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INTRODUCTION

Theoretical framework is a detailed description of a proposed study; it includes justification for the study, detailed description of the steps that will be followed in the study, the sequential related concept and events with the topic and information about the analysis of the collected data. Theoretical framework provides a guide for conducting the study. It provides the sequence of topic that means, how it is related to the present study with the past. It is also a background and context of the research and the operational explanation of the concept and ideas on the basis of which the work is carried.

It is generally agreed by all that philosophy must be based on experience. Often the term experience has been limited to certain specific regions.

From ancient age to the postmodern age, significant philosophical changes have taken place. Each and every age has its own contribution to society. Some also different places and their respective philosophers have influenced the field of education and philosophy. Now we have reached the postmodern age, there are tremendous changes have taken place in all respect, viz., literature, music, education, thinking process, life style etc.

In ancient age, different philosophical thought was prevail. Out tradition and culture has crossed different age. For example –

(a) Age of Darkness
(b) Age of Reasoning
(c) The age of Enlightenment

Dark Age

When it was fashionable to denigrate everything medieval, this term was after applied by way of abuse to the entire millennium called the middle ages, which comprises much of the finest culture. In Europe, many of the greatest painters and some of the great thinkers, as well as vivacious spirituality, diligent scholarship and remarkable technological skills were raised. As such it was unsuitable to the point of absurdity. It is now-a-days sometimes applied, with
more propriety to the earlier. Middle ages, a period during which conditions were primitive, anarchy prevalent, and culture stagnant, genuine thinkers were rare. The later Middle Ages, especially from the 12th century to till Renaissance, were anything other than dark.

**Darkness**

As a mythological category, darkness is used throughout the Bible, from the opening of Genesis onward, as a symbol of chaos and of the primordial alloys out of which the universe is created. In this sense, it is always set in opposition, and truth. So in John's Prologue (John 1), the Logos comes to the world as the light coming into the darkness, but the darkness could not understand it, so the light went generally unnoticed. Darkness at noon is represented the ultimate catastrophe. Darkness is been as evil: Satan and other wicked agencies work out of darkness although after assuming the appearance of light in order to achieve the deception they must employ to corrupt the minds and hearts of men and women. Sinners are cast into darkness, the darkness to which their sin belongs. The term functions both mythologically and metaphorically in such ways, especially in John nevertheless it is sometimes used of course in a straightforward empirical sense as would anyone, use it in referring to night or a room devoid of sunlight. The mythological and empirical uses are sometimes confused that is in the opening verses of Genesis, in which God not only creates light, thus dispelling darkness (chaos), but at the same time gives darkness a name (night) as he gives a name to light (day).

Dark Age or Dark Ages is a term in historiography referring to a period of cultural decline or societal collapse that took place in Western Europe between the fall of Rome and the eventual recovery of learning. The dating of the ‘Dark Ages’ has always been fluid, but the concept was originally intended to devote the entire period between the fall of Rome in the 5th century and the “Renaissance” on “rebirth” of classical values. Increased understanding of the accomplishments of the Middle Ages in the 19th century challenged the characterization of the entire period as one of darkness, and thus the term is often restricted to periods within the Middle Ages, namely the Early Middle Ages, though this is disputed by most modern scholarship as well. Modern scholarship
tends to avoid using this phrase. The concept of a Dark Ages was created by the Italian scholar Petrarch in the 1830 and was originally intended as a sweeping criticism of the character of Late Latin literature. Late historians expanded the term to refer to the transitional period between Classical Roman Ambiguity and the High Middle Ages, including not only the lack of Latin literature, but also a contemporary written history, general demographic decline, limited building activity and material cultural achievements in general popular culture has further expanded on the term as a vehicle to depict the Middle Ages as term of backwardness, extending its pejorative use and expanding its scope.

Age of reasoning

The concept of reason has been variously understood in the history of western thought. In Greek philosophy, three terms, nous, logos and prognosis might all be translated by the term ‘reason’. Nous, in Plato and Aristotle, is the highest faculty of human knowledge. Aristotle distinguished between nous poietikos or active reason and passive reason, which complement each other. Active reason, which makes all things, survives the body, being immortal. Passive reason, living the seat of individuality, does not do so. Aristotle called God, thought thinking itself.

The term logo was used in Greek philosophy even before the time of Socrates. Heraclitus used it to designate the objective reason or which the soul of man is part. The term tended however, to be replaced by nous until the stories designated their principle of purpose in the universe as logos or God.

Aristotle had drawn another distinction that was to have much importance in the subsequent history of Western thought: the distinction between reason as contemplative or on looking and reason as “practical”. By practical reason Aristotle meant the faculty with which we perceive what means are available to us in order to achieve contemplated goals, which among these means are the most efficient, and how to make the best use of these means.

The 18th century has been called “the age of reason”, but by then ambiguities had begun to undermine the meaning of the term, which traditionally had been invested with significance inseparable from religious concerns. Hobbes for instance, in the 17th century had understood reason as what we might now call a
computer-like, mechanistic process. Locke, although taking a very different stance, might be said to have envisioned the reasoning process as one of combining and arranging the simple ideas of experience in such a way as to produce general or abstract ideas. Hume's thought, especially in this doctrine of the association of ideas, tended to empty still further the traditional role of reason in the human mind. He saw reason as "the slave of the passions" and therefore limited to showing us the means to ends that the passions dictate. Kant, however, took the concept of reason very seriously, distinguishing between "pure reason" and "practical reason". Pure reason functions on its own, independent of other faculties of human consciousness such as appetite and will, what Kant called "practical" reason originates knowledge about ethical conduct and reflects on the possibilities opened up to us by human freedom. Kant also distinguished reason from understanding. By contrast, reason is an active principle, driven by an impossible demand to transcend the limitations of human experience.

The term "reason" has come to be used, however, with a wide variety of meanings. For example, it can mean the capacity to reflect and to analyze, the ability to draw inferences, to think. One may be said to act "for a reason" or even "for a good (or bad) reason". Reasoning may be contrasted with reasoning, the process of making inferences. Reasoning may be seen as one of several kinds of states of consciousness and it may be used honestly in a quest for truth or dishonestly in trying to confuse or make the worse appear the better cause.³

In epistemology and in its modern sense rationalism is any view appealing to reason as a source of "knowledge" or "justification". In a more technical term it is a method or a theory in which the criterion of the truth is not sensory but intellectual and "deductive". Different degrees of emphasis on this method or theory lead to a range of rationalist standpoints, from the moderate position "that reason has precedence over other ways of acquiring knowledge" to the radical position is "the unique path to knowledge". Given a pre-modern understanding of reason, "rationalism" is identical to philosophy, the Socratic life of enquiry.

Since, the Enlightenment, rationalism is usually associated with the introduction of mathematical methods into philosophy, as in Descartis, Leibniz and Spinoza. This is commonly called continental rationalism, because it was
predominant in the continental school of Europe, whereas in Britain empiricism dominated. The Age of Enlightenment

"The age of Enlightenment was a time in which many ideas were re-thought and clarified. Even the word enlightens means to "Shine a light on". During this period in time, Man’s power of reasoning was greatly appreciated. During this era many scientific inventions and concepts were created, such as industrial revolution."

Enlightenment is described by the historians as the age of reason. It was premised upon a belief in the universality of reason and the universal character of scientific explanation. Modernity emerged out of this scientific nature of human society. It became clear to social scientists that if nature can be explained in terms of reason, why not society be explained scientifically. It discouraged traditional understanding of society.

The emergence of modernity thus traces back to enlightenment. Enlightenment was renaissance, humanism and the recovery of classical thought in the city states of Italy from 15th and 16th centuries. Modern science, therefore, can through enlightenment and it was during this period that the tradition was questioned by scientific reasoning. The hegemony of traditions was so strong in Europe during this period that it received its first blow from modernity.6

The age of Enlightenment is a term used to describe a phase in Western philosophy and cultural life centered upon the 17th century, in which reason was advocated as the primary source and legitimacy for authority. Developing in Germany, France, Britain, the Netherlands and Italy, the movement spread through much of Europe, including Russia and Scandinavia.

There is no consensus on when to date the start of the age of Enlightenment and some scholars simply use the beginning of the 18th century or the middle of the 17th century as a default date. If taken back to the mid 1600s, the Enlightenment would trace its origins to Descartes Discourse on the Method. At the other end, many scholars use the beginning of the Napoleonic wars as convenient points in time with which to date the end of the Enlightenment. Still others describe the Enlightenment must beginning in Britain's Glorious
Revolution of 1688 and ending in the French Revolution of 1789. However, others also claim the Enlightenment ended with the death of Voltaire in 1778. The enlightenment occupies a central role in the justification for the movement known as modernism.\(^7\)

The thinkers of the Enlightenment were committed to secular views based on reason or human understanding only, which they hoped would provide a basis for beneficial changes affecting every area of life and thought. The more extreme and radical philosophers advocated a philosophical rationalism deriving its methods from science and natural philosophy that would replace religion as the means of understanding nature and destiny of humanity. These individuals were materialists, pantheists, or atheists. Other enlightenment thinkers supposed fanaticism, but were either agnostic or left room for some kind of religious faith.

The Enlightenment came to an end in Western Europe after the upheavals of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic era revealed the casts of its political program and the lack of commitment in those whose rhetoric was after more liberal than their actions. Nationalism indirect its cosmopolitan values and assumptions about human nature, and the romantic attacked its belief that clear intelligible its belief that clear intelligible answers could be found to every question asked by people who sought to be happy.

Enlightenment was eroded by the growth of a new wealthy educated class of businessmen, products of the industrial revolution. Only in North and South America, where industry came later and revolution had not led to reaction, did the Enlightenment linger into the 19\(^{th}\) century. Its lasing heritage has been its contribution to the literature of human freedom and some institutions in which its values have been embodied.\(^8\)

**Evolution of modernism and Postmodernism**

Modernization came with the processes of urbanization and industrialization. Industrialization which came in 18\(^{th}\) century, Europe is the forerunner of modernity. Certainly, modernity did not emerge over night. It took two century to develop. The attributes of modernity took multiple processes. Industrialization transformed the agricultural- traditional society into modern- bureaucratic- rational- capitalist society. There was consensus among social
thinkers that modernity ultimately led to progress and development. Admittedly, modernity started with an economic thrust, it finally took to a political shift, which divided the world into modern and modernizing and developed and developing. Modernization is both a theory and a process. As a theory it has given place to the condemnation of a large number of traditions, as a process it has landed itself to postmodernity, which is in fact, hypermodernity or late modernity.

In course of time, modernization also brought a change in the political system. The new political system differed substantially from the traditional form of political regime. In societies, the political authorities namely monarchs, emperors and kings had little direct influence on the customs and habits of most of their subjects, who lived in fairly self-contained local village.

The coming of industrialization revolutionized the production. It also facilitated transportation and communication. In the West, industrialization created new fields of social life, which were non-economic in content. Now, there emerged nation-states which increasingly became political communities divided from each other by clearly delimited borders rather than the vague frontier areas that used to separate traditional states. In the context of nation states resulting from industrial economy, the new governments assumed extensive powers over many aspects of citizen’s life, framing laws that apply to all those living within their borders.

Anthony Giddens, who has written extensively on modernization and its consequences, says that the process has not only influenced the traditional economy but has also given new dimensions to some of the sensitive areas of power concentration. The key word, which helps to analyse modernity, is development. From the 17th to the early 18th century, the western countries came to be known as developed countries. They had substantial development in the fields of industry, democracy and capitalism. In their maturity, they established colonies in numerous areas previously occupied by traditional societies, using their superior military strength and capital resources. Although these colonies have now attained their independence, the process of colonialization was central to shaping the social map of the globe as we know it today. Thus, in the
beginning development was considered as the key feature for the identification of a nation. Modernity thus is identified with industrialization. Second it is also clubbed with capitalism. The north of the world is industrialized that is, it is wealthy, and the south is lesser modernized and therefore is developing, that is, lesser wealthier. There is yet another mark of modernity. It is political power, which is industrializations result in development, development proceeds to capitalism, capitalism leads to superiority in power.

Modernity is fundamentally about order: about rationality and rationalization, creating order out of chaos. The assumption is that creating more rationality is conducive to creating more order, and that the more ordered a society is, the better it will function (the more rationally it will function). Because modernity is about the pursuit of ever-increasing levels of order, modern societies constantly are on guard against anything and everything labeled as "disorder," which might disrupt order. Thus modern societies rely on continually establishing a binary opposition between "order" and "disorder," so that they can assert the superiority of "order."

Modernism has two facets, or two modes of definition, both of which are relevant to understanding postmodernism.

The first facet or definition of modernism comes from the aesthetic movement broadly labeled "modernism." This movement is roughly coterminous with twentieth century Western ideas about art (though traces of it in emergent forms can be found in the nineteenth century as well). Modernism, as you probably know, is the movement in visual arts, music, literature, and drama which rejected the old Victorian standards of how art should be made, consumed, and what it should mean. In the period of "high modernism," from around 1910 to 1930, the major figures of modernism literature helped radically to redefine what poetry and fiction could be and do: figures like Woolf, Joyce, Eliot, Pound, Stevens, Proust, Mallarme, Kafka, and Rilke are considered the founders of twentieth-century modernism.

From a literary perspective, the main characteristics of modernism include

1. An emphasis on impressionism and subjectivity in writing (and in visual arts as well); an emphasis on HOW seeing (or reading or perception itself) takes place,
rather than on WHAT is perceived. An example of this would be stream-of-consciousness writing.

2. a movement away from the apparent objectivity provided by omniscient third-person narrators, fixed narrative points of view, and clear-cut moral positions. Faulkner's multiply-narrated stories are an example of this aspect of modernism.

3. A blurring of distinctions between genres, so that poetry seems more documentary (as in T.S. Eliot or Cummings) and prose seems more poetic (as in Woolf or Joyce).

4. An emphasis on fragmented forms, discontinuous narratives, and random-seeming collages of different materials.

5. A tendency toward reflexivity, or self-consciousness, about the production of the work of art, so that each piece calls attention to its own status as a production, as something constructed and consumed in particular ways.

6. A rejection of elaborate formal aesthetics in favor of minimalist designs (as in the poetry of William Carlos Williams) and a rejection, in large part, of formal aesthetic theories, in favor of spontaneity and discovery in creation.

7. A rejection of the distinction between "high" and "low" or popular culture, both in choice of materials used to produce art and in methods of displaying, distributing, and consuming art.

Conclusion: Modernity is both a process and a theory. Sociological literature has two sets of theoretical frameworks which help us to understand both these. The first set of thinkers consists of classical theories which conclude modernity as summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thinkers</th>
<th>Theoretical sum up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>Enlightenment is reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galileo</td>
<td>Empiricism, science, and progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonnies</td>
<td>Modernity is from community to society (continuum theory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durkheim</td>
<td>Modernity is increased social differentiation or stratification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marx</td>
<td>Modernity is commodification, exploitation and alienation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>Formal rationality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmel</td>
<td>Money and market (modernity).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contemporary theories of modernity have different approaches and consequently different variants. Some of the variants are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thinkers</th>
<th>Theoretical sum up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giddens</td>
<td>Modernity is multi-dimensional: Capitalism, industrialism, administrative power and military power. Modernity is juggernaut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>Modern society is risk society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritzer</td>
<td>Hyperrationality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holocaust.</td>
<td>Bauman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habermas</td>
<td>Modernity is rationality, an incomplete project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Postmodernism**

Postmodernism was first identified as a theoretical discipline in the 1980s, but as a cultural movement it predates them by many years. Exactly when modernism began to give way to postmodernism is difficult to pinpoint, if not simply impossible. Some theorists reject that such a distinction even exists, viewing postmodernism, for all its claims of fragmentation and plurality, as still existing within a larger 'modernist' framework. The philosopher Jürgen Habermas is a strong proponent of this view.

The theory gained some of its strongest ground early on in French academia. In 1979 Jean-François Lyotard wrote a short but influential work *The Postmodern Condition: a report on knowledge*. Jean Baudrillard, Michel Foucault, and Roland Barthes (in his more post-structural work) are also strongly influential in postmodern theory. Postmodernism is closely allied with several contemporary academic disciplines, most notably those connected with sociology. Many of its assumptions are integral to feminist and post-colonial theory. Some identify the burgeoning anti-establishment movements of the 1960s as the earliest trend out of cultural modernity toward postmodernism.

Tracing it further back, some identify its roots in the breakdown of Hegelian idealism, and the impact of both World Wars (perhaps even the concept of a World War). Heidegger and Derrida were influential in re-examining the fundamentals of knowledge, together with the work of Ludwig Wittgenstein and
his philosophy of action, Soren Kierkegaard's and Karl Barth's important fideist approach to theology, and even the nihilism of Nietzsche's philosophy. Michel Foucault's application of Hegel to thinking about the body is also identified as an important landmark. While it is rare to pin down the specific origins of any large cultural shift, it is fair to assume that postmodernism represents an accumulated disillusionment with the promises of the Enlightenment project and its progress of science, so central to modern thinking.

The movement has had diverse political ramifications: its anti-ideological insights appear conducive to, and strongly associated with, the feminist movement, racial equality movements, homosexual rights movements, most forms of late 20th century anarchism, even the peace movement and various hybrids of these in the current anti-globalization movement. Unsurprisingly, none of these institutions entirely embraces all aspects of the postmodern movement, but reflect or, in true postmodern style, borrow from some of its core ideas.

Finally, postmodernism is concerned with questions of the organization of knowledge. In modern societies, knowledge was equated with science, and was contrasted to narrative; science was good knowledge, and narrative was bad, primitive, irrational (and thus associated with women, children, primitives, and insane people). Knowledge, however, was good for its own sake; one gained knowledge, via education, in order to be knowledgeable in general, to become an educated person. This is the ideal of the liberal arts education. In a postmodern society, however, knowledge becomes functional—you learn things, not to know them, but to use that knowledge. As Sarup points out (p. 138), educational policy today puts emphasis on skills and training, rather than on a vague humanist ideal of education in general. This is particularly acute for English majors. "What will you DO with your degree?"

On another level, however, postmodernism seems to offer some alternatives to join the global culture of consumption, where commodities and forms of knowledge are offered by forces far beyond any individual's control. These alternatives focus on thinking of any and all action (or social struggle) as necessarily local, limited, and partial—but nonetheless effective. By discarding "grand narratives" (like the liberation of the entire working class) and focusing on
specific local goals (such as improved day care centers for working mothers in your own community), postmodernist politics offers a way to theorize local situations as fluid and unpredictable, though influenced by global trends. Hence the motto for postmodern politics might well be "think globally, act locally"—and don’t worry about any grand scheme or master plan.

Post structuralism, the end of Structuralism

The origin of post structuralism goes back to Ferdinand’s Saussure’s structuralism. Structuralism has given the idea that a language creates its own objects. It says that the meaning of a word is never present in the word itself. It is always somewhere else. On the simplest level, what structuralism says is that the meaning of a word depends upon its relationship to other words—meaning lies between words rather than in the relationship to other words—meaning lies between words rather than in the relationship to other words—meaning lies between words rather than in the relationship between word and object. Post structuralism has also developed from the soil of France. It seeks to distance itself from existentialism, empiricism, historicism, phenomenology, Marxism and Freudian theory. It also keeps away from Barthes, Levi-Strauss, Althusser, and so on. It is difficult to pinpoint the period when structuralism ended and poststructuralism began. However Lamert (1990) traces the beginning of poststructuralism to a 1966 speech given by Jacques Derrida in which he proclaimed the dawning of a poststructuralism from much of the philosophical background of postmodern theory.

Postmodernity is Deconstruction

Derrida’s post structuralism:

Postmodernist is multi dimensional. Each author has defined it from his own theoretical perspective. Jacques Derrida is a poststructuralist and is therefore, postmodernist also. He characterized post modernity by the concept of deconstruction and difference.

Derrida is basically a poststructuralist and his postulate of deconstruction is therefore structural construction. He argues that though deconstruction digs up the hidden suppressions and exclusions upon which texts are constructed it is far from being an act interpretation in the normal sense. Deconstruction does not
mean trying to root out what a text is ‘really saying’. On the contrary, it tries to show that the grounds from which texts and theories seem to proceed are always shifting and unstable.

**Evolution of Philosophical Schools of Thoughts**

The age of enlightenment carries a lot of changes in the traditional society. Though it was first raised with Renaissance in Europe, gradually it affected all spheres of the world. Consequently, different philosophies entered in the world and made a strong change in the society of human beings. Different educationists, philosophers contribute their significant influence to the field of education.

In the West, there are tremendous growths of philosophy given by different philosophers. As a result, the education system changed accordingly. Up to date and need based curriculum is provided to cope with time. Developed countries are result of this advanced philosophy of education.

Though, traditional education system for example – idealism prevailed in those countries, but after raising Humanism, Naturalism, Pragmatism, Realism, Existentialism and Logical Positivism, the whole education system has changed.

Probably, in India traditional education namely Vedic, Buddhist and Islamic educations were prevailed. After the British arrival, fragmented education system was exhibited. The colonial rule and their selfish education paralyzed the Indian Education system. To modernize the education system many Indian educationists for example Sri Aurobindo, Mahatma Gandhi, Vivekananda came forward. They tried to maintain the legacy of the traditional education system and to adopt measures to modernize and the system effective, fruitful to the age. They had conducted experiments of their own to evolve a new system of education. The modern education system prevailed in the present day society is the combination of Classical Indian Thinkers and Postmodern European academicians.

As such, in Western, many philosophers and educationists came. Among them, one of the French Philosopher Michel Foucault has revolutionized the whole system of education through his revolutionary ‘power – knowledge’ relationship. He has contributed a lot to the field of education. The other was Derrida, who had forwarded ‘Deconstruction’ as post structural theory.
Evolution of Educational Theories

There are similarities between philosophies and theories of education; of course some distinctions can be made. Traditional philosophies, such as idealism and realism, refer to complete bodies of thought that present a world view of which education is a part. (other, newer philosophies such as philosophical analysis are primarily methodological. They seek to establish meaning for human experience.) Theories of education such as progressivism, essentialism, perennialism and social reconstructionism are often derived from parent philosophies, but they concern themselves primarily with education and learning and do not necessarily present a fully developed world view.

Perennialism is an educational theory that draws heavily on the principles of realism. It presents a conservative or traditional view of human nature and education. Perennialists, who agree with Aristotle’s statement that human beings are rational, see the school as an institution designed to cultivate rationality. Perennialists oppose political, social, and economic movements that seek use the school as a multipurpose institution. They do not want it to become a therapeutic agency that stresses students’ emotional adjustment nor do they want to transform the school into a training ground for entry into various vocations.

Essentialism is a conservative educational theory that arose in opposition to progressive education. Rooted philosophically in both idealism and realism, essentialism emphasizes an academic subject-matter curriculum and encourages teachers to stress order, discipline, and effort. For essentialists, the important aim of education are; 1) To transmit the basic skills and knowledge found in the cultural heritage. 2) To emphasize the learning of those skills and subject that can lead learners to still higher level skills and knowledge. For the essentialists, education involves learning the basic skills, arts, and sciences that have been developed in the past mastering these skills and subjects prepare the student to function as a member of a civilized society.

The educational theory of Progressivism is often associated with John Dewey’s pragmatism or experimentalism. The progressive education movement wove together a number of diverse stands. In its origins the progressive education movement was part of the larger socio-political movement of general reform that
characterized American life in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Educators such as G. Stanley Hall, Francis Parker and William H. Kilpatrick argued against traditional school practices that stressed mindless routine, role memorization, and authoritarian classroom management styles. Anti traditional and ami-authoritarian teachers began to develop practices that emphasized students' own interests.

Social reconstructionism postulates that humankind is in a state of profound cultural crisis. If schools reflect the dominant social values, as the traditional educational theorists suggest, then, according to the reconstructionists, organized education will merely transmit the social ills that are symptoms of the pervasive problems and afflictions that beset humankind. The reconstructionists generally assert that the only legitimate goal of a truly humane education is to create a world order in which people are in control of their own destiny. In an era of nuclear weapons, they see an urgent need for society to reconstruct itself before it destroys itself.9

**Implication**

Modernity is that distinct and unique form of social life which characterizes modern societies of Europe, U. S. and almost all the so-called developing societies. It had a serious encounter with the traditional structures of these countries. Modernity can be termed as the achievement of science and technology. It is a chronological development from Dark Age to Postmodern age to Deconstruction. Dark Age or Dark Ages is a term in historiography referring to a period of cultural decline or societal collapse that took place in Western Europe between the fall of Rome and the eventual recovery of learning. The dating of the 'Dark Ages' has always been fluid, but the concept was originally intended to devote the entire period between the fall of Rome in the 5th century and the "Renaissance" on "rebirth" of classical values. Enlightenment is described by the historians as the age of reason. It was premised upon a belief in the universality of reason and the universal character of scientific explanation. Modernity emerged out of this scientific nature of human society. Modern societies emerged in Europe from about the 15th century, but modernity in the sense we use today was given a decisive formulation in the discourse of the 18th century. In the 19th
century modernity became identified with industrialism and sweeping social, economic and cultural changes associated with it. In the 20th century, several non-European societies, for example, Australia and Japan, joined the company of advanced industrial societies. In the long process of evolution, there appear Fordism, post-Fordism and the industrial society transformed into post-industrial society. What we call postmodern today is the outcome of the evolutionary process of post-industrial society. During the post-industrial period, the economy got a radical shift in its structure. The post-Fordian or neo-Fordian shifts are explained by the increasing role of knowledge, information and technology. These processes created a new service class. The new economy created by information and knowledge is landing us to a different kind of organization of production and rise of industries. This transformation of society has made our future flexible. Where shall we move beyond post-industrialism or postmodernisation, is only a matter of guess. Everything is flexible. Postmodernists, for example- Lyotard, Baudrillard, Foucault, Derrida, Jameson argue that the present scientific knowledge is never neutral. It does not give any knowledge; it only provides only skills and technology. Deconstruction is associated with Derrida and it has become a major feature of postmodernism. Modernists have resolved the problem of communication. They presupposed a tight and identifiable relation between what was said (the signified or message) and how it was being said (the signifier or medium) whereas poststructuralists see these as continually breaking apart and reattaching in new combinations.
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