

# COMBAT OF SHOUICAN: A QUANDARY?

*Time is the glitch  
And life is full of wish  
Were I CAN is the least  
Our conscious tries to twist  
Being oblivious to our teach  
That I SHOULD is the only cinch  
One can aim to clinch*  
-----LALPAT

Unlike many proverbial combats, this one has never received any special explicit mention in our history; even though this evolutionary combat is the mother of all combats and also their root cause.

Let us first comprehend the foundation on which SHOUICAN exists and then explore its implications.

This combat is the psychological interplay of two of the most basic verb in English language (irrespective of tense) creating copious options resulting in mental and hence physical ramifications affecting each and every human being directly or indirectly. SHOUICAN stands for abbreviated form of SHOULD & non-abbreviated form of CAN. More pertinently it is “I SHOULD” versus “I CAN”; the sources of predicament.

Before we discuss the plot of warfare, we need to know on what grounds do they exists in the first place. So logically we have to understand the psychological origin of SHOULD & CAN.

SHOULD is an intricate concoction of one's VALUES (Moral, Ethic, Conscience & Discipline) & PRIORITY (Basic hygiene, Aspiration like wants and desires). More importantly it is almost an act to satiate one's immediate NEED (Desperation where Dominant Emotions (eg Fear, Love, Compassion) are strong). Here NEED may be equated to PRIORITY, but it is not the case always and hence almost (Here NEED has high IRRATIONAL component as compared to PRIORITY). Thus it is a product of refined battle between immediate NEED & intricate concoctions were higher weightage is given to the former in deciding the outcome.

CAN is simply an intricate concoction of one's range of PRESENTIMENTS. The outcome is the creation of a notion of certainty thereby forcing oneself to act in accordance. Here certainty embrace's both validness & in-validness of PRESENTIMENTS though at any given point of time only one of them prevails the most to force such an act.

Thus began the COMBAT of SHOU CAN. The story says that the first ever initiation of this warfare in crude form began within the evolutionary human mind when one's mind encountered conscious with the preliminary ability to interpret the senses. (Refined implicit & more importantly explicit interpretation was due to the development of language system, which leads to copious classification of reality, thereby guiding the evolution to its current state of creation's.). Without interpretation skill, mere conscious cannot structure the senses. This is to say that interpretation of senses lead to the development of language system, which further refined the former creating a loop. Even now one can observe such first time initiation of the above combat during the upbringing of a newborn child; clearly indicating that not all aspects of evolution are mutable. (Rather for clear insight try to relate from here onwards the below discussions with respect to the upbringing of a newborn child more specifically relating to the development of interpretation of senses)

So what exactly happens when these two entities encounter each other? In the initial period of development the encounter answers mainly to the call of the conscious, as interpretation of senses is still in preliminary state not having enough meaning upon which one can take any action. Hence here conscious tries to satisfy the immediate NEEDS of one's existence like hunger, protection etc. Hence NEEDS equals PRIORITY at this stage, as VALUES are none. Thus I SHOULD is effectively the strongest fighter on the battleground with outright leadership on one's mind.

Of course it is quite obvious that the supremacy of I SHOULD existed even before it encountered interpretation of senses. But here we are talking of a combat that requires two distinct opponents. Thus the initiation of this combat is nothing but the infiltration of I CAN on I SHOULD territory. And this transient period of supremacy is assumed to be of relatively short duration. This is so because preliminary ability of interpretation of senses initially begins through kinesthetic, visual, audio & olfactory means that gets further refined & generates more meaning over a period of time through processing of the inputs.

Now as the time progresses the conscious mingles with interpretation of senses and starts registering present thereby creating a repertoire of presents' in other words experience. This repertoire of experience is of course processed by special processing functions of evolved mind before it is stored. (Basic functions been to differentiate & integrate the inputs.) This fuels creation of PRESENTIMENTS and hence birth of I CAN takes place. These PRESENTIMENTS initially been based upon repertoire of presents, are also created gradually by taking into account future estimates. Hence any one PRESENTIMENT is interplay of past & future value to produce a notion of certainty for present action.

Thus at every point of time the battle gets highly tactical were I CAN, the new entrant, tries to overcome the mighty power of I SHOULD, which is strategically entrenched as a strong opponent. The result of their warfare creates what is known as FANTISIZED REALITY in one's mind that creates perceivable actions, perceivable in some form or another to the outside world. Of course not always is the true intent of FANTISIZED REALITY is perceivable at the exact time of creation to the outside world as at times the true form of intent takes time to develop.

One striking feature of this warfare is that I CAN partly fuels I SHOULD even though it cannot avoid this perennial battle with the latter. This is so because one main component of I SHOULD is VALUES. And I CAN being intricate concoction of PRESENTIMENTS actually creates VALUES. Remember that VALUES are least mutable as compared to PRESENTIMENTS. Repetitive occurrence of similar PRESENTIMENTS only strengthens the previously well-established VALUES. Thus I SHOULD thrives on I CAN and hence on most of the occasions I SHOULD maintains an upper hand in the warfare.

But when I CAN adopts guerilla warfare tactics in which it attacks the opponent with sudden burst of energy I SHOULD can do nothing. In this event even if VALUES are not aligned with the dominant PRESENTIMENTS, they temporarily capitulate to strengthen themselves by seeking solace in time. During this time NEED shakes hand with I CAN and renders I SHOULD in despair. Hence dominant PRESENTIMENT equals NEED and I CAN wins the battle for particular time period. But stronger the VALUES, stronger will be the force of I SHOULD. Hence with combined strength of PRORITY (which also gets driven partly by VALUES) & strong VALUES I SHOULD tries to overcome I CAN's dominance. But if

VALUES are not strongly entrenched than repeated guerilla attacks by I CAN can changed the VALUES and hence I SHOULD may never win any progressive battle. Eg mentally retarded mind has high dominance of I CAN.

But isn't I CAN's status prominent in the initial period of development of VALUES when the latter is not strongly entrenched? Then as per the above discussion I SHOULD will never ever be in a position to regain strength isn't it?

Uptill now one major component was not considered in the above discussion, which guided the development of interpretation of senses thereby changing PRESENTIMENTS & hence VALUES. That major component is the external source of interpretation of senses namely Mother, Teacher etc. As long as the external source has command over the interpretation of senses sudden burst of I CAN's are suppressed thereby enforcing the previously entrenched VALUES and subsequently creating complimentary VALUES. In fact this external force is the primary reason for creation of VALUE in the first place. But as the time progresses very few external sources can maintain initial level of command. But due to initial reinforcement, under normal circumstances I CAN is shaped partly by I SHOULD as PRESENTIMENTS starts to factor in the VALUE component in its equation.

What a battle it is? Weak opponent helps the stronger to finally keep itself under check and hence relatively weak, mostly forever. And who is the ultimate winner of this combat?

Needless to say, the above battle is not a one-time event. As long as both the players are existent together the warfare is alive. And obvious is the fact that as soon as conscious and hence I SHOULD is dead the warfare is finished.

The above discussion throws light on few very critical aspect of battle.

- ✧ I SHOULD cannot avoid the battle with I CAN
- ✧ I CAN is still a loser if I SHOULD dies
- ✧ I SHOULD is the winner on most occasion though its victory is shaped by I CAN.
- ✧ I SHOULD acts as a controller for I CAN
- ✧ Evolution is the ultimate winner of their combat

Below grid depicts the warfare at higher level of cognizance. Though grid shows only 2 dimensions of entity the 3<sup>rd</sup> dimension namely TIME is assumed

to be existent even before the start of the combat. The point is that TIME creates spatial ground on which the battle is fought.

		I SHOULD	
		Yes	No
I CAN	Yes		
	No		

It would have been a great relief if the dominant sources of predicament were not I SHOULD and I CAN but rather should be SHOULD I and CAN I. But mind grasps & take actions faster on answers than on questions. This is so because questions most of the time leads to further questions and may temporarily get tangled in a loop. As long as this phase is not too long, mind can still tackle its existence and serve its needs. But this phase rarely short lives and by that time mind resources needs some actionable preoccupation. This can be provided by quick answers provided by I SHOULD and I CAN. Hence evolution created predominance of I SHOULD and I CAN over SHOULD I and CAN I.

**Is the COMBAT OF SHOUCAN a quandary? Quandary  
or not but it is certainly a REALITY more precisely a  
FANTISIZED REALITY.**

LAMPAT