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CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION

Postmodernism is a very elusive and elastic term to define. In 1970s and 1980s new attitude and approach to literature arose in France and USA with the writers Derrida, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, Jean Baudrillard, and Jean Francois Lyotard. The postmodernist like Jean Baudrillard, Jean Francois Lyotard, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and their concepts simulacra and simulation, hyperiality, modern knowledge legitimation, rejection of meta-narrative, intertextuality, deconstruction, relationship of power and knowledge are very core of postmodernist. In the conclusion there is a multiplicity/plurality in the meaning in the text. It depends on reader’s perspective. Postmodernism is the combination of various theories or concepts of multiple. The postmodern society is heterogeneous society and multinarrative technique represents such society.

The conclusion highlights present status of postmodern concepts, importance and relevance of the above theories/concepts in the present era. Post-World-War II critical theorists apprehended that their war-time pessimism about total administration, the culture industry, and instrumental rationality had come true in the comfortable one-dimensional society of the 1950s. In their view, the consequences of post-war prosperity and the capital-labour compromise suburbs, shopping centres, and TV translated bourgeois values entered into the culture of mass consumption and integrated the working class into the system. At the same time, liberals heralded trends toward educational expansion, increased advantage, new informational technologies, service sector growth, social and political pluralism, consumerism, state welfare conditioning, Keynesian economic policy, and reduced class conflict as the end of ideology and the coming of postindustrial society. Regardless
of their political differences, radicals and liberals alike agreed that the United States seemingly had unlocked the secrets of permanent economic growth and of effective technocratic management of social problems. Since these changes supposedly constituted a qualitative break from modern industrial capitalism, post-war society required a new theory that broke sharply with previous models of capitalism and socialism. But post-war thinkers overestimated the degree and duration of the socio-economic reorganization and middle-class expansion.

In the early 1970s, the highly competitive international economic climate eroded the capital-labor accord, while racial violence, urban decline, Vietnam protests, Watergate, resource dependency, deindustrialization, increasing class inequality and poverty, and other severe social dislocations and political conflicts ended the dream of postindustrial consensus. And by the late 1970s, free-market thinking returned with revenge in the ruins of welfare state politics. Aggressive claims were made about the virtues of a new service economy driven by informational technologies and by debureaucratized business organizations free of government and union interference. Postmodernists spoke, besides above, of a hypertechnocratic society lacking potential for liberatory change and demanding new theories and politics. However, the question should be posed whether they, like their postwar counterparts, have been too general and premature in their claims about a fundamental social transition. The postmodernism is merely a reaction to the ending of the post-war conjuncture rather than to an epochal transformation or it is even a transitory response to the conservative administrations that dominated Western superpowers in the 1980s. It is a sharp change in the political economy and subsequent new socio-political dynamics suddenly make the approach out of date. As the recent events in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, and the Middle East make apparent that sharp
turnabouts are definitely possible even under the most forced conditions. For this, strong resolution and appropriate words for the favourable situation is the most important. Besides, the technical sources are also major concerns for the change, progress and development. For example, in the capitalists or the terrorists groups the training and technology matters for difference so they are on their point of achieving the target. The thing or the consumption differs because of the technology and the proficiency.

Postmodernists cannot provide a strong break to the above questions because they are uncritical about the historical context of their own ideas. Although they postulate major historical ruptures, the postmodernist’s overly general vision of history can easily inflate the significance of short-term, conjunctural changes, or passing events. They also lack the theoretical resources to theorize the very notion of a postmodern rupture because they renounce all global theories along with the objectionable types of grand narratives.

The terms like ‘modern’ and ‘postmodern’ are not experimentally self-evident concepts; generally, the terms are truly under theorized in the vast literature on the topics because postmodernists have discarded classical theory's meta-assumptions and historical mode of social criticism. They are not bound by methodological limits stressing the need to consider countertendencies and socio-historical data that could falsify their claims about culture and politics. Analogous to their own critique of classical Marxism’s homogeneous proletarian subject, postmodernists can be accused of an essentialist reduction of discontinuous and discrete cultural phenomena into a single dedifferentiated whole. Even Fredric Jameson’s characterization of postmodernism as a “cultural dominant” is merely a hypothesis that demands systematic historical inquiry and support.
Postmodernism may express a new historical conjuncture or it may be nothing more than a reaction, by playful cultural critics, to a narrow range of transitory conditions. But such judgments require a mode of discourse where arguments are open to evidential inquiry and disconfirmation. Theorizing the postmodern demands a periodization and geographical localization of an extremely broad and complex set of phenomena constituting postmodernity. Postmodern description of the ensemble of artistic, musical, architectural, and other postmodern cultural forms; and inquiry into the complex of socio-cultural conditions (e.g., indiscrimination, monotony, unresponsiveness, loss of detachment) produce the postmodern structure of experience.

By definition, postmodern implies an understanding of the modern that is of similar scope and complexity to the above claims as about a postmodern epochal, which presumes the capacity to systematically define the differences between the new and the old periods. A comprehensive postmodern social theory therefore would synchronically map society’s core social structures that is the pattern of institutional connections between the economy, associational life, the polity, expressive culture, and the forms of social experience and diachronically elaborate its central developmental patterns and processes for instance hyperrationalization, dedifferentiation. Properly executed, this type of global theoretic project would provide a language and concepts that raise culturally significant questions to guide inquiries about specific features of particular nations, regions, and communities; that provide models for comparative analyses of individual cases; and that offers conceptual languages inviting translation of disciplinary matters into broader public discourses. Trends toward increased internationalization of the economy, destruction of the world’s natural environment, and radical restructuring
of the international political order all call for broad theorizing in the tradition of classical social theory.

Even in Marx’s time, capitalism’s complexity, rapid change, and differentiated structure were difficult to map with precision. However, the task is even harder today with corporate capitalism’s exceedingly complex connections and multiplex macroscopic structures and processes, its mix of bureaucratic and ‘post-Fordist’ organizational forms and its vast diversity of information production and management, all of which contribute to obscuring capitalism’s huge networks of interdependence (Foster and Woolfson 1989, Rustin 1989). Because cultural fragmentation and pluralism cannot be understood separately from the highly internationalized flows of capital and information or from the machinations of hyper-rationalized private and public sectored organizations, the postmodern condition increases rather than decreases the need for critical global analyses of big structures. National and transnational interdependencies have never been broader than they are today, and the contradictory mixture of decentralizing and centralizing tendencies require new systematic theorization and mapping.

Most postmodernists want to preserve cultural criticism in the face of homogenizing forces and imposing threats to the individual. In this regard, they have not broken completely with the critical variants of classical social theory nor with more recent theorists who have continually attempted to renew the project. However, postmodernists excuse themselves from clarifying their own implicit normative claims and political intentions. The totalizing negativity of the postmodernist stance is a product of their weak sociology and one-sided theoretical emphasis on fragmentation. Giving up the historical basis for cultural criticism without a careful reckoning of the prospects for social change
merely opens the door to resignation, irrationalism, and even to revival of essentialism.

Against postmodern nihilism, the method of seeking critical viewpoints historically surrounded in existing or emergent social structures and movements is still a valuable legacy of modern theory. Even the postmodernists own attacks on the excesses of Enlightenment rationalism point toward freeing this radical historicist method from the fundamentalist and essentialist elements that have hitherto limited its effectiveness. Shorn of its dogmatic features, social theory of broad scope in the classical style still provides the best resources for carrying out the postmodernists implicit holistic problematic. Renewed efforts to globally theorize contemporary society and to anchor normative criticism in its structural attributes and emergent political movements could benefit from the recent postmodern critiques as well as from the findings of the specialized sciences. Properly constructed, new global social theories would augment rather than undermine theories and politics of the local and particular. Social and cultural fragmentation is a reality even if has not been adequately theorized by the postmodernists. Simple affirmation of the emancipatory tradition does not refute the postmodernist’s contentions about the contemporary era or about the exhaustion of critical theory. Instead, their claims and challenges have to be taken seriously as objects of theoretical discourse and historical inquiry.

But much postmodern thought is characterized by nihilistic pessimism deriving from it’s a historical methodology and its treatment of humanity as robot/android rather than as critical subjects participating in communities of memory (Bellah et. al. 1985 ) and struggle. In addition, critical social theories of the contemporary era must be attached normatively in the historical process of made different subjects forming themselves into publics through their communicative capacities and self-
organizing activities, rather than in the correspondence motivation of emancipatory subjectivity. These theories should preserve the themes of plurality, difference, and heterogeneity in the context of a reconstructed conception of collective emancipation. To avoid the errors of postwar and postmodernist thinkers, critical theorists must read the current historical conjuncture with its characteristic patterns of fragmentation and interdependence in the context of the everlasting social and cultural development. The conceptions of former social formations and long-term developmental processes should be accredited with determining force in much classical theory. Instead, they ought to be treated as critical devices to prevent loss of memory about tendencies of past societies that may return again, to create distance from the closeness of the present, and to assist in the always uncertain process of sorting narrow and transitory historical events from those that arise out of long-term conditions or structures with widespread, inter-generational conflict.

Recent upheavals in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union prove that even four decades of authoritarian control did not destroy oppositional thought or the historical bonds of national, ethnic, and religious community. It should remain an open question, subject to critical inquiry, whether cultural and human resources exist within capitalist societies, especially the United States, for a reawakening, renewal, and extension of democracy. However superficial and contradictory the state of contemporary culture, it is doubtful that historical experience has been so obliterated that all traces of community have been eliminated. Normative ideals have a genealogy in the history of specific cultural communities. If critical theorists are stern about achieving a public, they must carry out constructive as well as deconstructive genealogies to uncover and reformulate the critical normative languages of their potential publics.
Postmodernists make an important contribution to contemporary thought by dramatically addressing the collapse and irrelevance of professionally theory. Furthermore, they have dealt with some of the most novel and potentially important social conditions ignored by the earlier theorists. However, the complete rejection of global theorizing by Lyotard and others prevents them from conceptualizing the epochal changes that their theories presuppose. In the same way, Baudrillard’s discharge of history and the collective challenge the claim of his conception of simulation in critical theories of contemporary culture and society. In particular, it challenges social theorists to incorporate into their own work postmodern questions about new technologies, new configurations of mass culture, new social experiences, new forms of cultural fragmentation, and new social movements. If this challenge is taken up, the hostile and aggressive metatheoretical escape of the postmodernists might ultimately lead to a renewal of critical theory and even renew its progressive political development.

Postmodernists have launched an essential attack on modern theory. As part of their broadside against the totalizing features of Enlightenment rationalism, Jean Baudrillard, Michel Foucault, Jean-Francois Lyotard, Jacques Derrida, and others reject claims about modern theory’s capacity to articulate modernity’s complex form and to contribute to progressive social change. Extreme postmodernists like Baudrillard (1983) make claims concerning the end of the real and the end of history which suggest that any form common theory is outdated. Others, such as Lyotard (1984), challenge that the postmodern condition calls for a new type of theory that destroys the bases of modern social theory’s assumptions and systematic venture. More specifically, postmodernists challenge that modern theory’s core meta-assumptions concerning “representation,” “public coherence” and the rational subject
result in foundationalist, essentialist, and reductionist, overly totalized, and homogenized thought.

In the research study the postmodernists attack on modernism and historical modes of social criticism challenge their own complete claims about periodical change, and concludes in a one-sided emphasis on cultural and social fragmentations that ignores public interdependencies and reduce social solidarities. Moreover, here the study challenges that the postmodernists have treated the modern tradition too one-sidedly and monovocally, focusing almost entirely on its excesses and errors. Positivist and hyperrationalist elements are flourished in their works; modern social theorists also developed themes pointing to the limits of their assumptions that anticipated the postmodern critique. They also had a much more balanced approach to the play of integrating and disintegrating forces than doe’s postmodern theory today. Consequently, while postmodernists address some problematic features of modern theory, their picture of the tradition and radical break with the approach ignores the extent to which it continues to provide resources for the projects of understanding social reality and promoting social reconstruction.

Postmodernists attack classical theory’s claims about mapping the social totality, detecting social progress, and facilitating beneficial social change. Since many postmodern critics are former Marxists who now reject Marxism and even welfare state reformism. They go forward especially mocking criticism of Marxism’s global claims concerning history and universal liberation. The postmodern critique embraces that virtually all modernism bound from a trusting Enlightenment faith in science and reason and leads to “grand narratives” that legitimate political repression and distinctively modern forms of social and cultural oppression. Postmodernists argue that social theory contributes to
legitimating centralized systems of power and planning that destroy individuality and block the creative forces of language and desire. In order to turn away these problems, postmodernists maintain that social and cultural critics must make a clean break with Enlightenment rationalism by rejecting classical theory’s meta-assumptions about representation, social coherence, and the subject.

Postmodern theorists adopt the poststructuralist strategy of severing the connection between signs and their referents, and abandons modern theorists’ efforts to represent the real. For instance, for Derrida language is a form of ‘free play’, independent of a ‘transcendental signified’, and rejects claims about its capacity to objectively represent extra-linguistic realities. He also believes that the modern propensity to center on the meaning or central proposition of a text blurs differences and diminishes the richness of linguistic creativity. His deconstructive attack on modern epistemology aims to free heterogeneous desires and signifiers from linguistic constraints. Baudrillard goes much further, evaporating social reality into a contingent play of simulacra’ While modern epistemology focuses on the correspondence of representations to external objects, Baudrillard claims that signs and images have replaced “the real” in the contemporary era. Speaking explicitly of a new postmodern age, he states: ‘We are in logic of simulation which has nothing to do with logic of facts and an order of reasons’ (Baudrillard, Jean 1983, 31-32). The propagation of conflicting images and messages ‘implodes’ the boundaries between signs and referents, and between reality and fiction, ultimately, dissolving the concepts of truth and meaning.

The experience of the postmodern homo significance is constituted by language, texts, codes, and images without connection to an external world. Postmodernists treat different social theories merely as conflicting
narratives, or incommensurable perspectives, rather than as portrayals of factual realities that can be judged in accordance with inter-subjective standards and procedures for determining valid knowledge. Although postmodernists do not attempt to justify their views methodologically, they privilege their own positions or narratives over competing accounts of the historical conjuncture and are especially dismissive of modernist perspectives. Secondly, postmodernists emphasize pervasive cultural fragmentation and social disintegration, rejecting the very concept of a coherent social order. They conceive of postmodernity as an exceedingly complex matrix of discontinuous processes; of ubiquitous, instantaneous, and nonlinear changes; of fractured and overwhelming space; of dissonant voices; and of divergent images and messages, all of which produce a schizophrenic fragmentation of experience (Jameson 1984).

Baudrillard speaks of ‘the end’ of the social, of meaning, and of history, and claims that events lack consequences beyond the moment because they shift so rapidly and so radically that their impact is lost and because the saturation of ‘messages’ reduces them to mere ‘noise’. The obliteration of standards for interpreting the meaning of events and for discerning between different pieces of information produce a nihilistic relativization of experience; postmodern life is reduced to one-dimensional presence and indeterminacy that can only be felt and experienced, but not coherently interpreted. Comprehension of the social is demolished by the ‘eclipse of distance’ (Bell 1978, 99-119) by implosive dedifferentiation of boundaries, and by the consequent incorporation of spectators into a world of media and consumerist fantasy. The classes and other structured social relations are decayed into a multiplicity of undetermined and detached experiences and events. The extreme cultural fragmentation and incoherence of postmodern experience supposedly puts an end to modern theory’s global discourses.
about inflexible social structures and attractive social processes like integration, differentiation, domination, exploitation.

Following Descartes and modern epistemology, classical theorists treated humanity as rational subjects who are capable of achieving an unambiguous understanding of the external world and of applying this knowledge to improve the human condition. By contrast, Friedrich Nietzsche, the most important forerunner of postmodernist thought, characterized the modern philosophic subject as a ‘little changeling’ who should be disposed of; he argued that “there is no being behind doing,’ effecting, becoming; the ‘doer' is merely a fiction added to the deed....” (Nietzsche, Freidrich 1969, 45).

In Nietzsche’s view, the fictive subject is a by product of cultural homogenization and conflicting desires and strivings. However, by turning them inward to internalized norms, self control, and guilt, the myth of subjectivity transforms modern subjects into a tame and conformist shadow of what an individual could be there (Antonio, Robert 1990, 88-116).

Like Nietzsche, postmodernists reject the concept of a rational and autonomous subject because it supposedly represses human spontaneity, difference, desire, and power. Foucault challenges that the modern subject is a product of Enlightenment efforts to make man an object of scientific knowledge and of social manipulation by new disciplinary and therapeutic institutions. According to his genealogical studies of the interplay of knowledge and power, the subject’s highly refined capacities for self-observation and self-regulation harden modernity’s panoptical regime of discipline and domination by elevating social control and cultural homogenization to unimagined heights. But Foucault implies that the modern ‘episteme’ of thought is crumbling as others have done in the
past and that the subject will disappear ‘like a face drawn in sand at the edge of the sea’ (Foucault 1973, 387).

Baudrillard claims that the advent of postmodernity has already completely erased the subject and that the ‘drama of the subject at odds with his objects and with his image’ is over. He declares that we are now ‘terminals of multiple networks’ not creators of the script. Baudrillard states: YOU are news, you are the social, the event is you, you are involved, you use your voice, etc. (Baudrillard 1988, 16). A turnabout of affairs becomes impossible to locate an instance of the model, of power, of the gaze, of the medium itself, since you are always already on the other side. No more subject, focal point, centre or periphery: but pure flexion or circular inflection. Given the fractal and multiple nature of the postmodern self, Baudrillard declares that the reign of the rational subject is over (Baudrillard, Jean 1983, 55-56).

By rejecting its core meta-assumptions about representation, social coherence, and subjectivity, postmodernists undermine the very possibility of modern social theory. Yet, contrary to the postmodern picture, most classical theorists recognized the limits of their own theoretical practices. Because they envision the classical tradition in a mono-vocal fashion as if it were nothing more than a replication of the worst aspects of Enlightenment thought, postmodernists ignore the fact that the classical theorists developed epistemologically critical as well as dogmatic themes. Overreacting to its positivist features and blind to the fact that modern theorists began a critique of Enlightenment thought, postmodernists abandon altogether the vocation of classical social theory to depict and to change social reality. Postmodern thought extends too many disciplines, most notably art, but has also moved stealthily into sociological discourse since the mid-1980s. Kellner noted that the primary methods of postmodernism are deconstruction, reversal, and
inversion. This implies that the theorist must question the taken-for-granted world, the rules of the game, and the claims to authority found in a society. Kellner viewed postmodernism as a new stage of society, a break with the previous social order. The postmodern attitude is replicated in expressionist art. Postmodern critical theory is the first narrative to pose a possible utopian future not as a determinate outcome of nature-like social laws but rather as one conceivable discursive accomplishment among many. Agger Ben argues that Postmodernism, conceived within the eschatological or ‘critical’ framework of Marxist critical theory, does not betray Marxism but extends Marxism into the late 20th century, formulating postmodernity as the latter-day version of Marx’s socialism. In particular, postmodern critical theory is the first narrative to pose a possible utopian future not as a determinate outcome of nature-like social laws but rather as one conceivable discursive achievement among many. It’s a horn of ‘necessity’ postmodernism bridges the global and local, system and action.

In short postmodernism stands for the acceptance of a difference, and the celebration of heterogeneity within an overwhelming capitalist framework. (Jameson, Fredric. 1991, XIV). Postmodernists have their own view of the world. They have sense of adventure and take risks to explore life’s options to tell. The people are conscious, “they have one life to live” and must work hard to enjoy, experience and express it (Featherston, Mike 1991, 83).

In the postmodern world postmodernists seek to build up, they prefer plurality to singularity, difference to conformity, otherness to sameness. Goodbye to universalisms all sorts for universalism is oppressive. It has pluralist’s world where there is liberty for everything the Church, couple, the gays, lesbians, live in relationships, separation, and liberty for the advantage and disadvantages.
Everything is open in the postmodern world for patent, for first’ ‘door, in media, technology, like What’s App, Facebook, Twitter and on websites, or blogs, plurality taken place in their differences and for monitions and simplistic pattern of first invention/discovery.

Pointing out a key contradiction in the postmodernist approach Linda Hutcheon writes: “Is the theorising of Derrida, Lacan, Lyotard, Foucault, Baudrillard, J. Derrida and others not in a very real sense, entangled in its own de-doxifying logic? Is there not a centre to even the most decentred of these theories? What is power to Foucault, writing to Derrida or class to Marxism? Each of these theoretical perspectives can be argued to be deeply and knowingly implicated in that notion of centre they attempt to subvert. It is this paradox that makes them postmodern” (Hutcheon, Linda 1989, 14), itself, proclaimed from so many side, merely phoney (sic)?” (Anderson, Perry1998, 37)

According to Terry Eagleton in postmodern we have a sort of ‘Romantic ultra-Leftism’ coupled with ‘Brittle Pessimism’ (Terry Eagleton, 1997, 17-25). Bowes argues that post-modern thinking and particularity postmodern politics is a mode of engagement that may best be described as a form of ‘qualified capitulation. It seeks to offer a rational for retreating from politics itself” (Bewes, Timothy 1997, 11-12).

Postmodernism is a growing field of study that is moving beyond the supposedly ‘radical postmodern’ positions of Lyotard and Baudrillard by recognizing the interplay of grand narratives of modernity with the spectacularity of virtuality and hyper-competitiveness that is the basis of global grasping late modern and postmodern-capitalism, and the new forms transcorporate-empire, the postindustrial supply and distribution chains addicted to sweatshops, wedded to postmodern identity-formation through the age of virtuality and advertising, such that we no longer distinguish real from fantasy.
For general, postmodernism makes a temporary application. Its radical idioms, its not-so-common phrases, sometimes create a blend, but he soon discovers that the promises of postmodernism are hollow, words are empty. For some others postmodernism is a passing phase. In a sarcastic vein, an American journal writes: Yesterday we had modernism, today we have postmodernism tomorrow we shall have post postmodernism!

The key ideas of postmodernism are represented with special attention to the works of Derrida, Foucault, Lyotard and Baudrillard. These postmodernists include most of the variants of postmodernism in their writings. There are liberal among them and also radicals, there are Marxists and also later on non-Marxists. All variants of ism come to the conclusion that postmodernism is fragmented, plural and multiethnic. The diverse, fragmented, multi-lingual and multiethnic structure is spread everywhere in the world. Postmodernism’s key ideas are fragmentation, autonomy, local narratives, plurality and diversity, multicultural ethos.

Postmodernism seems to reveal in fragmentation, momentary, suspended, preferring difference over uniformity. Michel Foucault and Lyotard attacked any notion that there might be a metalanguage, meta-narrative or meta-history, through which all things can be connected, represented or explained. They rejected foundational theories like Marxism, Christianity or the truth presented in the religion. Lyotard’s argument on scientific knowledge or the knowledge generated by science is largely a myth. It is limited by the institutions in which it is created. Philosophers and historians tell more truth than science. Therefore, Lyotard rejects science narratives. The postmodernists put an emphasis on local factors or partial explanations such as the micro-politics of power relations to specific discourses, language games or interpretative communities. They stand for local narratives. Postmodernists strained the
issues of labour conflict and class war. They connected with multiple, local, autonomous struggles for liberation by rejecting the imperialism of an enlightened modernity that presumed to speak for others such as ethnic groups, religious minorities, women and weaker sections with a unified voice. In our India we also experience such postmodern life.

Deconstruction is associated with Derrida. It has become a major feature of postmodernism. Modernists have determined the problem of communication. They presumed a rigid and identifiable relation between what was said that is signifier or message and how it was said that is the signifier or the medium whereas poststructuralists see as continually breaking apart and reattaching in new combinations. Deconstruction views cultural life as annoyance texts. Deconstructive cultural analysis is concerned with reading texts by deconstructing them or breaking down the narratives to show its composition to different textual elements and fragments.

The postmodernists condemn the privileged and high-brow authority over cultural experience. The elite culture is replaced by popular culture. Pop music, pictures of gods and divine beings, calendars of all kinds and pictures of film stars are example of new popular culture. Postmodernism encourages sub-culture among members of the new generation. Various groups of youths and ethnic minorities have developed their own sub-cultures. Fredric Jameson sustained the development of culture in postmodern society in favour of the extension of capitalism. For postmodernists culture is an economic activity.

Some postmodernists have argued that the contemporary society is highly fragmented and diverse. It has developed a new kind of micro-politics. The politics takes the form of class and class war. Michel Foucault has used his notion of power-knowledge relationship to explain micro-politics. Such politics is the politics of region and sub-culture.
Francis Bacon has established for the first time that knowledge and power are like cause and effect. Jean Francois Lyotard also used such politics in his *Report on Knowledge*.

Fukuyama observed that there was end of history in 1989. By this end the decline of socialism in former Russia has become a thing of the past. There is no history, there is no alternate to capitalism. Beyond Fukuyama there are other postmodernists who argue that in postmodernism there is no place for history. According to Anthony Gidens all Postmodernists have denied that history has no intrinsic form and overall teleology. Postmodernism has been related not only with the end of foundationalism but with the ‘end of history’. A plurality of histories can be written and they cannot be secured by reference to the idea that history has an evolutionary direction. The basic thing about postmodernism is that when society is plural, diverse and fragmented, how it can have a coherent history. All postmodernists denied relevance of history. Jean Baudrillard’s *Illusion of the End of History* reveals the end of history is a kind of illusion. It is like centre cannot hold condition. The things or everything as occurring again and again, so no end of history but reversal of history since the human beings exist in the world. The end of history means the birth of new history as circle in the cosmos. The end of history may be a kind of perception or chimera. Michel Foucault’s writing reveals the ideas and discourses on knowledge and power. It was earlier known as history of mad people to discipline them. But later these came to be known as rational not as the particular history. Postmodernism considers science to be a myth. It is a tool, a handmaid of elites and trading class. Postmodernism labels science as a ‘little science’ robbed off its earlier glory. For it empiricism, ceases to be a methodological naturalism.
Derrida is regarded as postmodernist philosopher. His career started with an attack on structuralism. It is apt to quote Derrida’s famous views about differences and plurality: “There is nothing outside the text” (Derrida Jacques 1982). A text does have not a single meaning but it has a multiple meanings. The text is nothing but a play of differences. Difference is only one that differs from something else. Difference creates different meanings in the text. There is no absolute meaning or truth in any text. Derrida opposed to a central meaning to a text. He thinks: “The margins are at the centre” (Kaviraj Narhari 16). A text has more than one meaning. Differance means both to ‘differ’ and to ‘defer’. The word differance works on both meanings at once that is differ and defer. Derrida claims that our concepts distinguish themselves only through difference from other concepts. If meanings are not possible, it may always be already suspended/ postponed. Although Derrida is regarded as a deconstructionist, he cleared his status as a postmodernist. He asserted his status as a postmodernist with a difference in his speech “Spectres of Marx”. So difference is his concept of postmodernism. Difference is the spirit of postmodernism which bends towards heterogeneity. This forms the major in a wide and broad way in postmodernism.

Postmodernist critics’ attempt to distribute something novel in the existed critical theory cannot be ignored. Michel Foucault is a precursor of postmodernism. He is an important philosopher, historian and a postmodernist of his time. Earlier he refused to call himself as postmodernist. After some years he agreed on his postmodern thought by responding “what are we calling postmodernity? I’m not up-to-date” (Kaviraj Narhari 2005, 6). This writing of Foucault remains postmodernism’s source of encouragement. The writers/thinkers regarded Michel Foucault as the postmodern Guru. He had lost his faith on
Marxism. He introduced the episteme (knowledge) through his writing with entire alteration that is how knowledge gives birth to power. Foucault has given emphasis on history of thought, knowledge, philosophy, literature to disclose the discontinuity and the traditions of genealogy, truth, discourse, knowledge and power. Foucault believes in disciplinary society and the society based on power-knowledge. Power-knowledge is emerged through careful and minute observation.

Like Derrida, Jean Francois Lyotard is regarded as prominent postmodern philosopher. His famous quote ‘let us wage a war on totality’ represents his postmodern thoughts and rejection of metanarratives. He emphasized on the local narratives. Postmodernists’ slogan is ‘think globally, act locally’. It is the highly developed society that compelled to think and change the status of the living, thinking and acting as they want with the advancement of technological knowledge.

Jean Baudrillard is a cultural critic and media intellectual. The contemporary culture is postmodern. Postmodern culture is marked by plurality, diversion, intense fragmentation, and indirection. Postmodern society is powerful consumer society. Baudrillard claims that the relationships between the real and simulacra have undergone a sea change in the contemporary society. Models and simulacra have become reality. In the postmodern media and consumer society, everything becomes an image, a sign, a spectacle, a transaesthetic, transpolitical, and transsexual. Baudrillard emphasized that postmodern society is the society of communication established by mass media; postmodern society is a consumer society. The culture of postmodern society is based on simulation or hyperreality; it is close to the fractal order.

The Postmodernism opposes the grand narrative of Modernism. Michel Foucault is known for postmodernism, his knowledge-power relationship defines postmodern society. Lyotard has characterized it by
the rejection of metanarratives: postmodern science ceased to be a superior form of knowledge. Knowledge is splintered. Baudrillard identified it with simulations that are signs and images. Baudrillard interprets the postmodern society as of simulating society only. Jacques Derrida introduced it with difference in multiple meanings. The man in postmodern society is multi-plural, diverse and fragmented. For Derrida it is a fragmented society. Postmodernism is multi-dimensional. Derrida is poststructuralist, therefore postmodernist.

Postmodernism has become the buzzword of contemporary society in the 1990s. It offers clear and accessible study of literature. It encourages researcher and reader to study the basic philosophical, cultural and technological ideas. Postmodernism helps reader to understand the areas of contemporary culture, philosophy and cultural theory, architecture and concepts of space, visual art, sculpture and the design arts, popular culture and music, film, video and television culture, and the social sciences. Thus, it is clear that postmodernism plays very vital role in current critical theories in English literature and social sciences. Though postmodern critics play vital role in shaping literature after 1980’s, there are some critics like Linda Hutcheon and others who bring out the pointlessness and contradictions in the postmodernism and its followers: “Is the theorising of Derrida, Lacan, Lyotard, Foucault and others not, in a very real sense, entangled in its own de-doxyfying logic? Is there not a centre to even the most decentred of these theories? What is power to Foucault, writing to Derrida, or class to Marxism? Each of these theoretical perspectives can be argued to be deeply and knowingly-implicated in the notion of centre they attempt to subvert. It is this paradox that makes them postmodern” (Hutcheon, Linda 1989, 14). Habermas asks the question bluntly: “Is the modern as outdated as postmoderns would have it or is the postmodern itself, proclaimed from
so many sides, merely phoney (sic)?” (Habermas quoted by Perry, Anderson 1998, 37). Another critic like Agnes Heller exposes fake radicalism in postmodernism. She claims that “Postmodernism has a simple enough message: anything goes. This is not a slogan of rebellion, nor is postmodernism in fact rebellious. As far as everyday life is concerned, there are many and various things and patterns of life against which modern men and women can or should rebel, and postmodernism indeed allows for all sorts of rebellion. However, there is no single great target for collective and integrated rebellion. ‘Anything goes’ can be read as follows: you may rebel against anything you want to rebel against but let me rebel against the particular thing I want to rebel against or alternatively speaking, let me not rebel against anything at all because I feel myself to be completely at ease” (Agnes Heller quoted by Bewes, Timothy 1997, 25-26).

However, the contribution of postmodernist critics to the development of contemporary literature and culture cannot be ignored. Since today’s world is full of diverse culture, postmodern critics prefer plurality to singularity, difference to conformity, and otherness to sameness. For them universalism is oppressive; they celebrate local and mini-narratives to suit particular culture. They accept difference and refuse sameness; celebrate heterogeneity within an overwhelmingly capitalist framework. It is apt to quote Featherstone: “In the postmodern scheme of things, consumer culture manages to push its way into the mainstream of social science. They study consumption and culture - both incidentally until recently designated as derivative, peripheral and feminine, as against the centrality which was accorded to the more masculine sphere of production and the economy- are granted a more important place in the analysis of social relations and cultural representations. Culture, once on the periphery of social science
discipline, has now been thrust increasingly towards the centre of the field” (Featherstone, 1992, VIII).

Postmodernists have their own view of the world. This is the world of men and women who quest for new and the latest in the relationship and experiences, who have a sense of adventure and take risks to explore life’s options to the full, who are conscious “they have one life to live” and must work hard to enjoy, experience and express it” (Ibid. 86).

Derrida’s concept of difference and writing, Foucault’s power and knowledge, Lyotard’s metanarrative and mininarratives and Baudrillard’s simulacra and hyperreality bring a sea change in our approach to the study of culture and literature. The study will help us to understand contemporary culture and enhances our perception of literature and culture.