



International Journal of Recent Development in Engineering and Technology
Website: www.ijrdet.com (ISSN 2347-6435(Online) Volume 15, Issue 02, February 2026)

JAINA Philosophy and their Strategies for the Sake of Truth

Dr. Rajendra Mahato

Raiganj, Uttar Dinajpur, West Bengal, India

Keywords-- Art of reasoning, non-violence, respect, theory of relativity of knowledge.

I. INTRODUCTION

Jainism was characterized by its immense emphasis on non-violence, truth, non-possessiveness and strict Puritanism. In Jainism, philosophical and ethical principles guide its followers and help them to lead a life of compassion, non-violence, and spiritual purification. Jaina philosophy or *Jaina Dharma* did not originate from one man. The Jainas are the conquerors of attachment and jealousy. It would not be true to state that Jainism is propagated by a single individual or that only one personality is installed as a God in it. The conquerors of attachment, jealousy and passions are called *Jinas*. Their religion is called Jainism and those who follow and practice this religion are known as Jainas. With time, the Jains installed as their gods those who had won the victory over attachment and jealousy, accepted them as their respected gods and designated them as '*Tirthankaras*'. In their opinion, the number of *Tirthankaras* was construed to be twenty-four, beginning from Ādinātha or Śrī R̥ṣabhadeva to Śrī Vardhamāna or Mahāvīra.

II. RESPECT AND SELF-DISCIPLINE

Jainism is a profound philosophy that emphasizes ethical living, self-discipline and a deep commitment to non-violence and truth. Jaina philosophy offers a unique perspective on the nature of reality, *karma* and the path to spiritual liberation. Furthermore, Jainism has an important logical, philosophical and cultural impact on India and continues to be followed by a devoted group of people worldwide. The concepts of logic had been covered in works on metaphysics and religion during the period of tradition, but there was no organized Jaina treatise on logic at that time.

Their philosophical standpoints: Like other Indian philosophical traditions, Jainism deployed a methodical and logical approach to comprehend the nature of reality and the path to enlightenment. Jainism has a strong tradition of debate and intellectual discourse. Scholars are engaged in discussions to explore and refine their understanding of the Jaina doctrine as well as to defend it against challenges from other philosophical traditions. Jaina philosophers have made significant contributions to Indian logic.

They developed a sophisticated system of logic to support their philosophical arguments and to engage in meaningful debates with other schools of thought. Jaina philosophical reasoning is an ongoing process. It has a rigorous inquiry, the preservation of tradition and the aspiration for spiritual and ethical understanding.

It is important to note that Jaina debates have typically been characterized by a high level of civility, respect and a focus on the pursuit of truth rather than winning arguments. Debates have been expected to cohere to the principles of non-violence and truthfulness in their discourse. Using the Jaina theory of standpoints, Vidyanandin asserted that an object's constituent elements and the object itself have been experienced from different points of view. Siddhasena Divākara's *Nyāyāvātāra*, one of the earliest comprehensive explanations of Jaina logic, made clear how much the Nyāya School's methodologies and terminology were implemented. The Jainas employed logic to both defend their own position and to criticize competitors. They have used different and unique techniques to search reality and prove reality. Most probably, all ancient Indian thinkers had a common technique to establish their theories or philosophical doctrines and that technique or art of reasoning is called debate.

III. ARGUING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUTH:

Jaina debate is an activity in which two opposing viewpoints are presented and persuasive arguments are used to persuade the audience of the position that is supported. A youngster may talk to his parents about whether or not to consume sweets and a student can decide what to study for a profession. Debates are lively teaching tools that help students enhance their fields of study and sharpen their public speaking skills. This has prepared by gathering data to either support or refute a certain position.

In the context of Jaina philosophical debate, almost all philosophical schools have been involved in a debating process. It has a long-standing and rich tradition. Jaina philosophers had also been engaged in debating or a logical process. It was an essential component of intellectual discourse and the accomplishment of knowledge in various schools of Indian philosophy. The concept of debate was integral to the process of arriving at a deeper understanding of philosophical and religious truths.



In Jaina philosophy, the main objective of conversation was to find out the truth or a more fundamental understanding of a given idea. It could be conducted for various reasons, including clarifying doubts, resolving contradictions, defending one's position and testing the validity of philosophical principles like 'non-one-sidedness' (*anekāntavāda*), *Syādvāda*, etc. Debate in Jaina philosophy is not only a means of intellectual inquiry but also a way to cultivate critical thinking and sharpen one's analytical skills. Prominent Jaina scholars Akalaṅkadeva and Prabhācandra asserted that 'debate' must have four elements (*caturanga*). Stated differently '*Sabhāpati*' or the chairman was required for the debate in addition to the two participants and interrogators.

Discussion (*vāda*) consists of assertion and counter-assertion for the establishment of a certain proposition by rejecting its opposite. The disputant or the person who opens the discussion may be eager either to gain a victory or to ascertain the truth. The truth may be sought either for one's self, as a disciple seeks it or for others as a teacher seeks it. The same remarks apply to the opponent or respondent.

In the Jaina debate, '*vādī*' referred to a disputant or a proponent who puts forward a thesis or a proposition for discussion. During debates, participants are engaged in intellectual discussions to explore and understand various philosophical concepts. The proponent (*vādī*) took on the role of presenting and defending a particular viewpoint or argument. The proponent is often to arrive at a deeper understanding of truth and to refine one's own beliefs through rigorous intellectual exchange. Jaina debates often involved a rigorous examination of various viewpoints. *Vādī* plays a crucial role in presenting arguments, counterarguments and logical reasoning. The purpose is to gain a deeper comprehension of the Jaina teachings through the process of dialectical inquiry. It is a dynamic and stimulating aspect of the Jaina philosophical tradition.

The debate continues with each side presenting arguments and counterarguments, following the rules and principles of Jaina logic and philosophy. The Jaina philosophy places a strong emphasis on respectful and logical debate as a means of intellectual and spiritual development. In the context of Jaina debate (*kathā*) for the sake of truth, the term '*prativādī*' (opponent) refers to the opponent or the one who presented counterarguments and alternative viewpoints to the thesis or proposition put forth by the proponent (*vādī*). The *prativādī* played a crucial role in the debate by challenging the proponent's position and offering objections, aiming to engage in a constructive and intellectual discussion.

Opening and closing the debate: The president typically opens the debate by introducing the topic, outlining the rules and setting the tune for the discussion. At the end of the debate, the president could summarize the key points and formally declare that the debate is closed.

Managing turn-taking: The president supervises the order in which participants present their arguments. This involves a structured turn-taking system, allowing each side to express their views systematically. In the debate of disagreements or disputes between participants, the president takes care to resolve conflicts and maintains a fair and impartial atmosphere.

Time management: The president ensures that the debate progressed within the allocated time frame. This involves keeping track of time for each participant, managing breaks and making adjustments as needed to ensure a timely and efficient debate. The president also facilitated question-and-answer sessions, allowing participants to engage with each other's arguments. The president ensures that the questions were relevant and participants have an opportunity to respond.

Remaining neutral: The President maintains a neutral stance throughout the debate. While overseeing the proceedings, the president doesn't take sides or express personal opinions on the topic. This neutrality is essential for creating a fair and unbiased debating environment.

The president in a Jaina debate plays a central role in upholding the principles of respectful dialogue, fairness and obedience to the established rules, contributing to the overall success and meaningfulness of the debate.

IV. THE KEY PHILOSOPHICAL STANDPOINTS IN JAINISM

Several central debating standpoints are in Jaina philosophy of the understanding of reality, morality and the path to liberation. Here, we have discussed some key philosophical principles that often become central points of thought within the Jaina tradition:

Non-absolutism (anekāntavāda) in Jaina philosophy:

These philosophical standpoints collectively contributed to the unique and complicated decoration of Jaina thought. These debating standpoints contribute to the rich and diverse tradition of philosophical discourse within Jainism, fostering a deep understanding of the nature of reality, morality and the path to spiritual liberation. The emphasis on open-mindedness and respect for diverse viewpoints are distinctive features of Jaina philosophical discussions. The theory of non-absolutism (*Anekāntavāda*) is the central idea of Jainism.



As far as the historical development of this theory of *Anekāntavāda* is concerned, historical development can be divided into three phases. The first phase began with the preaching of Mahāvīra, i.e., C. 6th B.C., and was extended up to the composition of Umāsvāti's *Tattvārthasūtra* (the first half of C. 4th A.D.). It was the period of origination of *Anekāntavāda*. The non-violent and tolerant attitude of Mahāvīra helped much in the development of the non-absolutistic principle of *Anekāntavāda*. In *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga*, he opined, One who praises one's viewpoint and discards another's view as a false one and thus distorts the truth will remain confined to the cycle of the birth and death.

A synthesis of opposite viewpoints in philosophy always presents some problems. Philosophers from Jainism were completely cognizant of these challenges. The *Anekānta* doctrine has remained more or less obscure to modern minds. The acceptance of reality and complexity can be summed up by the '*Anekānta*' principle. Jaina philosophers maintain that no statement, whether philosophical or metaphysical, can be valid if it is only stated directly, without qualification or restriction. The principle of '*Anekānta*' can be briefly described as the acceptance of the manifoldness of reality.

We find that Mahāvīra carried the concept of non-violence from the domain of practical behavior to the domain of intellectual and philosophical discussion. Consequently, the Jaina belief in 'respect for others lives' gives the foundation for the principle of 'Respect for others perspectives.' The essence of the *Anekānta* doctrine was embodied in this principle of respect for the views of others. This principle also indicated that all ancient Indian philosophical thoughts respect opposing views. This is the great, unique standpoint of ancient Indian debaters. The philosophical position of the Jainas in this way found expression in the *Anekānta* doctrine, a doctrine that was characterized by tolerance, understanding and respect for the views of others. This is a unique characteristic of Jaina philosophy and religion.

The non-absolutist philosophy generally referred to as *Anekāntavāda*. In fact, it is a unique contribution of the followers of Mahāvīra to the philosophical tradition of India. The term "*Anekānta-vāda*" means, the theory of non-one-sidedness, or to be more specific, 'The theory of the many-sided nature of reality'. A serious study of the Jaina doctrine revealed that it is a philosophy of synthesis - a synthesized presentation of different metaphysical or ontological theories of ancient India.

Anekāntavāda is associated with the metaphysics of Jaina philosophy. According to the Jainas, there are many things in this world, and each of these things has infinite qualities.

According to this doctrine, truth and reality have been perceived differently from different points of view and no single point of view is a complete truth because things have infinite qualities. Some of these qualities are eternal or permanent and some qualities are momentary or impermanent. Eternal qualities are those which are constantly present in things. In contrast, momentary qualities are those that are constantly changing. Since eternal properties determine the nature of the object, they are also called essential properties. Momentary qualities are not always present in the object. They are changeable qualities.

For example: Consciousness is the nature of the soul. On the contrary, happiness, sorrow, desire, imagination, etc. are momentary qualities of the soul. They keep coming and going. The above-mentioned qualities have some basis. The substance has two things: one attribute and another is modes. Essential properties which determine the nature of an object are called attributes and unnecessary properties are called modes. Attributes are unchangeable, while modes are changeable. As there are many qualities of each object, full knowledge is impossible for human beings. Humans can be able to know some properties of an object. There are limits to human knowledge. Only *Kevalins* or omniscient beings can comprehend objects in all aspects and manifestations. This interpretation proves that all human knowledge is partial, one-sided, incomplete and relative.

Jainas hold that dogmatism and fanaticism are the born children of absolutism, i.e., one-sided outlook (*ekāntavāda*). An extremist or absolutist holds that whatever he propounds is correct and what others say is false. Relativists, like *anekāntavādī*, have a tolerant attitude towards other ideologies and beliefs because they believe that both themselves and their opponents may be valid when evaluated from two distinct perspectives. Such individuals are known as non-absolutists. It is the Jaina doctrine of *Anekāntavāda* or non-absolutism on which the concept of religious tolerance and fellowship of faiths are based. The study of Philosophy of the Jaina tradition emphasized that reality is multidimensional, having various attributes, modes, and aspects that can be recognized and experienced from different points of view. As a result, diverse judgments may be formed about it. Even two contradictory statements about an object may hold if they were made from two different angles or viewpoints.

We can understand that the Jaina philosophical concept of *anekāntavāda* made important contributions to ancient Indian philosophy in the areas of skepticism and relativity. Ancient Indian logic and philosophy had been greatly influenced by the theories of *anekāntavāda* and *syādvāda*.

Some scholars state that modern revisionism has attempted to reinterpret *anekāntavāda* with religious tolerance, open-mindedness and pluralism. Non-absolutism is a method used to arguing and analysis. It is a mental eye that is open from all directions and all sides. Shortly, we can say *anekāntavāda* is a philosophy of synthesis and reconciliation since it tries to establish an approach between seemingly disagreeing philosophical schools. Jaina philosophers contended that no philosophical proposition can be true if it is only unconditionally asserted.

The theory of relativity of knowledge (syādvāda) in Jaina philosophy:

Anekāntavāda is closely associated with two more doctrines. These two doctrines are *nayavāda*, which is the doctrine of standpoints and *saptabhaṅgī*, which is the doctrine of sevenfold predication. It is also called *syādvāda*. Let us come to the other significant doctrine related to *vāda*, or the doctrine of sevenfold prediction. The distinctiveness of Jaina's methodology lies in the use of words in its seven-fold predication. That is why it is called *syādvāda*. The word 'syād' means perhaps or may be. According to *syādvāda*, we can make seven assertions about a thing, which appeared to be contradictory, but they are partially true. They are -

V. SAPTA-BHAṅGĪ OR THE SEVEN-FOLD FORMULA

1. May be, is (*syāt asti*),
2. May be, is not (*syāt nāsti*),
3. May be, is and is not (*syāt asti ca nāsti*),
4. May be, is inexpressible (*syādvaktavyah*),
5. May be, is and is inexpressible (*syāt asti ca avaktavyah*),
6. May be, is not and is inexpressible (*syāt nāsti ca avaktavyah*),
7. May be, is, is not, and is inexpressible (*syāt asti ca nāsti ca avaktavyah*).

Number one: from a certain point of view or in a certain sense. 'This man is a father'. Number two: from a certain point of view 'This man is not a father.' Number three: from a certain point of view 'This man is a father and 'This man is not a father.' Number four: from a certain point of view, 'This man is indescribable.' Number five: from a certain point of view, 'This man is a father and is indescribable'. Number six: from a certain point of view, 'This man is not a father and is indescribable'. Number seven: from a certain point of view, 'This man is a father, is not a father, and is indescribable.'

The seven '*Bhaṅgas*' and their origins are similar in that the term '*Bhaṅgas*' refers to the structure of a phrase that reveals the object's all-sided shape. We discover discrepancies in the opinions of several intellectuals on the same thing or religion. We should determine if the distinction is due to a mutually contradictory character. If this is not the case, we must investigate how the seeming conflict is free of contradictions. Put another way, this *saptabhaṅgī* has its roots. "When, in the case of a matter under the description, view differences are visible in matters of *dharma*, the differences should be coordinated with proper modes of proof and due justice should be given to these views by arranging the genuine views in proper order."

We see that Mahavīra advocated for the utmost caution when it comes to one's speech. He believes that discourse ought to be truthful and non-assaulting. He cautioned the monks under his tutelage not to negate or make unjustified categorical claims. He gave them the directive to just declare a condition (*vibhājjavāyam ca viyāgarejjā*). *Syādvāda* which is also called *saptabhaṅgi-naya* is the theory of relativity of knowledge. *Saptabhaṅgi-naya* means 'the theory of sevenfold judgment'. "The word 'Syāt' literally means probable, perhaps, or maybe. The word 'Syāt' is used here in the sense of the relative end. The correct explanation of *syādvāda* is the theory of relativity of knowledge. Reality has infinite aspects which are all relative and we can only know some of these aspects. For this reason, every judgment we make must be constrained, conditional and relative. It is incorrect to accept absolute affirmations or absolute negations. Every judgment has a condition. Because affirmation and denial are not produced from the same perspective and because reality is inherently ambiguous and infinitely complicated, this stance is not self-contradictory. By arguing that the subject and predicate are distinct from the perspective of modes and the same from the perspective of substance, the problem of prediction is resolved. Therefore, it is determined that categorical or absolute prediction is false. Every judgment has many sides. In the same way that negation requires affirmation, affirmation requires negation. From various perspectives, the infinitely complex reality permits all contrary predicates. It is both surreal and real. It is both specific and universal. It is both transient and lasting. It is both numerous and unique. When considering substance, it is actual, global, everlasting, and one. When viewed from the perspective of modes, it is numerous, specific, fleeting and unreal.



Jaina philosophy quotes the old story of six blind men and an elephant. The blind men touched various parts of the elephant with their hands and from the portion they touched, they each attempted to describe the entire animal. Therefore, the man who touched the elephant's ear said that it was like a domestic fan; the man who touched the elephant's leg said it was like a pillar; the man who held the trunk said it was like a python; the man who felt the elephant's tail said it was like a rope; the man who touched the elephant's side said it was like a wall; and the man who touched the elephant's forehead said it was like the breast. And all six of them argued with one another, each saying his account was the only accurate one. As for the blind men, each one feels only a portion of the elephant, which he confuses for the entire animal, but the one who sees the elephant in its entirety may readily discern this. The major cause of almost all disagreements and conflicts in philosophy, ideology, and religion is the mistake of taking a portion of the truth to be the complete truth. Our opinions can only assert a partial truth as they reflect distinct facets of complex reality. According to this perspective, Jainism is tolerant, open-minded and Catholic. It encourages regard for the opinions of others.

Everything exists concerning its substance, space, time and form of a person but it does not exist concerning its substance, space, time and form of another person. Saying 'this table exists' does not imply that it exists in all absolute and unconditional terms. Our understanding of the table is inherently subjective. There are many qualities in the table, of which we are only aware of a small portion. Our understanding of the table is relative; it is entirely real and immensely complicated reality in and of itself. The table has to exist for us in its material form-wood-in its specific shape, length, width and height in a specific location, at a specific moment and in that precise place. It is not present in other substances, forms, locations or eras. Thus, a table does not contradict itself when viewed from multiple perspectives, as it may be both real and non-existent. Jaina logic differentiates seven types of judgment. Since every judgment is subjective, 'syāt' comes before it. It is *syadvāda* and is also known as *saptabhāṅginaya*.

Nayavāda asserted that a thing has infinite aspects, and therefore there are infinite philosophical positions. Each position or standpoint is called a '*naya*'. Each '*naya*' is partially true and therefore gives partial knowledge. The various *naya*'s are then synthesized to give a full picture of the object to understand what it means.

'Siddhasena Divākara in his work *Sanmātītarka* rightly observed that all the schools of thought are valid'. They are understood from their standpoints or angles, and they didn't discard the truth value of others. A non-absolutist doesn't divide them into the categories of true and false.

The same spirit is also followed by Haribhadra in his works such as *Śāstravārtā-Samuccaya* and *Śaḍḍarsāna-Samuccaya*. It is only Haribhadra, who in his *Śaḍḍarsāna-Samuccaya*, presented all the six schools of thought in their true spirit and without condemning them. No other work in the history of Indian philosophy has been written to date in such a noble spirit. Jaina Ācāryas attempted to create harmony and peace in the community at his time by attempting to combine the various opposing viewpoints. This non-absolutistic, broader outlook can develop harmony among conflicting ideologies and faiths. Jainism holds that the followers of other sects can also attain emancipation or *mokṣa*, if they can destroy attachment and aversions. They don't believe in the narrow outlook that the followers of Jainism only can achieve emancipation. This broader outlook of Jainas is only possible based on *anekāntavāda*. Haribhadra further says that neither one who remains without clothes nor who is white-clad, neither a logician nor a philosopher, nor a devotee of personal cult, will get liberation unless he overcomes his passions. A non-absolutist accepts that the differences or the diversity of the modes of worship depend on the time, place and levels of aspirants. Jainas accepted that all other viewpoints and schools of thought conjoin to each other and a broader outlook. We can ensure peace and harmony in our world by adopting this more expansive and objective perspective.

The traditional seven standpoints may be understood in the following way:

The doctrine of seven-fold *nayas* was also developed from time to time. The *nayas* are: (i) Considering both the general and particular properties of the thing (*Naigama Naya*), (ii) Considering the general properties of an object (*Samgraha Naya*), (iii) Considering specific properties of an object (*Vyavahāra Naya*), (iv) Confined only to the present mode of an object (*Rjūsūtra Naya*), (v) Treating with synonyms (*Śabda Naya*), (vi) Taking into consideration only etymological as well as the different meanings of the word (*Samabhirūḍha Naya*) and (vii) Denoting an object in its actual state of performing its natural function (*Evambhūta Naya*).

VI. CONCLUSION

In Indian philosophical tradition, there was a trend to reject the other's standpoint and establish their theory through the system of debate. This is the true sense of philosophizing and through this they have established their philosophical outcomes. At that time, there were many theories. It was difficult to choose what is the right method? That's why the Jaina thinkers decided to look after the world from a new standpoint.



Not only this, nowadays the problem is much more than the ancient. We are pitting one class against the other by claiming the superiority of our own caste, creed and culture over others. Class disputes are getting more intense every day, not just in India but around the world as well that are disturbing the serenity and peace of human civilization. This work aims to provide an overview of the contribution of the ancient tradition that is Jainism to the framework of philosophical disputation in India.

If we want to save humanity from the curses of fanaticism and dogmatism, we should accept the Jaina theory of non-absolutism (*Anekāntavāda*). It is the *Anekāntavāda*, which forbids being dogmatic and fanatic in our approach. The spirit of *Anekānta* is very much necessary in society especially in the present days when conflicting ideologies are trying to assert supremacy aggressively. *Anekānta* brings the spirit of intellectual and social tolerance. For present-day society what is needed, is the virtue of tolerance. This virtue of tolerance which is the regard for other ideologies and faiths has been maintained in Jainism from the very beginning. According to the Jaina thinkers, equal regard for different faiths and religions should be the base of religious harmony and fellowship of faiths. Whatever excellent qualities and virtues they possess, unless they are united in the common thread of fellowship and equal regard for others, they cannot have their due place in human hearts and can be changed for spreading hostility and hatred in mankind. So, one thing we must bear in mind is that if we consider other ideologies and faiths as totally false, then we shall not be able to establish real harmony in human society and conflicts among different religions will remain forever.

Every religion or faith has its origin in a particular social and cultural background and has its utility and truth value accordingly. As the different parts of the body have their position and utility in their organic whole and work for its common good, so is the case with different religions in human society. They should work for the common goal of human society and try to resolve the conflicts of ideologies and faiths and make life on earth peaceful. If every faith is working for the human good, it has an equal right to exist and work for that. According to Siddhasena Divākara, divergent viewpoints or faiths may be charged as false only when they negate the truth value of others and claim themselves to be exclusively true. But if they accept the truth value of other ideologies and faiths based on *Anekāntavāda*, they attain righteousness. He further propounded that every viewpoint or faith in its sphere is right, but if every one of them considered itself as a whole truth and disregarded the views of their rivals, they do not attain righteousness, for all the viewpoints are partially true.

Their truth value is remained in their respective spheres or angles. If they encroach upon the province of other viewpoints and consider them as false, they are wrong. For a non-absolutist, rightness of a particular faith or ideology depends on the acceptance of the partial rightness of others. In another way, we can say that debater believes in a harmonious coexistence and works for the common good of mankind. Jainism said that acceptance of non-absolutism is the only way to remove religious conflicts and violence from the earth and establish harmony among various ideologies and faiths. According to Jainism, it is only the concept of non-absolutism that can develop a tolerant outlook and establish peace in the earth.

Jaina philosophy presents a profound and systematic approach to the pursuit of truth, grounded in intellectual humility, ethical discipline, and spiritual realization. At its core, it emphasizes that truth is complex, many-sided, and cannot be fully grasped from a single standpoint. This insight is expressed through the doctrine of *Anekāntavāda*, which teaches that reality possesses multiple aspects and that every judgment reflects only a partial perspective. By encouraging openness to diverse viewpoints, Jain thinkers developed a strategy that reduces dogmatism and promotes dialogue, tolerance, and coexistence. This philosophical pluralism becomes an effective means for safeguarding truth in a world shaped by differing beliefs and interpretations. Closely connected to this is the doctrine of *Syādvāda*, or conditional predication, which provides a logical framework for expressing truth with precision and caution. It reminds individuals that statements about reality must be qualified according to context, time, and standpoint. Such a method not only refines rational inquiry but also nurtures intellectual responsibility. Alongside these epistemological strategies, Jain philosophy integrates ethics with knowledge. The practice of *Ahimsa* (non-violence), truthfulness, non-attachment, and self-discipline creates the moral conditions necessary for the realization of truth. According to Jainism, truth cannot be separated from purity of conduct; rather, it emerges through the transformation of the self.

Furthermore, the emphasis on self-experience and spiritual discipline reflects the teachings of figures such as Mahavira, who regarded truth as both a philosophical and existential goal. Thus, Jain strategies for the sake of truth combine logical analysis, ethical living, and spiritual practice. In the contemporary world, these principles remain highly relevant, offering a constructive model for resolving conflicts, fostering mutual respect, and promoting harmony. Ultimately, Jain philosophy teaches that truth is not merely an abstract concept but a lived reality, achieved through compassion, restraint, and openness to the plurality of existence.



International Journal of Recent Development in Engineering and Technology
Website: www.ijrdet.com (ISSN 2347-6435(Online) Volume 15, Issue 02, February 2026)

REFERENCES

- [1] Balcerowicz, Piotr. (2003). *Jaina epistemology in historical and comparative perspective: Critical edition and English translation of Logical Treatise on Jain Philosophy*. Motilal Banarsidass.
- [2] Chakravarti, A.. (1952). *The philosophy of the Jaina*. University of Calcutta.
- [3] Dundas, Paul. (2002). *The Jains* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- [4] Jaini, Padmanabh S.. (1979). *The Jaina path of purification*. University of California Press.
- [5] Koller, John M.. (2000). Syādvāda as the epistemological key to the Jaina system. *Philosophy East and West*, 50(3), 400–407.
- [6] Matilal, Bimal Krishna. (1981). The central philosophy of Jainism (Anekāntavāda). In *The Central Philosophy of Jainism* (pp. 1–46). Motilal Banarsidass.
- [7] Mukerjee, S. C.. (1974). *The Jaina philosophy of non-absolutism*. Motilal Banarsidass.
- [8] Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli, & Moore, Charles A. (Eds.). (1957). *A sourcebook in Indian philosophy*. Princeton University Press.
- [9] Sangave, Vilas A.. (1980). *Jainism: A cultural, social and religious study*. Popular Prakashan.
- [10] Shah, Natubhai. (1998). *Jainism: The world of conquerors* (Vols. 1–2). Motilal Banarsidass.
- [11] Sinha, Jadunath. (1990). *Indian philosophy* (Vol. 1). Motilal Banarsidass.
- [12] Tatia, Nathmal. (1994). *That which is: Tattvā*
- [13] *rtha Sūtra of Umasvati*. HarperCollins.