

A Perceptive Journey through Postmodernism

ROCHNA MITTAL

Associate Professor & HOD

Department of Political Science, Shambhu Dayal (PG) College, Ghaziabad (U.P.) India

ABSTRACT

This research paper summarizes the broad topic of postmodernism and distills it into its essential elements. First, it reviews the literature regarding what postmodernism is, in both a temporal and a theoretical sense. This review includes some of the common elements found in postmodern thought and writing, as well as some of the key differences among postmodern thinkers. Next, the paper discusses the application of postmodern thought to empirical research. The large body of contemporary research influenced by postmodernism cannot be reviewed here. However, empirical work deriving from social construction theory is an area in which postmodernism has been most influential, and this research paper discusses public perceptions of crime and politics and the application of social construction theory to our understanding of institutional life. Next, it discusses the policy implications offered by postmodern thought and research and, in particular, policy implications of the key postmodern assumptions that reality is entirely subjective and that there is a dark side to our existence in postmodern bureaucratic systems. Indeed, from a postmodernist perspective, dominant narratives and discourse blot out a myriad of politically and socially important experiences, perspectives, and voices of both individuals (e.g., prison inmates, radical political actors, sex offenders) and entire groups of people (e.g., undocumented immigrants, women, and ethnic and racial minority groups). Simply, postmodernists draw our attention to concerns that we would otherwise not consider. The paper also examines future directions for postmodern theory in relation to the mass media and ends with a summary and a conclusion regarding the importance of understanding postmodernity as both a temporal and a theoretical frame of reference.

Key Words : Postmodernism, Essential elements, Prison inmates

What is the Postmodernism?:

No doubt, before a concept of the Postmodernism there was another so-called the Modernism. It came into existence to the modern period combined with industrialisation, market-oriented capitalist economies, new social classes, democracy, and Enlightenment values. "Postmodernism is associated with relativism and a focus on ideology in the maintenance of economic and political power. Postmodernists are "skeptical of explanations which claim to be valid for all groups, cultures, traditions, or races, and instead focuses on the relative truths of each person".

A number of trends or movements in the arts and literature developing in the 1970s in reaction to or rejection of the dogma, principles, or practices of established

Modernism, especially a movement in architecture and the decorative arts running counter to the practice and influence of the International Style and encouraging the use of elements from historical vernacular styles and often playful illusion, decoration, and complexity is relating to, or being any of various movements in reaction to Modernism that are typically characterized by a return to traditional materials and forms (as in architecture) or by ironic self-reference and absurdity (as in literature). Postmodernism has appeared in a complex political circumstances, after the end of World War II, especially in the context of the Cold War and the spread of nuclear weapons, and the declaration of the birth of human rights, and the emergence of theater of the absurd and the emergence of philosophies irrationality such as surrealism,

existentialism, and, absurdism, and nihilism, moreover, the deconstruction was expressing president to move from the stage of Modernism to Postmodernism. Hence, the philosophy of Postmodernism has adopted the questioning, undermining and nihilism, also relied on intertextuality, disorder and non-compatibility, as well as, revisit a lot of the central axioms and arguments started dating by Western thought, past and present. Consequently, it is destabilising postmodern - by David Carter ”: all the traditional notions of language and identity, as we hear a lot of foreign students who are studying English literature are accused of anything that they do not understand is expressed as postmodern. Often literary texts reveal what postmodern absence of narrow-mindedness, and focused its analysis on it. The care of all the criticism of texts and lack of clarity of identity, and what is known as the Intertextuality is reformulating early work or correlation between literary texts. Clearly, it has been shown that the ideas are relatively different between Postmodernism concepts and former Modernism. There are those who believe that the Postmodernism is radically totally different on Modernism ideas. Some of them believed it is possible to consider that the writers and artists in the premodern stage that they as the post-modernists, even though the concept was not formulated at the time, this is the closest to the controversy that sees Freuds theories of the unconscious that they are already present in the German romantic thought. The German philosopher Jurgen Habermas discussed: that Modernism project was never finished yet, as this project continues to seek to achieve its objectives. In this, he is intended to enlighten values of the mind and social justice. Whatever the use, it is clear that the theory of interpretation of social and cultural developments through the Metanarrative are no longer possible or acceptable, he thinkers had been linked between the Postmodernism and societal transformations that taking place in the Post-industrial phase, or the so-called Information Society, as well as a Consumer Society.

Thus, the new global conflicts have been associated with economic and political transformations of social and private cultural that characterise the new phase, which entered human after the fall of the Soviet Union. Among other things, this means transformation, abandoning traditional concepts and tools in the analysis of society and state relations, such as social class, ethnic and cultural conflict, or partyre presentation and associative citizens within the state institutions and their access to civil rights,

and relations with States regarding the foundations of dependency and control centers of power and their perimeters. Postmodernism also associated with the historic and contextual reference, and the evolution of western capitalism ,it has been closely associated with the development of the media. Postmodernism as it came as a reaction to structural linguistics, Western and central statements that refer to the hegemony, domination, exploitation and alienation. Also, Postmodernism had been targeted to undermine Western philosophy, and the erosion of capitalist institutions that control the World, a monopoly on the means of production, and it has the scientific knowledge. This principle has worked on criticism of the Logos and logic through questioning mechanisms, dispersion and disassembly too. Postmodernism has appeared firstly in the field of painting, architecture and civil engineering, before moving to philosophy, literature, art, technology, and the rest of the humanities and knowledge. Postmodernist theory has invaded all the disciplines, such as literature, criticism, art, philosophy, ethics, education, sociology, anthropology, science and culture, economics, politics, and architecture.

There is a reflection of the ideas of Postmodernism on the daily life, all humanitarian and technical fields in the community frame, where a lot of the pioneers are connected Postmodernism with current intellectual and philosophical shifts, among other changes in social, economic, political, cultural and even psychological in different societies. The beginning was in Western societies, where the latter has refuse delite control on all sources of power and influence. As well, a lot of social movements emerged calling for the end of ideologies and exit all standard measurement, the consolidation of individual affiliation and encourage consumer culture. And thus creating new sources of power in society, which has been described by many of the descriptions, so-called the society post-industrial by American Daniel Bilal, who is of the brightest brains of the neoconservatives, and it so-called information society or the consumer society by the American critic Frideric Jameson. In general, the framework of Postmodernism consists of four perspectives toward it. Philosophical perspective that believes Postmodernism is an evidence of vacuum in the absence of modernity itself. The historical perspective that sees the postmodern turn away from the modernity movement, or of a rejection of some aspects. The political ideological perspective that sees the postmodern erosion of the illusions of Western ideology. The Strategic

perspective who believes that the approach to the texts of Postmodernism does not comply with methodological standards, there is not a single reading, but in open and multiple reading. Politically, the concept of democracy is moving towards change as the Democratic majority is no longer required as urgent because of the features of the Postmodernism emphasis on the individual as a source of rights and duties, laws and therefore everyone has the right to be represented in power that govern, also has the right to reject any representation in this power, and this is what made the Postmodernism thinkers talking about the field of democracy and not about parliamentary democracy or a democratic majority. Democratically, legitimacy of interior has become insufficient alone to give legitimacy to the regime particularly in the regard to the Third World countries, as the organizations that are active in the field of human rights, election monitoring and the environment, etc. have become other major source of legitimacy through the so-called constitutional engineering that sponsored by the United Nations and that aim to move or shift to the democracy. The democratic parliamentary representation in all political parties and periodic elections the parliament came from needs of the industrial society, and with the changes that are shaking the foundations of industrial society, parliamentary democracy loses its validity in most communities, but it created its own environment, currently subject to the decision of the requirements of diversity and variation process orientations of the people, and the shift from hierarchical organisational basis to networking organization, and the pursuit of great faith to the younger efficiently, which is more mobile.

Postmodernism runs a similar course through the field of political science. Postmodernism in political science, as in the other social sciences, typically appears as forms of thought or of empirical research that question dominant narratives and seek out alternative voices and perspectives in order to enrich our political discourse through the inclusion of previously marginalized people. In addition to recognizing the importance of subjective, individual realities, postmodern theories highlight the role of conflict in social life—an important underlying consideration for many students and scholars who study complex societies and their institutions. For example, John David Farmer and others argue that in understanding modern organizational forms and purposes, postmodernism can help us understand how (and why) the instrumentalism of modern bureaucratic structures

limits the ability of human beings to self-actualize. This postmodern focus is supported by a number of scholars in multiple and varied fields who, although not necessarily postmodernist, continue to emphasize the negative effect that instrumentally oriented organizations may have on society and on those who work (or who are imprisoned) within them.

For example, in articulating a defense of postmodernism in public administration, Farmer (1997) asserts that postmodernism is a response to the dominant and oppressive narratives that have defined the modern period. Primarily, these narratives have had a negative impact on women, ethnic and racial minorities, sexual minorities, and the poor. In particular, Farmer is critical of the rigid, hierarchical form that bureaucratic structures typically take and the lack of focus on what he calls the bureaucratic “in between.” Farmer’s focus on the bureaucratic in-between revolves around the idea that the study of bureaucracy should begin to focus more on the individual experiences of bureaucratic workers and less on bureaucratic technology and efficiency. In this way, we can run less oppressive—and thus more effective—bureaucratic institutions. This concern is somewhat derivative from the Hegelian notion that “man” will fight to the death in order to be recognized as something other than a slave and recognizes that social conflict results from the enslavement of marginalized peoples. As Farmer, Max Weber, and others see it, bureaucrats should be included in our understanding of oppressed peoples, primarily because they are enslaved and marginalized in a postmodern society. In suggesting reforms, then, postmodernists attempt to eliminate social conflict by allowing individuals to be recognized, considered, and treated as unique entities with unique perspectives and needs rather than as efficient organizational instruments to be thought of only in aggregate, actuarial, or economic terms. However, Frank de Zwart (2002) writes, “Postmodernists confuse wrongs of bureaucracy with arguments against modern science and then propagate relativism to clear up the muddle they created” In many ways, de Zwart is correct. Because postmodernism does not seek to obtain generalized knowledge, many argue that an entirely postmodern focus in the social sciences may leave us “empty handed” in terms of usable facts. Simply, how does a society create sound policy based on anecdotal evidence? Obviously we cannot. But gaining an understanding of marginalized individuals and groups can help us expand the grand

narrative to be more inclusive and, perhaps, less destructive to the social life of those who are marginalized. This, some postmodernists argue, will eventually benefit our entire society. For example, some postmodern approaches can help us better understand how and why prisons evolved, how the courts have responded to a variety of individuals and social conditions, and how and why the mass media generate distorted, yet influential, images of some phenomena but ignore others altogether.

Postmodern Thinkers:

Postmodernists (broadly speaking) are not interested in building theory in a traditional sense. That is, they reject positivism and are not interested in building theory through what Thomas Kuhn (1962) has referred to as normal science. Rather, postmodernists are interested in studying the anecdotal (e.g., individual experiences and perceptions, media portrayals of phenomena, and language construction and usage) and the intellectual implications that these phenomena have for social life—especially among marginalized populations. It is important to note that postmodernists are quite willing to change their minds, about the conclusions they come to initially and recognize that knowledge is socially constructed and, thus, fallible. The following five thinkers are generally recognized as some of social science's most influential postmodern thinkers. However, and as discussed previously, postmodernism is a somewhat broad and nebulous concept, and the term postmodernist is rarely attributed to any of these philosophers (with the exception of Lyotard). That being said, all the thinkers discussed below are postmodern in the sense that they all reject positivist methodologies as the only valid form of knowledge acquisition. Similarly, they all reject modernity's grand narrative and explicitly or implicitly offer support to Lyotard's contention that the collapse of the grand narrative marks a new historical epoch.

Jean-Francois Lyotard:

Our working hypothesis is that the status of knowledge is altered as societies enter what is known as the post industrial age and cultures enter what is known as the postmodern age.

Jean François Lyotard (1979, p. 3):

French philosopher Jean-François Lyotard was concerned with articulating a coherent conceptualization of postmodernism and is widely regarded as having been

successful in doing so. In *The Postmodern Condition*, Lyotard discusses the changing nature and acquisition of knowledge in the postmodern period, due, in large part, to rapidly changing technology and the resulting social transformation. Of interest in this work is Lyotard's discussion on the changing nature of knowledge. In a postmodern, technological age requiring more and more technical knowledge, knowledge for knowledge's sake is becoming less important to social survival and is being replaced by knowledge that may be sold to purchasers who seek to put it to work. In the social sciences, we see this transformation very clearly as knowledge becomes distinguished by its applied or theoretical nature. In addition to our ranking the natural or hard sciences over social sciences because of utility concerns, what we see is a trend toward valuing applied social science research far more than we value theoretical or philosophical social science research—a trend that many scholars see as disastrous for the acquisition of future knowledge. Implicit in Lyotard's discussion in *The Postmodern Condition* is the idea that those who possess the skills and knowledge needed to produce applied research will garner most of the social, political, and economic power, essentially leaving those who pursue knowledge for knowledge's sake outside the circle of power. In an ironic twist, then—irony is also a key feature of postmodern thinking—as we move away from the acquisition of broad-based, theory-driven knowledge toward increasingly specialized and applied descriptive and technical knowledge, we also decrease our ability to create generalizable knowledge in the future.

In other work, Lyotard has focused on the role of language in our acquisition and understanding of the world around us. In particular, Lyotard has focused on the collapse of the grand narrative, or rather, the metanarrative, due to social atomization (*i.e.*, individual isolation) and the resulting rise of micronarratives. Micronarratives, according to Lyotard, represent the rejection of grand narratives at the individual level and the acceptance and integration of knowledge by an individual only as it relates to the individual's particular circumstance (*i.e.*, ideology, race, class, gender, experiential realities). As discussed below, understanding the micronarrative is a key focus in constructivist research and is extraordinarily important to, for example, our understanding of how the media influence public perceptions of any given phenomenon.

Jacques Derrida:

The history of writing should turn back toward the origin of historicity. A science of the possibility of science? A science of science which would no longer have the form of logic but that of grammatics? A history of the possibility of history which would no longer be an archaeology, a philosophy of history or a history of philosophy?

Jacques Derrida (1967/1997, pp. 27 28):

As is the case with all the postmodernists discussed here, French philosopher Jacques Derrida questioned the notion that there is an objective truth. Rather, social reality is highly subjective and prone to abuses by powerful, self-serving elites who use their power to help society construct dominant narratives about reality. Unfortunately, these grand narratives are used to oppress or enslave social minorities, non-elite workers, women, and the poor, among others. Throughout history we can see that some “truths” were simply not that accurate at all. For example, the medieval notion that animals were as culpable (and thus, as punishable) as the humans who abused them in medieval bestiality cases, or that “quirky” women were witches, simply did not pan out over time. However, these “truths” did serve to facilitate the power interests of elites for a time. The same can be said of the United States’ early and long-lasting use of prisons as places of “rehabilitation,” or the perpetuation of Black slavery based on the accepted “truth” that African American slaves were less human than Whites. This latter, erroneous “truth,” perhaps more than any other social construct associated with American slavery, continues to haunt and create conflict within our society to this day.

According to postmodernists, we continue to live in a world rife with dominant and harmful mythologies designed to serve powerful elites. To cite one example, today, most citizens of the United States mistakenly believe that sex offenders (broadly defined) are incurable. Unfortunately, this “truth” is unsupported by empirical research yet has led to a large number of lifelong penal sanctions (including the possibility of the death penalty) for a large number of people convicted of sex offenses ranging from indecent exposure and simple kidnapping to the most serious types of rape and child molestation. It is interesting that the technologies of control and penal leniency (Foucault, 1977/1995) designed to control sex offenders have now begun to move to other offenders

and, ultimately, will likely be used to maintain control over society more generally (see Diana Gordon, 1990). One recent example is a proposal by South Dakota corrections officials to make identities, addresses, and criminal histories available about all offenders, not just sex offenders, via online websites.

Language—and the manner and means in which it is delivered—is an important part of how society constructs reality and an important part of understanding the essential focus of postmodernism. Derrida, like Lyotard and Baudrillard, was concerned with the role of language in our society and the way language is used to construct reality. In particular, Derrida was concerned with deconstruction—an examination of the underlying meaning and foundations of language, text, symbols, and other signs—in order to show that the dominant interpretation and foundational logic were flawed. In other words, multiple interpretations and meanings are possible and the foundation on which dominant interpretations rest is not solid ground but rather nothing more than subjective and biased beliefs.

Derrida, essentially, was criticized by peers and laypeople alike for his philosophical position—often likened to nihilism—that we cannot really know anything. In particular, academics attempting to generate useful, if not generalizable, knowledge vigorously opposed Derrida’s position and philosophy. Indeed, Derrida poses a somewhat serious epistemological problem for social scientists attempting to conduct, analyze, and interpret research and its findings: They all rest on subjective and biased foundations and so cannot really be true. Derrida’s intellectual position on the acquisition of knowledge generated a great deal of controversy precisely because it devalued all acquired knowledge.

Michel Foucault:

In my view one shouldn’t start with the court as a particular form, and then go on to ask how and on what conditions there could be a people’s court; one should start with popular justice, with acts by the people, and go on to ask what place a court could have within this.

Michel Foucault (1980, p. 1):

Foucault’s (1977) understanding of power, influenced to a large degree by Friedrich Nietzsche and Max Weber, is linked, somewhat ironically, to the rise of an enlightened and egalitarian society in the 18th century. That is, argues Foucault, the rise of the egalitarian state

in the 18th century also gave rise to distinctly less-than-egalitarian forms of social control. In order to ensure that the rights of “all” were respected, it was necessary to segment and discipline society in order to control, correct, and monitor transgressors. The disciplining and “correction” of transgressors set an example for society and ensured a more disciplined society. Therefore, in implementing egalitarianism, society in fact became more repressive and repressed. However, argues Foucault, these methods of control, correction, and surveillance were not born out of thin air and in fact had been present in very diffuse form for quite some time. Thus, Foucault’s understanding of power is heavily reliant on an understanding of preexisting forms of social control and their systematic linkage and evolution through reform (e.g., penal leniency) in the 18th century. In doing so, argues Foucault, the egalitarian project merely enabled a more systematically intrusive governance system and repressed society.

In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault (1977) shows how irregular forms of punishment were consolidated and “reformed” in order to better regulate and economize the state’s use of power in its attempt to transform and control society. The reformation of technologies of power was not so much about the elimination of certain behavior as about modulating social behavior so that it could more efficiently serve the needs of the state. In reforming punishment, then, the point was not so much to eliminate crime or criminals as to ensure that the efficient and economical regulation of crime and criminals served the state’s and, ultimately, society’s needs. Simply, crime and criminals serve the economic and political needs of the state, as well as establish a model, or an example, for the rest of society of how not to behave. This new “political economy” was facilitated by the development of panopticism. Panopticism, in relation to 18th-century reform, draws on, and integrates, notions of internment, hierarchical differentiations, and inescapable surveillance, much as the “new penology” does today. Thus, Foucault’s postmodern analysis regarding the rise of prisons not only helps us understand the driving force behind mass incarceration in our society but also gives us insights into the driving force behind all our institutions.

Jean Baudrillard:

Reality is a bitch. And that is hardly surprising since it is the product of stupidity’s fornication with the spirit of calculation—the dregs of the sacred illusion offered up

to the jackals of science.

Jean Baudrillard (1996, p. 3):

Like Derrida, French philosopher Jean Baudrillard questioned the notion that there is an objective truth. Rather, social reality is highly subjective and prone to abuses by powerful, self-serving elites who use their power to shape society’s construction of dominant narratives about reality. In particular, Baudrillard was interested in semiotics, the study and understanding of how words (signs) interrelate. Specifically, semiotics is not necessarily interested in what words themselves mean but rather what they mean in relation to one another. For example, a semiotic approach to understanding an individual’s reality would assert that if an individual thinks about his or her automobile, the individual is actually thinking about those things that are not his or her automobile (e.g., home, spouse, school). This is because in order to construct an image of the automobile, an individual must locate it within a previously constructed web of meaning. This focus is evident in Baudrillard’s work, especially in his analyses of mass media.

In *The Perfect Crime*, Baudrillard (1996) is concerned that we have overburdened ourselves with meaningless, confusing, referential imagery and positions the age-old philosophical question, “Why is there something rather than nothing?” (p. 2) as a straw-man argument. Baudrillard rebuts his own question with another: “Why is there nothing rather than something?” (p. 2). In answer, he argues that the perfect crime has been committed. In fact, he argues, we have murdered reality—false though it may have been to begin with—by extinguishing the grand illusion. The grand illusion, according to Baudrillard, is a personally coherent set of referential signs and meanings—to include the cherished notion of an objective reality and the formal illusion of truth, which we have traditionally used to hide from grim social realities. This “murder,” he argues, has been accomplished through the swamping of society in a sea of virtual and meaningless imagery (e.g., fantasy video games, the trials and tribulations of Paris Hilton, infomercials, Facebook). It is a perfect crime because the sea of meaningless images masks the “murder” of society’s mythical image of an objective reality. In sum, society continues to believe, generally, in an objective reality but only on an individual level. Reality, then, is very individualized, and perceptions of reality are unlikely to be shared on a very large scale.

Included in the idea that we are left to our own devices when constructing individual realities is the notion that we construct our individual realities based on imagery (signs and symbols) that were not real to begin with. In *Simulacra and Simulations* (1981), Baudrillard suggests that we are creating “bad” copies from false images—images originally constructed to mask the fact that there was nothing there to begin with. There are a number of rather poignant examples we can use to illustrate this point. The one that may resonate most with students is the notion that men and women seek physical inspiration from the sea of visual imagery depicting perfect bodies in perfect health. Unfortunately, very few of these images are real and are most likely airbrushed or digitally enhanced in some way. Thus, many of us attempt to personally re-create a physical reality that never existed to begin with, and inevitably we “produce” (e.g., through cosmetic surgery, obsessive dieting and exercise, and the conspicuous consumption of name-brand products) incomplete physical “copies.” Needless to say, the results of this “copying” process have led to a great deal of social and personal angst (e.g., the inability to accurately simulate our favorite supermodels, media stars, or sports heroes).

Anthony Giddens:

The views I shall develop have their point of origin in what I have elsewhere called a “discontinuist” interpretation of modern social development. By this I mean that modern social institutions are in some respects unique—distinct in form from all types of traditional order.

Anthony Giddens (1990, p. 3):

British sociologist Anthony Giddens is a critic of modernity in the temporal sense and of postmodernism in its theoretical and philosophical sense. However, he is, arguably, a postmodern thinker in the sense that he places a great deal of importance on the study of power, knowledge acquisition (and the influence of power on knowledge acquisition), and the influence of knowledge on people’s ability to alter their individual and collective social and material reality. In particular, Giddens confronts the question of how social reality is constructed. In his theory of structuration, Giddens’s main area of concern is whether social reality is primarily influenced by individuals or by broad social forces.

In *The Consequences of Modernity*, Giddens confronts the issue of whether we are in a postmodern

period, as Lyotard and others argue, or whether we are experiencing a type of radicalized modernity in which modernity has simply accelerated its pace. This radicalized modernity is primarily fueled by the disembedding processes of globalization, best characterized by global, cultural homogeneity; the disappearance of tradition; the erosion of place-based community; and the erosion (and shifting nature) of trust in persons, institutions, and abstract systems. In sum, radicalized modernity, although postmodern in a temporal sense, is not postmodern in a theoretical sense, because it is simply a continuation of modernity, not a temporal epoch that will usher in a dramatically different type of social order (such as the transition between premodern and modern societies).

Conclusion:

Even after the huge confusion and criticisms, the trend of postmodernism survived in several disciplines. This is because of the fact that postmodernism offers a different approach to understand social reality. Though many scholars express a doubt on whether we have really entered into a world that can be termed as postmodern or it is just an extension of the modernity, there is no doubt that over the last half century, the world has changed a lot because of the massive dominance of the media and the great advancement in technology. We are getting tremendously influenced by the activities of the media and thus in our subconscious, a virtual world is being created and in most of the cases we are living both in the real and the virtual world simultaneously. Moreover, because of this amazing improvement of information technology, information is not having any border. As a result, multiculturalism is becoming a common matter. Social problems and movements are also taking new turns. Feminism, gay rights, environmental conservation, terrorism, and fundamentalism – all these are becoming the issues of the common people. This multidimensional society is creating multidimensional individuals. Each individual is shaping himself/herself in a different order, according to own choice. Such a multidimensional society that belongs to multidimensional people with differences in their choices is difficult to analyze. That is why; the postmodernists reject the scientific way of analyzing society. In contrast to the Modernist movement that emphasized on abstract formalism, Postmodernism “aims to be decorative and scenographic, full of signs and symbols, wide ranging and eclectic. This mixing allows

the deployment of the symbolism of everything from historicism and revivalism to metaphysical references and kitschy pastiche” (Knox). Postmodernism with its liberty, unconventional and unique forms has significantly influenced the generation. However, like every coin that has two opposing sides, Postmodernism also comes with certain hiccups and criticism. Jean-Francois Lyotard asserted that “Postmodernism, which by the end of the 1980s becomes tied to globalization, where styles from radically disconnected cultures gradually amalgamate into a multi-cultural concoction, accompanied by a certain degree of alienation, cultural homogenization, and loss of original context and tradition”. In the contemporary contradiction indifferent cultural environment and ominous tolerance for oppression it becomes difficult to draft the Distinctions required for the raising the local and global state of the society. The operative choice is not between

rationality and its opposite, but between decency versus

REFERENCES

- Christopher, B. (2002). Postmodernism-A Very Short Introduction. New York Oxford University Press. Link: <https://goo.gl/NdLu7o>
- Delaney, T. (2004). Classical Sociological Theory: Investigation and Application, Prentice Hall, NJ.
- Gary, A. (2015). Postmodernism. February. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
- Habermas, Jürgen, 1987 (1985). The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity, Frederick Lawrence (trans.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stephen, H.R.C. (2004). Defining Postmodernism: Skepticism and Socialism from Rousseau to Foucault. Arizona: Scholary Publishing.
