Theoretical Strands of Poststructuralism and Postmodernism: A Review of Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida

Dr. A. K. M. Jamal Uddin[*]

Abstract

The fundamentals of postmodernism and poststructuralism are examined within an analytical and critical kaleidoscope to expatiate upon the core ethos of the theories. Alongside, the mainsprings of Foucault and Derrida are explored with a theoretically comparative analysis to hypothetically postulate a postmodernistic and poststructuralist platform for the adherents of social sciences. The treatise involves the pivotal theoretical strands with polemical filaments for a better understanding of the theories. A different angle to reorient poststructuralism and post modernism to look into the transitional, critical and refurbishing phases of these theories is depicted with an investigative ray to formulate a newer causeway for analyzing within time, space and standardized framework. The theoretical aspects of Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida are analyzed critically for a broader elaboration of postmodern and post-structural configuration and a compelling comparison has been enacted between their thoughts and ideas. The future of the theories and their currents of existing module across theoretical firmaments are idyllically translated into eclectic senses.

Introduction

Poststructuralism and postmodernism are two of the most influential theoretical aspects upon which immeasurable streams of intellectual exertions have been employed to understand the fathoms within. Postmodernism, having derived, in a very pragmatic sense, however from the discarding wombs of modernism, has walked a long way to surface on the theoretical world fraught with euphoria. The basic ideas of both the theories are the basics to accelerate the wheel of today's trains of thoughts. As we study and proceed further, the strengths of postmodernism are pluralism, multiculturalism, and the respecting of all voices. Yet are not democratic pluralism, minority rights, public discussion, free press and religion, and the rational assessment of views a pluralistic part of modernity? And though partly based on the structuralist linguistics, poststructuralism efforts to enter all the environments and encircle the structural patterning of the society. These two are, as a matter of fact, with a sincere scrutiny, broad terms for a loose agglomeration of theories and ideas, which arose in the mid-sixties as a reaction to the prevailing intellectual approaches of structuralism. The contributions of Claude Levi-Strauss, Louis Althusser and Jacques Lacan were a reaction to the subject-centered philosophies of phenomenology and existentialism. Structuralism is a social scientific method, which uncovers the universal individual and social structures that people unconsciously enact in their everyday behavior. For example, the myths told within given

---
[*] Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Dhaka, Dhaka-1000, Bangladesh.
E-mail: akmjamal2001@ yahoo.com

societies can be broken down into their elemental parts and the relationship between the parts mapped. These maps can then be compared cross-culturally and the deep structures of the psyche of humanity revealed. Jacques Derrida[1] became a central figure in the post-structural reaction to structuralism with his critique of Levi-Strauss. His deconstructive method takes the very idea of 'a structure'[2] and shows how it is built on contradictions that it represses in order to appear consistent. The concept of 'structure', like all concepts, derives its meaning not from a self-identity or a one-to-one correspondence to what it describes, but from its subterranean relationship to what it is not. Structures are supposed to be fixed, motionless and synchronic as opposed to their opposites such as events, play, systems and the diachronic. But, Derrida would contend, 'structure' derives its very sense from both what it is and what it is not. It is dependent for its meaning on the other. Derrida's *anti-method* method, i.e. a method that is used to show what is problematic in other people's methods, does not provide a clearcut positive program to replace what has been deconstructed. Likewise, Michel Foucault[3], in his poststructural phase, used a method of social history writing that told a version of the past while simultaneously raising the question of the very possibility of history writing. He adapted Nietzsche's[4] concept of the 'genealogy'[5] to trace the convoluted twists and turns that particular ideas and practices go through as now this or that group appropriates them for their differing needs. The idea of history as genealogy undermines the positive evolution and developmentalism that was promoted by some prominent theorists.

Theoretical Mainstays
Poststructuralism: Inception of the Concept

Late 1960s was the period when poststructuralism emerged in France. The two figures most closely associated with this indoctrination are Roland Barthes (1915-1980) and Jacques Derrida (1930-2004). Poststructuralism is a form of analysis, primarily in literary criticism, particularly associated with the French philosopher Jacques Derrida. The formal starting point of poststructuralism may be taken as his 1966 lecture: 'Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences' (at John Hopkins University, variously reprinted most recently in abbreviated form in K.M. Newton's Twentieth Century Theory: A Reader, Macmillan, 1988). In this paper, Derrida sees in modern times a particular intellectual event, which constitutes a radical break from past ways of thought, loosely associated this break from philosophy of Nietzsche and Heidegger and the psychoanalysis of Freud. The event concerns the decentering of our intellectual universe. Prior to this event the existence of a norm or centre in all things was taken for granted and thus 'man' as the Renaissance slogan had it. It is often opposed to structuralism. Although Derrida sees his work as consistent with the real principles of structuralism, the fundamental idea is that we cannot apprehend reality without the intervention of language. This prioritizes the study of language or texts. Texts can be understood only in relation to other texts, not in relation to an external reality against which they can be tested or measured. The principle of inter-texuality holds that the meaning of a text is produced in reference to other texts (Hill, Abercrombie & Turner 2004: 273). Poststructuralism probably makes sense to say something first about how structuralism used mainly in a literary context drew attention to how much of our imaginative world is structured in a binary way. A focus upon current binary views can

be challenged in two ways. First, the binary oppositions can be overturned and replaced by new structures that are themselves binary. Second, the limitations of binary views can be exposed by saying there are a much wider range of ways to look at things. Foucault outlined the idea of how one system of thought, with dominant ways of thinking, replaced another in periods of revolutionary cultural changes. He also analyzed the range of ways knowledge and power operated in a modern society. In the course of a root and branch questioning of traditional modes of philosophical and linguistic theorizing, central aspects of this linguistic theory as deconstructed by poststructuralism, especially by Derrida, includes: (a) a questioning of implications of linguistic conceptions of difference seen specially in Derrida's challenge what he still regards as Saussure's still metaphysical presuppositions about the subject and language the prior given to speech over writing and (b) a view that writing too, is also questionable as a source of any grounding for objectivity or culture (Jary & Jary, 2006: 476).

The term 'poststructuralism' is used very loosely and it is difficult to identify it with any specific school of thought. Derrida, Baudrillard, Deleuze, Lyotard, Rorty and the later Barthes could all be described as poststructuralists. Poststructuralism is often equated with deconstruction and also with postmodernism in general, but it can also be seen as a strand within everything from new historicism to post-colonial theory, if there is a common core to all the tendencies that have any theory of metaphysical origins, an insistence on the inevitable plurality and instability of meaning, a distrust of systematic scientificity, and the abandoning of the old English Tenment project (Macey, 2000: 309). In contrast, poststructuralism sees a much wider range of possibilities and questions the extent to which people can be represented as sharing one of a relatively small number of ways of thinking about society and culture. The much wider range of options is coupled with a view that cultural 'scripts'[6] are much more open to individual influence. Poststructuralists argue: there is no way of drawing a firm methodological line between text and commentary, language and meta language, ideological belief system and other (theoretical) modes of discourse that claim to unmask ideology as a product of 'false consciousness'[7] or in the language of structuralist Marxist like Louis Althusser, a form of 'imaginary'[8] misrecognition. Such ideas took hold through the false belief that theory could achieve a decisive 'epistemological break'[9] with the various kinds of naturalized commonsense knowledge which passed themselves off as straightforwardly true but which in fact encoded the cultural values of given (e.g. bourgeois humanist) socio-political order. However, this position becomes untenable it is realized that all subject positions that the analysts included are caught up in an endless process of displacement engendered by the instability of language, the 'arbitrary' relation between signifier and signified, and impossibility that meaning can ever be captured in a moment of pure, self present utterer's intent (Edgar and Sedgwick, 2002: 300). Poststructuralism derives ultimately from philosophy. Philosophy is a discipline which has always a tendency to emphasize the difficulty of achieving secure knowledge about things. This point of view is encapsulated in Nietzsche's famous remark: 'there are no facts, only interpretations.'[10] Philosophy is, so to speak, skeptical by nature and usually undercuts and questions commonsensical notions and assumptions. Its procedure often begins by calling into questions what is usually taken for granted as simply the way things are. Post-structuralism inherits this habit of skepticism and intensifies it. It regards any confidence

in the scientific method as naïve and even derives a certain masochistic intellectual pleasure from knowing for certain that we cannot know anything for certain, fully conscious of the irony and paradox which this entails.

Poststructuralism: Heralding a New Spectrum

Barthes's work around this time began to shift in character and moved from a structuralist phase to a newer phase. This difference can be seen by comparing two different accounts by Barthes of the nature of the narrative one from each phase namely the essay: *The Structural Analysis of Narrative* (first published in 1966) and *The Pleasure of the Text* (1973). Hence this early phase of structuralism seems to license and reveal in the endless free play of meanings and the escape from this textual authority. Later there is an inevitable shift from all forms of textual permissiveness to the more disciplined and austere textual republicanism suggested in the quotation from Barbara Johnson. For her, deconstruction is not a hedonistic abandonment if all restraint but a disciplined identification and dismantling of the sources of textual power. Derrida maintains:

> "the writer writes in a language and in a logic whose proper system laws and life his discourse by definition cannot dominate absolutely. He uses them by only letting himself after a fashion and up to a point, be governed by the system. And the reading must always aim at a certain relationship unperceived by the writer between what he commands and what he does not command of the patterns of the language that he uses. This relationship is not a certain quantitative destruction of shadow and light of weakness or of force but a signifying structure that critical reading should produce" (1978:157-8).

Derrida's own description of deconstructive reading has the same purport. As he mentions: "a deconstructive reading must always aim at a certain relationship, unperceived by the writer between what he commands and what he does not command of the patterns of language that it uses...it attempts to make the not seen accessible to sight" (Derrida 1978:157-8). Poststructuralism is concerned with breaking down over-arching narratives, concerned with the 'big picture'[11], into a series of smaller narratives that deconstruct the 'structure'as a whole and thereby release more ways of making sense of particular parts of the bigger picture. In some senses, therefore, poststructuralism is a tool to sensitize the researcher to the possibility of multiple meanings and narratives associated with discourse and action in the particular contexts under investigation. It also has the potential to throw light upon aspects of society that could be overlooked. In this sense, depending on the nature of the topic and the intention of the researcher, this perspective may be useful as a frame for investigation. Ironically, the more often this approach is used the less useful it may become: whether the focus upon discourse and meaning is illuminative partly depends upon how many previous studies there have been adopting this approach and the extent to which does indeed generate new insight. In addition, anybody can use one of Foucault's (1972b) own ideas of 'discourse'[12] existing within a complex web of meanings affected by shared, but changing, understandings of the 'rules of exclusion'[13] to apply to much of this work: many of us are excluded from discussions on this because the ideas are not clearly expressed. However, it may be good to hear from those with more familiarity with some of these ideas, especially if they can communicate in a less exclusive way.

Postmodernism: the Origin of a New Paradigm

Postmodernism is potent and groundbreaking though polemical itinerary of thoughts, which bolstered the theoretical paradigms. It started with the hands of Nicaraguan dramatist Federico de Onis. He first coined the term to conceptualize 'postmodernism'. It is a movement in painting, literature, architecture, literary criticism, film and the arts generally. Sociologically, the interesting question is the relationship of postmodernism to post-modernity—whether the former is the culture of the later. The issue for both is whether they represent genuinely new cultural and social forms or whether they are merely transitional phenomena produced by rapid social change (Hill, Abercrombie & Turner, 2004: 272). The postmodern theories involve preponderantly art, music, literature, architecture, historicity and cultural criticism. It began in the structural humanities and has strong roots in the philosophies of existentialism, nihilism and anarchism and in the sweeping ideas of Heidegger, Nietzsche, and Sartre and Wittgenstien. Postmodernism is a rejection of modernism. Postmodernism distrusts abstract explanation and holds that research can never do more than describe, with all descriptions equally valid. It distrusts all systematic empirical observation and suspects that knowledge is generaliziable or gets imbibed over time. Postmodernists see knowledge as taking numerous forms and as unique to particular peoples or specific locales: " almost all postmodernists reject truth as even a goal or ideal because it is the very epitome of modernity...Truth makes references to order, rules and values' depends on logic , rationality and reasoning all of which are postmodernists questions" (Rosenau,1992:77). Apart from this, the postmodernist argues that the knowledge about social life may be better communicated through a skit or a musical piece than by a scholarly journal article. Postmodernism is anti elitist and rejects the use of science to predict and make policy decisions. Postmodernists oppose those who use positivist science to reinforce power relations and bureaucratic forms of power relations and control over people (Neuman, 1997: 81-82). Jean François Lyotard views the postmodern as an incredulity toward metanarrative in the introduction to his enormously influential *The Postmodern Condition (1979)*. He casts a criticism toward all general claims, universal theories of history and attempts to view society as a coherent totality with a fixed or stable subject. The Postmodern condition, in this way, fosters a new sensitivity to the differences among individual and groups even as it reinforces toleration of the 'incommensurable'[14] (Bronner, 1997:237). Some other sweeping landmarks were demarcated by the theorists like Jean Baudrillard, Richard Rorty, David Harvey, Linda Hucheon who made theoretical exertions for reshaping the ideas.

The Postmodernist Challenge to History

One can now argue, is there such a thing as objective history or is objective history merely a myth? Is history simply a story told from a subjective point of view, usually that of the powerful who wish to perpetuate their rule? Richard J. Evans, professor of modern history at Cambridge University in England and author of many books, including *Rethinking German History* (1987) and *In Defense of History* (1999), examines the theories of 'poststructuralism', or 'postmodernism', and the challenges they present to orthodox approaches to the writing of history. He also investigates the historical threads of the theories with a rather nagging doubt.

The Phenomenal Turnaround of Modernism

Ever since history started to be written, historians have reflected on the theories and methods with which they approach the past and the possibilities and limitations of acquiring reliable knowledge about it. From the ancient Greek historian Thucydides to historical scholars of the Enlightenment and the Romantic periods such as Edward Gibbon and Leopold von Ranke, they have maintained in different ways a fundamental distinction between history and myth, objective knowledge about the past and poetic reinventions of it, historical fact and historical fiction. In the last quarter of the 20th century, however, this distinction was challenged by a number of writers and thinkers, mainly from the disciplines of literary and linguistic studies. Taking their cue from French linguistic theories grouped generally under the label of 'poststructuralism' who have argued that since the human mind understood everything through the medium of language, everything could be regarded, in some sense, as a text. Nothing, indeed, could be shown to exist outside texts. Moreover, the language of which texts were composed bore no demonstrable, direct relation to the concepts of the things to which it referred; it took its meaning from the linguistic context around it. Thus, for example, *chien* no more suggested in itself a meat-567890-eating, social, four-legged, barking animal than did *dog* or *Hound*—the word in question was only understood to have such a reference because it formed part of a larger system of words, a language. This system of meanings was not fixed, however. On the contrary, it was reinvented every time a text was read. Meaning in a text was thus constituted by the reader, not by the author, whose purposes and intentions in writing it were more or less irrelevant. The implications of such ideas for the study of history are radical indeed. If meaning is put into a text by the reader, then historical texts—the sources on which all historical scholarship has traditionally depended—have no meaning apart from what the historian puts into them. Thus historians do not discover anything about the past; they simply invent it. Historians do not normally use the evidence of the past simply to shore up the ideas and interpretations they bring to it. On the contrary, the evidence is used to test these ideas and interpretations and to discard them if they do not fit, or amend them and modify them until some kind of defensible fit is achieved, by which time they have often become virtually unrecognizable. Presumably, in fact, historians writing from, say, an African-American perspective do not simply believe that what they are writing is as valid as what White Anglo-Saxon Protestant historians are writing, but no more so; they believe, on the contrary, that they are right and those whose views they criticize are wrong, and that there are objective criteria by which the issues at stake can be resolved.

Here, however, we can also find a stimulating and beneficial aspect of the impact of post structuralism on historical studies. By emphasizing language, discourse, and textuality, it has successfully challenged the widespread assumption, shared by many non-Marxist historians as well as by Marxists of various kinds that historical causation worked upwards, as it were, from economy and society through to politics and culture. Instead, it has liberated historians to look at causation in a more complex and fruitful way, to take beliefs and ideologies seriously on their own terms, and to treat culture as a causative factor in history in its own right. It has also led to a mass of exciting new work in cultural history, not least by directing historians' attention away from the search for the progress

of reason in society and towards the attempt to understand the irrational, the marginal, and the strange in the past. It has put a questionmark under the social historian's obsession with quantities and averages and let back the individual into history, the ordinary individual, that is, the representative, or emblematic, or indeed the eccentric and the peculiar individual, not the 'great man'[15] so beloved of the mainstream political historians of the past. These developments can be seen as part of a broader reorientation of historical studies towards the end of the 20th century. Theories, whether Marxist or non-Marxist (such as modernization theory) which measured everything in the past according to whether it furthered or impeded progress towards economic prosperity, political democracy, and equality of social opportunity, have been sharply challenged as the costs of economic progress have become clearer, from environmental degradation to social alienation. Class, whether based on economic position or social consciousness, has given way to a more complex mode of social cleavage, including gender, religion, national identity and sexual orientation, none of which can easily be shown to be based purely or even principally on economic factors. History in this postmodern mode has become a multifaceted discipline in which the old priorities of the political, the economic, and the social no longer obtain. Historians now study a staggering variety of subjects, from love and hate to smell and taste, from health and sickness to madness and fear, from childhood to old age, from water to smoke, from crime and justice to sex and pleasure, from tiny villages to great cities, from obscure individuals to huge collectivities, from seemingly irrational folk-beliefs to constructs of collective memory and forgetting. History has always been a diverse subject, but the sheer range of its concerns at the beginning of the 21st century is surely unprecedented. All these are positive developments that have been greatly accelerated by the advent of postmodernism, of which poststructuralist theory is merely one among many different aspects. Many historians have greeted the spread of extreme skepticism and relativism about historical knowledge with alarm and even despair, but it too can be turned to good advantage, if it is treated as a challenge to historians to rethink the way they do things and the theories of knowledge on which their work implicitly rests (Hill, 1996).

Social Postmodernism

From a concern with discursively, the variety of approaches discussed shed light on a common concern with the rejection of modernity and the search for a new spirit of creativity irreducible to either a politics of autonomy or social fragmentation. Lyotard, Foucault, Bauman, Barthes, Habermas and their proponents who spearheaded this movement eventually led it to a social perspective to deepen the impacts into the core of social phenomena. Even though these theorists have very different projects and see their own work from different vantage points underlying their general approaches is the idea that sociology must address the possibilities opened up by fragmentation of the discourses of modernity. The 'social' is seen as constructed in cultural contexts and social theory must radically rethink the very notion of novel ideas. The turn to culture opens up possibilities for understanding social change in a broader way (Delanty, 1999: 100).

From Deconstructionism to Constructivism

Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida are generally associated with postmodernism even though their writings have been more central to poststructuralism. Undoubtedly, the

justification for seeing these theorists as postmodernists lies in their advocacy of a particular methodology and epistemology namely 'deconstructionism'[16]. Postmodernism can, to an extent, be seen as the generalization of this method to the condition of society itself—society as a self-interpreting text. Central to their epistemology is the idea of the 'death of the Subject'[17]; be it the subject of history as in historicism or the subject as the author as in linear context. Inspired by structuralist linguists and development in modern literature, Barthes effectively announced the death of the author. In the context of the declining influence of Marxism in French intellectual life since 1968 and the attack on existentialism, Barthes's celebration of the authorless text becomes a model for the apparent death of the Subject and "in this context, poststructuralism went on only one step further in the denial of development logics; in the absence of any possibility of constructivism which would entail a developmental logic – the role of the intellectual could only be to deconstruct the basic structures of experience" (Delanty, 1999:102).

Postmodernism as the Termination of Metanarratives

Foucault did not designate himself a postmodern thinker. However, other writers including Lyotard (1984) have embraced the perspectival conception of knowledge and the term 'postmodernism' with greater alacrity. Lyotard argues that there is no unity of language but rather islets of language each governed by a system of rules untranslatable into those of others. Truth and meaning are constituted by their place in the specific language games and cannot be universal in character. For Lyotard, the postmodern condition is not a periodizing concept, that is, postmodernism is not a historical epoch. Nor does the concept refer to the institutional parameters of modernity and postmodernity. Rather it is:

> "the condition of knowledge in the most highly developed societies. I have decided to use the word postmodern to describe that condition .... It designates the state of our culture following the transformations, which, since the end of the nineteenth century, have altered the rules for science, literature and the arts" (Lyotard, 1984: xxiii).

Postmodernism no longer avows the prevalence of metanarratives, for it shows the temporal lassitude of the theoretical perspectives; it has fervid relativizing attitudes, it triggers unbound interpretation and the grand narratives turn obsolete as soon as postmodernism entrenches them.

Foucault and Derrida: Discursive Power and Deconstruction

Michel Foucault deals, mainly, with a critical history of the present, earlier in an archeological mode, and later a genealogical mode. His epistemological studies recognize the changing frameworks of production of knowledge through the history of such practices as science, philosophy, art and literature. In his later genealogical practice, he argues that institutional power, intrinsically linked with knowledge, forms individual human 'subjects'[18], and subjects them to disciplinary norms and standards. These norms have no basis in truth but are produced historically. He examines the 'abnormal'[19] human subject as an object-of-knowledge of the discourses of human and empirical science such as psychiatry, medicine, and penalization. In *The Order of Things* published in 1966, he accounted for a genealogical study of the development of the natural sciences, economics

and linguistics through the 18th and 19th centuries. It is in this book that he made his famous prediction that 'man', a subject formed by discourse as a result of the arrangement of knowledge over the last two centuries, will soon be 'erased like a face drawn in sand at the edge of the sea'[20]. His later seminal work *Archaeology of Knowledge* published in 1969, studies wholeheartedly the nature of knowledge formation from across the discourses to power structures that essentially entrench the societies. As with *The Order of Things,* this text uses an approach to the history of knowledge—inspired by Nietzsche's work. This attitude to history is based on the idea that the historian is only interested in what has implications for present events, so history is always written from the perspective of the present, and fulfills a need of the present. Thus, Foucault's work can be traced to events in his present day. *The Order of Things* would have been inspired by the rise of structuralism in the 1960s, for example, and the prison uprisings in the early 1970s would have inspired *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison* (1975).

In 1970, Foucault was elected Professor of the History of Systems of Thought at the College de France. In 1975, with the publication of *Discipline and Punish*, his work began to focus on the technology of power: He rejects the Enlightenment's philosophical and juridical construction of power as conceptualized particularly in relation to representative government, and reestablishes a pervasive form of power in its somewhat concealed operations. He examines the relationship of power to knowledge and to the body as a decentralized technology without substantive content. Similar to his work in the *History of Madness*, Foucault links the birth of the prison in the 19th century to a history of institutions. He argues that these institutions, including the army, the factory and the school, all discipline the bodies of their subjects through surveillance techniques, both real and perceived. He maps the emergence of a disciplinary society and its new articulation of power. He uses the model of Jeremy Bentham's 'Panopticon'[21] to illustrate the structure of power through an architecture designed for surveillance. The design of Bentham's prison allows for the invisible surveillance of a large number of prisoners by a small number of guards, eventually resulting in the embodiment of surveillance by the prisoners, making the actual guards obsolete. The prison is a tool of knowledge for the institutional formation of subjects, thus power and knowledge are inextricably linked. During this time he wrote *The History of Sexuality*, a project he would never finish. The first volume of the work was published in 1976, entitled *Volume I: An Introduction*, and the second and third volumes entitled *The Uses of Pleasure* and *The Care of the Self* were published shortly before his death in 1984. In these books, Foucault relates the Western subject understands of us as sexual beings to our moral and ethical lives. He traces the history of the construction of subjectivity through the analyses of texts. In *The Uses of Pleasure* he looks at pleasure in the Greek social system as a play of power in social relations; pleasure is derived from the social position realized through sexuality. Later, in Christianity, pleasure was to become linked with illicit conduct and transgression. In *Care of the Self*, Foucault looks at the Greek systems of rules that were applied to sexual and other forms of social conduct. He analyses how the rules of self-control allow access to pleasure and to truth. In this structure of a subject's life dominated by the care for the self, excess becomes the danger, rather than the Christian deviance. In all his final books, Foucault works with a system of control, not understood by traditional concepts of authority, which he calls 'bio-power'[22]. Bio-power can be understood as the prerogative

of the state to 'make live and let die'[23], which is distinct from the rule of sovereign power which would 'let live and make die' by rule of the king. This attitude toward the lives of social subjects is a way of understanding the new formation of power in Western society. Foucault's history of sexuality suggests that pleasure is found in regulation and self-discipline rather than in libertine or permissive conduct, and encourages resistance to the state through the development of individual ethics towards the production of an admirable life. He argues: "We must at the same time conceive of sex without the law and power without the king." [24] Foucault used genealogy as a method. To trace the discontinuities ruptures in history in order to emphasize the singularity of events rather than seeking to identify historical trends. In effect, to show that history had become accounts of the powerful. In doing so, Foucault was attempting to show what had been marginalized or neglected in the accounts of traditional history. Foucault's genealogy was designed to show what had and crucially who had been neglected in these accounts and so effectively, denied a history. Since the legitimacy of the current social and political order is embedded in certain interpretations or stories about the past, it is possible in this way to delegitimize the present social and political order and expose the current configuration of power relations.

Deciphering Derrida and His Realm

Jacques Derrida fathered a new paradigm with his 'deconstruction'. Its popularity indicates the wide-ranging influence of his thought in philosophy, in literary criticism and theory, in art and in particular, in architectural and political theories. Besides critique, Derridean deconstruction consists of an attempt to re-conceive the difference that divides 'self-reflection'[25] (or self-consciousness). But even more than the re-conception of difference, and perhaps more importantly, deconstruction works towards preventing the worst violence. It attempts to render justice. Indeed, deconstruction is relentless in this pursuit since justice is impossible to achieve. Derrida extensively deals with the linguistic plays. He works with the textual grammar of language and so many other issues, seemingly much more focused on language game. Derrida, almost from the beginning of his long career, a state of affairs that the almost willful obscurity of much of his writings has done nothing to dispel. Even his most ardent supporters are forced to acknowledge that he sets us considerable problems of comprehension, with the cultural theorists Christopher Norris, for example conceding Derrida's that writing style (Sim, 2001: 9). Some of his avid exponents even feel tougher in analyzing him and to bring out the gist. His philosophical and theoretical propositions are likely to be conceptualized in a different way with different projections. Christopher Noris holds "it will strike most philosophers–at least those in the dominant Anglo-American tradition – as a style of extravagant metaphorical whimsy. Such wordplay, they are – likely to argue, is a most a kind of sophistical doodling on the margins of serious, truth – seeking" (Noris, 1987:79).

Derrida's form of textual analysis which is 'endless, treacherous and terrifying' (Booth, 1979:216) traits to recommend a cultural theorist to us in the normal course of events. Derrida's contribution to the endist debate is culturally extremely important. It also provides a way into deconstruction that helps to make it seem a far less esoteric area of intellectual activity than its current reputation amongst the wider public. By focusing on the 'On Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourses of the Human Sciences' he tries to

unravel the mysteries of plays of language. By orienting and organizing the coherence of the system, the center of structure permits the play of its elements inside the total form. And even today the notion of a structure lacking any center represents the unthinkable itself (Derrida, 1978). There is first the explicit privileging of philosophical discourse over historical structures (again a binary of Derrida's making), and the imperative to fully understand the former before confronting the challenges of the latter. Here there is a bit of a knot that Derrida ties himself up in, for it is precisely the impossibility of uncovering meaning itself, meaning in-itself that forms the critical thrust of deconstruction. His critique of Husserl is precisely grounded on the impossibility of meaning to reside in itself as sign and the Derridian sign is one that is intrinsically decomposing on the axis of space and time. However it is not the claim of Deconstruction that there are no structures or that there is no subject; but rather that the possibility of the latter are predicated precisely on a fundamental instability, on what Derrida in another context calls 'play'[26]. It is precisely so that we can understand some of Derrida's concluding remarks such as 'the historicity proper to philosophy is located and constituted in the transition, the dialogue between hyperbole and the finite structure, between that which exceeds the closed totality and the closed totality' or 'the economy of this writing is a regulated relationship between that which exceeds and the exceeded totality, the 'difference' of the absolute excess' (Derrida, 1978).

Derrida and Foucault: A Comparative Analysis

A question might arise in the realm of theoretical knowledge, what did Derrida and Foucault think of each other? The exact answer might be a tough poser to explore, yet we will try to fathom the currents. "For Foucault, Derrida was a defender of the one form of understanding that would always remain the same, that would always produce holy wars in the name of truth, and sanctified divisions between the experts and the ignorant, for Derrida, Foucault's subtle defense of the established order was the false promise of Utopia, an image which if pursued would always lead to disillusionment and the acceptance that nothing can ever change the way the world is" (Boyne, 1990: 4). Foucault is not concerned with the subject, but with the ways in which what is now seen as madness might have been constituted in a particular manner and might have existed differently before its constitution. Derrida asks whether Foucault has successfully determined the relationship between this text and the historical structure (it must be noted that this is a Derridian binary), and whether the meaning of the text is exhausted by its historicity. Through the phraseology one can detect the subservient status of the 'historical structure'[27] in relation to the sign, as he says it is only 'once' one has determined the meaning of the sign in itself one move on to the question of historical structures. Let us note in passing the implications as well as the presuppositions of the above questions. Meaning exits, in and as itself - for Foucault is questioned at the level on his hermeneutic skills; and there is a relation - nor fully determinedly Foucault according to Derrida, between this and historical structure Derrida does not elaborate on this historical structure, [not his subject] either on his own terms or on the terms through which Foucault has set up his project. For Derrida's very claim is that the meaning of the book can be found to reside, make home, reveal itself in its fullness in these lines where Foucault reads Descartes. Derrida now wonders, through the terms he has set-up, whether

Foucault has fully understood Descartes, whether the relationship between these lines of Descartes and the historical structure has been validly determined, and then whether the former can be exhausted by the latter's historicity. The violence of exclusion that constitutes the subject's subjectivity is held to the true and real object of study. Is this really the case in '*Madness and Civilization*?' No effort to examine the nature of the historical structure that Foucault is himself trying to elaborate, and no effort to examine with care and patience with which Foucault weaves the contorted relationships between the various articulations of concept and Event. Foucault insisted that it is possible to analyze the power structures that underpin a body of discourse, and given that the pattern of power in any historical situation has a characteristic form then the discourses produced under that regime will also have specifiable features. In contrast, Derrida insisted that any given text is open to a range of possible interpretations and has no single authoritative reading. For Derrida, deconstruction is a set of approaches to help us break free of the straitjacket of established interpretations of texts, while Foucault's emphasis on power and discourse provides new perspectives on what happened in history. There are similarities in the two thinkers' methods, but the differences between them also mean that they have had divergent receptions in different academic disciplines. While Derrida has found a receptive audience in literary arguments, some historians have been wary of the more extreme versions of deconstruction put forward by Derrida's acolytes, especially regarding claims about the undecided ability of texts. Foucault is focused much more on designing discourses than mere textual discovery. The analytic explications delivered by both Derrida and Foucault, suggest a different method of unearthing knowledge as Foucault frames all these in his *Archeology of Knowledge*. In *Of Grammatology* Derrida also plays with the linguistic games of texts and shows how texts cascade and stream meanings, how they are constructed culturally. As Foucault says, "in the density of its workings, should be both knowledge and a modification of what it knows, reflection and transformation of the mode of being that on which it reflects" (Foucault, 1970: 327). We can easily, be an audience of the dramatized pieces of polemical conflict by both of them. If we delve deeper we find-Derrida is concerned largely and draws on the physical mass of a text and argues a text is nothing more than what it describes inside it. Making senses or creating meanings are the act of the signifiers as it likes or its customs set it forth. Actuality is absent, as Derrida posits, and the main substance of a text is the textual ingredients. For Foucault, the significance of texts fares vehemently sine it hinges the pivots and peripheries of power. Power is of much concern for Foucault. Though intangible, power has a perceptible play on the actual podiums. Derrida takes us only inside the text, but Foucault thrives in and out with something more; as Edward Said reckons- "Derrida's criticism moves us into the text, Foucault in and out" (Said, 1983: 184). Said again puts- "Yet another Foucault and Derrida would deny that what unites them, more even than the avowedly revisionist and revolutionary character of their criticism, is their attempt to make visible what is customarily invisible in a text, namely the various mysteries, rules and play of its textuality" (p.184).

Derrida, in the opening of his seminal *La Pharmacie de Platon* prescribes- "A text is not a text unless it hides from the first corner, from the first glance, the law of its composition and the rules of its game. A text remains moreover, forever, imperceptible. Its laws and its rules are not. However, harbored in the inaccessibility of a secret; it is simply that

could rigorously e called a perception." (1981:63). But Foucault, has argued, in other way round-if a text conceals any of the destined matrix or anything about a text is intangible, they might be, in some other forms, revealed and reinstated. Said again enunciates "...mainly because the text is a part of a network of power whose textual form is a purposeful obscuring of power beneath textuality and knowledge (*savoir*). Therefore, the countervailing power of criticism is to bring the text back to a certain visibility. In addition, if some texts, particularly, those in the later phase of a discursive development, assume their textuality because their sources in power have either been incorporated into the text's authority as text...Derrida, works more in the spirit of a negative theology. The more he grasps textuality for itself, the greater the detail of what is not there for him-since I consider his key terms *dissemination, supplement, pharmakos, trace, marquee...*" (Said, 1983: 184). Derrida is inclined to ratify a textual interplay of the infrastructure that bulk large in situating meanings. Many confer them a badge of literary critics. But, none of them is anything of that kind. Derrida is a philosopher and the other is a historian. But Foucault is oriented towards the forms of subjugation that rotates with the cycles of power. He wants to an overthrow of the domination or the vulgar determinism to the suprapersonal authority in orienting the manuscripts the social order. Yet the challenge of the relationship between individual and collective forces is acknowledged here:

> "Can one speak of science and its history without referring to the scientist himself-and I am speaking not merely of the concrete individual represented by a proper name, but of his work and the particular form of his thought? Can a valid history of science be attempted that would retrace from beginning to end the whole spontaneous movement of an anonymous body of knowledge?.....I should like to know whether the subjects responsible for scientific discourse are not determined in their situation, their function, their perceptive capacity, and their practical possibilities by conditions that dominate ad even overwhelm them" (Foucault, 1970: xv).

We commit an inconsiderate projection if both Derrida and Foucault are treated fully as literary critic; one is a philosopher and the other is a historian. Paraphrasing their doctrinal and didactic aspects-generically hybrid depictions: quasi-philosophical, quasi-literary, quasi-scientific, it is a more intelligible issue to internally fathom. As Said invites us-"I want simply to state that at least since *De la grammatologies*, Derrida has attempted what he has called a form of *écriture double*, one half of which provokes an inversion of the cultural domination Derrida everywhere identifies with metaphysics and its hierarchies, the other half of which allows the detonation of writing in the very interior of the word, thus disrupting the entire given order and taking over the field.....Similarly in Foucault's case, there is a double writing, intended first, the text he studies , as discourse, archive, statements, and the rest, then later to present a new text, his own, doing and saying what those other invisible texts have repressed, doing and saying what no one else will say and do"(1983:188).

Both of them, posit propitiously in their *logocentric and discursive* worlds one the one hand, and Derridian and Foucaldian critique on the other. With both of them there are hypothesized and intermittent cultural strings associated against which their *redefinitions* are directed. *The Archeology of Knowledge* and *The Discourse on Language* are two of

Foucault's most seminal doctrinal manuscripts that invariably dictate his assumptions. He shows how archeological methods are supposed to reveal how discourses-impersonal, systematic, highly regulated by enunciative formations overrides society and governs the productions of culture. Over and above every opportunity for saying something, there stands a regularizing collectivity that Foucault has called a discourse, itself governed by the archive, thus his investigations of various social and psychological issues like the sexual repressions, formations of knowledge, penal system are of studies of certain anonymity during and because of which he draws in the *Discipline and Punish* "the human body was entering a machinery of power that explores it, breaks it down and rearranges it (Foucault, 1977:137). As he again lends, "These methods which made possible the meticulous control of the operating of the body, which assured the constant subjection of its forces and its imposed upon them a relation of docility-utility, might be called disciplines" (Foucault, 1977:138). Said tries to differentiate the basic polemics arguably nurture the central figure between their arguments. He analyses in an academically delectable way so that particular issues could be exercised. He looms here large on some other crucial underpinnings in his own ways. As he maintains,

> "Certainly, Foucault's work since the *Archeology of Knowledge* and the two long interviews given in 1968 has progressed in the directions suggested by his remarks about individuals. He provided a prodigiously detailed set of possible descriptions whose main aim is, once again, to overwhelm the individual subject or will and replace it instead with minutely responsive rules of discursive formations, rules that no one individual can either alter or circumvent. These rules exist, he argues, and they are to be complied with, mainly because discourse is not a mere formulization of knowledge, its aim is the control and manipulation of knowledge, the body politic, and ultimately the state. Perhaps, his interest in rules in part of the reason why Foucault is unable to deal with, or provide an account of, historical change"(1983:189).

Foucault was dissatisfied with the subject as sufficient cause of a text and his betaking to the much talked Foucauldian *discursive and archival power* is intriguingly matched by Derrida's deconstruction and involuntarism. Derrida, in a critique of Foucault had peppered the *Historie de la folie* with objections to its cavalier indifference about its own discursive complicities. As Said again lends us, "In accusing Foucault of not having dealt sufficiently with the philosophic and methodological problems of discussing the silence of unreason in a more or less rational language, Derrida opens up the question of Foucault's rigor. For even if Foucault claims to be himself using a language maintained in a relativity without recourse...it is this troubling economy between reason, madness, silence, and language that Derrida accuses Foucault of overlooking as he seems to announce the exteriority of the archeological method to the structure of imprisonment and enclosure he describes. I have simplified a very complicated argument, and I shall not now rehearse Foucault's response to Derrida's criticism. For the moment my interest is in Derrida's positing of the metaphysical, logo-centric world an asking how the writers examine as instances of that world become a part of it. For it is never apparent how the logo-centric fallacy-which takes many different forms: binary, axiological oppositions

with one apparently equal term controlling the other, paternally organized hierarchies, ethnocentric valorization, phallic insemination-how the logo-centric prejudice insinuates itself to begin with , or how it becomes the larger thing that is Western metaphysics" (Said, 1983:190).

Poststructuralism and Postmodernism: Confluence or Dissension?

According to Foucault the idea of a rational autonomous human subject is also a fiction. In his earlier work Foucault presented a view of the human subject as a body of an empty vessel, a product of the power relations to which we are all subjected through our lives in sexual relationships, in the family, in the school by exposure to media and communication by the police force and law courts by the discipline we are subject to in the workplace and so forth. Unsurprisingly, this view of the human subject has been criticized as anti-humanist and profoundly pessimistic. If we are only ever the product of discipline and punishment, how can we ever escape? To the end of his life Foucault began to change his view to some extent. Certainly most contemporary postmodernists do recognize the capacity for resistance and empowerment. If this was not the case, we would not find examples of opposition, or different perspectives and stories about the world. Indeed postmodernists see inherent value in a multiplicity of approaches and perspectives on world politics, not because collectively they will increase our stock of knowledge and take us closer to the truth, but because they allow us to see the world through different lenses, enable us to hear diverse voice articulating various issues and concerns, and so undermine the truth claims of orthodox or hegemonic world views. It is clear that Derrida is proposing an alternative to Archeology. He is not content to critique Foucault, but keen to demonstrate that is necessary to radicalize Foucault's project into one that later generations can deconstruct. In a certain way, like Descartes moving from the first stage of premetaphysical doubt to a radical properly metaphysical doubt, Derrida seems to be suggesting that Foucauldian archeology too must be lifted from its structural determination to a more fundamental philosophical anthropology. Thus the authentic subject has to be the subject in its lack of authenticity that necessarily plays itself out as part of its theoretical enunciation. This is the general condition for the subject. Man as subject, Man as subject/object is ontologically trapped immune to any genre of specificity–historical or otherwise. Method and subject are but meager instances in this radical aporia. In developing this critic of enlightenment postmodernists also develop a philosophy. In so far philosophers have sought to understand the truth about the human condition and speculate about the ends of human life, philosophy is rejected on the grounds that there can be no single truth and no conception of the good life. Derrida was critical of Western philosophy because it was phonocentric, centered on one authority voice. It was also logo-centric, committed to a belief in some presence, or reality. Derrida argued that this occurred because of the human desire for certainty, the need to posit a central presence- something or someone there at the beginning of time and whose idea or will is being played out throughout history. If Enlightenment thinkers were concerned to challenge the one authoritative voice of God, they were never be able to quite give up on the idea of a point of origin and ultimate destination- the human subject progress and a better future for the world (Steans and Pettiford, 2005: 140).

Conclusion

It could be argued that postmodernism sets an impossible goal for seeking knowledge about the human condition. If everybody's language counts, if nobody has the right to question anyone's opinion, if there is no ultimate court of epistemological appeal then the only incontrovertible knowledge any person has is their autobiography. But, through their work, most of the authors in the postmodern oeuvre (though understandably they all resist the meta-label for themselves) show ways to escape this spiral into the loneliness and powerlessness of autobiography. Postmodernism is continuously skeptical of knowledge that labels people, especially people who are 'other' to the author in a timeless manner, e.g. 'these people behave traditionally'[28] – even if the 'traditional behavior'[29] is being evaluated positively; but postmodernism is skeptical not closed. Like modernism, postmodernism sets high epistemological standards in principle, but the devil lies in the detail of application. The shift from postmodernism to poststructuralism is a move that sacrifices some of the rigor of post-modernist epistemology but gains in applicability. Like postmodernism, poststructuralism sees a potential for human agency operating everywhere in conditions of uncertainty. But agency is exercised within structures that are more transparent and more tractable than envisaged in postmodernism though there are processes of legitimation which claim to justify large inequalities in agency. Techniques of deconstruction can be used to analyze the texts of this legitimation, especially policy documents. The model of the person in poststructuralism is less sophisticated than in postmodernism. In postmodernism, the person is multi-centered, carrying numerous possibilities of identities that the forces of modernist reproduction attempt to contain and direct, accepting some and rejecting most. In poststructuralism, the person is mono-centered, capable of playing multiple roles, but with considerable consciousness of the choices under constraint and uncertainty that are involved. Postmodernist principles can guide the practice of poststructuralism to provide some epistemological discipline and improve poststructuralism's knowledge claims to know development. Postmodernism does not perceive knowledge as produced by disinterested, anonymous authors. The human author is a presence in any work that is about being human. This perception permits, and even encourages, the author to appear in the text. Epistemologically, the reader needs to know the author to know the text. Poststructuralism pleads that this presence falls short of a full autobiography, but some presence is appropriate, especially if specific characteristics of the author probably influence responses of people giving information. The tools of deconstruction are clearly useful in analyzing secondary information contained in pre-existing texts. Even the most anodyne of apparently technical policy documents can yield some interesting insights, notably in the language used to describe the people who are the objects of the policy. In principle, poststructuralism should have no problem with this. But some poststructuralism, unanchored by the deeper critical stance of postmodernism, wishes to make deals with policy and therefore treats policy documents with perhaps more respect than postmodernism would expect. Postmodernism can see no reason to privilege state officials as information sources. Postmodernism, in so far as it was tied to poststructuralism, looked at cultural change from the standpoint of the aesthetic, with the consequences that the reflexivity that this entails leaves very little room for normative and cognitive dimensions. However, recent developments in postmodernism have

reinstated the primacy of the social and reveal a concern with reflexivity and social knowledge. Bauman's version of postmodernism overcomes the normative deficit in much of postmodern thinking, providing us with a strong ethical conception of a potentially creative subject (Delanty, 1999:121). Lastly, postmodernism ontologically perceives the human condition as inherently uncertain.   To the postmodernists, no epistemologically sound texts can conclude with a closure. Many poststructuralists in the development field, certain of the justice of their claims to know the path to a better world may find this hard to accept.

Notes

[1] Jacques Derrida was born to an Algerian Jewish family in El-Biar, Algeria, in 1930. At the age of 22, he moved to France and began studies at the École Normale Supérieur in Paris. Derrida was introduced to America in 1967 by the Johns Hopkins University. Derrida taught at the Ecole Normale Supérieur from 1965 to 1984. He died on October 09, 2004. Since 1986 he has also been Professor of Philosophy, French and Comparative Literature at the University of California. Derrida published three books in 1967 *Speech and Phenomena*; *Of Grammatology*; and *Writing and Difference*, which outline the deconstructive approach to reading texts. Deconstruction has been applied as a strategy of analysis to literature, linguistics, philosophy, law and architecture. Derrida has maintained a strongly political presence, fighting for the rights of Algerian immigrants in France, against apartheid, and for the rights of Czech Charter 77 dissidents. His works are frequently cited by other academics in a wide range of fields, particularly in literary criticism and philosophy.

[2] Structure according to Derrida is not presupposed or preconstructed. Any transcendental origin, essence or meaning of structure is nothing but clear fiction of mankind. He argues that social ideologies elevate particular terms (e.g. Freedom, Justice, and Authority) to the status from which all other meanings are derived.   Deconstruction shakes up a concept like text in a way that provokes questions about the borders, the frontiers, the edges, or the limits that have been drawn to mark out its place in the history of concepts.   Meanings take on their identity; they come to mean what they mean, by just such a marking out of frontiers, opposing concepts to each other, defining terms by their differences.   So deconstructive reading begins by asking, "What are the borders?   What are the limits?   And how do they come about?"   This is the question that Derrida throws to conveyors of the traditional ideologies.Deconstruction is the most convoluted term used by Derrida. Ambiguity and the idea of Deconstruction walk hand in hand due to the term's multifaceted meanings. Even Derrida did not draw up any definitive sketch of deconstruction paving the way for confusion ambiguity and dizziness around this term. Nevertheless the idea of deconstruction conveys particular meanings which rocked the traditional texture of Western philosophy and thought. Derrida developed this term as criticism, in particular of phenomenology, Saussurean linguistics, and structuralism and Lacanian psychoanalysis. Derrida suggests that language is an unstable medium unable to carry any meaning or truth directly. Language as Derrida thinks works utilizing interconnected ideas institutionalized by society and forged up by power play. The project of Deconstruction is to reveal the ambivalence of all texts (intertexuality) and not in relation to any literal meaning or normative truth.

[3] Michel Foucault was born on October 15, 1926 in Poitiers, France. Foucault graduated from Saint-Stanislas school, attended the Lycée Henri-IV in Paris, and then in 1946 entered the École Normale Supérièure. In 1950 he was awarded his agrégation in Psychology, and in 1952 his diploma in Psychopathology. In 1959 Foucault received his doctorate d'état under the supervision

of Georges Canguilhem. The paper he presented was published two years later with the name Folie et déraison: Histoire de la folie ý l'âge classique (Madness and Unreason: History of Madness in the Classical Age 1961).In the 1960s Foucault was head of the philosophy departments at the University of Clemont-Ferrand, and at the Vincennes Experimental University Centre. He took the position of head of the Philosophy Department at the University of Paris-VII at Vincennes where he brought together some of the most influential thinkers in France at the time. It was in 1968 that he formed, with others, the Prison Information Group, an organization that gave voice to the concerns of prisoners.

[4] Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (October 15, 1844 – August 25, 1900) was a 19th-century German classical scholar, philosopher, and critic of culture and one of the most influential of all modern thinkers. He was highly educated in theology and philology and became a professor in 1869. His attempts to unmask the motives that underlie traditional Western religion, morality, and philosophy deeply affected generations of theologians, philosophers, psychologists. His key ideas include the death of God, perspectivism, the Übermensch, the eternal recurrence, and the will to power. Central to his philosophy is the idea of 'life-affirmation', which involves an honest questioning of all doctrines. Nietzsche began his career as a classical philologist before turning to philosophy. At the age of 24 he was appointed to the Chair of Classical Philology at the University of Basel, but resigned in the summer of 1879 due to health problems that plagued him most of his life. In 1889 he became mentally ill. He lived his remaining years in the care of his mother until her death in 1897, then under the care of his sister until his death in 1900. For details, please see, Lee Spinks (2007), Friedrich Nietzsche, London, Routledge, pp. 57-58

[5] The term genealogy has been a building block in the proper understanding of the development and scope of Nietzsche's works. In his most important work On the Genealogy and Morality, Nietzsche developed this term to embark on a genealogical mode of analysis in order to distinguish his approach from that of his contemporary traditional historians of morality and culture. Nietzsche by genealogy elucidates and scrutinizes the construction of our moral values and contends that to grasp fully we need to understand the historical development of moral values. Nietzsche's genealogical critique attempts to trace the emergence of immoral values without relying upon a prior determination of the value and nature of morality and man. For details please see Nietzsche, On the Genealogy and Morality, Cambridge University Press, 2007; Lee Spinks (2007), Friedrich Nietzsche, London, Routledge, pp. 57-58

[6] The much wider range of options is coupled with a view 'cultural scripts'. It has been developed into a theory of cross-cultural pragmatics, intercultural communication and indeed cross-cultural understanding in general. The term cultural scripts refers to a powerful new technique for articulating cultural norms, values, and practices in terms which are clear, precise, and accessible to cultural insiders and to cultural outsiders alike. Cultural scripts' are a way of spelling out different 'local' conventions of discourse using the metalanguage of universal semantic primes.

[7] The concept 'false class consciousness' has been derived from the theory of Marx. False consciousness is the material and institutional processes in capitalist society. Growing false consciousness the capitalist society perpetuates the system of exploitation and oppression of working class people escalating huge differences of wealth between proletariats and capitalists. According to Marx capitalist society legalizes its functioning and upholds the basic characteristics by giving birth particular ideology. These processes betray the true relations of forces between capitalist classes. For details, please see, Christopher L. Pines (1993), Ideology and False Consciousness: Marx and His Historical Progenitors, State University of New York, p. 242

[8] Imaginary misrecognition is the modern version and revision of Marxist notion of false consciousness in capitalist society. Althusser revitalized Marxism in Western academia and

challenged those thinkers who thought Marxism to be obsolete and unrefined. In his writings Althusser sought to integrate structural Marxist and Lacanian psychoanalysis in order to understand the functions of ideology in modern societies. Althusser traces ideology as a discourse which leads the individuals to support the reproduction of ruling class power arguing that society and political life is experienced less in the public world of institutions than in the fantasy realm of imaginary. For details, please see, Anthony Elliot (2010) ed. The Routledge Companion to Social Theory, New York, pp. 91-92

[9] Althusser's contention is that Marx's thought has been fundamentally misunderstood and underestimated. He fiercely condemns various interpretations of Marx's works - historicism, idealism, economism - on the grounds that they fail to realise that with the 'science of history', historical materialism, Marx has constructed a revolutionary view of social change. These errors, he believes, result from the notion that Marx's entire body of work can be understood as a coherent whole. Rather, Althusser holds, Marx's thought contains a radical 'epistemological break'. Though the works of the young Marx are bound by the categories of German philosophy and classical political economy, with *The German Ideology* (written in 1845) there is a sudden and unprecedented departure. This 'break' represents a shift in Marx's work to a fundamentally different 'problematic', i.e. a different set of central propositions and questions posed, a different theoretical framework.

[10] According to Nietzsche the common terms we use in general in our everyday essence like life, being, substance, fact or the world are produced by the historical dominance of particular interpretations. Fact does not emerge itself by applying any divine law rather it is the upshot of human experience over the ages. Our vision of the world is constituted by the interplay of perspectives brought to bear upon it; to make the world criterion of truth for its interpretation is to transform an effect into a cause. 'There are no facts, only interpretations.'- Nietzsche's such statement is intended to convey his assertion that there is no metaphysical reality. Truth and knowledge have no universal justification, no transcendental entity or significance. John McGowan (1991), *Postmodernism and Its Critics,* New York: Cornwell University, pp.71.

[11] 'Big picture viewing' is a laden characteristic of enlightenment philosophy. Enlightenment philosophy fostered a unidimensional knowledge system by integrating all kinds of knowledge and theory into a unified context which is much known as metanarrative. Rejecting the dogmatic stance of structuralism poststructuralism appears to have more analytical potential in that it accepts that the world is messy and complex and that neat structures do not provide the full story. For details, please see, Janet Mills Springer llc (2006), *Systematic Governance and Accountability*; *Working and Reworking the Conceptual and Spatial Boundaries* New York p.104

[12] Discourse is one of the most frequently used terms from Foucault's work. In the *Archaeology of Knowledge* he used the term discourse to refer to the general domain of all statements, sometimes as an individualizable group of statements, and sometimes as a regulated practice that accounts for a number of statements, (Foucault 1972: 80). According to Foucault discourse can be used to refer to all utterances and statements which have been made, which have meaning and which have some effects. Sometimes he has used the term to refer to individualizable group of statements, that is, utterances which seem to form a grouping such as the discourse of femininity or the discourse of racism. For details, Sara Mills (2007), *Michel Foucault*, New York: Routledge, pp. 53-54.

[13] Exclusion (of individuals and groups) means the examination of the situation of people existing on the margins of society is one of the mainstays of Foucault's work. His analysis focuses on the 'negative structures' of society or excluded groups, as opposed to more traditional approaches which focus on the mainstream. Foucault defines 'techniques of the self' or 'arts of existence' as 'those reflective and voluntary practices by which men not only set themselves rules of conduct,

but seek to transform themselves, to change themselves in their singular being, and to make of their life into an oeuvre that carries certain aesthetic values and meets certain stylistic criteria'.

[14] One of the building blocks of postmodernism lies in its conception of the toleration of incommensurable i.e. the rejection of grand theory of knowledge and appreciating the multitudinal formation, spreading and experience of knowledge. Toleration of the incommensurable implies that the stance of enlightenment philosophy is human-centric, biased, and purposive and is derived for the support of powerful. Lyotard claims that prime knowledge refines our sensitivity to differences and reinforces our ability to tolerate the insurmountable. For details, Raphael Sassower (1993), *Knowledge without Expertise: On the Status of Scientists*; State University of New York, pp.55

[15] Postmodernists are fiercely critical of the approach and attitude of modernist historians. They argue that the history written hitherto is nothing but the reflection of the powerful – the great men in the history. Postmodernists criticise the traditinal historians for being the historians of the powerful. Postmodernists assert that the ordinary people must not be avoided rather they need to be integrated in the evaluation of history. Baverley C. Southgate (2003), *Postmodernism and History: Fear or Freedom*; London: Routledge

[16] The term deconstructionism is associated with the name of Jacques Derrida. Deconstructionism is a doctrinal stance with regard to the interpretation of texts that denies any prospect of objectivity in this domain. Initially projected as a theory about literary texts the enthusiasm of its more ambitious exponents soon led them to expand the theory's application to texts. In general, the doctrinal core of the position involves two theses: first that a text always allows many alternative interpretative enterprises and second that all these various interpretations are effectively equal in merit that none can be rejected as unsuitable, inappropriate incompetent without much ado. For details please see, Nicholas Rescher(2010), Taken from Philosophical Textuality: Studies on Issues of Discourse in Philosophy, Berlin: Ontog Verlag

[17] During the 1960s, Foucault was noted for his critiques of humanist philosophy, which is founded on the belief that something called 'human nature' or 'man' is at the centre of all knowledge and morality. Foucault also linked the death of man to the death of God.

[18] Foucault was deeply concerned with the radical questioning of the stability of the individual subject or self in the *Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972) and *The Order of Things* (1973). Foucault became interested in how and when human individual or the self posited itself to be the subject of the knowledge. Foucault sees the emergence of man as an object of knowledge, as an epistemic shift, a dramatic change in the way that societies conceptualize. This emergence of 'Man' has profound consequences for representation of the self. Foucault argues that in the general arrangement of the episteme man is not represented. But with the development of medical science human being as human subject underwent in a process of scrutiny and investigation – the dissection and examination of the corpse. Once the discovery of the use of dissection is made, Foucault argues, life, disease and death now form a technical and conceptual trinity. For details, see Sara Mills (2007), *Michel Foucault*, New York: Routledge, 2007, pp. 102-106; Mark Olsen, Bergin and Garvey (1999), *Michel Foucault: Materialism and Education*, London

[19] Abnormal like Foucault's other courses at the College de France anticipates, intersects with and develops themes of most important analysis of Foucault. The announced topic of this course is the emergence of the abnormal individual in 19th century. Foucault shows that the domain of the abnormalities constituted historically on the basis of three elements or figures: the human monster, the individual to be corrected and the onanist. If three figures remained separate until the end of the 18th century or the beginning of the 19th century, a technology of abnormal individual was

formed precisely when a regular network of power and knowledge had been established that brought together and took possession of three figures according to the same system of regularities. For details, Michel Foucault, Abnormal: Lectures at the college de France 1974-1975.

[20] Foucault proclaims that Man will be erased like a face drawn in sand at the edge of the sea. These are the closing lines of Foucault's *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1973). Foucault writes: 'If those arrangements were to disappear as they appeared, if some event of which we can at the moment do no more than sense the possibility - without knowing either what its form will be or what it promises - were to cause them to crumble, as the ground of classical thought did, at the end of the eighteenth century, then one can certainly wager that man would be erased, like a face drawn in sand at the edge of the sea (p. 387).

[21] The Panopticon is a type of building designed by English philosopher and social theorist Jeremy Bentham in the late eighteenth century. The concept of the design is to allow an observer to observe (-opticon) all (pan-) inmates of an institution without them being able to tell whether or not they are being watched. The design comprises a circular structure with an 'inspection house' at its centre, from which the managers or staffs of the institution are able to watch the inmates, who are stationed around the perimeter. Bentham conceived the basic plan as being equally applicable to hospitals, schools, poorhouses, and madhouses, but he devoted most of his efforts to developing a design for a Panopticon prison, and it is his prison which is most widely understood by the term. Bentham himself described the Panopticon as 'a new mode of obtaining power of mind over mind, in a quantity hitherto without example'. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* is a book by philosopher Michel Foucault. Originally published in 1975 in France under the title *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la Prison*, it was translated into English in 1977. It is an interrogation of the social and theoretical mechanisms behind the massive changes that occurred in western penal systems during the modern age. It focuses on historical documents from France, but the issues it examines are relevant to every modern western society. Foucault challenges the commonly accepted idea that the prison became the consistent form of punishment due to humanitarian concerns of reformists. He does so by meticulously tracing out the shifts in culture that led to the prison's dominance, focusing on the body and questions of power. Prison is a form used by the 'disciplines', a new technological power, which can also be found, according to Foucault, in schools, hospitals, military barracks, etc. For details, David Lyon (1994), *The Electronic Eye: The Rise of Surveillance Society*, Polity press, p. 270

[22] Biopower was a term coined by French social theorist and philosopher Michel Foucault which refers to the practice of modern nation state and their regulation of their subjects through an explosion of numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugations of bodies and the control of populations. In Foucault's work, it has been used to refer to practices of public health, regulation of heredity, and risk regulation, among many other things often linked less directly with literal physical health. For Foucault, biopower is a technology of power, which is a way of managing people as a group. Biopower allows for the control of entire populations. Biopower for Foucault contrasts differently with traditional modes of power based on the threat of death from a sovereign power. For details, please see, Jeffrey Thomas Nealon (2008), *Foucault Beyond Foucault: Power and Its Intensifications since 1984*, Stanford University Press, p.136

[23] Foucault considers the breakthrough of the governmental reasoning of the population as a substantial event in Western history and society where a substantial transfer of techniques and technologies was transferred from the sovereign individual (the monarch) to a new modified apparatus such as, *The Carceral archipelago, Discipline and Punish* which culminated into a new version known as nation states. This change took place in the 16th century and continued right

through the 19th century. Foucault introduces into his ontology investigations the concept of 'police'; not the police of the criminal justice system as we know it today, but as a concept known at that time as urbanization of the territory which means making the kingdom, the entire territory into a large industrious town. Police according to Foucault consists of a sovereign exercise of royal power over individuals who are therefore subjects. For details please see, Ann Laura Stoler (1995), *Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*, Duke University Press, p.81

[24] Foucault argues, "in political thought and analysis, we still have not cut off the head of the king:...We shall try to rid ourselves of a juridical and negative representation of power, and cease to conceive of it in terms of law, prohibition, liberty, and sovereignty...We must at the same time conceive of sex without the law, and power without the king" (pp.88-91). It imposed itself as an agency of regulation, arbitration, and demarcation by establishing a principle that would temper all other powers and distributing them according to boundaries and fixed hierarchy. Its main belief is that law has to be the very form of power and that power always had to be exercised in the form of law. For details please see, Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, Volume 1: An Introduction.

[25] Jacques Derrida (1930-2004) was the founder of 'deconstruction', a way of criticizing not only both literary and philosophical texts but also political institutions. Although Derrida at times expressed regret concerning the fate of the word 'deconstruction', its popularity indicates the wide-ranging influence of his thought, in philosophy, in literary criticism and theory, in art and, in particular, architectural theory, and in political theory. Indeed, Derrida's fame nearly reached the status of a media star, with hundreds of people filling auditoriums to hear him speak, with films and televisions programs devoted to him, with countless books and articles devoted to his thinking. Besides critique, Derridean deconstruction consists of an attempt to reconceive the difference that divides self-reflection (or self-consciousness). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (2006), *Jacques Derrida*, First published Wed Nov 22, 2006; substantive revision Friday, June 3, 2011

[26] 'Be free': this phrase might also evoke the notion of so-called 'free play'. Derrida has often been associated with 'virtuoso dazzling textual performances' demonstrating the 'subversive effects' of 'linguistics free play'. His point is that there is no pure freedom or play' and that the distinctions between what is linguistic and what is non-linguistic are more complex and strange than have traditionally been understood. Derrida was deeply interested in the nature and possibilities of language,which entails at the same time a constant preoccupation with what he variously evokes as the 'other of language' (fS 27), a nation of the other as that which is 'beyond language and which summons language' (DO 123). 'Play', for Derrida, is never 'simply playing' (EO 69), anymore than it is for a child. But this also means that play can be 'very risky' in ways that a child would not understand. For details, Sara Mills (2007), *Michel Foucault*, New York: Routledge, pp. 32-34.

[27] Foucault's entire philosophy is based on the assumption that human knowledge and existence are profoundly historical. He argues that what is most human about man is his history. He discusses the notions of history, change and historical method at some length at various points in his career. He uses history as a means of demonstrating that there is no such thing as historical necessity that things could have been and could be otherwise. This term, which Foucault introduces in his book *The Order of Things*, refers to the orderly 'unconscious' structures underlying the production of scientific knowledge in a particular time and place. It is the 'epistemological field' which forms the conditions of possibility for knowledge in a given time and place.

[28] Modernism, in its broadest definition, is a modern thought, character, or practice. More specifically, the term describes the modernist movement, its set of cultural tendencies and array of associated cultural movements, originally arising from wide-scale and far-reaching changes to Western society in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Related terms are modern; modernist; contemporary; postmodern. Modernism was a revolt against the conservative values of realism. Arguably the most paradigmatic motive (motif) of modernism is the rejection of tradition and its reprise, incorporation, rewriting, recapitulation, revision and parody in new forms. Modernism rejected the lingering certainty of Enlightenment thinking and also rejected the existence of a compassionate, all-powerful Creator God in favor of the abstract, unconventional, largely uncertain ethic brought on by modernity, initiated around the turn of century by rapidly changing technology and further catalyzed by the horrific consequences of World War I on the cultural psyche of artists.

[29] A tradition is a ritual, belief or object passed down within a society, still maintained in the present, with origins in the past. Common examples include holidays or impractical but socially meaningful clothes (like lawyer wigs or military officer spurs), but the idea has also been applied to social norms such as greetings. Traditions can persist and evolve for thousands of years—the word 'tradition' itself derives from the Latin tradere or traderer literally meaning to transmit, to hand over, to give for safekeeping—and new traditions continue to appear today. While it is commonly assumed that traditions have ancient history, many traditions have been invented on purpose, whether that is political or cultural, over short periods of time. Certain scholarly fields, such as anthropology and biology, have adapted the term 'tradition', defining it more carefully than its conventional use in order to facilitate scholarly discourse. The concept of tradition, as the notion of holding on to a previous time, is also found in political and philosophical discourse. Eugene T. Gendlin, David Michael Kleinberg-Levin (1997), *Language beyond Postmodernism: Saying and Thinking in Gendlin's Philosophy*, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, p.138

References

Barker, Chris, (2003), *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practices*, London: Sage Publications.

Barry, Peter. (2002), *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Booth,Wayne C. (1979),*Critical Understanding: The Powers and Limits of Pluralism*, Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.

Boyne, Roy. (1990). *Foucault and Derrida: The Other Side of Reason*, New York: Routledge.

Bronner, Stephen Eric (1997) ed., *Twentieth Century Political Theory*, London: Routledge.

Delanty, Gerard. (1999), *Social Theory in a Changing World: Conceptions of Modernity*, London: Polity Press.

Derida, Jacques. (1976), "The Exorbitant Questions of Method" in *Of Grammatology*, translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Bultimore: Johns Hopkins University.

---------------- (1978), "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourses of the Human Sciences" in Writing *and Difference*, Translated by Alan Bass, Chicago: Routledge & Kegan Paul and University of Chicago Press.

---------------- (1978), *Writing and Difference*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

----------------- (1981) *Dissemination, trans. Barbara Johnson*, Chicago: Chicago University Press,

Docherty, Thomson (1993). *Postmodernism: A Reader*, U.K: Pearson Education,

Edgar A. and Peter Sedgwick. (2002), eds. *Cultural Theory: The Key Concepts,* London: Routledge.

Evans, Richard J. (1999), *In Defense of History*, New York: W. W. Norton and Sons.

Foucault, M (1970), The Order of Things and Archeology of Human Sciences, London: Tavistock Publications,

---------------- (1972a), *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, New York: Pantheon.

---------------- (1972b), ''The Discourse on Language'' Appendix to Foucault, M. *The Archaeology of Knowledge,* New York: Pantheon.

---------------- (1977), *Language and Counter-memory,* edited by Donald, F, New York: Cornell University Press

---------------- (1977), *Discipline and Punish*, New York: Pantheon, pp-137

Harvey, David. (1990), *The Condition of Postmodernity*, U.K: Blackwell Publications,

Hill, Chapel. (1996), *Historical Truth and Lies about the Past*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, (Case-studies in postmodernism and historical objectivity) in Microsoft Encarta 2007. 1993-2006 Microsoft Corporation

Hill, Stephen, Abercrombie N., & Turner, S. (2004), *The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology*, London: Penguin Books

Iggers, Georg G. (1997), *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge*, Hanover: Wesleyan University Press

Jary, David and Julia Jary. (2006), *Collins Dictionary of Sociology*, India: Harper Collins.

Lyotard, Jean Francois. (1984), *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge,* United Kingdom: Manchester University Press

Macey David, (2000), *The Penguin Dictionary of Critical Theory,* London: Penguin Books

Mills, Sara. (2004), *Michel Foucault*, London: Routledge

Neuman, W.Lawrence, (1997), *Social Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches,* London:Allyn & Bacon

Noris, Christopher. (1987), *Derrida*, London: Fontana.

Rosenau, Pauline Marie (1992), *Post-modernism and The social sciences,* New Jersey: Princeton.

Robinow, Paul. (1991), *The Foucault Reader: An Introduction to Foucault's Thought*, London: Penguin Books.

Royle, Nicholas (2001), *Deconstructions: A User's Guide*, Hampshire: Pallgrave,

Royle, Nicholas (2006), *Jacques Derrida,* London: Routledge

Said, Edward W. (1983), *The World, the Text and the Critic,* Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Sarup, M. (1988), *An Introductory Guide to Post-Structuralism and Postmodernism*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf,

Sim, Stuart (2001), *Derrida: The End of History*, London: Icon Books.

Steans, Jill, & Lloyd Pettiford (2005), *Introduction to International Relations: Perspectives & Themes*, 2nd Edition, London: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Turner, Bryan. S. (1990), *Theories of Modernity and Postmodernity*, London: Sage Publications,

Wierzbicka, Anna (2003), *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: the Semantics of Human Interaction,* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter