The Triumph of Science and Reason*. New York: Harper, 1953.
- Seed, David. *The Fiction of Joseph Heller Against the Grain*. London: Macmillan, 1989.
- Seiden, Melvin. "Yossarian as an Anti-Hero." *The Nation* 18 (1961): 408-9.
- Smullyan, Paul Dietrichson, David Keyt and Leonard Miller. *Introduction To Philosophy*. New Delhi: G.D. Makhija at the India Offset Press, 1967.
- Spinoza, Benedict. *The Cambridge Companion to Spinoza*. Ed. Don Garret. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Stromberg, Ronald L. *An Intellectual History of Modern Europe*. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1966.