

**PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE IN THE POSTMODERN  
CONTEXT: THEIR INTERDEPENDENCE AND MUTUAL  
DETERMINATION - A CRITICAL INVESTIGATION**

THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT  
FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF  
**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN PHILOSOPHY**

*Submitted by*  
**SAJNESH E.V.**

*Under the Supervision of*  
**Dr. P.K. POKKER**  
**PROFESSOR & HEAD**  
**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY**



**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY**  
**UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT**

**2013**

**Dr. P.K. Pokker**  
Professor & Head  
Department of Philosophy  
University of Calicut

## **CERTIFICATE**

This is to certify that the thesis entitled **“PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE IN THE POSTMODERN CONTEXT: THEIR INTERDEPENDENCE AND MUTUAL DETERMINATION - A CRITICAL INVESTIGATION”** submitted to the University of Calicut for the Award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Philosophy, under the Faculty of Humanities, is a bonafide research work done by **Sajnes E.V.** Department of Philosophy, University of Calicut under my supervision and guidance and the thesis has not previously formed the basis for the award of any degree, diploma, associateship, fellowship, or any other similar title.

Place: Calicut University Campus

**Dr. P.K. Pokker**

Date:

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

*I express my wholehearted gratitude to my supervising teacher, Dr. P.K. Pokker, Professor & Head, Department of Philosophy, University of Calicut, whose guidance, valuable suggestions and inspiration has helped me to successfully complete my research work.*

*I express my sincere gratitude to other faculties and staff members of Department of Philosophy, University of Calicut, for their help and support.*

*I extend my sincere thanks to Dr. K.N. Ganesh, Professor, Department of History, Dr. T.V. Madhu, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, Dr. K.M. Anil, Assistant Professor, Department of Malayalam and Kerala Studies, and Dr. O.K. Sheeja, Guest Lecture, Department of Philosophy, University of Calicut, for their timely help and encouragement.*

*I am thankful to the librarians Lailechi, Sujechi, Minichechi (Department of Philosophy) and Librarians of JNU, MG University, Kerala University Library.*

*I am grateful to T.V. Krishnan, Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy for his valuable help.*

*I am very much glad to my friends Unnikrishnan K., Nishanth T.V., Subair K. (Central University, Gujarat), Ajith P. (Hyderabad Central*

*University), Deepulal V.M., Nishanth T., Rajeevan Kunnath (JNU) Suresh N.K. and Vimeesh Maniyoor for their support and help.*

*Thanks to Indicon Computers, Chenakkal, Calicut University for the neat completion of this work.*

*I also extend my sincere gratitude to my family members who lend their support throughout my work.*

*At last but not the least a special thanks to Gee (Geetha K.P.) Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy and Rinku (Sarangi S.) for enriching me with their reflections, help, support, care and love throughout my research.*

**Sajnesh E.V.**

## **DECLARATION**

I, SAJNESH E.V., do hereby declare that the thesis entitled **“PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE IN THE POSTMODERN CONTEXT: THEIR INTERDEPENDENCE AND MUTUAL DETERMINATION - A CRITICAL INVESTIGATION”** submitted to the University of Calicut for the Award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Philosophy, is a bonafide record of research work done by me under the supervision and guidance of Dr. P.K. POKKER, Professor & Head, Department of Philosophy, University of Calicut. I also declare that this thesis has not been submitted by me for any award of a degree, diploma, associateship, fellowship or other similar title.

Place: Calicut University Campus

**Sajnesh E.V.**

Date:

## CONTENTS

Chapter	Title	Page No.
	INTRODUCTION	1 - 11
	Problem Analysis/Literature Review	4
	Objectives	4
	Area/Scope of the Study	5
	Methodology and Methods	5
	Content	6
I	PHILOSOPHY: AN ENQUIRY AND INTERVENTION IN HISTORY	12 - 81
	1.1 Truth (The Reality of Life, search for Knowledge)	17
	1.2 Problems of Aesthetics	38
	1.3 Theory of Justice	60
II	CULTURE – A HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL PHENOMENON	82 - 139
	2.1 Nature and Culture	87
	2.2 Culture-Agriculture Relations	90
	2.3 Concept of Culture	92
	2.4 Culture and Language	94
	2.5 Culture as System of Values	97
	2.6 Material and Ideational Culture	99
	2.7 Functions of Culture	100
	2.8 Culture and Civilization	103
	2.9 Anthropology and Culture	109

<b>Chapter</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
	2.10 Culture as Social Construct	115
	2.11 Socialization	122
	2.12 Culture as the Product of Human Creation	124
	2.13 Culture-intellectual and Moral Development	135
<b>III</b>	<b>IDEOLOGICAL IMPLICATION IN CULTURE</b>	<b>140 - 196</b>
	3.1. Some Characteristics of Ideology	142
	3.2 Marxist interpretation	144
	3.3 The Social Roots of Ideology	150
	3.4 Antonio Gramsci: The Turn towards Culture Criticism	156
	3.5 Louis Althusser; out of State Apparatus	176
	3.6 Culture as a Product of Dominant Ideology	192
<b>IV</b>	<b>THE POSTMODERN TURN IN PHILOSOPHY</b>	<b>197 - 254</b>
	4.1 Postmodernity: A Historical Survey	198
	4.2 The Emergence of Modernity	202
	4.3 Declaring the Postmodern	209
	4.4 Lyotard on Knowledge and Little Narratives	222
	4.5 Foucault on Historicism	234
	4.6 Deconstructive Turn and Language - Derrida	238
	4.7 Postmodernism – Logic of Late Capitalism – Jameson	245
<b>V</b>	<b>CULTURE AND PHILOSOPHY IN THE CONTEXT OF POSTMODERNISM</b>	<b>255 - 315</b>
	5.1 Semiology: Saussure–Barthes	258
	5.2 Post-colonial Intervention and the Postmodern Ideology	263

---

<b>Chapter</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
5.3	Fanon's Intervention: A Cultural Turn	274
5.4	Postmodernism and the Postcolonial World: Homi K. Bhaba	280
5.5	Nation and Nationalism	281
5.6	Questioning of Gender Justice	283
5.7	Ecology and Politics	298
5.8	Critique of Phenomenology	298
5.9	Philosophy – Modern and Postmodern	304
	CONCLUSION	316 - 323
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	324 - 339

---



## INTRODUCTION

The present thesis is an in-depth analysis of the history of philosophy and its relation to culture and vice versa. In the context of post-modern developments culture has become the centre of attraction unlike the earlier periods in written history. When we consider the situation, a new approach towards philosophy and culture seem to be relevant. Essentially this is a new approach in philosophical discourse, shifting from traditional understanding of philosophical enquiry. The attempt is to prepare a cognitive mapping with regard to the relation between philosophy and culture. Simultaneously the ideological influence of postmodernism in culture, society and socio-political life gets revealed as part of the endeavour. In this thesis, the concept of postmodernism is being used as a philosophical tool to analyze and criticize the mainstream understanding of culture. The approach towards culture and ideology in the postmodern context is important to map the relevance and scope of philosophy in the world of globalization. Most of the philosophers whose contribution seems to be relevant from ancient to postmodern have been analyzed in this study.

This thesis is a critical and analytical exploration of the postmodern concept of culture and ideology, their interdependence and mutual determinations. The concept of philosophy deals with three major concepts,

namely truth, justice and beauty. From time immemorial the debates in the broad field of philosophy have been around the three issues, truth, beauty and justice. The formation of Social life is always within the influential atmosphere of philosophical investigations and understandings. Different philosophers have contributed in the area of the intellectual growth and philosophical emancipation. The world outlook and novel innovation in the field of philosophy and knowledge have been helping to reconstruct the social condition and life-worlds of human beings. The writings of philosophers like Socrates, Plato and Aristotle show the ancient way of putting forth philosophical arguments in order to arrive at a better understanding of both nature and culture. They raised and persuaded the people to question the prevalent view of man about the society and the world. Socrates inaugurated the philosophical intervention in culture which perturbed the state leading to the extermination of his own life. Throughout the history philosophers and philosophy have been sowing the seed of dissent, criticism and new concepts enriching the cultural life of society.

Philosophy as a genre requires analysis since it has paved way for change unlike the accepted belief. Whatever is written and discussed as philosophy paved way for analyzing our own belief system and approaches. Descartes brought forth the modern epistemological approach while Bacon put forth new organ for empirical analysis. As Herbert Spencer mentioned philosophy begins from where science ends. The epistemological and

ontological enquiries really yield far reaching consequences in human understanding. The traditional way of seeing philosophy as love of wisdom remains relevant since the human quest for knowledge determines the growth of philosophy. Kant has brought forth a Copernican revolution and its impact in culture is irrefutable. It is taken for granted that Newton and Einstein changed the approaches in science. Similarly Descartes and Kant have changed the cultural sphere of human life. However the effect of philosophy in culture is seldom recognized.

The term culture is usually used in a loose and vague sense. Man began his/her social life when he/she started cultivation and settled life. In this way culture has its origin from agriculture. Social life required communication and related sign system. Similarly social coherence required certain way of behaviour. In this way man created language, dwelling places, dress, family, totems, taboos, etc. There are numerous cultural variation and distinction in the existing world by its living condition. However the cultures are not static. The cultural sphere changes in each society depending on the social production. In the same way the thought or philosophy also changes human ways of life. Invention of printing enabled man to read and write widely. Likewise the thoughts of Rousseau changed the attitude of man. Social perspectives develop from philosophy. Marx, Foucault and Derrida have produced new way of seeing things.

The new era in production created a new socio-political culture. Jameson called it as 'cultural logic of late capitalism'. As part of this, there evolved philosophies of Lyotard, Foucault, Derrida and Deleuze. Their thoughts became new philosophical movement and tool to analyze the text, society and all other things. It became the key to analyze the contemporary concept of culture and its ideological interdependence. The philosophy of postmodern period not only becomes a tool to understand cultures but also itself.

### **Problem Analysis/Literature Review**

All available texts related to philosophical investigation of culture have been analyzed.

### **Objectives**

- a) To analyze the emergence and development of philosophical ideas such as truth, justice and beauty and the rise of renaissance thought and the influence of philosophy.
- b) Problematising the interdependence of culture and philosophy and the changes in philosophical understandings.
- c) Examines social and historical aspects of ideology and hegemony.
- d) Explore the mutual determinations and interconnections between culture and ideology.

- e) Analysis of the postmodern turn in philosophy.
- f) Enquire the dialectical relation between Culture and philosophy in the postmodern context.

### **Area/Scope of the Study**

This thesis examines the areas of ancient, modern and contemporary western philosophical thought, and the Indian Philosophical systems. This study focuses upon the philosophical concepts; such as truth, justice and beauty and identifies them as the base of this intellectual tradition. The broad area of 'culture', its growth, development, different field of enquiry are coming into the study. 'Ideology' is analyzed as a philosophical movement and various thinkers in this area are identified using postmodernism as a tool to examine and explaining the recent philosophical shifts from the traditional understandings.

### **Methodology and Methods**

The Thesis is a textual analysis of the philosophy, culture, ideology and deconstructive turn in thinking. The important characteristic of the methodology employed in this study is analytical and critical. Descriptive method also is used wherever essential according to the necessity of the argument of the study. Specifications and explanations are given to support the arguments specified below. So, textual, critical and descriptive methods are adopted in this study.

## **Content**

This thesis consists of five chapters and an introduction and conclusion. The First Chapter “PHILOSOPHY: AN ENQUIRY AND INTERVENTION IN HISTORY” deals with the emergence of the analytical and critical thinking both in western and Indian philosophy. In the history of human thought the thinker who was considered as philosopher had to exhibit freedom to interpret the nature and culture without fear and prejudice. The enthusiastic intellectuals enquired about the essential problems of existence and sought to find out the answers for the human race at various stages of civilization. Such initiations helped men to understand their own and other times. It spread light on ethical, religious, political, legal and economic conceptions of the past and present by enlightening the fundamental principles on which they are based. Philosophy is not only significant to question of ‘how we should conduct our lives’ but also ‘why human beings are thinking creatures’ and they have the capacity to revisit the knowledge, for which pure understanding is an end in itself.

Philosophy, as Aristotle said more than two thousand years ago, began with wonder at the marvels and mysteries of the world. It begins in wonder, in the pursuit of truth and wisdom, and ends in life lived in passionate moral and intellectual integrity. The fundamental questions of philosophy from antiquity onwards focused on truth, beauty and justice.

Almost all the question under the sun belongs to these three fundamental principles. This chapter tries to explore and problematise these three principles.

The Second Chapter “CULTURE – A HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL PHENOMENON” covers broad area of culture and civilization and its development and progress both in historical and social condition. Culture is historically created system of explicit and implicit design for living, which tends to be shared by all or especially designated members of a group at a specific point in time. Or it has been described as the prescribed set of expectation as man’s adjective mechanisms to life conditions. Culture defines the reality, influencing one’s perception of the world and explaining the supernatural. Each culture has their values and norms, standards of behaviour; some societal norms are enforced equally upon all individual. Culture stress the behaviour channelling nature of culture, as transmitted and created content and patterns of value, ideas and others symbolic-meaningful system as factors in the shaping of human behaviour and the ratified produce through behaviour. Culture provides a means of social control. Not all cultures have complicated legal machinery, but all impose sanctions against those who defy their most sacred customs. Sometimes these sanctions are merely ridicule and ostracism but these can be powerful force to control in small, self-contained groups.

The Third Chapter “IDEOLOGICAL IMPLICATION IN CULTURE” deals with the ‘ideology’ as a philosophical speculation and crucial area of discussion. Ideologies map the political and social worlds. Nothing is done without ideology because individuals cannot act without making sense of the world he inhabits. Making sense let it to be said, does not always mean making well or right sense. But ideologies will often contain a lot of common sense. General definitions about ideology examine here and step in to different concepts and approaches towards ideology are discussed in the third chapter. In the Marxist concept of ideology the views of Marx and Engels about ideology are included. They maintained that ‘in all ideology men and their circumstances appear upside-downs as in a camera obscure’. By using the metaphor they projected that ideology was an inverted mirror-image of the material world. The fact is that the material world itself subject to dehumanizing social relations with the contradictions. The illusory world created by the ideology itself making them appear as necessary, normal and congruous. In Marxist theory of ideology, they depend on the important difference between true consciousness and distorted or false beliefs. As the superstructure the inverted consciousness also became a metaphor which produced tremendous involvement of thinkers.

Karl Mannheim was to extent from the Marxist approach, in his views; ideology was a reflection of all historical and social environments.



Marx identified the social conditions under capitalism as the source of ideological illusion, while Mannheim realized that it was a feature of any social environment to influence the thought processes of human beings and, moreover, that knowledge was 'a co-operative process of group life'. In those acute senses, ideology was not a passing fantasy. Antonio Gramsci further modified the Marxist understanding of the term 'ideology' active within a broadly Marxist tradition. He defined the concept of ideology through his concept of hegemony. In his opinion the Ideological hegemony could be exercised by a dominant class, the bourgeoisie, not only through using state force but through various cultural means and actions. Later Louis Althusser developed a critical theory of ideology acknowledging that ideology was a 'new reality' rather than the obscuring of reality. He linked the ideological superstructure to the top story of a three- storied house. It was superimposed on the economic and productive base- the ground floor- and on the middle floor, the political and legal institutions. These were also part of the super structure, but one that intervened directly in the base. Although the upper floor was held up by the base, they exercised 'relative autonomy'. These are major arguments in this chapter.

The Fourth Chapter "THE POSTMODERN TURN IN PHILOSOPHY" explores discussions and taking stand against the conventional way or understanding of philosophy and also new areas and debates in contemporary philosophy. Postmodernism pursues to define a

new socio-cultural formation and economic dispensation that, according to a number of theorists, has the capacity to redefine modernity, at least in the western world. Postmodernism represents efforts to integrate a number of diverse; in them ambiguous themes. Irrespective of the particular usage of the terms, postmodernism is often understood as something that not just comes after the ‘modern’, but is based on a negation of the ‘modern’, a perceived abandonment, a break with or shift away from what characterizes the modern. Occasionally the postmodernism seemed as a dimension within modernism. There are authors who describe postmodernism in terms of changes in the realm of economy. Postmodern debates begin with Lyotard and his famous book *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* published in 1979. With his new theory of ‘Deconstruction’ Derrida influenced the intellectual tradition and introduced a way of a looking text. Foucault’s concept about history, Jameson with his logic of late capitalism and Deleuze’s psycho analytic study of capitalism have put the new way in to its heights. At this time postmodernism and its cognates have a slew of meanings. Postmodernism is relatively a new development, which has its roots in the social and cultural changes of the present world. Different opinions and discussions and critical analysis of postmodernism is included in this chapter.

The Fifth and final Chapter “CULTURE AND PHILOSOPHY IN THE CONTEXT OF POSTMODERNISM” discusses the new approach

both in philosophy and culture in the present context. Postmodernism proposes a free attitude, breaking down disciplinary boundaries, challenging conventional wisdom and giving voice to view points and perspectives hitherto silenced. It is also the stage of industrialization, liberation and the expansion of capitalism and the market development and corresponding social and cultural changes. So the understanding of culture and philosophy is necessary to connect and make clear the doubts and debates in the new context. Technological development, mass production and mass distribution, decrease human values and ethics, emergence of new understanding about beauty and aesthetic sense, societal and political formation of ideology and the philosophical understanding of this context are problematising here.

The last part of this study is included with concluding remarks followed by a Selected Bibliography.

**CHAPTER - I**

**PHILOSOPHY: AN ENQUIRY AND  
INTERVENTION IN HISTORY**

Every system of thought is dependent on the civilizations from which they are derived and developed. It is not apart from the living ambiance and human conditions. Philosophy aims to provide a related description of the diverse attempts which have been made to resolve the problem of existence or to make understandable our world of experience. It is the development of human thought from its initial beginning to the present time. It is the study of the relation between one another. It is an attempt to trace the line of progress in the history of human speculation. It shows how the intellectual attitudes called philosophy arises, how the different problems and the solutions developed and within this condition novel questions and answers are aroused.

In the history of human thought the thinker who was considered as philosopher had to exhibit freedom to interpret the nature and culture without fear and prejudice. The enthusiastic intellectuals enquired about the essential problems of existence and sought to find out the answers for the human race on various stages of civilization. Such enquiry helps men to understand their own and other times. It spreads light on ethical, religious,

political, legal and economic conceptions of the past and present by enlightening the fundamental principles on which they are based.

Philosophy is not only significant to us to question how we should conduct our lives but also why human beings are thinking creatures and they have the capacity to revisit the knowledge, for which pure understanding is an end in itself. Finding out about the origin of the universe, or about the nature of consciousness, may make no difference to the way we behave, but it would run counter to human nature not to pursue such questions.

Philosophy has been playing a revolutionary and vitally important role in the creation of good life. Philosophy, as Aristotle said, begins with wonder at the marvels and mysteries of the world. It begins in wonder, in the pursuit of truth and wisdom, and ends in life lived in passionate moral and intellectual integrity. The term 'philosophy' literally means the love of wisdom, but it is a wisdom that results from the pursuit of knowledge of the most important fundamental questions.

Philosophy is love of knowledge in the sense that every rational approach belongs to it until each branch of knowledge developed as separate science. Hence while different branches of knowledge developed in to separate science philosophy had to broaden its approach. As a consequence, with the advent of modernity philosophy elaborated and

broadened its area of enquiry and thereby attained great status. As Herbert Spencer says when the philosophy begins science ends.

Philosophy is sometimes deviating from the mainstream process and the way of looking at things differently. Since philosophizing always involves questioning these accepted truths and it goes beyond what is being accepted in any situation. From Socrates to Deleuze or whoever belongs to this realm of philosophy in any part of the world argues not for public recognition but for knowing or revealing the 'unknown'. So, such knowledge or understanding invites going beyond and hence need genuine quest for truth and knowledge. In this sense it is seeking wisdom or love of limited interest.

Philosophy goes against the stream of the majority because the majority opinion is often a composite of past intellectual struggle or pragmatic basis. There is often deeper truth, better and new evidence that disturbs the statuesque and that forces us to revise or reject some of our beliefs. Rational inquiry, which philosophy promotes, is liberating; feeling as from prejudice, self-deceptive notion, and half-truths. Philosophers clarify concepts, analyse and test propositions and belief, but the most important task is to analyse and construct arguments. Meanwhile philosophy becomes interpretation of nature and culture. As nature is essential aspect of human existences she is forced to interpret it as and

when she confronts it. Similarly as social being man makes certain culture based on his own interpretation.

The fundamental questions of philosophy from antiquity onwards focused on truth, beauty and justice. Almost all the question under the sun belongs to these three fundamental principles. The entire question related to society and polity is actually pertaining to the question of justice. In ancient Greek as well as in other schools of thought different Polities were discussed in order to find out which society is a just society. Justice is the fundamental principle around which almost all and social issues are being raised. Similarly the principle of truth itself became a big question before thinkers since the determination of truth and error is the inevitable aspect of our analysis. The quest for knowledge is actually the quest for knowing justice, truth and aesthetics. Whenever human beings began to live as community the question of knowledge also come up before them. Actually the communitarian life gave birth to language. As part of language the question of semantics and semiotics issues evolved. In such a situation philosopher like Aristotle not only wrote about the ethics or politics but also logic or different forms of syllogisms. In the same way as part of social life they had to analyse not only what is good and bad but also beautiful and ugly. Even the argument in theology such as whether God exists or not also had its roots in human quest for knowing the reason for just and unjust, good and bad, and truth and untruth. In this way a close examination of the

history of human thought would reveal that the whole enquiry is ultimately about justice, truth and beauty.

Greek thought began with an enquiry in to the essence of the objective world. Greek philosophy is one of the best examples of the evolution of human thinking from simple mythological beginning to complex and comprehensive system. Greek philosophy is essentially an intellectual movement which originated and developed in the Hellenic world. Greece is famous for strong and active race, navigation and commerce; by their way of their mobility they got contact and connection with the outside world and its culture. The social condition of Greece also helped the emergence of philosophical thinking and the intellectual involvement. (Economic progress, development of commerce, industry and trade, the rise of cities, accumulation of wealth, division of labour and the leisure time). The social, political, intellectual and religious life of the Greeks and their world opens a new and richer civilization.

Men start to ask the stars not only for guidance on the sea but also for an answer to the riddles of the universe. According to Aristotle first philosophers were astronomers. “Proud of their achievements” “men pushed further afield after the Persian wars; they took all knowledge for their province and sought ever wider studies”.<sup>1</sup> Men grew bold enough to attempt explanation of process and events before attributed to supernatural agencies and powers; magic and rituals slowly gave way to science and



control; and philosophy began. At the initial stage the philosophy was physical in its whole approach (philosophy of nature). It looked upon the material world and asked what the final and irreducible element of things was. This line of thought was the materialism of Democritus. 'In reality there is nothing but atoms and space'. Gradually Greek philosophy turns its eye, on man himself, or it become humanistic. For the philosopher of that time the first problem is about what nature is and its relation with man and then man to nature.

### **1.1 Truth (The Reality of Life, search for Knowledge)**

The significant growth of Greek philosophy begins from the Sophists. For sophist Knowledge is perception. The mind of man is a significant factor in the process of knowing. The sophists' turns its light on the knowing subject and concludes that knowledge depends upon the particular knower. Thus perception is the product of both the object moving towards the subject and the subject moving towards the object. This perception alone is knowledge. This knowledge is relative to different men at different times. Hence the famous saying of Protagoras *Homo Mensura*, i.e., man is the measure of all things. In other words, what appears to me is true for me and what appears to you is true for you. Hence there is no knowledge, which is valid and acceptable to all men universally.

### **1.1.1 Questioning Traditional Understanding of Knowledge**

Socrates was one of the inspiring human beings to have lived and provided a new method of questioning. He spent much of his life in the market place of Athens, by questioning and arguing with his followers on philosophical issues like, truth, justice, friendship, self-control, piety, and virtue. Socrates claimed that real knowledge of justice, virtue, eternal ideas are already present in man. As a youth, he got attracted to the ideas of the physicalists. But finally he turned his attention away from natural sciences towards the problems of everyday life.

Socrates was assassinated for corrupting the youth of Athens. The teachings of Socrates give morale to the young generation of Athens and they began to ask questions and try to demolish the conventional beliefs. If they decided to put an end to his life, Socrates was not ready to stop his teachings of the basic philosophy of life. It was impossible for Socrates to give up philosophy. He expressed his commitment to the knowledge by the dictum, “the unexamined life is not worth living.”<sup>2</sup> From his point of view, a life that was not enriched by philosophical reflection was no better than death. Socrates said, “One thing I know, and that is that I know nothing”.<sup>3</sup>

Philosophy begins when one learns to doubt – particularly to doubt one’s cherished beliefs, one’s dogmas and one’s axioms. There is no real philosophy until the mind turns round and examines itself. Philosophers prior to Socrates, naturally give priority for the physics or nature of external

things, the law and constituents of the material and assessable world. Socrates said, “That is very good; but there is an infinity worthier subject for philosopher than all these trees and stones and even all those stars; there is the mind of man. What is man, and what can be become?”<sup>4</sup> Socrates defends knowledge against the attack by the employment of logical method. His purpose was realistic rather than speculative; he was interested in the correct method of enquiring knowledge more than theory of such a method or approach. Socrates said, “it was mere a matter of asking the right questions. By knowing the proper questions when faced with a problem debate or issue, one can find good answers more easily than someone who starts off without such a foundation”.<sup>5</sup>

The Sophist studied the psychological method for the reality, while Socrates had faith in a law of reason that determines the truth. His whole attempt was only a continuous invitation to his fellow citizens to help him in this search. He said this “I am wiser than they in this small respect: that I know that I do not know, whereas they think they know something when they really don’t”.<sup>6</sup> Yet he demanded the same measure of self-knowledge also from others. For nothing more dangerous blocked the way of wisdom than that conceited affection of wisdom which the Sophist half-education developed in the majority of mind.

### **1.1.2 Knowledge is based on Reason**

Plato's chief aim is to attain reality, to know reality in all its phase-physical, mental and moral – to understand it in its unity and completeness. He knows that the knowledge – problem itself cannot be solved without an understanding of the nature of the world. Plato argued that, the concepts of sophist are quite right that there can be no genuine knowledge, if our proposition is derived from sense perception and opinion. The sense-perception does not reveal the true reality of things, but give us mere appearance. Accordingly opinion may be true or false; as mere opinion it has no value whatever; it is not knowledge; it cannot justify itself. So he does not give much value to the sense perception and opinion. It would be misrepresented, fabricated and half-truth; and not real in its perfect sense. For him genuine knowledge is based on reason.

According to Plato, Ordinary virtue is not better off; it too, rests on sense perception and opinion; it is not conscious of principles. In his verdict “we must advance from sense-perception and opinion to genuine knowledge. This we cannot do unless we have a desire, or love of truth, the Eros, which is around the contemplation of beautiful ideas: we pass from the contemplation of beauty to the contemplation of truth- the love of truth implies us to dialectics; it impels us to rise beyond sense perception to the idea; to conceptual knowledge, from the particular to universal”.<sup>7</sup>

Truth is the knowledge of reality, of being as such, of that which is. The world perceived by our senses is not the true world; it is changing, fleeting world one thing today, something else tomorrow, and it is a mere appearance of reality. True is being something permanent, unchanged, eternal. In Plato's opinion the particular object which we perceive are imperfect copies or reflections of these eternal patterns; particular may come particular may go, but the idea or forms remains forever. Man may come and man may go, but the man type, the human race, goes on forever. There may be object or copies, but there is always only one idea of a class of things.

### **1.1.3 Knowledge is Impossible without Experience**

Aristotle was a man with independent mind to recreate the system and to develop it into a more consistent and scientific manner. He developed his concepts and perspectives by examining and criticizing Plato, his teacher. Aristotle retains the changeless eternal form, the idealistic principles of Plato, but discards their transcendence. He brings them down from heaven to earth, so to speak. For him Form is not separate from things, but inherent in them; they are not transcendent, but immanent. Matter is not non-being but active; form and matter are not separate, but eternally together: matter realizes the form or idea of the thing, moves and changes, grows, or evolves forward. The world of sense, the phenomenal order, is not mere imitation or shadow of the real world; it is the real world, form

and matter is one, and the true object of science. Aristotle reconciles both empiricism and rationalism. Knowledge is impossible without experience; but truth derived from experience, by induction, would not be certain- they would yield probability only. Without experience, truth would never be known; without being implicit in reason. They would not be certain. He proposes a new logic to derive the knowledge, in his work known as *Organon*, i.e., is an instrument for attaining true knowledge. Logic of Aristotle deals with inference, division, definition and induction. Aristotle regarded that both deduction and induction are essential in attaining knowledge.

#### **1.1.4 Medieval Philosophy**

Medieval era is famous for ethical and theological discussions such as problems of man's origin and destiny, his relation to God and the world and his fall and liberation from sin. The rise of Christianity as a new religion was the significant development in this era. The mediaeval philosophy established the largest part of the philosophy of the middle ages, or Christian philosophy, had for its aim the exposition, systematization and demonstration of the Christian dogmas- the creation of a theory of the world and of life on a Christian basis. The creation of the world is explained after the Greek models. God is the ground and purpose of all things: from him they come and to him they return. The logos, however, is pattern, or archetype, or prototype, of all created beings: which means

everything is created in the image of reason and by the power of reason or divine intelligence. Creation is the result of God's love and goodness and for the benefit of man. The important thinkers in the medieval philosophy were St. Augustine, St. Anselm and Thomas Aquinas.

#### **1.1.4.1 Theories of Knowledge**

In St. Augustine's philosophy the most significant theological and philosophical problems of his age are discussed, and a Christian world-view developed which represents the culmination of patristic thought. Characteristic of the spirit of the entire Christian age is the Augustinian view that the only knowledge worth having is the knowledge of God and self. All the other sciences, logic, metaphysics and ethics have value only in so far as they tell us God. It is our duty to understand what we finally believe, to see the rationality of our faith. "Understand in order that you believe, believe in others that you may understand some things we do not understand unless we believe".<sup>8</sup> Besides natural knowledge, faith in divine revelation is a source of knowledge of God. Intelligence is needed for understanding what it believes; faith for believing what it understands.

Augustine thought that the human mind to grasp eternal truths implies the existence of something infinite and eternal apart from the world of sensible object, an essence that in some sense represents the source or ground of all reality and of all truth. He also accepted the Gospel story of

the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ and believed that God took on human form in the person of Jesus.

St. Anselm was among the first to evaluate the faith in Christian God from a purely philosophical perspective, that is, from a perspective that does not make religious assumption from the outset. Anselm never interested the slightest doubt about whether God exists. He made no difference between philosophy and theology, and he thought it impossible for anyone to reason about God or God's existence without already believing in Him. He recognized the priority and primacy of faith over reason. His slogan, which was 'credo, it intelligence' i.e., Let me believe that I may understand. Without faith a man is blind to understand god who is light. But he also held that one should try to understand as much as possible the doctrines of one's faith.

St. Thomas Aquinas chooses a life as a Dominican teacher. He further perceived his purpose in life to be a harmonizing of the theology of the church with the logic of Aristotle. He was called 'the philosopher', and so fully were the scholars convinced that it satisfied God to allow Aristotle to say that last word upon each and every branch of knowledge. That they humbly accepted him along with the Bible, the church fathers, and the canon and Roman law, as one of the unquestionable authorities which together formed a complete guide for humanity in conduct and in every branch of source.



Aquinas wanted to justify the function of the re-established secular authority of the church and its continued sacred authority. Aquinas, like philosopher before him, believed that man was a social animal intended to live in community. But man the social animal, capable of directing his actions by intelligence, was in danger of being victimized that the potential social unity of man be secured by political unity. The end, peaceful unity, was never questioned. The means were, by analogy, seemingly apparent; as only one heart commends the functionally integrated body, so government rule by one person is presumably the best. An intelligent monarchy must rule in justice. A society structural like nature, which is ruled by God, will best function in unity through unitary leadership.

### **1.1.5 Renaissance and Modernity**

The transitional period between medieval and modern times was the Renaissance. Through its emphasis on worldly experience and reverence for classical culture, the Renaissance helped and emancipated Europe from the intellectual authority of the Church. The modern period in history and philosophy and its interesting cultural and social development include among other things, the rise of nation states, the spread of capitalism, and industrialization, the exploration and settlement of the new world, the decline of religion, and their eventual domination of science as the most revered source of knowledge.

### 1.1.5.1 Descartes to Kant

Modern philosophy began with Rene Descartes. He made important contributions in various fields including psychology, physiology, optics and especially mathematics, in which he originated the Cartesian co-ordinate and Cartesian curves. Descartes' like Bacon, resolutely set his face against the old authorities and, like him emphasizes the practical character of all philosophy. "Philosophy is a perfect knowledge of all that men know, as well for the conduct of his life as for the preservation of his health and the discovery of all the arts".<sup>9</sup> Unlike the English empiricist however, he takes mathematics as the model of his philosophical method.

Rene Descartes, known as the Father of Modern Philosophy employed a new kind of skepticism to defeat skepticism. He doubted in such a way that, he hoped, would pave the way for the end of doubt and the beginning of absolute certainty. He was a rationalist who believed that all truth can be known by the mind alone by inquiring within itself. He holds the doctrine of innate ideas (that the mind possesses knowledge at birth) which we know a priori - that is, prior to experience, through experience may be necessary to stimulate awareness of this knowledge. Regarding truth, Descartes says that if the idea of a thing is clear and distinct, it does not mean that the thing really exists (true); but all the ideas of existent things must be clear and distinct to be existent. Our judgments

should be based on this assumption, i.e., clarity and distinctness as the criterion of truth.

#### **1.1.5.2 Knowledge began with Experience**

Kant is considered at par with Plato and Aristotle as one of the most important philosophers in western culture. He was a product of crucial time between the continental allegiances to rational thought and British adoption of sense experience. He attempted a synthesis of these two themes and thereby changed the course of philosophy. He recognized the strength of the empiricist claims that sense experience is the source of all our belief but could not accept its skeptical conclusion that those beliefs cannot be justified. At the same time he rejected the rationalistic claim that factual truth about what does and does not exist can be conclusively established by the use of reason none. Accordingly his task as that of finding out whether it is possible to have metaphysical knowledge, that is knowledge of the soul and whether human have free will.

In *Critique of Pure Reason* he argued that we are confined within the world of our perception, with the realities that gave rise to our perception forever beyond our grasp. We understand our world only by imposing on it our own broad conceptual categories: time, space and causality. These concepts provide an essential element for our understanding of physical world. They are not derived from sense experience or observation but are, in Kant's terminology, *apriori*. That is to say, they are fundamental

requirements of reason he argued that morality, too must be grounded in *a priori* reasoning, rather than in any appeal to authority or religion.

#### **1.1.5.2.1 The Copernican Revolution in Philosophy**

Kant called his most fundamental epistemological insight, the Copernican Revolution in philosophy. He said that the old assumptions that our ideas, to be traced, must certain to objects outside mind must be replaced with a new assumption: that object outside the mind must conform to that which the mind imposes on them in experiencing them. Kant argued with Hume that all knowledge began with experience. But it does not follow Kant maintained that knowledge must therefore arise from experience. Experience is the occasion for the awakening of the knowing mind, He said; but the mind, the awakened, is not limited in knowledge to what, it what, it has found in experience.

Because the constituents of experience must themselves always be ordered and organized in certain ways even to counter as experience. And it is possible to have knowledge of the underlying principle by means of which the constituents of experience are ordered and organized. Because the knowledge is of the universally applicable preconditions of experience which is absolutely certain.

After Kant there was deep enquiry in the field of philosophy and it stretched as the major influence in thinking process. Philosophy as

mentioned travelled all over the world without any boundaries and the knowledge production developed as all. The particular conditions and the different approaches and the developed theories helped the new movements in thinking process.

### **1.1.5.3 Scientific approach in Philosophical Thinking**

Science began with the scientific Revolution, which itself commenced when Copernicus (1473-1543) broke with long tradition and proposed that the earth is not the centre of the universe but it revolves, with the other planets, around the sun. The essence of these revolutions lies in several ideas: (1) It is important to understand how world works; (2) To do that you have to examine the world itself rather than read your Aristotle or consult scripture; (3) a fruitful way of examining the world is through experimentation - this is an idea expressed by most clearly by Francis Bacon and (4) The world is a mechanical system that can be described mathematically - this is an idea expressed most clearly by Rene Descartes.

Many European thinkers of the sixteenth century began to question established precepts and above all to question the accepted authorities as the spokesman for the truth. This tendency to question authority effectively set the stage for the scientific Revolution and modern philosophy, which are products of seventeenth century.

Philosophical reasoning is closely associated with scientific reasoning. Science and philosophy may be said to have had their origin in religion. In its initial stage the religion and the philosophy were one and have the same teachings. Mythology was a primitive attempt to understand the world. Man at first interpreted the phenomena on the basis of practical reason and his basic experience. In beginning, the philosophy and science are in an inseparable form, but in future they normally become two form of knowledge. Science tries to explore the laws behind the objects through observation, experimentation, using the materialistic research methods and with the theory of causation: while philosophy mainly focused on the analysis and enquired about the innermost character or plane of meanings by depending on inferences, thoughts and imaginations. Science also has the same intention to reveal the truth and reality of the character of human beings and the universe by examining the objects and its causation.

The scientists require an expensive laboratory with all sorts of experimental equipment's. The laboratory of the philosopher is the domain of ideas: the mind, where imaginative thought experiments take place; the study where ideas are written down and examined; and wherever discussion or debate about the recurrent question take place, where thesis and counter-examples and counter-thesis are considered. The truth is that it is not easy to analysis philosophical theories as it is to test a mathematical theorem or a scientific hypothesis. Because philosophical problem are more exploratory

and metaphysical, one cannot prove or disprove most of the important thesis. The relationship of philosophy to science is more complicated than this subject, for somewhat theoretical scientist could do with justice to be called philosophy.

#### **1.1.5.3.1 Nothing is beneath Science or above it**

Francis Bacon, in many respects a typical representative of the new movement. He is known as the father of scientific thinking in philosophy. He is opposed to the ancient authorities to Aristotle and Greek philosophy no less than to the barren philosophy of the school. The eye of the mind, he tells us, must never be taken off from the things themselves, but receive their images truly as they are. The past had done nothing; its methods, foundations, and results were wrong; we must begin all over again, free our minds of transmitted and inherited prejudices and opinion, go to the things themselves instead of following opinions and dealing in words - in short, do our own thinking. For him, "As the sciences in their present state are useless for the discovery of works, so logic in its present state is useless for the discovery of sciences".<sup>10</sup>

The fruitlessness of science and philosophy in the past, Bacon thinks, has been due to the absence of a proper method. The unassisted hand and the understanding left to itself possess but little power. For overcoming this Bacon think that we must develop a new way of reaching knowledge, a new machine or organ for the mind, a new logic, *a novum organuam*. According

to him the old logic is inadequate for the discovery of the sciences. Bacon held that mankind must begin the work of science anew. It was natural, under the circumstances, that he did not offer a complete theory of the universe himself; his office was to stake out the ground and to point the way to new achievements. He said, "There are, and can be, only two ways to investigate and discover truth. The one leaps from sense and particulars to the most general axioms and from these principles and their settled truth, determines and discovers intermediate axioms; this is the current way. The other elicits axioms from sense and particulars, rising in a gradual and unbroken ascent to arrive at last at the most general axioms; this is the true way, but it has not been tried".<sup>11</sup>

He divided the field of knowledge, or 'intellectual globe', into history and philosophy, according to the faculties of the mind (memory, imagination and reason). Philosophy is the work of reason; it deals with abstract notions derived from impressions of sense; and in the composition and division of these notions, according to the nature and fact, its business lies. In the former, we considered man separate, in the latter joined in society. Human philosophy studies body and soul and their connection. The human soul has a divine or rational part and an irrational part. The faculties of the soul are understanding, reason, imagination, memory, appetite, will, and all these with which logic and ethics are concerned. Logic treats of the understanding and reason; and ethics of the will, appetite, and affection; the



one produces resolutions, the other action. The art of logic are inquiry or invention, examination or judgment, custody or memory, elocution or delivery. The study of induction belongs to the art of judgments. Ethics describes the nature of the good and prescribes rules for conforming to it.

He said that nothing is beneath science or above it. Bacon moves from field to field, exploring various notions in every science. At the end of his survey he comes to the conclusion that science by itself is not enough: there must be a force and discipline outside the science to co-ordinate them and point them to a good. In *Novum Organum* he explains, “The things that have hitherto been discovered in the sciences all fit nicely into common notions; in order to penetrate to the more inward and remote parts of nature, both notions and axioms must be abstracted from things in a more certain, better-grounded way; and a more certain and altogether better intellectual procedure must come into use”.<sup>12</sup> Science needs a philosophy or an analysis of scientific method, and the coordination of scientific purpose and results; without this, any science must be superficial.

Bacon proceeds to give an admirable description of the scientific method of inquiry. “There remains simple experience; which, if taken as it comes is called accident” (empirical), “if sought for, experiment... the true method of experience first light the candle” (hypothesis), “and then by means of the candle shows the way” (arranges and delimits the experiment); “commencing as it does with experience duly ordered and

delighted, not burning nor erratic and from it reducing axioms, and from established axioms again new experiments”.<sup>13</sup>

Bacon embodied new delight in the human intellect and its capability to know the world. It was acknowledged that man’s rational mind, purged of its bad habits and superstitions (idols) can understand the natural world and gains control of it in the interest of human needs. This new belief was a far turn from the traditional theological doctrine that man’s reason is corrupt and that man, on his own, can’t do anything right or good. Bacon saw himself as the ‘trumpeter of his age’, uniquely qualified to do battle against the fallacious thought system of the past. ‘I was fitted for nothing so well as for the study of truth’. Bacon set out to abolish the closed knowledge system of a stagnant tradition. His goal, he said, was to perform ‘a true and lawful marriage between the empirical and the rational faculty’. Unfortunately, he threw out the rational body with the theological bath waters; by concentrating on empirical fact- gathering he neglected the role of deduction in scientific method.

Bacon believed that the wrong-headed logic must be replaced by inductive scientific method. It is a way of thinking that begins by looking at the world, carefully observing singular events, and then trying these observations together with hypotheses that causally explain them and make them intelligible. Good scientific method requires a variety of a further logical technique, including testing hypotheses.

Bacon was the original philosopher of science, the first to describe not only the intellectual ambitions but also provided the characteristics of modern science. Like his contemporary Descartes, Bacon proposed a scientific method that suspended most conventional belief in favour of a project of establishing an inclusive new understanding of the world. Unlike Descartes, Bacon's science would be based on carefully gathered observation and experiments and would involve the organized corporation of numbers of scientist. In his book *Novum Organum* (New Organ) Bacon describes his valuable ideas and philosophy. The most prescient of Bacon's suggestions was that, to understand nature.

#### **1.1.5.4 Russell**

Science without philosophy, fact without perspective and valuation, cannot save us from havoc and despair. Science gives us knowledge, but only philosophy can give us wisdom. According to Russell "philosophy is like all other studies aims primarily at knowledge. The knowledge it aims at is the kind of knowledge which gives unity and system to the body of the sciences and the kind of results from a critical examination of the grounds of our convictions, prejudices and beliefs. But cannot be maintained that philosophy has had any very great measure of success in its attempt to provide definite answers to its question".<sup>14</sup>

Science seems always to advance, while philosophy seems always to lose ground. Yet this is only because philosophy accepts the hard and

hazardous task dealing with problems not yet open to the method of science. Problems like good and evil, beauty and ugliness, order and freedom, life and death. So soon as a field of inquiry yields knowledge susceptible of exact formulation is called science. Every science begins as philosophy and ends as arts; it arises in hypothesis and flows into interpretations. Science is the captured territory: and behind it are those secure regions in which knowledge and art build our imperfect and marvellous world.

He says, "Philosophy is to be studied, not for the sake of any definite answers to its questions, since no definite answers can, as a rule, be known to be true, but rather for sake of the questions themselves; because these questions enlarge our conception, and diminish the dogmatic assurance which closes the mind against speculation; but above all because through the greatness of the universe which philosophy contemplates, the mind also with the universe which constitute its highest good".<sup>15</sup>

#### **1.1.5.5 Ahimsa: Desire is the course for Pain and Sorrows**

Life is full of suffering. Suffering is due to desire or will-to-live. Will to live is due to ignorance. Ignorance is false knowledge of the impermanent as the permanent. It is delusion of individuality which is the root of the cycle of birth and death. It cannot be killed by philosophical knowledge. The Buddha adopts anti-metaphysical attitudes. There are ten interminable questions which are insoluble. Philosophical wrangling is

unavailing, for it generate self-conceit and skepticism. The Buddha's teachings aim at the total extinction of suffering and attainment of nirvana here on earth. Nirvana is the cooling of passions, perfect peace and perfect enlightenment. The way to nirvana is the eight fold path of right conduct, concentration and insight. The delusion of individuality or egoism should be extirpated. When egoism eradicated, will-to-live or craving is destroyed. When craving is destroyed the round of birth and death is ended and nirvana is attained. Non-injury (ahimsa) in thought word and deed, is the corner stone of moral life. Religion of animal sacrifice, ritualism and ceremonies is condemned. The Buddha teaches neither Being nor Non-Being, but Becoming. He teaches neither self-indulgence nor self-mortification but the middle path-right view, right speech and right conduct. He teaches the religion of ahimsa and self –help.

The whole way of teaching of Buddha is assumed in the four noble truths: (1) there is suffering; (2) it has cause; (3) it can be stopped; (4) there is way to stop it. The first noble truth is suffering. Birth is attended with pain; decay is painful; a disease is painful; death is painful. Sensual pleasure is transitory and followed by pain. 'Sorrow comes from merriment. Fear comes from merriment'. The loss of objects of sensual pleasure leads to sorrow. The second noble truth is concerning the origin of suffering. Desire which generates the cycle of birth and death is the cause of suffering. Desire or will to live are cause of suffering. All pain arise from

individuality which is due to ignorance (avidya). Ignorance is due to will-to-live, which is the root cause of suffering. The third noble truth is the way to the extinction of suffering. It is complete destruction of craving or will-to-live. Delusion of individuality, desire for mind-body-complex and egoism are the cause of suffering. The fourth noble truth is the way to the extinction of suffering. It is the eight fold path: (1) Right Belief, (2) Right Resolve, (3) Right Speech, (4) Right Conduct, (5) Right livelihood, (6) Right Effort, (7) Right Mindfulness, (8) Right Concentration. When the four noble truth are grasped, and craving or will-to-live is extirpated, there is no more birth.

## **1.2 Problems of Aesthetics**

The term 'aesthetics' was first used in the eighteenth century by the philosopher Alexander Baumgartner to mention the cognition by the senses, sensuous knowledge. He later comes to use it in reference to the perception of beauty by the senses, particularly in art. Kant picked up on this use, applying the term of Judgement of beauty in both art and nature. It has succeeds not only judgements or evolution, but properties, attitudes, experience, and pleasure or value as well, and its application is no longer restricted to beauty alone. The realm of aesthetics remains broader than of aesthetically pleasing art works: we can experience nature aesthetically as well and it will take to value art works. The notion of aesthetic attitude, aesthetic properties, and aesthetic experience are inter-definable.

The history of beauty theory can be divided into two main traditions, according to the kinds of pleasurable experience that is recognized as evoked by beauty. Those who recognize the sober, contemplative kind of pleasure evoked by a certain state of formal relation as the only pleasure characteristic of an experience of beauty can be grounded into the Pythagorean tradition. On the other hand, those who recognize the entire pleasure associated with the sense as evoked by beauty can be grouped into the pleasure-principle tradition.

### 1.2.1 **The Pythagorean Tradition**

The Pythagoreans believed that the world is beautiful because there is a certain measure, proportion, or harmony between its elements. They believed that the harmonies of music reveal the same harmonies that underlie nature. These harmonies, according to the Pythagoreans, can be reduced to number. In time, this conception of beauty was modified to accommodate the idea of moral beauty or intellectual constructs. Eventually, within this tradition, beauty comes to be understood as a relational property.

To see that something is beautiful yet at the same time to claim to be unmoved, untouched by the experience, seems contradictory. Built into the concept of beauty is the notion of pleasurable response on the part of the perceiver. On the other hand, judgments of beauty can be defined by pointing out the basic properties within an object from which the beauty seems

to emerge. Either knowledge of beauty is deeply embedded a priori in our mind or beauty is a characteristic of the divine which we come to know through our experience of its manifestation. Alternatively, we might have an inner sense or faculty of beauty which is fitted to respond to a certain constitution of parts in an object, and from which we derive our notions of beauty. According to the Pythagorean tradition in common there are two kinds of beauty, one relative and one universal or absolute. The two kinds of beauty are incorporated in to the one theory of beauty either by maintain that the relation is a manifestation of the absolute, or by postulating that both kinds of beauty are generated from different aspects of the inner sense/faculty of beauty.

### **1.2.2 The Pleasure-Principle Tradition**

Beauty evokes a pleasurable response. While perceiving an object you do not experience pleasure you do not perceive beauty. While it does not necessarily follow that all pleasure evoked by perceiving an object is a response to an object's beauty. Within the pleasure-principle tradition, all pleasurable response to the perception of an object are counted as response of beauty. They also include concepts of the objects when the object gives pleasure because we anticipate the personal benefits and would enjoy on owing or engaging in some way with the object. In other words, when all pleasures evoked by the perception of the object are counted as pleasurable response to beauty, beauty is collapsed in to the agreeably serious and the



good. The pleasure-principle tradition is the tradition of the Sophists and Epicureans. To the former, whatever, gives pleasure to the eye and. Or the ear is beautiful. In similar vein, the Epicureans believe that there is no difference between the good and the beautiful.

Beauty is an aesthetic asset generally thought of as a kind of aesthetic value. As such, it has been differently thought to be (1) a simple, indefinable property that cannot be defined in terms of any other properties; (2) a property or set of properties of an object that makes the object capable of producing a certain sort of pleasurable experience in any suitable perceiver; or (3) whatever produces a particular sort of pleasurable experience, even though what produces the experience may differ from individual to individual. It is in this last sense that beauty is thought to be 'in the eye of the beholder'.

If beauty is a simple, indefinable property, then it cannot be defined theoretically and has to be apprehended by intuition or taste. Beauty on this account would be a particular set of aesthetic property. If beauty is an object's ability to produce a special sort of pleasurable experience, as then it is necessary to say what properties provide it with the ability. Many of the great philosophers of the Western tradition have discussed art. Both Plato and Aristotle viewed art as first and foremost reproduction- an attempt of copy reality.

### 1.2.3 Imitation of Imitation

Plato's works about the art play a basis role in the history of aesthetics, not simply because they are the initial significant impact to the subject. From a modern point of view it shows that Plato refuses to give autonomous value to art. For him there is a metaphysical and ethical order to the world which is philosophy's task to discover by means of rational thought, and the arts can have true worth only if they correctly represent this order or help in aligning us with it. Plato initially considers the role of the art in education. The young, especially those who will be the Guardian responsible for the city's well-being, must receive an education that properly forms their character.

In the *Philebus*, Plato argues that the form or essence of beauty is knowable, exact rational and measurable. He also holds that simple geometrical shapes, simple colours, and musical notes all have 'intrinsic beauty' which arouses a pure, 'unmixed' pleasure in the perceiver and is unaffected by context. Hence the pleasure experienced in response to such beauty can in principle be shared by anyone. Some have held, as that we apply the term 'beautiful' to things because of the pleasure they give us, and not on the basis of any specific qualities an object has.

Plato believed that the objects of our sense experience are themselves copies of some ideal former type- a table made by a carpenter is a copy of an ideal concept of a table; the artist paints a copy of an ideal concept of a

table; the artist paints the carpenter's copy. So, it is twice detached from the reality. Plato viewed art as an inferior pursuit. He believes that the art is an imitation of the world of sense, which is itself a mere copy of the true essence of things; art, therefore, is an imitation of imitation.

Plato criticises mimesis in the visual arts by comparing it with holding up a mirror in which the world mechanically reproduces itself. The points of the comparison are arguably that the painters make no real things, only an image. His products, when compared with the bed and the form of bed, is thus twice removed from reality. To make such an image requires no genuine knowledge, no knowledge of the real thing of which one makes an image.

Plato also wants to ban poets from his ideal state and allow only music with moral message or purpose- as citizens of Athens, he suggested uplifting martial music. For him, the state is an educational institution, the tool of civilization and as such it must have its foundation in the highest kind of knowledge attainable, which is philosophy. He begins with the content of the poetry used in early education. His censorship of the poets as school-books is in line with the practice of modern parents and school masters; but later it develops into a more general attack on poetry. He recognizes the power of poetry over the human soul and intimates that he has full appreciation of its pleasure. It is not rough insensitivity that he rejects pursuit of the pleasure of poetic image making. It is because he has

an argument that shows we should resist these pleasures unless poetry or its lovers perform on philosophy's home ground and present a good counter argument.

#### **1.2.4 Art is an Imitation of Reality**

For Aristotle fundamentally the form of art is an imitation of reality; it holds the mirror up to nature (*De Anima* 11). There is in man a pleasure in imitation, apparently missing in lower animals. Yet the main aim of art is to represent not the outward appearance of thing, but their inward significance; for this and not the external mannerism and detail; is their reality.

##### **1.2.4.1 Theory of Catharsis**

Aristotle gives nothing like theory of Catharsis; the word occurs in what service of the poets, once enigmatically in the definition of tragedy and once in an irrelevant context. He put Catharsis at the end of his definition, and that closing clause is his customary place for starting the purpose or goal of a thing. Moreover, in *Politics VIII* he speaks of the Catharsis that music and poetry bring, with the promise to say more in his work on poetry. And speaking pragmatically- the reader cannot ignore the quality of commentary that Catharsis has already inspired.

The function of art is Catharsis, purification; emotion accumulated in us under the pressure of social restraints, and liable to sudden issues in

unsocial and destructive action, are touched off and sludge away in the harmless firm of theoretical excitement; so tragedy “through pity and fear, effects the proper purgation of these emotions”.<sup>16</sup>

Aristotle appears to equate the subsequent Catharsis with the essential tragic pleasure that pity and fear induce (Poetic). The text lends itself to more than once reading, or Catharsis was used in several different context before Aristotle, and those contexts started the word’s central meaning of a ‘cleaning’. Catharsis in a more rational context meant simply a clean-up or purgation of the emotions.

#### **1.2.4.2 Mimesis**

As the existence of the arts and technologies sprang from a shared human nature, Aristotle believed that these basic forms would also display similarities. Aristotle regarded the visual and dramatic arts as naturally mimetic, in some way representing something, whether in words, marble, or paint. He viewed the human interest in representation-picture, drama, poetry, statues-as an innate tending, and he was the first philosopher to attempt to argue, rather than simply assert, that:

“For it is an instinct of human begins from childhood to engage in imitation (indeed, this distinguishes them from other animals. Man is the most imitative of all, and it is through imitation that he develops his earliest understanding): and it is equally natural that everyone enjoys contemplating

the most precise image of things whose actual sight is painful to us, such as forms of the vilest animals and corpses”.<sup>17</sup>

Aristotle’s frame of reference for generalization was specific to ancient Greek culture, but it is impossible to dispute the claim that children everywhere play in imitation of their elder, each other, even animals and machines. That such imaginative imitation appears to be a necessary, or at least normal, component in the enculturation of individuals. The other side of Aristotle’s mimetic naturalism holds that human beings everywhere enjoys to see, experience imitation; whether pictures, carvings, fictional narratives or play-acting. For him, the child’s fascination with a doll’s house with its tiny kitchen and table setting is not to be reduced to a desire for adult power, but in its imitative play is based in the instructive delight in representation as such.

Aristotle says, “Mimesis is natural to people from childhood”.<sup>18</sup> He sees them as natural and pleasant propositions. Then he goes further. Mimesis is natural and pleasant because it is a way of learning, and human beings love to learn. Aristotelian mimesis capture something about acting and drawing, and in general the works that produce similarity to be discovered. A line drawing can show a thing’s contours better than the thing itself.

### **1.2.5 Medieval Aesthetics – God’s Beauty**

Medieval aesthetics, much like medieval philosophy, remains peculiarly problematic and historically unavoidable as a consequence of its overriding concern with the conceptual relationship between creator and creation. Two leading figures of western Christian aesthetics, collected in a wide sense of 'medieval' are Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. Augustine offers the most ramified melding of Neo-Platonist philosophy and Christian doctrine that the western church achieved, and Aquinas the most ramified and authoritative melding of Aristotelian philosophy and Christian doctrine. The whole idea that the beauty of natural phenomena is rightly informed by God's beauty- that is, that the beauty of complex particular things is informed by the individual beauty of God-is rather a pretty notion.

Augustinian treatment of symbolic beauty, like the interpretation of the sack of Rome in the city of God (1972), is certainly an expression of an impressive piety. But Augustine's interpretive rule is committed to grasping the a historical indeed, the transcendent- truth of historical work and deeds; and that can hardly be compelling, even among Christians, in a world in which the corrective grasp of God's beauty (or Goddess of Truth) is not entirely transparent.

Aquinas's aesthetic of beauty and theory of art have almost nothing in common with the aesthetics of our detailed interest in the fine art, for instance the interpretation of the Gothic Cathedral. By distinguishing the good and the beautiful as between the appetitive and the cognitive (or what

is pleasurable when perceived), he is able to treat the discrimination of the aesthetic as unique to man “only man delights in the beauty of sensuous things as such”.<sup>19</sup>

In any case beauty and its perception and the pleasure taken in the thing perceived (or in the perceiving of it) are keyed to the formal essence of the things in question. This helps to explain his remarks, “Beauty demands the fulfilment of three condition; the first is integrity, or perfection, of the thing, for what is defective is, in consequence, ugly, the second is proper proportion, or harmony; and the third is clarity - this thing which have glowing colour are said to be beautiful”.<sup>20</sup> The recovery of medieval aesthetics as part of a general ethos cannot be adversely affected by these and Aquinas belongs to a small company of gifted discussions.

### **1.2.6 Kant on Aesthetics**

Immanuel Kant’s seminal work, *The Critique of Judgment*, published in 1790, is generally regarded as the fundamental treatise in modern philosophical aesthetic. Until the 1780’s Kant did not consider what we know today as aesthetics to be a legitimate subject for philosophy. He denied the possibility of principles of taste, holding that our judgments about beauty are based simply on pleasure, and being entirely subjective is only fit topic for empirical studies.



To begin with, two important points that Kant makes in his third critique' are (a) that the aesthetic is to be distinguished from the useful, and (b) that the beautiful is without a concept. The points add up to the view that works of art are not to be viewed as object of utility, and that such work do not admit of any predetermined rules. In respect of work of art Kant develops his view of 'genius' which according to him, "is a talent for producing that for which no definite rule can be given; and not an aptitude in the way of cleverness for what can be learned according to some rule; and that consequently originality must be its primary property".<sup>21</sup>

The beginning section of the critique of Judgment is titled the 'analytic of the beautiful' which Kant says consists in an analysis of "what is required in order to call an object beautiful".<sup>22</sup> It is divided in to four 'Moments' corresponding to the heading of the table of judgments in the Critique of Pure reason: quantity, quality, relation and modality.

#### **1.2.6.1 Disinterested Pleasure**

The first moment (quantity) of the 'Analytic of the Beautiful' concludes that in order to call an object beautiful one may judge it to be "the object of an entirely disinterested satisfaction or dissatisfaction".<sup>23</sup> Thus when beauty is affirmed of the object there is additional content to this affirmation, namely the ability of the object to provide satisfaction to those who judge it dis-interestingly.

He initiates with the observation that the judgement of taste is an aesthetic judgment, of which he contrasts with a cognitive judgement. In judging something to be beautiful, what is aware of (a painting, a building, a flower) is referred “back to the subject and to its feeling of life, under the name of the feeling of pleasure or displeasure”.<sup>24</sup> Thus, commonly, judgments of taste are a subset of that type of judgments that says something is pleasing to apprehend; they are therefore subjective rather than objective judgments. Kant differentiates the pleasure in the beautiful from other pleasure, by appealing that it is not based on any interest, but is “a disinterested and free satisfaction; for no interests, either of sense or of reason, here forces our assent”.<sup>25</sup>

#### **1.2.6.2 Universal Pleasure**

The second moment (quantity) begins to make this closer, although the concept text is difficult because Kant goes far beyond simply analysing the judgement of taste, and anticipates justifying its legitimacy as a class of judgments based on a priori principle. Its conclusion that “The beautiful is that which pleases universally without a concept”.<sup>26</sup> He argues for his universality thesis in two ways, first through the concept of disinterestedness. If one believes that pleasure in finding something beautiful is not owing to any interest, then one naturally concludes that the pleasure does not depend on any private condition but “must be regarded as grounded on what he can presuppose in every other person... consequently

the judgement of taste, accompanied with the consciousness of separation from all interest, must claim validity for everyone”.<sup>27</sup> Secondly, Kant appeals to semantic consideration: to say “This object is beautiful for me” is laughable, while it makes perfect sense to say “It is pleasant to me”... not only as regards the taste of the tongue, the palate, and the throat, but for whatever is pleasant to anyone’s eyes and ear.<sup>28</sup>

### **1.2.6.3 The Form of Purposiveness**

The third moment (relation) purports to explain what is being related to in the judgment that something is beautiful, the content of the judgment of taste. Kant concluded that it is the form of the purposiveness or finality of an object, insofar for this is perceived in it without any representation of a purpose or end.

### **1.2.6.4 Necessary Pleasure**

The final moment of the ‘Analytic of the beautiful’ is that of modality. Kant concludes, “the beautiful is that which without any concept is cognized as the object of a necessary satisfaction”,<sup>29</sup> since when we find something beautiful we think that everyone ought to give their approval and describe it as beautiful. He says, “necessity is exemplary”,<sup>30</sup> ‘subjective’ and ‘conditional’ and based on a “ground that is common to all”.<sup>31</sup>

### **1.2.6.5 Natural Beauty**

Kant's first characterization of natural beauty in *The Critique of Judgement* begins with the remark: "natural beauty.... Brings with it purposiveness in it's form by which the object seems to be, as it were, pre-adapted to our judgement, and thus constitutes in itself an object of satisfaction".<sup>32</sup> Here seems to think that beauty is the examples of the 'purposiveness of form' that he earlier claimed was the basis of pleasure understanding the judgement of taste. The second discussion of natural beauty is reflected in Kant's doctrines of "free and dependent beauties"<sup>33</sup> in that we do not consider their (reproductive) purpose in viewing them merely as to their form. When they please themselves, our Judgment of their beauty are pure. This contrasts with judgments that attribute beauty and on an object's realization of 'a concept of its perfection', how good a thing is of its kind, for example "human beauty...the beauty of a horse, one building (be it church, palace, arsenal or summer home)",<sup>34</sup> He implies that in judging a building to be a beautiful church, we consider its form a dependent on the purpose a church serves, where as in judging it as free beauty, we either do not know or do not consider its purpose. Nature provides us with the most accessible example of free beauty.

### **1.2.6.6 Fine Art and Artistic Genius**

"Nature is beautiful because it looks like art can only be called beautiful if we are conscious of it as art while yet it look like nature".<sup>35</sup> The

beautiful in nature appears as if it was designed, made in accordance with rule of art. Fine art differs from nature since it is the product of human freedom; it must appear spontaneous although rules may be followed precisely in producing it. Arts differ from science in requiring skill in addition to knowledge; it differs from handicraft since its production requires more than following rules, Kant's aesthetic theory is systematic and comprehensive relating our expressive and judgements of natural beauty and art to basic epistemological, metaphysical and ethical concepts. His doctrine of artistic creativity becomes the corner stone of Romanticising Fine art is the art of the artistic genius. Who has "a talent for producing that for which no difficult rule can be given", <sup>36</sup> something original and exemplary which serves as a model for others. Kant's treatment of the fine arts concludes with cursory analysis of the individuals, on attempt to classify the fine art in terms of their relative worth in terms of ability to express aesthetic ideas, stimulate mental activity, and promote culture.

Thus Kant clearly maintains that making a work of art does not involve following some pre-given rule or formula. Creativity in the region of fine Arts is an activity of the orders that, far from being in line with imitation, is autonomous in the sense of being independent of any rule. The creative artist must produce something original, the like of which has not been done before, a work that may be copied, but is capable of inspiring

other artist to create along the same line. In first place, art involves human skill or making by human effort. As he puts the matter “Where anything is called absolutely a work of art, to distinguish it from a natural product, then some work of man is always understood”.<sup>37</sup>

### **1.2.7 Hegel on Art and Aesthetics**

Hegel varied from Kant in several respects. In specific, he believed that human acquire their grasp of the world and of themselves not only through prosaic cognition but also through art and religion: they are always of discovering the world and ourselves, not simply ways of beautifying or sanctifying what we have already discovered. He believed too that our essential categories or thought develops over history. Thus Hegel is concerned not only with formal features of art but with its content or meaning. He sometimes presents art, religion and philosophy as progressively satisfactory ways of grasping the ‘absolute’ or the nature of things. Art grasps the absolute in sensory intuitions, religion in pictorial imagination (*vorstellung* – a mental image or idea produced by prior perception of an object, as in memory or imagination, rather than by actual perception), philosophy in concept of thought.

#### **1.2.7.1 The Role of Art**

Art serves the development of mind. Thus Hegel concerned with the beauty of art, not the beauty of nature. Nature is to be mastered and

redeemed by mind, not contemplated for its own sake: “the torch- thistle, which blooms for only one night withers in the wilds of the southern forests without having been admired, and these forests, jungle themselves of the most beautiful and luxuriant vegetation.. . rat and decay equally unchanged. But the work of art is not so naively self-centred; it is essentially a question, an address to the repressive breast, a call to the mind and spirit”.<sup>38</sup>

Art plays a relevant role in the development from infancy to adulthood. The child decorates its body to mark it as its own. It draws pictures of itself, of other and its environment. It produces effects in the world to contemplate the results of its own activity. Art provides material for contemplation and reflection in a way that purposive activity does not. But Hegel is more interested in art and its role in the development of mind over history. Humans have produced art from the earliest time, and art has commonly been associated with religion.

#### **1.2.7.2 The End of Art**

Hegel seems to have said the end of arts. “The form of art has ceased to be the supreme need of the spirit. No matter how excellent we find the status of the Greek gods, no matter how we see God the Father, Christ, and Mary so estimable and perfectly portrayed: it is no help; we bow the knee no longer”.<sup>39</sup>

Art reached its peak in ancient Greece, with a perfect coincidence of message and sensory medium that can never be recovered. Greek art is supremely 'beautiful' in a narrow sense of 'beauty'. In a wide sense of 'beauty', in which the word covers all artistic value, particularly the truth and profundity of the message expressed, Christian art is more beautiful than Greek. But Christian art is not a full, or the best, expression of the Christian world view. The art of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is inferior to medieval, let alone Greek art. One reason is this, art, does not promote morality in the sense of making bad people good. If this were its purpose, art would not be valuable for its own sake, but a means to an end which might be better served by others means. But art express and conforms, the on-going social morality or 'ethical life' - the customs, codes, hierarchies, and festival - of the society it serves.

Occasionally, however, Hegel suggests, "the decline of art is a cyclical phenomenon, not its final end: in the case of every people when art points beyond itself".<sup>40</sup> The suggestion that art had by his term done everything that art could do is invalidated by the art of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, in particular by new arts such as films, but Hegel's thesis of the end of arts as significant vehicles of the human spirit is less easy to refute. He presents us with a dilemma. Either art has a serious message or it is entertainment. In either case art is disposable. Art may be



entertaining; but we have other ways of entertaining ourselves; in any case entertainment is trivial.

### **1.2.8 Nietzsche's Concept of Aesthetics**

In Nietzsche's thought the relation between the ethical and the aesthetic remains good deal were stable than the relation between metaphysical and the aesthetic. As he notes in the mere reliable passage from the 'attempt of self-criticism' (Nietzsche, 1967 a, 1886), the birth of tragedy already set out to 'tackle' art in the perspective of life. To tackle art in the perspective of life, then is to seek to understand art as a particularly immediate index of the psychological economy, whether cultural or individual, that gave rise to it. He says, "regarding all aesthetic value I now avail myself of this main distinction: I ask in every instance is it hunger or superabundance that has become creative".<sup>41</sup>

In order to understand what actually Nietzsche means by saying this, we have to look in to another passage, "what does all art do? Does it no praise? Does it not glorify? Does it not select? Does it not highlights? By doing all this it strengthens or weakens certain valuation... is this no more than an identical? An accident? Something in which this instinct of the artist has no part whether? Or is it not rather the prerequisite for the artistic being an artist at all... is his basic instinct directed towards art, or is it not rather directed towards the meaning of art, which is life?"<sup>42</sup>

Nietzsche's later philosophy is engaged to the possibility of an affirmative evaluative stance towards life as lived in the real, non-metaphysical world of experience, embodiment and temporality. The artistry of self-realization then takes two forms, the first is transformative. Through the addition and removal of 'second' and 'original' nature the very materials of the characters are forced in to an aesthetic unity. The second is interpretive.

### **1.2.9 Formalism**

According to formalism art work may be concerned with religious or political theme, moral education, philosophical world view, or material emotion. But so are many other things. Definitely, many other things, including sermons, pamphlets, newspaper editorials, and philosophical treatises generally do a better job of conveying cognitive and moral information and emotional cognition than does art. According to formalism, the really primary function of exhibiting significant form is a necessary condition for art status. But this cannot be right. Many of our greatest works of art were produced with patently different primary intentions, such as many military monuments whose primary function were to commemorate great victories.

### 1.2.10 Pragmatism

One of the central features of Dewey's aesthetics is its naturalism. Dewey aims at "recovering the continuity of aesthetic experience with normal procedure of living".<sup>43</sup> Aesthetic understanding must start with and never forget the roots of art and beauty in the 'basic vital functions', "the biological common places' men share with 'bird and beast'".<sup>44</sup> For him, all art is the product of interaction between the living organisms and its environment, an undergoing and a doing which involves a reorganization of energies, actions, and materials. Though human art have become mere spiritualized, "the organic substratum remains as the quickening and deep foundation, the sustaining source of the emotional energies of art which make it so enhance to life".<sup>45</sup>

For Dewey, the aesthetic experience is the "experience in which the whole creative is alive".<sup>46</sup> "To aesthetic experience, than the philosophers must go to understand what experience is".<sup>47</sup> While he saw art as the qualitative measure of any society, analytic philosophers saw science as the ideal and paradigm of human achievement. He tries to deconstruct the traditional privileging opposition of science over art not only by reversing the privilege but by denying there is any rigid dichotomy or opposition between the two. He insists that "'science is an art', for 'aesthetic quality... may inhere in scientific work' and both enterprises perform the some essential function of helping us order and cope with experience".<sup>48</sup>

Dewey's aesthetic naturalism aimed at "recovering the continuity of aesthetic experience with normal processes of living" is part of his attempt to break the sifting hold of "the compartmental conception of fine art".<sup>49</sup> His aesthetic of continuity and holism, however, not only undermines the art/science and art/life dichotomies; it insists on the fundamental continuity of a host of traditional binary notions and genre distinction whose long assumed oppositional contrast has structured so much of philosophical aesthetic: form/ content, fine/practical art, high/popular, spatial/temporal art, artist/audience, to name but a few.

### **1.3 Theory of Justice**

The whole world comes to this important conclusion that what really connects the theme of law, rights, liberty and equality (including fraternity or co-operation), is the element of justice. In every organised community the ideals of law, rights, liberty and equality have their values and there must be something to bring them together so that we may understand the idea of a well-ordered community. Notice that Justice "is the reconciler and synthesizer of political values: it is their union in an adjusted and integrated whole: it is, in Aristotle's words 'what answers to the whole of goodness.... being the exercise of goodness as a whole.... towards one's neighbour'.<sup>50</sup>

The term justice has been assigned different meaning by different people at different time and different places. Not only this, its implications vary from man to man on account of their varying interpretations. Second

the idea of justice is a dynamic affair. As such, its implication changes with the passage of time. Thus what was justice in the past may be injustice in the present and vice versa; it is also possible that the justice of today becomes the injustice of tomorrow and vice versa. However the justice as a concept of philosophy cannot stop with the provisional notions.

The Greek word translated 'justice' is *dikaiosume*. It has a wider application than the English word 'justice'; and many passages in Plato's writings will sound strange and will be misleading unless this is remarked. We think of 'justice' and 'injustice' primarily as qualities displayed in the exercise of a judicial or administrative function. The just judge, for example, is a man who declares the law impartially; an unjust judge is one who inflicts punishment otherwise than in accordance with the deserts of the offender. But the Greek extended the term 'injustice' to the fault in the offender which made him deserving of punishment.

The sophists admitted that justice, or morality was essential to the existence of political society; but they denied that a man had to limit his individual activities and submit to regulation of his desires if it were to be possible for him to live socially with other men; but they denied that he become a better man by doing so. The sophist, Thrasymachus held similar position in the discussion concerning the nature of justice in the Republic which he lays down his famous definition "that justice is nothing else than the interest of the stronger".<sup>51</sup>

The notions and emotional state of justice may be two-fold or three-fold or even more fold, in accordance with different systems of values to which we respond positively at different time, or even simultaneously justice in the light of personal, ideas is, or at least may be, a barrel with several bottoms. In order to solve this predicament Brecht divides justice in two broad categories:

1.                    Traditional Justice: It accepts the fundamental institutions which constitute the basic of our daily life, take them for granted, does not question them. In so far as these institutions have been established by the positive law.
  
2.                    Trans-traditional justice: It detaches itself from the existing institutions, either in whole or in part, and criticise them according to principles which are taken from a trans-traditional scheme of evaluation.

The different forms of government makes laws democratically, aristocratically, tyrannical, with a view of their several interests; and these laws which are made by them for their own interests, are the justice which they deliver to their subjects, and him who transgresses them they punish as a breaker of the law and unjust. And that is what means when say that in all state there is some principle of justice, which is the interest of the government; and as the government must be supposed to have power, the

only reasonable conclusion is, that everywhere there is one principle of justice, which is the interest of the stronger.

The best example of a philosophical interpretation of this term in the history of western political thought is, however, Plato's theory of justice as contained in his *Republic*. Here justice has a purely metaphysical connotation implying a life of people conforming to rule of functional speculation. The original principle underlying it is that one man should practice one thing only and a thing to which his nature is best adopts it. Plato stresses the point that each individual should be put to the use of for which nature 'intended him, one to one work and then everyman would do his own business, and the one and not many'.

### **1.3.1 Human Virtue; Bond with the State**

It is Plato's doctrine that justice as part of human virtue. This doctrine will appear less like a platitude if we perform on the term 'virtue', the same operation which was necessary with 'justice' and restore to it the meaning which it bore in Greek. Justice is for Plato, at once a part of human virtue and the bond which joins men together in states. It is an identical quality which makes man good and fundamental principle of Plato's political philosophy.

In *Republic*, Plato speaks about the concept of justice by connecting it with the life. He even speaks of an 'art of justice'. He accepted Socrates

belief that there should be an art of living, analogous to the craftsman's knowledge and subsequent capacity to achieve a purposed end. A builder, building a house, knows what he is setting out to do and how to do it: he can account for all his actions as contributing to his end. The knowledge and ability to constitute the craft embodied in the builder and his special excellence or 'virtue', qua builders, similarly a man can live well only if he knows clearly what is the end of life, real value, and how they are to be attained. This knowledge is the moral virtue of man, qua man and constitutes the art of living. If a man imagines that the end of life is to gain wealth or power, which is valueless in them, all his actions will be misdirected.

When Thrasymachus asked that, is 'Justice as the interest of the stronger'.

Plato hold that justice or right is nothing but the name given by the men actually holding power in any state to any actions they enjoin by law upon their subject; and that all their laws are formed to promote their own personal or class interest. 'Just' accordingly means what is for the interest of the stronger, ruling party. Right and wrong have no other meaning at all.

In his opinion, "In every cause the laws are made by the ruling party in its own interest; a democracy makes democratic law, a despot autocratic ones, and so on. By making these laws they define as 'right' for their



subject whether is for their own interest and they call anyone who breaks them a ‘wrong doer’ and punish him accordingly. That is what I mean is; in all state alike ‘right’ has the same meaning, namely what is for the interest of the party established in power, and that is the strongest. So the sound conclusion is that what is ‘right’ is the same everywhere: the interest of the stronger party”.<sup>52</sup>

According to Plato, a just man is a man in just the right place, doing his best and giving the full equivalent of what he receives. A society of just men would be therefore a highly harmonious and efficient group: for every element would be in its place, fulfilling its appropriate function like the pieces in a perfect orchestra. Justice in society would be like that harmony of relationship whereby the planets are held together in their orderly movement. And in individual too, justice is effective co-ordination, the harmonious functioning of the element in man, each in its fit place and each making its co-operative contribution to behaviour. Every individual is a cosmos or a chaos of desires, emotions and ideas: let these fall in to harmony, and the individual succeeds and prospers. Plato replies to Thrasymachus and Callicles that, Justice is not mere strength, but harmonious strength- desires and men falling in to that order which constitute intelligence and organization; justice is not the right of the stronger, but the effective harmony of the whole.

Justice thus becomes another name for the principle of ‘proper stations. It indicates ‘doing your own work and not meddling with what belongs to others’. From this statement it may be understood that justice, as conceived by Plato, has both individual and social aspects. The highest good of both the individual and the society is conserved if we take it for granted that there is nothing better for a man than to do a work that he/she is best fitted to do, there is equally nothing better for the society than to see that each should be filling the station to which he is best entitled by the virtue of the special element of his personality. It follows that, as in the state, which is the analogue and product of man’s mind, there are three elements, so in the mind of each man there are parallel to them, and the source of their existence, three elements of reason, spirit and appetite. And as the justice of the state means that each of the three elements retains its place, so the justice of the individual means that reason, spirit and appetite, all keep their proper bounds.

#### **1.3.1.1 State – An Ideal Society**

According to Plato, The Republic would not require laws and state if all men were rational and virtuous. A virtuous man is governed by reason, and not by external law. There are several classes in society, in his opinion, “Those who received philosophical training represent reason and ought to be the ruling class. The warrior class represents the spirited element or will; their task is defiance; the agriculturists, artisans and merchants represent

the lower appetites; and have as their function the production of material good”.<sup>53</sup>

In the Republic Plato makes an attempt to construct a new model of ideal society. The states arise due to the inability of individual men to satisfy their requirements without outside help. The need to procure food, build house, make for the existence of farmers, artisans, merchants, etc. they constitute the lower class of society and shoulder the burden of providing the material goods.

In his ideal society Plato upholds the view that every individual ought to have some occupation, which should be that to which his natural capacity is best adapted. In his concept of state, Plato opposes private property and monogamous marriage and recommends the common position of wife and children. The other relevant recommendations are the exposure of weak children, compulsory state education, education for the children, education for women for war and government, censorship of work of art and literature. The perfect state is divided in to three parts, like the soul of man. There are the producers, the warriors, and the administrators. The perfection however of the entire state - its ‘virtue’ is justice that every one may get his right justice consists in these three classes having their proper distribution of power, while at the same time everyone achieves his own peculiar task. Therefore the rulers must have the highest culture and

wisdom, the warrior an undaunted devotion to duty, and the people an obedience which curbs the appetites.

### **1.3.1.2 Virtues of the State**

In his Republic Plato speaks about his concept of state and its rulers and their qualities. The original aim in instituting an ideal state was to find justice exemplified on a larger scale than in the individual. Plato now asks wherein consist the wisdom, courage, temperance and justice of the state or in other world of the individual composing the state in their public capacity as citizens. Wisdom in the conduct of the state affairs will be the practical prudence or good counsel of the deliberative body. Only the philosophic ruler will possess the necessary insights in to what is good for the community as a whole. They will have right belief grounded on immediate knowledge of the meaning of goodness in all its forms. .

The courage of the state will obviously be maintained in the fighting force. Socrates had defined courage as knowledge of what really is, or is not, to be feared and he had regarded it as an inseparable part of all virtue, which consists in knowing what this are really good or evil. If the only, real evil is moral evil, the poverty, suffering and the so-called evils that others can inflict on us, including death itself, are not to be feared, since, if they are met in the right spirit, they cannot make us more men. This knowledge only the philosophy rulers will possess to the full.

Temperance is, not as we might expect the peculiar virtue of the lowest order in the state. As self-mastery, it means the subordination of the lower element to the higher; but government must be with the willing consent of the government, and temperance will include the unanimous agreement of all classes as to who should rule and who obey. It is consequently like a harmony pervading and unity of all parts of the whole, a principle of solidarity. In the laws, which stress the harmonious union of different and complimentary elements, this virtue overshadows even justice.

Justice is the complimentary principle of differentiation, keeping the part distinct. It has been before us all through the constitution of the state since it first appeared on the economic level as the division of labour based on natural aptitude. In Republic Plato says, “Doing one’s own work’ now has the larger sense of conclusion on one’s peculiar duty or function in the community. This conception of ‘doing and possessing what properly belongs to one’s is wide enough to cover the justice of the law-courts, assuming to each man his due rights. Injustice will mean invasion and encroachment upon the rights and duties of others”.<sup>54</sup>

### **1.3.2 Lawfulness and Fairness**

The philosophical interpretation of justice takes an empirical direction at the hands of Aristotle who says that ‘Injustice are treated equally’. For Aristotle Justice is a virtue, implying a relation to others, for

it promotes the interests of somebody else, whether he will be a ruler or a simple- citizen. Justice is taken in two sense, lawfulness and fairness. Laws pronounce upon all subjects with a view to the interest of the community as a whole or of those who are its best or leading citizens whether in virtue or in any similar sense. That is all virtues are included in the notion of justice, only that in this case they are regarded from the standpoint of the general welfare. The term justice is also used in the more usual sense of giving each man his due. He says, “When men are friends they have no need of justice, while when they are just need friendships as well, and truest form of justice is thought to be a friendly quality”.<sup>55</sup>

The philosophical interpretation of justice has taken an empirical distinction at the hands of Aristotle who says that ‘injustice arises when equals are treated unequally and also when unequal’s are treated equally’. The important implication of Aristotle’s explanation is that justice is either ‘destructive’ or ‘corrective’ the former requiring equal distinction among the equals, the latter applying wherein remedy for a wrong is provided. In *Nicomachean Ethics* Aristotle illustrates, “The justice of a master and that of a father are not the same as the justice of citizen, though they are like it; for there can be no injustice in the unqualified senses towards things that are one’s own, but a man’s chattel, and his child until reaches a certain age and setup for itself, are as it were part of himself (for which reason there

can be no injustice towards oneself). Therefore the injustice or injustice of citizen is not manifested in these relations”.<sup>56</sup>

### **1.3.2.1 State is to Produce Good Citizens**

For Aristotle Man is a social being, who can realize his true self only in society and the state. Families and village communities are prior to the state in time, but the state is good for the evolution of human life. Social life is the goal or end of human existence. The aim of state is to produce good citizens. Society is composed of individuals and the purpose of society is to enable the individual citizens to live a virtuous and happy life.

He insisted that the form of the ideal state depends on and can change with circumstances. Unlike Plato, Aristotle did not set forth a recipe for the ideal state. A state he said can be ruled properly by one person; but it can also be ruled properly by a few people or many. Even though Plato's ideal state has no slaves, Aristotle held that some people are by nature suited for slavery, whereas others by nature are suited for freedom, even freemen are equals. Aristotle too regarded that the state as an organism, as a living thing. He thought that the state as living beings exists for some and for some purpose, and he believed, is to promote the good life for humans.

The constitution of the state must be adapted to the character and requirement of a people. It is just when it concerns equal rights on the people in so far as they are equal and unequal rights in so far as they are

unequal. Citizens differ in personal capability, in property qualification. The concept of freedom and justice demand that they be treated according to these differences.

There are good constitutions and bad ones; the monarchy, the aristocracy and the polity (a form in which the citizen are namely equal) being good form and the tyranny, oligarchy and democracy as bad. As the best state for his own time, Aristotle regards a city state in which only those are to be citizens whose positions of life and education quality than for government that is an aristocracy. He justifies slavery on the ground that it is a natural institution; it is just that foreigner, and they alone composed the slave- class in Greek- being inferior to Greeks, should not enjoy the same right as Greeks.

The notion of natural justice was mixed up with the myth of divine sanction with the advent of Christianity. What the Stoics and the Romans meant by 'nature' becomes 'God' to the Church Father. The result was that religious canons become handy instruments to distinguish between the just and unjust. St. Augustine linked up the idea of justice with the precepts of Christian religion. St. Thomas ruled that in case of the civil law was contrary to natural law, it was not binding on the 'consciousness of the ruled'. In this way, theological basis 'provided absolute ideal of justice at the beginning of society. It was also starting point of the inductive and inspirational ideal of justice. Later on, the scholastic philosophy and its



non-scholastic development were responsible for the growth of absolute and universal elements in justice. In other words it signified that nature 'is not, in this context, a source of justice which is distinct from religion and from ethics: it is rather a combination and fusion of religion and ethics'.

The philosophical or metaphysical concept of justice reared a setback in the medium period of with the growth of 'new learning'. The conversion of the idea of natural justice into 'transcendental idealism' is conceived by Immanuel Kant. The notion of natural justice, though quite abstract on account of its philosophical or metaphysical connotations, has been a source of inspiration to the man of liberal jurisprudence. The philosophical as well as natural theories of justice may, likewise, be accused of being too abstract to easily graft into the premise of positive jurisprudence.

### **1.3.3 Natural Theory: Justice as an Ultimate End**

The natural theory of justice should be understood as an extension of the philosophical theory of this subject in that first pronounced by the stoics and then borrowed from them by the Roman lawyers, it treated justice as an ideal of absolute value whereby the right order could be established. What the stoics meant by nature was that the ruling principle in the universe was 'reason'. Their idea of living in agreement with nature was therefore fundamentally a canon of living according to the norm which man ought to realize.

The idea was lent by the Roman lawyers who took justice as an ultimate end. The distinctive contribution of the Roman lawyers, however, lies in their integration of the idea of ‘natural justice’ with the positive law of the state. With result of that jus civile (civil law) and jus gentium (law of nations), as they called it, were insisted upon to be in conformity with the law of nature. According to the Digest “justice is a fixed and binding disposition to give to every man his right. The precepts of the law are as follows: to live honourably, to injure no one, to give to every man his own. Jurisprudence is knowledge of things, human and divine, the science of the just and unjust.”<sup>57</sup>

#### **1.3.4 Marxist Theory: Class Concept of Justice**

Viewed from an ideological stand point, the idea of justice may be divided into two categories – liberal and Marxist. It takes justice in terms of law is pronounced by the state through its accredited government, including the organs of legislature, executive and judiciary. Moreover, justice is not mere performance according to law; it has an overriding effect two in case the administration of law leads to manifest injustice either due to violation of principles of natural justice or due to the exercise of unfettered conscience of the person administering justice.

Essentially the Marxist view of justice integrates the ideal of justice with the doctrine of class war. If the state is an instrument of exploitation and oppression by one class over another, naturally the systems of law and

justice are originally board up with it. According to the view, the laws are needed by the bourgeois class to keep itself in power by hook or crook. Obviously after the successful revolution, the whole system is changed. In the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat, laws are needed to affect the transformation of the bourgeois society into a socialist order.

### **1.3.5 Social Justice: Predominance of the Interest of the Community**

Social justice relates to the balance between an individual's right and social control ensuring the fulfilment of the legitimate expectations of the individual under the existing laws and to assure him benefits there under and protection in case of any violation or encroachment of his rights, consistent with the unity of notion and needs of the society. Certainly the idea of social justice requires the sacrifice of certain rights of an individual at the altar of, what is known, the general interest. However viewed in a broader perspective the idea of social justice not only aims at the proper reconciliation of the interest of an individual with the over-all interest of the community or prevalence of the latter over the former in the event of any conflict. It also constitutes an essential part of the great complex of social change, for which something may have to be sacrificed for greater good.

It is evident that the notion of social justice is a very wide term that covers with its fold everything relating to the norm of 'general interest' ranging from the protection of the interests of the minorities to the

eradication of poverty and illiteracy. It not merely relates to the observance of the principle of equality before law and independence of judiciary, it also related to the eradication of massive social evils.

### **1.3.6 Justice as the Principle of Right Order**

Justice in Indian philosophical thought has been identified with the *Dharma* having its English equivalent in the idea of 'righteousness'. As such, it not merely implies what is covered under the word 'religion', it also implies all what comes within the fold of a righteous way of life. Dr. U. C. Sarkar refers to four senses in which the term 'Dharma' may be used: (1) It means religion in the category of theology. (2) It means virtue as opposed to vice in the category of ethics. (3) It means virtue in the category of jurisprudence. (4) It means duty in the category of action. Accordance to Hindu jurisprudence, *Dharmamaya*, meaning equality and justice, is given precedence over Dharma meaning law, whenever there is any conflict between the two. It prevails; generally speaking, there is no separation between law and religion as both are treated interchangeably.

As above mentioned, the concept of truth, justice and beauty are the three relevant areas where the notion of philosophy developed. It is never be limited in to philosophy, it give way to the new thinking and ideas about the society and its culture. Culture is actually a social practice by men and the community. So naturally the prevalent philosophy would effect and influence the culture in a great sense. Culture itself will become a

philosophy in its progress concerned. Socrates first questions the world with a new vision of approaching the prevalent truth and reality, Plato was his disciple with his new notion of state and its ethical justice and Aristotle with his materialization of ideas. It suggests that in an enquiry everything is relevant and everyone has a role to play whether it is philosophy or culture. So naturally we move to enquire the form of social knowledge or culture.

## **References**

- <sup>1</sup> Durant, W. (1926). *Story of Philosophy*. New York, p. 3.
- <sup>2</sup> Cooper, J. M., & Hutchinson, D. S. (Eds.). (1997). *Plato Complete Works (Apology)*. Indianapolis/ Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, p. 38a.
- <sup>3</sup> Durant, W. (1926). *Op. cit.*, p. 6.
- <sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, p. 6.
- <sup>5</sup> Mann, D., & Dann, G. E. (2004). *Philosophy – A New Introduction*. Wadsworth Incorporated Fulfilment, p. 1.
- <sup>6</sup> Cooper, J. M., & Hutchinson, D. S. (Eds.). (1997). *Op. cit.*, pp. 17a to 42a.
- <sup>7</sup> Thilly, F. (2003). *History of Philosophy*. New Delhi: SWB Publishers, p. 62.
- <sup>8</sup> *Ibid*, p. 148.
- <sup>9</sup> *Ibid*, p. 272.
- <sup>10</sup> Bacon, F. (2000). *The New Organon*. Lisa Jardine & Michael Silverthorne (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 34.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid*, p. 36.
- <sup>12</sup> *Ibid*.
- <sup>13</sup> Bacon, F. (2000). *Op. cit.*, pp. 1-84.
- <sup>14</sup> Russell, B. (1912). *The Problem of Philosophy*. London, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, p. 90.
- <sup>15</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 93-94.
- <sup>16</sup> Halliwell, S. (1987). *The Poetics of Aristotle* (trans.). Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- <sup>17</sup> *Ibid*, p. 14489.

- <sup>18</sup> *Poetic. 1448b6.*
- <sup>19</sup> Aquinas (1942). *Summa Theologiae*. Burns, Oates & Washbourne (trans.). London: English Dominican Fathers. Berys & Dominic McIver Lopes (Eds.). (2001). *The Routledge companion to Aesthetics*. London, New York: Routledge, p. 34.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>21</sup> Kant, I. (1973). *Critique of Judgements*. James Creed Meredith (trans.). Oxford: The Clarendon Press, p. 168.
- <sup>22</sup> Kant, I. (1951). *Critique of Judgment*. J. H. Bernard (trans.). New York: Haffner, p. 1.
- <sup>23</sup> Ibid, p. 1.
- <sup>24</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid, p. 2.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid, p. 9.
- <sup>27</sup> Ibid, p. 6.
- <sup>28</sup> Ibid, p. 7.
- <sup>29</sup> Ibid, p. 22.
- <sup>30</sup> Ibid, p. 18.
- <sup>31</sup> Ibid, p. 19.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid, p. 23.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid, p. 16.
- <sup>34</sup> Ibid.

- 35 Ibid, p. 45.
- 36 Ibid, p. 46.
- 37 Kant, I. (1973). *Op. cit.*, p. 168.
- 38 Hegel, G. W. F. (1975). *Aesthetics: Lecture on Fine Arts*. T. M. Knox (trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 71.
- 39 Ibid, p. 103.
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 Nietzsche, F. (1974). *The Gay Science*. W. Kaufmann (trans.). New York: Vintage, p. 329.
- 42 Nietzsche, F. (1968a). *Twilight of the Idols*. R. J. Hollingdale (trans.). London: Penguin, p. 81.
- 43 Dewey, J. (1987). *Art as Experience*. Carbondale: Southern Illusion University Press, p. 16.
- 44 Ibid, pp. 19-20.
- 45 Ibid, pp. 30-31.
- 46 Ibid, p. 33.
- 47 Ibid, p. 278.
- 48 Dewey, J. (1929). *Experience and Nature*. Chicago: Open Court, p. 358.
- 49 Ibid, p. 14.
- 50 Barker, E. (1967), *Principles of Social and Political Theory*. London: Oxford University Press, p. 102.



- <sup>51</sup> Conford, F. M. (1941). *The Republic of Plato*. London, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, p. 14.
- <sup>52</sup> Ibid, p. 14-15.
- <sup>53</sup> Thilly, F. (2003). *Op. cit.*, p. 71.
- <sup>54</sup> Conford, F. M. (1941). *Op. cit.*, p. 121.
- <sup>55</sup> Ross, W. D. (trans.). (1908). *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, p. 1155a 26
- <sup>56</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>57</sup> Johari, J.C. (1987). *Contemporary Political theory: New Dimensions, Basic Concepts and Major Trends* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., p. 344.

**CHAPTER - II**  
**CULTURE – A HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL**  
**PHENOMENON**

Culture is a total way of life of the people of a society, including their customs, institutions, beliefs and values. It functions as a binding force, holding people together by common attitudes, beliefs and traditions. It consists of the thoughts and behaviour pattern that members of a society learn through language and other forms of symbolic interaction – their customs, habits, beliefs and values, and it is the common viewpoints which bind them together as a social entity in a society. Culture changes gradually picking up new ideas and dropping old ones; but many of the culture in the past have been so persistent and self-contained that the impact of sudden change has torn them part uprooting their people psychologically. Cultures are developed and transmitted through societies. Societies can be defined as self-perpetuating human groups, usually possessing a territory and government or other means of social control, and often including subgroups within. It refers to people and their organization; culture refers to thought and behaviour patterns and means of communication in this societies. It is the total way of life of the people of a society, including their customs, institutions, belief and values. The word ‘culture’ used in a wide sense to

describe all aspects and characteristic human life and in a narrow sense it denotes the system of values.

Culture may be thought of a fundamental agent that affects the evolutionary process of human civilization. It permits the self-conscious evolution of human possibilities in the light of a system of values that reflect prevailing ideals about what human life. Thus 'culture' is a necessary device for control over the direction in which human species changes. Thus culture is a system of learned behaviour shared by and transmitted among the members of a group. Men begin to learn it since his birth. By picking up the culture and tapping the heritage of its past, man becomes distinctively human. Man has therefore, been called the culture-bearing-animal.

Various explanations exist about the notion of culture. Culture is an acquired quality and not an innate one. Characters learned through socialization, habits and thoughts are called as culture. Culture is social, not individual heritage of man. It is inclusive of the expectation of the members of the groups. It is a social product which is shared by most members of the group. Culture is idealistic. It embodies the idea and norms of a group. It is sum-total of the ideal patterns and norms of behaviour of a group. It is the manifestation of human mind in the course of history. Culture is the total social heritage. It is linked with the past. The past endure because it lives in culture. It passed from one generation to another through tradition and

customs. Culture fulfils some needs. It fulfils those ethical and social needs of the group which are ends in themselves.

In one of the most quoted passages which are considered to provide a definition of culture, E.B. Tylor also uses the terms as synonyms. He holds, “Culture is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society”.<sup>1</sup> An important aspect of his definition was that it introduced the concept of acquired behaviour at a time when belief in biological determinism was especially widespread. Once established as a legitimate area of inquiry, the non-biological origins of behaviour could be studied along with its biological origins. In Eagleton’s words, “‘Culture’ here means an activity, and it was a long time before the word comes to denote an entity”.<sup>2</sup>

Culture accumulates new traits over a period of time; and it drops many traits that are no longer useful. Sometimes, however, ingrained cultural habits make change difficult. Although culture is a vehicle for human survival, it is also a trap of habits and custom from which no one can fully escape. In Leisure’s opinion “Culture is the quintessence of all natural goods of the world and of those gifts and qualities which, while belonging to man, lie beyond the immediate sphere of his needs and wants”.<sup>3</sup> Culture fulfils some needs. It fulfils these ethical and social needs which end in themselves. Social habits are included in culture. Habit can be

formed of these activities only which lend to fulfil some needs. Without fulfilment of these needs, culture cannot exist. Eagleton explains, “‘Culture’ at first denoted a thoroughly material process, which was then metaphorically transposed to affairs of the spirit. The word thus charts within its semantic unfolding humanity’s own historic shifts from rural to urban existence; pig-farming to Picasso, tilling the soli to splitting the atom”.<sup>4</sup>

Cultural qualities spread from one society to another. Cultural traits diffuse if they fit in to the needs and values of the receiving culture. Foreign ideas are less likely to be accepted than are products and techniques. Fear of outsiders and extreme physical isolation are very important factors in the prevention of diffusion. Where cultural diffusion is impossible, culture fails to develop the technologies that the western world characterizes as advanced. It is difficult to avoid use of words ‘primitive’ and ‘advanced’, but they should not be taken as descriptive of levels of happiness or psychological well-being. Spencer describes, “Culture is the super organic environment as disguised from the organic or physical, the world of plants and animals”.<sup>5</sup>

Some of the functions of culture are those of defining the ‘right’ family type and pattern of rearing the young and ‘proper’ social role for men and women. Culture develops values, traditions and heroes. It helps it regulate nature, even interfering to some extent with such biological

matters as age of maturity, how often the individual should eat and what he should eat. Culture defines reality, influencing one's perception of the world and explaining the supernatural. Wallas defines, "Culture is an accumulation of thoughts, values and objects, it is the social heritage acquired by us from preceding generations through learning, as distinguished from the biological heritage which is passed on to us automatically through the genes".<sup>6</sup>

Cultures accumulate more techniques, ideas, products and skills as time goes on, and the more traits a culture has, the more rapidly it grows. The pace of change in modern western societies is often bewildering. Edward Sapire explains, "Culture includes those general attitudes, views of life and specific manifestation of civilization that gave a particular people its distinctive place in the world".<sup>7</sup> At a time some new cultural traits are added and certain old ones have to be dropped because these old ones have outlived their usefulness. However, culture sometimes accumulate customs that are outdated but very hard to drop, such as our cumbersome method of spelling words, our dividing lengths in to inches, rods, furlongs, and miles, and dividing weights in to ounce, pounds, and tons. In Eagleton's opinion, "If culture is originally means husbandry, it suggests both regulative and spontaneous growth. The cultural is what we can change, but the stuff to be altered has its own autonomous existence, which then lends it something of

the recalcitrance of nature. But culture is also a matter of following rules, and this too involves interplay of the regulated and unregulated”.<sup>8</sup>

Culture has the characteristic of adaptation and integration. It is frequently undergoing changes in accord with the environment and due to this transformation it is constantly being adapted to external forces but once it is developed the influence of the natural environment begins to decrease. Besides, the various aspects of culture are also undergoing development and some internal adaptations among them are consequently being necessitated? Culture has the quality of becoming integrated. It possesses an order and a system. Its various parts are integrated with each other and any new element which is introduced is also integrated. Those cultures which are more open to external influence are comparatively more heterogeneous but nevertheless some degree of integration is evident in all cultures.

## **2.1 Nature and Culture**

The primitive societies were small, homogenous and folk culture societies. Custom had been in vogue in these societies in the form of an unwritten law. In these form of societies there was little or no division of labour as we seen today. Man was over-awed by the forces of nature. Morality constituted in obeying the customs of the tribe. The inequalities among men and their possessions slowly led to a division of the primitive society in to various classes. The social lives thus become very complex

and the stage was set for the creation of a more well-knit political organization. These forms societies gradually carved out of the primitive ‘social structure for the fulfilment of specific needs.

Early demarcation of environment surrounding human beings into *natural* and *cultural* holds key to understand the nature of human creations. The world in which human beings have been created is defined as natural world where as the world that is created by human has been understood as the cultural realm. In this view the entire non-human reality that includes physical and biological realms is considered as nature. Prior to human existence events and processes taking place on planet earth fell in natural domain and formed a part of natural causal nexus. The processes of evolution have also been explained to a sensible extent by the principles of natural selection. In order to survive, species had to adapt themselves to the changes taking place in the ambience. Only those species survived which adapted themselves. Those which failed to do so vanished from surface of this planet. Homo-sapiens are considered members of first species that intervened in processes of nature on a significant scale, produced changes in the environment, and tried to tailor it to suit their needs. With this, the era of evolution is supposed to give way to the era of human history. This usage has its roots in the common sense view of the genesis of culture. Terry Eagleton expressed that, “culture etymologically speaking is a



concept from nature. One of the original meanings is 'husbandry', or the tending of natural growth.<sup>9</sup>

Common sense does not associate the term culture with early humans - who primarily were food gatherers and hunters - as they were using the products of nature when they appeared in nature. The term 'culture' is employed in the context of societies which started domesticating animals and began producing food crops. The etymological roots of the word 'culture' also points in this direction as it is taken to be related with tending of something, basically crops or animals. Malinowski defined "culture as social heritage comprising inherited artefacts, goods, technical processes, ideas, habits, and values".<sup>10</sup> Sorokin defined it as "the sum total of everything which is created or modified by the conscious or unconscious activity of two or more individuals interacting with one another or conditioning one another's behaviour".<sup>11</sup> In this way it helps to understand the nature of the human creation as opposed to the phenomena of nature.

In human intervention in the process of nature not only differentiated them greatly from lower animals, rather through it they created a world of their own, which includes not only objects, but meanings and values as well. Culture in the broad sense means that it is socially transmitted rather than genetically and consists of the whole structure containing of human creations. So the category of culture was used to distinguish human creation from mere governance of the nature.

## 2.2 Culture-Agriculture Relations

The important modern development of the concept of ‘culture’ took place between the late eighteenth and late nineteenth centuries. Broadly, the concept was developed in a four ways, all of which still defects its meaning. First ‘culture’ comes to mean ‘a general state or habit of the mind’, with close relations to the idea of human perfection. Second, it comes to mean ‘a general state of intellectual and moral development in a society as a whole’. Third, it comes to mean ‘the general body of the arts and intellectual work’. Fourth it comes to mean ‘the whole way of life, material, intellectual, and spiritual of the given society’. Culture has been called “one of the most profound concepts to come out of modern science... At the simplest level we can say that culture is everything learned and shared by men”.<sup>12</sup>

The word ‘culture’ in its social and intellectual and artistic sense is a metaphorical term derived from the act of cultivating the soil. (Latin *cultura*) The cultivation of mind was seen as a process comparable to the cultivation of the soil; hence the early meaning of ‘culture’ in this metaphorical sense centred on a process, ‘the culture of mind’, rather than on an achieved state. The first important development from this metaphorical use of ‘culture’ was description of certain men as ‘cultivated’ and then as ‘those who are not cultivated’. In this use the meaning is very close to ‘civilized’.

Its origin is linked to 'cultivate' and 'cultivation and the definition given in the concise Oxford Dictionary being with; Tillage of the soil, rearing, production (of bees, Oysters fish, silk, bacteria). During the seventeenth century, the word also began to be used in metaphorical sense, to refer the growth of the individuals or of human society. Particularly in Germany, by the late eighteenth century 'culture' was being used in scholarly works on historical progress and also being employed to refer to distinct social group. By the turn of the twentieth century, 'culture' had already become the concept with a complex of overlapping, but potentially different meanings. The broadest meaning related to debates what the theory of evolution which continue up to the present. This is the argument about the extent to which human behaviour is determined by biology. For those who maintain that human are not just another type of primate, the crucial difference between humans and animals is culture. Hence culture refers to 'learned adapted symbolic behaviour, based on a full- fledged language, associated with technical inventiveness, a complex of skill that in turn depends on a capacity to organize exchange relationship between communities'. Barnard and Spencer explains, "Any particular person is a product of the particular culture in which he or she has lived, and difference between human beings is to be explained by difference in their culture (rather than their race)".<sup>13</sup>

### **2.3 Concepts of Culture**

The concept of 'culture' was from the beginning controversial and often confused. Three main emphases can subsequently be traced. First, there is the idealist emphasis, which survives in every much its original form. 'Culture' is here seen as a process and a stage of civilization that should be a universal idea. This usage is ethical and indeed, spiritual and express an ideal of human perfection. It can easily be conflict with the emphasis on particular 'culture', which stresses the difference in the ways in which men find meaning and values in their lives and indeed conceive of perfection itself.

Secondly probably the most common popular meaning of the word 'culture' - namely a body of actual artistic and intellectual work. There is an inevitable tension between this meaning and the other two. Actual artistic and intellectual work often fails to conform to the idea of a perfect or perfecting state of mind already associated with known, traditional meaning and values. It becomes necessary, in this middle position to distinguish 'high culture' from 'mass culture' or 'mid culture' and other similar twentieth century coinages.

On the other hand, if culture is viewed as a body of artistic and intellectual work to which great, and at times supreme value is attached, it is difficult from such a position to accept the anthropological and sociological use of the word 'culture'. In this respect these uses are mainly

neutral, since they refer to what different people do and make and think, without regard to any artistic or intellectual merit. In any case these uses includes element of social and economic life that do not seem to be culture in the artistic and intellectual sense at all. There is an important controversy within anthropology and sociology concerning the concept of cultures. But beyond this dispute, at time overlapping it are the radical difference between ‘culture’ as a social concept, ‘culture’ as an artistic and intellectual classification, and ‘culture’ as an embodiment of universal and absolute value.

Culture is a universal concept, and we cannot just wash it away because it is a difficult thing to define and write about. There are common understandings of the term and it is important that we engage and debate with the ways in which people use it. ‘Culture’ remains a significant part of people’s lives. Understanding culture in a conceptual framework can help us to interpret what things mean to people.

The vast form of knowledge and writings related to culture across and beyond the social may be rather mind-boggling, but some of the material is extremely valuable. The fact that in these many discourses the word ‘culture’ carries different meaning can be unsettling, but it doesn’t necessarily mean that one discourse is correct and another is wrong.

## **2.4 Culture and Language**

A society shares a specific culture expresses the same awareness. A cultural group is always a linguistic community, for such a community shares the same means or symbolic order to communicate. In other words the sign system employed to communicate in such societies are the same. It does not mean that the sign used as symbols, icons or indices have the practical level it has a potential to say many more things owing to the peculiarity of language.

Language is the chief vehicle: man lives not only in the present but also in the past and the future which transmits to him what was learnt in the past and enable him to transmit the accumulated wisdom. Culture is a learned behaviour, transmitted through communication, largely in the form of language. Language is so intimately connected with culture that it links its users in common modes of thought and perception. It raises the level of human possibilities far above those of the animal world because it can relate present to past and future and the close-at-hand to the faraway. Language makes possible the relation of the learning of the past and their transmission to younger generation. Language is not meant for a particular scheme or sphere but it is a tool to bring definiteness to the homogeneity of impressions and connotative boundary of a symbol.

Language is the life blood of culture. Therefore the vitality of a culture depends on the vitality of its language. The vitality of a language

lies in its power of expressing fully human soul's creative urge, its urge for freedom. If thought cannot express itself through the language, it is deprived of its freedom, it dies out. New value-images are not born and the old one loses their utility. This is how a cultural decay sets in. Great thinkers, poets, artists and saints give vitality to language and through language to culture.

It is rather an attempt to conceive of culture in no other terms than the formal and ideal tools of thought, which is capable of abstracting in to and sometimes building forms and patterns out of the empirical, in to a realm beyond the empirical. This complex structure of pattern together constitutes the culture of a group or of a person. In such a conception, language would be a basic element, as without it no pattern - in fact no thought - is possible.

The term 'language' brings in as broad terms as possible, so as to include not only ordinary language of communication, the language of science and discourse but also the language of mathematics, of music, of visual art and even tools of enquiry-both material and ideational. All societies have their systems of symbols. A symbol is any sign, signal or word that stands for something else. The most obvious symbolism by which culture is transmitted is language. All words are symbols; having only the meaning assigned them by the speakers or readers of language. Language among human beings conveys a great variety of meanings that the simple

crisis of animals cannot transmit, language not only describes what is here, but it can recall the past and warn of the future language includes not only simple names for things but also abstractions such as 'justice', 'love' and 'idealism'. Language focuses on the things most important to culture, changes with a culture, and not only expresses through but helps to shape the thought processes.

For, art is mainly a matter of individual enjoyment of the creative artist whether it is Leonardo, Beethoven or Shakespeare. When it is communicated through a language it becomes an object of aesthetic enjoyment by others. It is such a pattern of conceived forms that constituted culture. Historically, the culture of any group of people is an organized complex of such identical forms expressed in different types of language. Language is therefore, the most important determining factors in regard to the nature of culture. Human consciousness and the world are therefore to act upon each other, and the language is born. It means that symbols are inevitable products of the contact between man and the world.

The public sphere is controlled by the hegemonic ideology, which is the ideology of the ruling class. As Althusser argues the individuals living in particular society act as the subjects who obey or follow the dictate of the ruling class. Since our language is structured like unconscious the act of communication cannot escape the ideological trap. Wherever human beings inherent they share the consciousness produced and propagated by the



dominant ideology and culture. Language and thought are inextricable. Language act any historical movement is riddled with style, rhetoric, ‘ways of speaking’, that produce a definite view of the world. These ideological discourses are the products of the articulation of ideology in practice.

## **2.5 Culture as System of Values**

Culture is a realization of value- image of the human soul through action. The realization is in both individual and social. The formation of the value- image is indeed a foundation principle of reality. Culture is the collective expression of human consciousness. It is a record of the souls’ continuous enterprise in the seeking for the sensuous and at the same times its continuous attempt to free itself from it. There is morphology of consciousness in the act of creating. Myth-making is the result of this bondage-freedom oscillation of human consciousness. When it oscillates towards freedom the images become more suggestive. The world of facts then gets terms formed, taking a new complexion of meaning.

A man brought up in a particular culture has its habitual attitude towards words which ultimately leads to conceptual configurations having significance, intelligible only to those who belong to that culture. Thus cultural patterns are conceptually generated out of the need of perfection. These are born of experience, brought up by language and sustained by the human souls urge to freedom.

### **2.5.1 Habits/ Beliefs/ Values/ Traditions**

A culture is historically created system of explicit and implicit design for living, which tends to be shared by all or especially designated members of a group at a specific point in time. Or it has been described as the prescribed set of expectation as man's adjective mechanisms to life conditions.

Culture develops values, traditions and heroes. It help to regulate human nature, even interfering to some extent with such biological matters as age of maturity, how often the individual should eat, and what he should eat. Culture defines the reality, influencing one's perception of the world and explaining the supernatural. Each culture has its values and norms, standards of behaviour; some societal norms are enforced equally upon all individual. Culture stress the behaviour channelling nature of culture, as transmitted and created content and patterns of value, ideas and others symbolic- meaningful system as factors in the shaping of human behaviour and the ratified produce through behaviour.

Cultures have their values and norms, standards of behaviour. Some societal norms are enforced equally upon all individuals; others place stronger expectations upon people in respected position then upon the common person. It allows certain alternatives in such minor matters as style of dress and sometimes in such major matters as religious and political opinion. There are always limits to such alternatives, however where laws

do not impose limits the threat of social ostracism does. Culture becomes intelligible as a general state of mind. It carries with the idea of perfection, a goal or an aspiration or individual human achievement or emancipation. At one level this might be a reflection of a highly individualistic philosophy and at another level an instance of philosophical commitment to the particularity and difference, even the 'choosiness' or superiority of human kind.

## **2.6 Material and Ideational Culture**

Material culture denotes the realm of human creations that are visible and are of physical nature. It categorized as that which all that human beings created on the basis of their experience and labour. Almost from the beginning, human beings have been creating cultural objects in material form. Primarily those creations were in the form of arrows, tools and utensils for their day today livings. The system of material culture undergoes changes in accordance with the change of interest, capacities and environment of the people and society.

Material aspects of being concrete are taken to be measurable and are considered to be relatively simpler. Hence part of material culture of one society can be adopted by other groups with relative ease. Material culture is considered to be consisting of the things created by humans that are important to them because of their usefulness.

Ideational culture on the other hand refers to that aspect of culture which does not have a corporal form and efforts human behaviour through ideas. The beliefs, norms, traditions and customs that develop as a result of social heritage are considered to be elements more effective in influencing human society. People face much more resistance if they do not follow ideational culture of society. Whereas the opposition in case of material aspect is much less.

### **2.6.1 From Material to Spiritual**

In culture there is a definite movement away from bodily and material, towards spiritual. It is not merely a response of animal in man to a challenge of nature, but a pursuit of human will and consciousness that is profoundly different. It is a voyage aimed at discovering moments of bliss that are of intrinsic value as opposed to any pragmatic and utilitarian price tag attached to them. Human existence reveals itself in various types of activities. Culture is related more to those moments of human life which are considered intrinsically important. In moments of life considered to be forming a part of civilized life, we reached out to the outer world in search of things, techniques and institutions which are considered useful.

### **2.7 Functions of Culture**

Culture serves three broad functions. First, culture enables man to adopt and to change his environment. Using his artefacts, man has made

deserts bloom, mountains crumble and skyscrapers rise. Second, culture facilitates man's functional adaptation to other man. With patterned behaviour as his guide, man may relate to others in subordinated ways or norms, or in relatively enduring ways or in socially approved ways or norms, or in relatively enduring ways through institution. Culture prescribes human relationship. Third, culture enables man to adapt to the unknown through his belief system. In some situation, the triangle of these three functions approaches an equilibrium, with each equally served in a balanced culture.

An enquiry of the function of culture makes it clear why the expression 'culture creates people' is not an exaggeration. Culture defines what the proper family structure should be, how many wives a man should have, and, how whether premarital sexual relation are a proper preparation for marriage or are grossly immoral. There are set rules for the socialization and care of children: what they should wear, how they should be carried for, and to what extent they should be trained for independence. An educational system is found in all cultures for teaching growing children what they must know and how they must behave. Values are culturally defined so that growing children are taught right and wrong and what should be their aims and goals in life. Culture provides heroes who exemplify what a good man or woman and after whom one can pattern his life.

Culture also provides for economics need, telling how to earn a living. Which job should be done by men and which should be done by women? Some occupations are assigned to high prestige in one culture and only the most debased status in others, for example, prostitution. Tilling the soil might be considered the only sacred way of life in one culture, but in another culture it might be thought of as so demeaning as to be done only by slaves.

Culture provides a means of social control. Not all cultures have complicated legal machinery, but all impose sanctions against those who defy their most sacred customs. Sometimes these sanctions are merely ridicule and ostracism but these can be powerful force for control in small, self-contained groups. Primitive culture depends upon taboo and fear of the supernatural as a means of control. Modern, secular cultures find the problem of social control more difficult and must depend in increasingly upon power and court procedure rather than upon family and neighbourhood opinion.

Culture even defines reality and a person's relationship to the transcendental. In modern culture, of course, much of existence is defined by science, which greatly enlightens but takes away much of the mythological wonderments of the past. Even science, however, does not supply answer to the existential questions of people, and they usually look to the religious and philosophies of their culture for a torch to guide them.

## 2.8 Culture and Civilization

Civilization is related primarily to the physical and objective dimensions of the society whereas culture is taken to be related to subjective and spiritual realm of human existence. Civilization is regarded more as related seen as enriching realm that opens up new extents to human perception and existence. Civilization is the expression of our nature in our models of living and thinking, in our everyday intercourse, in art, in literature, in recreation and enjoyment. According to A. W. Green, “a culture becomes a civilization only when it possesses written language, science, philosophy, a specialized division of labour, and a complex technology and political system”.<sup>14</sup> Civilization is constantly progressing: Machine means of transformation and communication etc. which constitute the civilization not only marches but marches ahead, provided there is no catastrophic break of social continuity in the same direction. According to MacIver and Page, “civilization includes all those things which led to the attainment of some objective, such as type writers, press and lathe, motor etc. Civilization includes both basic technology and social technology. Basic technology means the authority of man over natural phenomena. Social technology implies the model which controls man’s behaviour. On the other hand, culture includes such elements which bring satisfaction and pleasure to man. Examples of these are religion, art, philosophy, literature and music”.<sup>15</sup> Civilization shows a persistent upward trend. It is cumulative

and tends to advance forever. Since men invented the automobile, it has continually improved. This measure of progress cannot be applied in the case of culture. For example we cannot say that the arts, literature, thought or ideals today are superior to those of the past.

Raymond Williams explains, “‘Civilization’ and ‘culture’ (especially in its common early form as ‘civilization’) were in effect in the late eighteenth century, interchangeable terms. Each carried the problematic double sense of an achieved state and of an achieved state of development. Their eventual divergence has served causes. First there was the attack on ‘civilization’ as superficial; an ‘artificial’ as distinct from a ‘natural’ state; a cultivation of ‘external’ properties-politeness and luxury- as against more ‘human’ needs and impulses”.<sup>16</sup>

The word ‘civilization’ was derived from the Latin word ‘civic’, is a term descriptive of a state of belonging to a collectively embodied certain qualities. In this context the idea of ‘culture’ is not so much descriptive a metaphorical and derives philosophically, from the agricultural or horticultural process of cultivating the soil and bringing fauna and flora in to being through growth. The former concept ‘Civilization’ is descriptive of a kind of stasis, a membership, a belonging -indeed a status once achieved not to be relinquished; the latter, ‘culture’ is resonant with other ideas of emergence and change, perhaps even transformation. Thus move to ideas of socialization a ‘cultivating’ the person, education as ‘cultivating’ the mind



and colonization as ‘cultivating’ the natives. All of these uses of culture as process imply not just a transition but also a goal in the form of ‘culture’ itself; it is here that hierarchical notions begin to emerge such as the ‘cultured person’ or ‘cultivated group, or individuals’ and even the idea of ‘high culture’. All of which reduce with the original notion of descriptive state of being not essentially unlike the formative idea of civilization itself. Max Weber regarded civilization as the product of science and technology and as universal and accumulative in that it relates primarily to nature rather than to man. Culture on the other hand, was the human interpretation expressed in meanings and values in philosophy, religion and art of purposes of life and society. Raymond Williams claims, “Civilization became an ambiguous term, denoting on the one hand enlightened and progressive development and on the other hand achieved and threatened state, becoming increasingly retrospective and often in practice identified with the received glories of the past. In the later sense ‘civilization’ and ‘culture’ again overlapped, as received states rather than as continuing processes”.<sup>17</sup>

In civilization there is an essential element of physical, biological and social adjustment. Civilizational achievement and attainments provide human beings with a minimum level of physical comfort, ensuring survival and preservation. In contrast to the virtues of the spirit- that are reflected in culture- civilization reflected bio-physical aspects of human existence.

According to Raymond Williams, “‘Civilization’ had produced not only wealth, order, and refinement, but as part of the same process poverty, disorder, and degradation. It was attacked for its artificiality-its glaring contrasts with a ‘natural’ or ‘human’ order. The values upheld against it were not those of the next higher stage of development, but of an essential human brotherhood, often expressed as something to be recovered as well as gained”.<sup>18</sup> Civilization is taken to be principally related with material wellbeing and is considered to be consisting of those elements which are useful for human existence. They are important mainly because of their functional aspects as they fulfil some need rooted in bio-physical dimensions of human existence. It contains chiefly of means useful to master the forces of nature. Civilization attainments are taken to be of help in human ‘victory’ over nature. Civilization is considered to be equivalent to the realm of utilization of instruments and machine which humans use in order to control the conditions of their life in the outside world. MacIver asserts that “our culture is what we are; our civilization is what we use”.<sup>19</sup> MacIver, particularly in his earlier work, made a broadly similar distinction; he related culture to ends and civilization to means and viewed the technology order of civilization as determined within the cultural order of meanings and values.

Since civilization is a means it has a universal standard of measurement that is utility. But culture is an end in itself. Therefore, it has

no similar qualitative or quantitative standard of measurement. The element, ideas, values, thoughts etc. of culture change are in accordance with time and space. Civilization is associated to external things while culture to internal thoughts, feelings, ideas, values, etc. Civilization is the means for the expression and manifestation of culture. It is the body, and culture the soul. For Eagleton, “Civilization was abstract, alienate, fragmented, mechanistic, utilitarian, in thrall to a faith in material progress; culture was holistic, organic, sensuous, autotelic, re-collective. The conflict between culture and civilization thus belonged to a fall-down quarrel between tradition and modernity”.<sup>20</sup>

### **2.8.1 Culture, Civilization and Tradition**

Culture civilization and tradition are some of the important kinds and spheres of phenomena that have taken the attention of almost all the thinkers aiming to study collective human seeking and creations. Of these, culture and civilization refer to the realm of human creations and traditions indicate how these creations are transferred through the generations. The usage of the terms ‘culture’ and ‘civilizations’ requires detailed discussions as more often than not these terms have been used interchangeably. Traditions are considered to be the medium of this social transmission through which cultural and civilizational creation and attainments are transferred down the generations. The term tradition has its roots in the Latin world traders which has the connection of having down, passing on

and to deliver. In this sense tradition refers to all the social inheritance of the group and collectivity. Present generation cannot undermine the past of society as present institution or learning does not begin a new in the absolute sense. Tradition like memory is not something that is prefabricated and stagnant, rather human acts weave the fabric of both memory as well as tradition. Memory creates a sense of identity in the individual; similarly tradition also serves the purpose of evading a sense of cultural identity.

### **2.8.2 Culture and Creativity**

Culture and creativity both are expressions of human activity to produce and distribute the material requirement. They are results of creative human seeking and aspirations. Physical and biological aspect of human existence and seeking are taken to be personified in civilization, whereas spiritual and transcendence related aspects and aspirations are taken to be reflected and expressed in culture. Thus when human creativity is directed towards realistic and utilitarian ends, it is considered to produce civilization; and when it is directed towards expanding the horizon of human consciousness. It is said to be creating culture.

Culture could never be confused with the arrangements that ensure survival of human collectivity. Cultural activity is much more than an activity aimed at mere physical adjustment as human aspiration and passion are intensely different and deeper than physical one. Cultural activity segregate human person form mere animal organisms by breaking the

shakes of domain of natural causal necessity. Through culture, human enters the threshold of symbols and meanings, which is the realm of freedom.

## **2.9 Anthropology and Culture**

The concept of culture has been so closely associated with the development of the discipline of Anthropology, or at least one major branch of anthropology, is the comparative study of culture. The concept of culture in anthropological literature, is perhaps not surprising that the concept has been used in a variety of ways and has been linked to different assumption and method. The origin of the nation and culture which has dominated the social science in the last century or so may be found in the kind of cultural anthropology which emerged during the colonial period. As has often remarked, anthropology was a social science born of the encounter between western and new western societies. This happened to be also an encounter between industrializing societies and those following more traditional models of productions. As Marshall Sehlin put it, “A culture is an integrated organization of technology, social structure and philosophy, adjusted to the life problems posed by its natural habit and nearby and often completing culture”.<sup>21</sup>

Certain assumptions were made in Anthropological studies of the colonial period which clearly displaced the influence of Romantic thinking. The world was perceived as being divided into discrete cultural system

which was able to maintain their distinctiveness over time. Further, it was assumed that cultural system formed a reasonably coherent whole, each with its own mode of rationality and its own value system. As Sapir put it, “The genuine culture is not necessarily high or low, it is merely inherently harmonious, balanced, and self-satisfying. It is the expression of a rich varied and yet soon how unified and consistent attitude towards life, an attitude which see the significance of any one element of civilization in its relation to all others”.<sup>22</sup>

E. B. Tylor was a professor of Anthropology at the University of Oxford, whose major work, *Primitive Culture*, was published in two volumes in 1871. In the English context, the contrast between ‘culture’ and ‘civilization’ was not as marked as it was in Germany. Tylor employed these terms interchangeably, offering at the outset of primitive culture. This class definition is, “culture and civilization taken in its wide ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge’s, belief, art, moral, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society. The condition of culture among various societies of mankind, insofar as it is capable of being investigated on general principles, is a subject apt for the study of laws of human thought and action”.<sup>23</sup>

Tylor’s definition contains the key element of the descriptive conception of culture. According to this, culture may be regarded as the interrelated array of belief, customs, law, forms of knowledge and art,

which are acquired by individuals as member of a particular society and which can be studied in scientifically. These beliefs, custom etc. form a 'complex' whole which is characteristic of a certain society, distinguishing the society from other that exist at different times and places. It is a task similar to that undertaken by the species of plants and animal of a district represent its flora and fauna, so the list of all the items of the general life of a people represents that whole which we call its culture.

He observes, human beings vary in two respects. In the first place, they vary in terms of their bodily structure and psychological characteristics. The study of these variations is the task of physical anthropology. They also vary in terms of their 'social heritage' or culture and these variations are the concern of 'cultural anthropology'. Culture comprises inherited artefacts, goods, technical process, ideas, habit and value and culture is a reality.

Anthropologists describe cultural integration as the conditions that exist when all phase of a culture seem to blend together and be intelligible in terms of certain major values and beliefs. Because of the idea of cultural integration is harder to illustrate in the modern world would than in the 'primitive world'. Integration can refer to a process - the integration of new elements in to a culture. Frequently the new elements are poorly understood and are reinterpreted in terms of the more traditional view of the receiving culture. The study of culture must seek to break the heritage down in to its

component elements and relate these elements to one another to the environment and to the needs of the human organism.

Anthropology began to describe culture as a form of life and it has often been maintained that the structure of a culture reflects the structure and rules of language. That understanding one culture from the perspective of another is as problematical as translating from one language to another and that evaluation should only be in term of the values of the culture under consideration.

Nineteenth century anthropology was gained by certain humanist values, although it opposed to kind of universalism associated with western Enlightenment. It defended the worth of different culture and their right to protect their unique way of life in the face of homogenizing forces. To study a culture from the point of view of participants and in terms of its native values and rationality was a gesture in this direction, although it could also sometime lead to patronizing assessments of other culture.

It was hold that all human activity is deeply influenced by culture and that perception, values, judgments and action-pattern should be understood in terms of culture. Social institution helped to reproduce the community over time by socializing individual in to the life of the community. The function of the anthropologists was to reconstruct the world-view and meaning which constructed its nature.



### **2.9.1 Culture and Community**

Communitarian notion of culture have had a long history in social and political thinking. The notion of culture put forward by German philosopher like Herder has had a deep and continuing influence on contemporary perception of culture. Communitarian notion of culture lead to a degree of cultural relativism and emphasis on cultural particularity and universal values. It is interesting to note that cultural particularity and relativism have been espoused both by colonial powers. They are interested in influencing indigenous culture. Relativism can be an effective way to opposing cultural domination; it can also lead to some reluctance to confront issues of power within and between cultures.

The use of the term culture and community convey a connotation of organic integration and face to face interaction and they may influence politics and political responses. Two kinds of issues are raised by communitarian notion of culture. Theories tend to present communities as 'given' of existence, as natural groupings emerging from the shared condition of existence and a shared history. The logic of communitarian assertions is to map out communities in their difference and uniqueness and to assume a shared culture for a group. Individual identities then are assumed to emerge from group identities.

The concept of culture emerged in the context of modernity and reflected some of the changes which were taking place in the West during

the early modern period. Terming culture a key concept in Western thought in the modern period, Raymond Williams remarked on the concentration of social thought around the term. He felt that this phenomenon reflected around in Europe to the Industrial Revolution, the French Revolution and the Democratic process.

The concept of culture emerged as a part of a conservative reaction in Europe to these processes. This social change or enlightenment was started in seventeenth and eighteenth century in England and France. It gives rise to new mechanist world-view and a new theory of knowledge associated with thinkers such as Descartes, Galileo, Bacon and Lock. Based on these philosophers a new atomistic and materialistic view of man and society was established. As in Galileo's and Newtonian view Man was located in a mathematically ordered universe in which God was needed, at most, to set rational process of motion. This constituted with the notion of a meaningful cosmic system which had dominated in the medieval and early Renaissance period. In the new mechanistic world view, man found his meaning and purpose not by reference to a cosmology but in relation to the interactions of self-directed human beings.

The individualistic and atomistic view of man and society put forward in the writing of western enlightenment provoked a reaction from idealist philosophers. Opposition took the form of attempt to re-articulate for the modern period the notion of a meaningful universe and an

anthropology which depicted man as a member of an organically constituted community. This was the guiding theme of the later German Enlightenment thinkers and their writings contrasting with earlier notion of community, finding its expression in language and aesthetic expression, its member sharing a pool of meaning and a history. The concept of culture emerged as a way of describing the shared life of the community.

The culture of each society represented its responses to the material condition of its existence. As such culture was felt to express the essential identity of a society, as identity which established some continuity overtime. The study of history should, it was felt, focus on the linkages within society. This would help to generate explanations of particular phenomena as also of wider processes of historical evolution and change.

## **2.10 Culture as Social Construct**

Culture is a social category and regarded as a whole way of life of a people. Society is an organized network of interacting people and groups within a defined geographical area. It is, in other words, the structural and operational relationship – the visible and formal links – between defined groupings of people. Culture focuses on why all this comes about-the convert orientations, the overt behaviour patterns and material possession through which society's organization is facilitated. A society cannot exist apart from culture. A society is always made up of person and their groupings. People carry and transmit culture, but they are not culture.

A society is an organized group of individuals and culture is an organized group of learned response and characteristic of a particular society. The individual is a living organism capable of independent thought, feeling and action, but with his independence limited and all his resources profoundly modified by contact with the society and culture in which he/she develops. No culture can exist except as it is embodied in a society of man; no society can operate without cultural directives, like matter and energy, like mind and body. They are interdependent, interacting and express different aspects of human situation. One must always keep in mind the interdependence and the reciprocal relationship between culture and society. Each one is a distinguishable concept in which the patterning and organization of the whole is more important than any of the component part.

Outside of the Natural Science, the word 'culture' is used mainly in two ways. The first and oldest use of the term to describe the 'fine arts – not any kind of art, but only certain kinds of music (classical) painting, sculpture and literature created by an intellectual elite and consumed largely by the upper classes and highly educated middle class. The second usage is much wider, and often much less specific. This is the idea of 'culture' as a way of life. At the broadest level this may refer to almost everything that distinguishes human beings from animals. Hence 'culture' is contrasted with 'nature' or biology. But culture in this sense is also used

to refer to the way of life of particular population. Thus might refer to the culture of a community or a nation or a tribe or a religious group or even a continent. Any discussion of the concept of culture in the social science has to begin with approaches which have emerged within anthropology and lesser extent sociology, later it briefly discussed in 'cultural studies'.

The idea of culture can be witnessed emerging in the late nineteenth century and largely as a relation to the massive change that were occurring in the structure and quality of social life. These changes, at the social political and personal levels, were both confusing and disorientating; and at least controversial. Such changes, through industrialization and technology, were unprecedented in human experience; they were widely expansionist, horizons were simply consumed, grossly productive, for good and evil; and both understructures was politically volatile, being increasingly and visibly divisive. This was a situation brought about through the new forms of ranking and hierarchy that accompanied the proliferating division of labour, being combined with the density and proximity of population, through urbanization, and the improved system of communication. In one sense the overall aesthetic quality of life, compared with the previously supposed rural idyll was threatened by the machine like excesses of industrial society. Where we began with 'culture' mediating between man and nature, it can now be seen to mediate between 'man and machine'. This provide as with several available 'meaning' of culture.

In the literature of social science, the study of Symbolic forms has generally been conducted under the rubric of the concept of culture. While there is little agreement concerning the meaning of the concept itself, many analyses would agree that the study of the cultural phenomena is a concern of central importance for the social science as a whole. Social life is not merely a matter of object and events which occur like happenings in the natural world. It is also a matter of meaningful actions and expressions of utterance, symbols, texts and artefacts of various kinds, and of subjects who express themselves through these artefacts and who seek to understand themselves and others by interpreting the expressions they produce and receive. In the broadest sense, the study of cultural phenomena is considered as the study of the social- historical world as a meaningful domain. It may be interpreted as the study of the ways in which meaningful expressions of various kinds are produced, contracted and received by individuals, situated in the social and historical world interpreted in this way. The larger controversy over culture has been reflected within anthropology and sociology. The first use of 'culture' in English as a precise scientific term generally credited to E. B. Tylor in his *Primitive Culture* (1871). But the concept was familiar in German Ethnology at least a generation earlier, and the basis for extending the term to a 'whole way of life' was already present in the work of the English Romantics. Tyler's definition of 'culture' began,

the emphasis being on that relation between elements in a whole way of life.

The concept of culture refers to a range of phenomena and set of concerns which are shared today by analysts working in a variety of discipline, from sociology and anthropology to history and literary criticism. It is a concept with a lengthy history of its own, and the sense which it conveys today is to some extent a product of this history.

The boundaries of the social settings are identified by two major concept-society and culture. These terms are complex, and many people have attempted to define them precisely; we shall present several definitions and comments to try to give a feel for the definition and distinction. Definitions of culture are varied, but they generally have two specific features. First the biological explanations of behaviour, secondly culture focuses on the way of life of a particular group of persons.

Any review of definitions of culture could be extensive in fact, delivering through a hundreds definition. The three basic elements of all definitions of culture are; First that culture is transmitted, it constitute a heritage or a social tradition; secondly, that it is learned, it is not a manifestation, in particular content, of man's genetic constitution, and third that is shared. From the above definition of culture we can list the following essentials for a composite definition. Culture (1) is a unified whole; (2) is

learned; (3) extend throughout time; (4) is cumulative and selective in its transmission (5) is systematically anchored through shared meanings; and (6) is potentially both fluctuating and distortional (i.e., both helpful and harmful).

### **2.10.1 Definition of Culture**

Culture can be categorized in five ways. The first and popular use of the term focuses on what society defines as desirable, that is, certain objects, mannerisms and tastes that bring the individual esteem and recognition. Here the popular use of the word 'culture' stresses the arts, music and style of the society elite. It should emphasize that the social and behavioural science do not use the culture concept with the implicit blisses and limitations of this approach. A second approach might be called the omnibus approach. Here the emphasis is on the totality of a society's values, system of thought and artefacts. All that man inherits, creates and passes on to future generations is impeded together and called culture. A third approach emphasizes the learned nature of culture, via conditioning, trial - and errors and habit formation. Learning is an important factor in acquiring culture.

The fourth approach undercover the adjustment and adaptive qualities of culture. In other words, culture is essential for survival. Without communication, shared knowledge and functional artefacts, human societies could not perpetuate themselves. The adjustmental approach identifies the



balance of cultural resource together with their accessibility to various groups with the culture. Finally a fifth approach concentrates on the behavioural inputs and outputs of a specific culture. Here people's behaviours and the results of their interactions is the principal interest. It should be noted that each culture tends to be ethno culture that is to view its culture as the culture of everything worthwhile and desirable. All cultures have their common components. These are; it's covert or underlying aspect, its overt behaviour patterns and its material products.

#### **2.10.1.1 Covert Aspect**

Different groups have different covert- underlying or hidden-orientation or ways of perceiving things. Time is a good example. All men experience the day light sequence of the passing time. However some think of time as broken in to intervals of second minutes and hours.

#### **2.10.1.2 Overt Aspects**

Overt behaviour pattern have no meaning in them, but must be understood in terms of the social setting of a particular time and place. Each social act is defined by culture. Where we like, what we do, how we live, and with who we live is culturally defined. In discussing the patterned nature of social life it can be said that: How we talk and gesture, what we marry, what we are proud of or ashamed about- virtually all that we think, emote, aspire to or do, - is structured by our cultural heritage.

### **2.10.1.3 Material Aspects**

The material dimension of culture consists of artefacts or the material possessions fashioned to meet defined needs. Many men have experienced the same material world but have used it differently. All cultures are saturated with various ideas or perceptual orientation seems to state the obvious. The important point is that every culture is viewed through its lens or its own frame of reference. That is, the members of each culture have a set of glasses through which ground over many generations. To understand why cultures differ in spite of the biology of man, one must understand the evolving nature of ideas common to various cultures. Ideas describe, restrict and provide an inventory for the perceptual influence of culture.

Beliefs are the central part of the covert aspect of culture. In belief, cultural values are collective judgments of worth within a culture; certain properties of what is important are shared by the populations. Culture share many common traits, but it is the ordering of their configuration - that produce the dominant theme or character of culture.

### **2.11 Socialization**

Socialization is a process of cultural learning and social development whereby a new person acquaints necessary skills and education to play a regular part in a social system. This process is essentially the same in all

societies, though institutional arrangements vary. Through the process of socialization, the person becomes capable of functioning as a member of the society. The process begins with the social relation established between the mother and the infant.

The content of socialization includes language, associated cultural objects and various kinds of interactive systems that are established in face-to-face relationship between persons. Socialization occurs in both informal and formal settings. Informal socialization occurs at home in daily routine meals, household tasks and conversational exchanges. The school provides a mixture of formal socialization.

### **2.11.1 Symbolic/ Descriptive Conception of Culture**

The symbolic conception shifts the focus to a concern with symbolism. Cultural phenomena, according to this conception are symbolic phenomena and the study of culture is essentially concerned with the interpretation of symbols and symbolic action. By viewing symbolic forms in relation to the structured social contexts within which they are produced and received, the structural conception of culture provides a basis upon which we can begin to think about what is involved in the emergence and development of mass communication.

The descriptive conception of culture refers to the varied array of values, beliefs, customs, and conventions habits and practices characteristic

of a particular society or historical period. A conception which may be summarized as follows; the culture of a group or society is the array of beliefs, customs, ideas and values, as well as the material artefacts, object and instrument, which are acquiring by individual as member of the group or society. The study of culture involves the scientific analysis, classification and comparisons of these diverse phenomena of life and society.

### **2.12 Culture as the Product of Human Creation**

Culture is embedded in common features of human existence and human species. But it must be noted that the relationship is dialectical as human belongs to a species not only in a natural way but also in a culturally mediated manner. Therefore whereas human beings are creations of culture, at the same time being human is also a creation of culture.

Human beings from their beginning are within the frame work of customs, norms, conventions, traditions, etc. as they are involved in various projects within the frame work of complex social institutions and practices. An account of goals, purpose, motives, intentions, beliefs, values, attitudes, preferences and self-images illuminate the specificities that are unique to each individual. The individual acquires this uniqueness as a participant in a culture. An individual's self-understanding is formed within a set of social relations and it is in interactions with others in a cultural context that one learns languages and other dimensions of social life. Human beings are

not only value creating, choosing and seeking beings rather they associate value with human as well as with circumstance and surroundings in and through which they perform this everyday life-activities. They evaluate the present situation and circumstances and it is seldom that they find them to be satisfactory.

### **2.12.1 Culture and Religion**

Religion is an ancient component of human culture. At far back cultural artefacts date, they indicate the presence of religious beliefs. Burial practices of ancient men indicate religious faith. Men have been buried with artefacts such as weapons, foods, jewelleries and tools for use in an afterlife. Men were buried in the knee-to-chest position so that they might be born in to the next world as they had been born in to this. Altars, sacrificial animals and sacred places were common for ancient man.

Religious practices seem to be universal among men. Evidently, religion has some basic needs, some purpose in the lives of all men. Functional theory in sociology states that this basic need results from three fundamental characteristics of human existence. Conditions of uncertainty (contingency): the uncontrollable factor of social life in the environment (powerlessness): and the sensed relation deprivation of rewards (scarcity). Using these guidelines, religion is interpreted as an adjective social institution enabling man to deal with uncertainties and mysterious in his life. Form of religion varies among groups, but the practice of religion is

common to all. Similar rituals, beliefs and rewards can be common for those crucial times in human life; fertility, birth, puberty, marriage and death.

Men are motivated to act by their belief systems. The social scientist is not primarily concerned about establishing the truth or falsity of a particular religious tenant. Religion, because of its commitment to a non-empirical system, must take the position that man's reason is subordinated to faith as a means to truth. A man who beliefs something to be true will act upon that belief whether it is true or not.

#### **2.12.1.1 Functions of Religion**

Primitive man was mainly motivated by the fear of hostile element of nature or the elements the working of which he/she did not quite understand. Phenomena such as earthquakes, typhoons and floods seemed to him to be set against him with inexplicable hate and bent on his destruction. This force or power which religious beliefs have over man originates in society. For instance, Durkheim conceives religion to be 'the sentiments inspired by the group in its members'. Such sentiment may be established unconsciously through child hood awareness of the greater wisdom of elder, or it may be the result of intentional guidance of wise leader or creativity self-interested rulers or priest.

Men seek to base his life on certain certainties. Many of these he/she finds by empirical means. History and cultural transmission assure him of what is acceptable to eat, to wear, to do. Science has provided an abundance of information concerning his/her life. However, there is always an unknown. Man's reservoir of knowledge, or potential knowledge, is infinite. There are always gaps in his empirical knowledge and these make his life fragmentary to an extent that at times life may seem to consist of randomized experiences. 'The gap in pragmatic knowledge man fills with explanations and these we call his religion'. Religion may be perceived as man's comprehension of the known. Man's experiences and his/her multiple unknowns are bound together into a meaningful whole by a religious system. Religion offers a synthesis of what is empirically known and what is unknown.

Traditional religion of the old is mostly engaged in the serialization of the crisis of human life. Every single crisis of human life – like birth, marriage, death and so on- implies an intensive emotional upheaval, deep mental conflicts and a possibility of disintegration. Yet religious belief and rituals, so far as they are commonly shared and practiced by the members of the community, have the stamp of common tradition and are backed by supernatural sanctions, they consolidated and strengthen the bond of human cohesion. On the ethical side religion acts as the most effective force of social control by sanctifying human life and conduct of which it

plays the ultimate custodian. The dogmatism of religion acts as the strongest cohesive forces between men. Religion, in the normal course, come out of every culture, since human knowledge- the most potent instrument of culture- fails to control fates and since deep- seated human sentiments which are built upon the basis of long co-operative living, refuse to accept death and dissolution as final. The cultural call for religion is grounded in the fulfilment of certain primary needs which are of highest social value.

Altogether, culture is essentially an instrumental reality for the aid of man. It is the cumulative creation, by man himself, which extends the range of individual efficiency and power of action and thus leads to it a depth of thought and breadth of vision unbelievable in any animal species. Culture in the way, deeply modifies human innate endowments yet in doing this, it not only bestows blessings but also imposes certain restriction in the form of obligations.

### **2.12.2 State and Cultural Construction**

When a social phenomenon like the state is our object of study, its origin in the human history is difficult to trace. To some the secrets of the origin of the state lay in the will of God, to others in the social contract; still others based their arguments on the role of simple forces or the family, or the process of evolution. The theory of force, which analysis the origin and the basis of political in terms of force, is based on an analysis of human



nature. Craving for power and desire for self-assertion are the two primary instincts of man. In his/her behaviour and action man is governed by these twin forces. In the early stages of human existence man's primary instincts found expression in ceaseless conflicts and aggressions. The physically strong man attacked, captured and enslaved the weak. The successful man began to exercise his sway over a sizeable section and this led to the emergence of clans and tribes. The primitive society provided a picture of working clans and tribes. The war between clans and tribes marked the next phase in the development of the state. Through such conflicts and struggle the authority of a tribal chief was established on a particular territory of a considerable size and the state emerged.

#### **2.12.2.1 The Evolutionary Theory**

The evolutionary theory of state is another important explanation about the origin of the concept of state. The most importance force contributing to the origin of the state are; Kinship, Religion, Economic activities, Force, Political consciousness;

#### **2.12.2.2 Kinship**

Primary social units are the family. The members of a family are tied together by blood-relationship and kin is a product of 'the recognition of consanguinity'. As the sexual impulse leads the young adolescent outside the known family, circle, it cumulates in formation of new family. The

extension of the thread of blood-relationship extends and subdivides the kin further and further. The family of unity and solidarity which is essential to political life is strengthening by such ties of kinship.

### **2.12.2.3 Religion**

Primitive men were at the mercy of the unexpected natural phenomenon like flood, lightening, thunder etc. In course of time, they came to worship these forces, imagining the heads of unseen agents behind them. The primitive form of religion called animism, was accompanied by fetishism, a superstitious belief in the effectiveness of material objects and later took the form of nature worship, often developing in to a beautiful mythology. Such religious forms ranging from animism to ancestor-worship, provided the sanction of promote tribal solidarity. Primitive religion in fact provided the sanction for law and government and assures the unity and obligation of the group. In the primitive ages there was hardly any distinction between religion and politics. Common religious beliefs held men together and taught them reverence and obedience.

### **2.12.2.4 Economic Activities**

The economic activities of primitive people contributed greatly to the origin of the state. The activities by which men secured food and shelters and subsequently come to possess property and wealth facilitated the emergence of the state. Co-operation is the essence of every form of

economic life. It demands conformity to certain recognized rules. Primitive men in their different stages as huntsman, herdsman and husbandmen came to evolve increasing body of regulations. In course of the evolutionary process, new forms of organization developed. Exchange of commodities gave rise to occupation diversification. Wealth came to be unequally distributed and class distinction arose. Further regulation and protection of property rights and the settlement of property disputes new laws were created. Thus the economic activities of early people lead to the rise of government.

#### **2.12.2.5 Force**

Marx viewed the state as a creation of the dominant economic class that uses it as a means of exploiting the masses. Similarly Gumpowicz's theory of struggle, in this connection, is of considerable significance. According to Gumpowicz, inter-group and intra-group conflicts are responsible for evolution and progress. The origin and evolution of the state were similarly made possible by the interaction of antagonistic forces.

#### **2.12.2.6 Political Consciousness**

The evolution of the state has significantly been helped by political consciousness of common ends which has always been present in human beings. It might at first have started in vague awareness of the efficacy of political organizations to maintain peace and order. Thus customary laws began to take

root almost imperceptibly. When Aristotle characterized man as a political animal, he merely pointed out this spontaneous acquiescence of men in the imperative codes of social co-ordination.

State was actually a political institution constituted in the progress of the society and human beings from its wondering stage. When a state is established and began to function there emerged a new form of culture and social livings controlled by some unwritten laws and regulation. State or political institution are societal arrangements for making and enforcing laws, protecting the public health and welfare, distributing public funds and tax burdens, conducting foreign affairs and deciding the issues of foreign policies. State or political institutions are the ultimate source of legitimate power in a social system, whether the system is based upon rule by the many or rule by the few. The state seeks to achieve a monopoly of power and a primary claim on the devotion of its people. In return it offers its people a sense of common identity and social cohesion. The new system of power structure and its implication created a new form of culture.

The theory of social contract assumes the existence of a state of nature as the initial condition of mankind where man was subject to no political control, and postulates the emergence of the state through voluntary argument or contract by the inhabitants of the state of nature. According to some writers, the state of nature was pre-social; some others considered it to be a pre-political condition. The code of regulation which

determined man's behaviour in the state of nature was designated as natural law. Man in the state of nature used to enjoy some rights known as natural rights. This theory began to grow in influence, till in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it had won an almost universal appeal. In the writings of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau it received systematic and wide treatment.

The starting point of Thomas Hobbes's philosophy is the analysis of human nature in terms of an egoistic psychology, which postulates that self-interest is the main spring of human action. In the state of nature man's actions were motivated by his selfish interests and not by reason and interest of others. There arose inevitably, in the state of nature, ceaseless conflict. There was absence of law and justice in the state of nature. Man experienced total insecurity. Life in Hobbes's classic phrase was 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short'. Craving for a new refuge where security could be assumed, men came out of the state of nature through a contract of each will and all with each, and setup the civil society. By such a contract every man gave up his natural rights and power to a 'common power' who would 'keep them in awe' and given them security. Only the right of self-preservation was retained by every individual. Each man addressed every other's person: Hobbes said that, 'I authorize and give up my right of governing myself to this man, or to this assembly of man, on this condition that you give up thy right to him, and authorize all his actions in like manner'.<sup>24</sup>

John Locke, in his two treatises of government upheld the ultimate right of the people to remove the monarch from his authority if he ever behaved in a despotic manner. Locke analyzed human nature in terms of essential social virtues. Man, he believed, is responsible and sympathetic. In the state of nature peace and good will prevailed. There regained equality and liberty. The individual was endowed with some natural rights. As Locke wrote, “the state of nature has a law of nature to govern it, which obliges everyone; and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions”.<sup>25</sup>

The starting point in Rousseau’s theory is an analysis of human nature. Man in his opinion, is essentially good, simple and sympathetic. The state of nature was a condition of perfect liberty and equality for man- a state of idyllic happiness. To Rousseau natural state is greatly preferable to civil society and hence “nature must be the rule for man in society”.<sup>26</sup> In Rousseau’s opinion, ‘a thinking man is a depraved animal’. Human nature which was previously simple, become, with the down of reason, increasingly complex.

The life of the common people and the social custom was somewhat decided by the new power of the state or state culture. The new form of nationalism was introduced, patriotism was established and created a social custom to believe and follow the state. A new practice of state culture

emerged where people of the ruling class became the creator of particular kind of culture and people became mere observer of this. For ruling and regulating the state, there created some form of order and rules that become the culture of the state. In its early stage we can witness with the Greek city states of Athens and Sparta etc. Every state absorbs a state of culture which was decided by the culture of the ruling class. Athens becomes a state of democratic culture but the Sparta was famous for their patriotism. When the world was moved to the new type of developments and progress the culture of the state also were gone through massive change and progress.

### **2.13 Culture-intellectual and Moral Development**

Culture is a more embodied and collective category: culture invokes a state of intellectual and moral development in society. This is a position linking culture with the idea of civilization and one that is informed by the evolutionary theories of Charles Darwin (1809-82 ) and informative of that group of social theorists now known as the ‘early evolutionist’. They pioneered anthropology with their competitive views on ‘degeneration ‘and ‘progress ‘and linked the endeavour to nineteenth century imperialism. This notion nevertheless takes the idea of culture in to the province of the collective life, rather than the individual consciousness.

Modern societies have so many complexities that variation on the word ‘culture” must be used for adequate description. Within the culture, there are various ethnic, occupational, regional and religious groups with

ways distinctive from the majority. The ways of life of such people are referred to as sub-cultures, variations on the general culture; but are contained within the same layers of society. Some of the sub-cultures, especially those of ethnic minorities of European descent, can be called convergent in the sense that they gradually lose their distinctiveness or sub-culture. Other sub-cultures are more persistent, trying to cling to distinctive ways, sometimes for reason of religious conviction.

A special sub-culture type arising out of opposition to the prevailing culture is called the contra culture, well exemplified by delinquent gangs, beatniks and hippies and the Black panthers. Such sub-cultures are understood as reactions against many of the prevailing societal norms. There are culture conflicts over cultural values and norms. The very discussion of sub-culture implies cultural conflict, which is a part of most societies and there are strong differences of opinion as to what the values, norms and laws should be.

Culture also acts as a descriptive and concrete category. Here the culture is viewed as the collective body of art and intellectual work within a society. This is very much an everyday language usage of the term 'culture' and carries along with the sense of particularity, exclusivity, elitism, specialist knowledge and learning or socialization. It includes a firmly established notion of cultures as the realm of the produced and sedimented symbolic; albeit the esoteric symbolism of a society.



## References

- <sup>1</sup> Tylor, E. B. (1871). *Primitive Culture* (Vol. 1). London: J. Marry, p. 1.
- <sup>2</sup> Eagleton, T. (2000). *Idea of Culture*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, p. 1.
- <sup>3</sup> Joseph, P., & Leisure. (1952). *The basis of Culture*, New York: St. Augustine Press, p. 20.
- <sup>4</sup> Eagleton, T. (2000). *Op. cit.*, p. 1.
- <sup>5</sup> Spencer, H. (1881). *Principles of Sociology* (Vol. 1). Harvard University: D. Appleton and Company, p. 89.
- <sup>6</sup> Wallas, G., & Raj, H. (2003). *Comparative Politics*, Op. Cit. New Delhi: India Oscar Publication, pp. 86-87.
- <sup>7</sup> Sapire, E. (1999). *Collected Works*. New York: Mouten de Gruyter Gmbtt & Co, p. 46.
- <sup>8</sup> Eagleton, T. (2000). *Op. cit.*, p. 4.
- <sup>9</sup> Ibid, p. 1.
- <sup>10</sup> Malinowaski, B. (1931). Culture. *Encyclopedia of Social Science*, (Vol. 4). New York: Macmillan, p. 621.
- <sup>11</sup> Sorokin, P. A. (1962). *Social and Cultural Dynamics* (Vol. 1). N. J.: Englewood Cliffs, Bedminster Press, p. 3.
- <sup>12</sup> Cuzzort, R. P. (1969). *Humanity and Modern Sociologist thought*. New York: HOH, Rinehart and Winston, p. 255.
- <sup>13</sup> Barnard, A., & Spencer, J. (1996). *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. London: Rutledge, p. 136.
- <sup>14</sup> Sharma, R. (1996). *Fundamentals of Sociology*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distributers (p) Ltd., p. 290.

- <sup>15</sup> Upadhyaya, V. S., & Pandey, G. (1993). *History of Anthropological thought*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company, p. 361.
- <sup>16</sup> Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and Literature*, London: Oxford University Press, p. 14.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid, p. 15.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid, p. 18.
- <sup>19</sup> MacIver, R. M. (1955). *The Modern Status*. Oxford: The Oxford University Press, p. 325.
- <sup>20</sup> Eagleton, T. (2000). *Op. cit.*, p. 12.
- <sup>21</sup> Sehlin, M., & Service, R. (Eds.). (1960). *Evolution and Culture*, Michigan: Michigan University Press, p. 53.
- <sup>22</sup> Sapire, E. (1949). Culture, Genuine and Spurious. W. Mandelbauns (Eds.). *Culture, Language and Personality*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- <sup>23</sup> Tylor, E. B. (1871). *Op. cit.*, p. 122.
- <sup>24</sup> Hobbes, T. (1996). *Leviathan*. John C.A. Gaskin (Eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, ch. 17.
- <sup>25</sup> Barker, E. (Eds.). (1962). *Social Contract: Essays by Locke, Hume Rousseau*. USA: Oxford University Press, see introduction.
- <sup>26</sup> Dunning, W. A. (1931). *A History of Political Theories* (Vol. 3). London: Macmillan, p. 13.

## CHAPTER - III

### IDEOLOGICAL IMPLICATION IN CULTURE

Ideologies map the political and social worlds. Nothing is done without ideology because individuals cannot act without making sense of the world he/she inhabited. Making sense let it to be said, does not always mean making well or right sense. But ideologies will often contain a lot of common sense. At any degree, political facts never speak for themselves. Through diverse ideologies, humans provide competing interpretations of what the facts might mean. Every interpretations, each ideologies, is one such instance of imposing a pattern-some form of structure or organization – on how to read political facts (material), events, occurrences, actions or how to see image and hear voice. Ideological maps to denote an objective, external reality.

The initial coiner of the term ‘ideology’ Antonie Destutt de Tracy, writing in the aftermath of French Revolution, intended to create a proper breach of study concerned with ideas. He sought to establish ideas of thought and action on an empirically verifiable basis form which both the criticism of ideas and a science of ideas would emerge. That enterprise was very much in line with the positivist movement in 19<sup>th</sup> century France, which held out the possibility of studying society with the precise tools

characteristic of a natural science. As he said: “It is an appropriate name, because it does not hint of anything doubtful or unknown; it does not bring to any mind any idea of cause. Its meaning is very clear to all, if only that of the French word ‘idea’ is considered, for everyone knows what he means by an ‘idea’, though few people know what it really is. This is appropriate, for ‘ideology’ is the literal translation of the science of ideas”.<sup>1</sup>

In its widest sense, the term ideology signifies a set of ideas ranging from one desiring no change in prevailing order to another crying for a total transformation of society. Likewise, it contains the rejection of one and the justification of another set of ideology as an ‘utopia’ or a ‘false consciousness’. The ideas may also be in a form of explanation of some fact, or a justification of some claim or a quest for some truths or a manifestation of some convictions and the like. In other words, ideology refers to an ‘action related system’ of political ideas in the sense that there are sets of structures and relationships. Ideology consists of commitment and action as a part of the political process. It ‘may or may not’, hold a logical or philosophical character, i.e., a content without which it cannot be described as ideology -a guide to direct political action.

S. E. Finer explains, an ideology “is a system of thought which has been intellectually worked out and organized usually in written form by scholars and intellectuals with their help, mentality denotes a way of

thinking and feeling which is more emotional than rationalized- something like a cast of mind”.<sup>2</sup>

### **3.1 Some Characteristics of Ideology**

- a. Ideology is not the same as values and attitudes of the political culture. It is both a program for action and an instrument of evaluation. It is a response to and a means of defending or changing existing political system; it provides a language to conduct an examination of political process.
- b. It is not the content of the ideologies alone that distinguishes one from another; it is the function of the ideology within the political and cultural system that creates differentiation. Ideological emphasis is a significant characteristic of the totalitarian states, but in liberal democracies the role of the underlying ideologies is often less obtrusive but no less important in different respects.
- c. Ideologies do change, but this is not necessarily due to their being ‘corrupted’ or the ‘death’ of their role in a political process, nor is the changes simply the result of political opportunism. An ideology is impossible to translate directly into practice; there was to be accommodation to political realities, a translation which may result in ideological splits between ideologies need ‘enemies’ to establish their credibility.

- d. Ideologies may be classified according to their role in relation to the political system as rightist or leftist, reactionary or progressive, conservative or revolutionary, reformist or radical and the like. No political system is, however absolutely free from the bond of ideology. It is a different thing that the adherents to the ideology of liberalism may claim and cry for the 'end of ideology'.
- e. It is the ideology that constitutes the keystone of the arch of a political party or a group. It may found that a scuffle between two groups or between two countries is conducted within the framework of ideological arguments.
- f. An ideology being a set of ideas connect sustain itself if it stems from faith. Since it rejects metaphysical and abstract notions, it should be based on proper scientific analysis, and political action should be directed towards the objective requirements of the society. Political action should aim at determining the interests of various social groups and not the subjective opinion of any individual or group of elites.
- g. Ideology has become an instrument where by the leaders motivate people to take part in political action, or they accord the character of 'legitimacy' to their political system. Moreover, others beat their opponents with the stick of their own more or less persistent and integrated doctrines a set of which constitutes their own ideology.

It is said that all powerful political ideas of our time are almost part of some ideology or other – a fact that makes the modern period an ‘age of ideology’. The result is that ideology means different things to different persons. For instance, while the liberals lay emphasis on the values of liberty, equality, justice and humanism, the Marxist look down upon ideology and desire to expunge it from the society.

If ideologies are the sets of norms and values that dominate each society as well as its each section, they cover a wide spectrum ranging from a loose variety relying largely on economic freedom and glorified pattern of the way of life to a rationalized and intolerant one smoking of a mental interim unwillingness to go beyond the established frame of reference.

### **3.2 Marxist Interpretation**

Marx and Engels responded to the existing cultural and philosophical approaches they had experienced and stated in the book *German Ideology*. They argued that German philosophers simply fought against phrases rather than coming to terms with the real world. One of these attributed independent existence of ideas, thought and consciousness when attempting to exchange illusory thought for correct thought. Philosophy thus concealed reality and adopted the form of what Marx and Engels called ideology. They maintained that ‘in all ideology men and their circumstances appear upside-downs in a camera obscure’. By that similarity they projected that ideology was an inverted mirror-image of the material world. The fact is



that the material world itself subject to dehumanizing social relations with the contradictions. The illusory world created by the ideology itself making them appear as necessary, normal and congruous. That way social unity could be maintained and enhanced. Ideology was sublimation- in its several guises such as morality, religion and metaphysics- of material life. Ideology was also distributed by those who expert in the mental activity of submission: priest offering 'salvation' was an early example of that 'emancipation' from the real world. The distribution could be an act of deliberate manipulation. For Engels - it is an unconscious, or self-deceptive, process. Ideology was the manifestation of the malicious effects of the division of labour.

Another view of ideology proposed by Marx and Engels had further dimension from the earlier and which was to be highly significant. They related ideology and class, stating that the ruling ideas of the society were the ideas of the ruling class. Ideological illusions were an instrument in the hands of the rulers, through the state and other institutions, they were engaged to exercise the control and domination; indeed to 'manufacture history' according to their interests. Ideology itself is to be represented as truth-claims that possessed universal, rational validity. That representation assisted the wielders of ideology in falsifying the myth of a unified political community, through illusory laws, cultural direction and 'verbal masquerading', that is the power over language.

The members of the subservient class- the proletariat believed that the dominant bourgeois ideology was theirs as well. The controller of human conduct and thought even convinced this ideology to the people of subservient class- the proletariat. An exploited worker naturally believed that it was a good idea to get up in the morning and work 14 hours for a pittance in his/her employer's factory. He/ She had internalized the ideological view that such dehumanizing work was a free act on their part. Ideology thus concentrated on external appearances, not on a real understanding of what was essential. The abnormal becomes normal through ideological sleight of hand and through commodities and the markets in which they are circulate.

In his later work, Capital- Marx focused on the actual capitalist practices from which ideology emanated, rather than on the distorted ideas of philosophers and ideologues. Understandably, a major mission of what later becomes known as Marxism was to remark and demystify the dissimulative nature of ideology. The critical exposition of ideology would expose the false aspiration of its promoters and install instead a set of whole some social practice provided the empirical basis of true social consciousness.

Ideology was the product of a number of basis. One was the need for simplified and easily marketable accounts of the world around us. A second was the desire of some individual and groups for power and control over

others. A third was a growing tendency to breakup human activity in to different compartments – the division of labour – and to alienate thought and action from each other. Ideology reinforced all that and it kept societies in a state of ignorance and suffering. One might justifiably conclude that Marxism accorded ideas considerable power, and so it did – to ideas that appeared in the form of ideology. But for Marx such concentrated power was wrong, as it blocked the possibility of human emancipation.

In Marxist theory of ideology, they depend on the important difference between true consciousness and distorted or false beliefs. In order to claim that our understanding of the (political) world is based on an illusion, and must be confident that non-illusory knowledge is attainable. Marx supposed that truth would emerge once falsehood was removed. In other words, that true human and material relation were both a default position that was covered by social and ideological distortions and a scientifically anticipated outcome of future social development.

Another is about those arguments based on the fleeting nature of ideology. If ideology is a distortion, it will disappear once true social relations have been (re)introduced. And if it consolidated a power relationship between ruling and ruled classes, once it will disappear such power relationship are transformed in to a democratic sense of social community and equality. So ideology is dispensable; it is a pathological product of historical conditions and it will wither away when they progress.

The Marxist view of ideology has contributed to a unitary understanding of ideology. If ideology is really an unfortunate smokescreen that cover-up reality, the faster we dispose of it the better. For many Marxists, ideology is part of a 'superstructure' that has no intrinsic value. As a result, their approach to ideology has discouraged any interest in the nature and variation of the covering smokescreen.

Another side of the unitary character of Marxist ideology is that ideologies are a part of a single, even total, account of the political world. They are the linchpin that holds together a seamless view of the world, papering over its internal contradictions. This image of co-ordinated totality prevailed for a long time in portrayals of ideology contributing to its inclusive nature and to an insistence by some ideologists that they were infallible.

The role of ideologists has been exaggerated. Although Marxist logic points to the social Provenance of ideology, its source has frequently turned out to be much smaller than an entire class. The Marxist linking of ideology to power relations as well as to the manipulation of the masses has often resulted in the identification of a professional group of ideologies, and even in the detection of the impact of single individuals. For some scholars, ideologies are intellectual with a dangerous sense of mission namely, to change the world according to a specific absolute vision. The Marxist theory of class assists in supporting such views, though the intellectuals

that figure in those theories sometimes act independently, less determined by their own material bases than Marxist assume. The association of ideology with such intellectuals was also contributed to the commonly held view that ideologies are a priory, abstract, and non-empirical.

Besides the Marxist concept, ideas and ideologies are assumed as the product of groups. They are also part of the control situation that shapes, and is shaped by our activities. Second, ideas matter. Marx may have seen the current domain of ideology as a harmful illusion, but even in that sphere the implication is that ideas are not merely rhetorical. If ideas appear not only as truths but in such commanding guises as ideology, they need to be taken very seriously indeed and accorded an even more central role than Marx himself had done. Third, ideologies endowed with crucial political functions. They order the social world, direct it towards certain activities, and legitimate or illegitimate its practices. Ideologies exercise power, at the very best by creating a framework within which decisions can be taken and make sense. That power doesn't have to be exploitative or dehumanizing, but then only some anarchists would argue that power-even as an enabling phenomenon- can be dispensed with completely. Fourth, the Marxist method has left something of importance even to non-Marxist. It is simply, that what you see is not always what you get.

### 3.3 The Social Roots of Ideology

Societies had several different social groups and class situations; therefore, such multiplicity of ‘ways of thinking’ could produce more than one ideology. This pluralist potential of ideologies becomes very important in later theories of ideologies. The key insight of Karl Mannheim (1883-1947) was sociological, for him, ideology was a reflection of all historical and social environments. Marx fated the social conditions under capitalism as the source of ideological illusion, which Mannheim realized that it was a feature of any social environment to influence the thought processes of human beings and, moreover, that knowledge was ‘a co-operative process of group life’. In those acute senses, ideology was not a passing fantasy. In his opinion ideology is; “The total conception of ideology raises a problem which has frequently been adumbrated before, but which now for the first time acquires broader significance, namely the problem of how such a thing as the ‘false consciousness’ (*falsches Bewnsstsein*) – the problem of the total distorted mind which falsifies everything which comes within the range – could ever have arisen. It is the awareness that our total outlook as distinguished from its details may be distorted, which lends to the total conception of ideology a special significance and relevance for the understanding of our social life.”<sup>3</sup>

Ideology was not only employed to manipulate intentionally those under its control. He also emphasized the unconscious beliefs that guided

human thinking, as well as the irrational foundations of knowledge. After all, social groups operate on the basis of shared rituals, prejudices, stories and histories- elements that ideologies incorporate. For, Mannheim, ideology had both social and psychological manifestation. “At first, in the course of this ever-deepening disintegration, native distrust becomes transformed in to a systematic particular notion of ideology, which however, remains on the psychological plane.”<sup>4</sup>

It is quite difficult to see ourselves from a different viewpoint and note the customs and habits that we internalize unthinkingly and uncritically. At a more advanced stage of social developments the unconscious and the irrational could be unmasked. It needs a rational approach to justify them. The effectiveness of that unmasking was often limited. Mannheim began his understandings by adopting the Marxist view of ideology as the obscuring of the real condition of society by the interest of a ruling class. But to this static view of ideology he added the parallel notion of Utopia. Utopia was a vision of a future of perfect society, held by oppressed groups, who bent on changing and destroying existing society, saw only its negative aspects and were blind to the situation as it really was.

For Mannheim, there are two types of ideologies ‘particular and total’. According to Mannheim, “The particular conception of ideology is implied when the term denotes we are skeptical of the ideas and representations advanced by our opponent. They are regarded as more or

less conscious disguise of the real nature of a situation, the true recognition of which would not be in accord with his interest”.<sup>5</sup> He further adds that:

“The particular conception of ideology therefore signifies a phenomenon intermediate between a simple lie at one pole, and an error, which is the result of a distorted and faulty conceptual apparatus, at the other. It refers to a sphere of errors, psychological in nature, which unlike deliberate deception, are not intentional, but follow inevitably and unwittingly from certain causal determinates”.<sup>6</sup>

Mannheim related it to specific arguments, more or less deliberately misrepresented by individuals. But the total conception of ideology was a *weltanschauung*, an all-encompassing view of the world adopted by a given group, always reflecting the general ideas and thought-systems of a historical epoch. In acknowledging the holistic nature of the total conception of ideology, Mannheim was working his way towards understanding it in an ordered and systematic way. For him total conception of ideology is; “This conception of ideology, which has only gradually become differentiated from the commonsense notion of the lie, is particular in several senses. Its particularity becomes evident when it is contrasted with the more inclusive total conception of ideology. Here we refer to the ideology of an age or of a concrete historico-social group, e. g. of a class, when we are concerned with the characteristics and composition of the total structure of the mind of this epoch or of this group”.<sup>7</sup> An ideology was an



interdependent structure of thinking, typical of social systems that could not be reduced to the aggregated and psychologically comprehensible view of concrete individuals.

A 'total' conception of ideology indicated the broad origins of ideology in group and even mass attitudes and views. This, Mannheim believed, was a gradual process. In his opinion; "The second stage in the development of the total conception of ideology is attained when the total but super-temporal notion of ideology is seen in historical perspective - this is mainly the accomplishment of Hegel and Historical school".<sup>8</sup>

An intelligentsia was a group 'whose special task it is to provide an interpretation of the world' for this society. As society's evolved and social mobility increased, the members of an intelligentsia began to be recruited from a more varied social background. They were no longer associated with a determined and closed body. For Mannheim an intellectual was not necessarily a person of education or culture, but one who could detach herself or himself from their conditioning social background and 'free float' among the different social and historical perspective a valuable in their society.

It was only with the developments of the total conception of ideology that the sociology of knowledge could surface. He stated, "The final and most important step in the creation of the total conception of ideology

likewise arose out of the historical-social process. When 'class' took the place of 'folk' or nation as the bearer of the historically evolving consciousness, the same theoretical tradition to which we have already referred, absorbed the realization which are while had grown up through the social process- namely- that the structure of society and its corresponding intellectual form vary with the relations between social class".<sup>9</sup> That allowed the term ideology to shift in its meaning from being 'simply' designated as a means of exercising or resisting political domination to bring a critical analytical tool that made sense of ideological arguments themselves. The question was no longer merely what ideologies did, but what kind of thinking ideology was.

In his book *Ideology and Utopia*, we can witness the approaches and concept of ideology, in this he says, "Both these conceptions of ideology, accordingly, make these so-called 'ideas' a function of him who holds them, and of his position in his social milieu. Although they have something in common, there are also significant differences between them. Of the latter we mention merely the most important:

- (a) Whereas the particular conception of ideology designates only a part of the opponent's assertions as ideologies-and this only with reference to their content, the total conception calls into question the opponent's total Weltanschauung (including his conceptual apparatus), and

attempts to understand these concepts as an outgrowth of the collective life of which he partakes.

- (b) The particular conception of 'ideology' makes its analysis of ideas on a purely psychological level. If it is claimed for instance that an adversary is lying, or that he is concealing or distorting a given factual situation, it is still nevertheless assumed that both parties share common criteria of validity. It is still assumed that it is possible to refute lies and eradicate sources of error by referring to accepted criteria of objective validity common to both parties.
- (c) Corresponding to this difference, the particular conception of ideology operates primarily with a psychology of interests, while the total conception uses a more formal functional analysis without any reference to motivations, confining itself to an objective description of the structural differences in minds operating in different social settings. The former assumes that this or that interest is the cause of a given lie or deception. The latter presupposes simply that there is a correspondence between a given social situation and a given perspective, point of view, or apperception mass."<sup>10</sup>

Ideologies, he observed were always changing and dynamic, and so was knowledge. Ideas could be studied objectively; more significantly, they could be generated objectively; as knowledge of social reality. Mannheim

believed that a group of individuals capable of rising above this class and historical context would break the hold of the ideologies emanating from that context. He assumed that the intelligentsia would all arrive at a single point of agreement, and that such a point would be non-ideological. Mannheim clearly wanted to avoid a situation in which all ideological positions assert their exclusive worth, and he anticipated instead ‘a new type of objectivity’.

In order to realize political thought, much of it had to be approached and interpreted as ideology, a product of historical and social circumstances. Marx had applied the critical core of his notion of ideology to eliminating its distortion of reality. Mannheim applied the critical core of his notion of ideology to highlighting the impermanent and malleable nature of all human thought.

### **3.4 Antonio Gramsci: The Turn towards Culture Criticism**

The contribution of Antonio Gramsci, the Italian Marxist theorist and activist (1891-1937) to the exploration of ideology is indicated in ways both different from and parallel to Mannheim’s. Gramsci modified the Marxist understanding of the term ‘ideology’ active within a broadly Marxist tradition. He defined the concept of ideology through his concept of hegemony. In his opinion the Ideological hegemony could be exercised by a dominant class, the bourgeoisie, not only through using state force but through various cultural means and actions. According to him “The

separation of powers, together with all discussion provoked by its realization and the legal dogmas which its appearance brought in to being, is a product of the appearance brought in to being is a product of the struggle between civil society and political society in a specific historical period. This period is characterized by a certain unstable equilibrium between the classes which is a result of the fact that certain categories of intellectual are still too closely tied to the old dominant class".<sup>11</sup>

Gramsci shifted ideology away from being merely a tool of the state. Ideology is produced and functioned in society, the province of non-state individual and group activity. The intellectuals appeared as the major formulators and conductors of ideology and as non-governmental leaders using cultural authority. Their permeation of social life was naturally based on the manufacturing of consent among the population at large, so that the masses would regard their own assent as spontaneous. That process of forming consent-which Gramsci termed leadership as distinct from domination- necessarily preceded, and paved the way for the dominance exercised through governmental power. Gramsci was therefore inclined to sharpen the distinction between ideologies as a more unconscious one for its consumers.

One insightful move forward of Gramsci's in investigating ideological hegemony was his sensitivity to its importance. The formation of hegemony involved the co-ordination of different interests and their

ideological expressions, so that an all-embracing group-possibly society as a whole, world be emerged. Hegemony creates compromises - an equilibrium that took some account of the subordinate groups.

Gramsci saw the concept of hegemony as a great advance, both philosophical and political towards a critical and unified understanding of reality. In the course of historical process a new intellectual and moral orders could evolve, an 'autonomous and superior culture' with 'more refined and decisive ideological weapons. Gramsci's theory of hegemony tries to raise some questions Marx had left unasked. What are the forms of that ideological control takes? What are the relationship, and the difference between ideological and political domination? Can we account for the multiplicity of ideologies, and for their rise and fall? In what sense, if any, do people choose to believe in an ideology? With these questions the agenda, a range of possible answers would be proved during the remainder of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Gramsci's concept of hegemony not with-standing, its role is retrospectively more important for another aspect of analyzing ideology- as against the abstract and complex nature of Marxist conception of ideology, exposed as a way of concealing and inhibiting correct social practice in the world. Ideology might refer as a thought practice; this simply means a frequent pattern of (political) thinking, one for which there is evidence in the lies in our actions and utterance. Our thought-practices interment with

and inform material and observable practices and acts. Sometimes it makes more sense to trace a movement from theory to practice; at other times the theory can be extracted from the practices itself.

For example, a belief in free choice is a recurring pattern among liberals, applied to numerous situations such as voting, shopping, or choosing a partner. In the case of voting it can be held as a conscious general ideological principle. Voting is deliberate exercise of political choice at the heart of liberal ideologies, linked to the core notion of consent. Shopping is an involvement in economic free-market transaction, though shoppers are really aware that their practice denotes the principle of free-trade. Selecting a partner for emotional and sexual relationship is a conscious ideological thought-practice only when put in the context of arranged marriages. Otherwise it is an ideologically unconscious practice that has to be decoded by analysts as an embodiment of the voluntary principle. The outcome of all this is to see ideologies are situated in concrete activities, not as floating in a stratosphere high above them. The contradiction between doing and thinking is challenged, for thinking is an activity that shows its own regularities. Political thinking is evident in reflection on how to organize collective behaviour, but it may also be recovered through unpacking empirically observable acts.

### 3.4.1 Gramsci on philosophy

Marx and Engels had discussed German philosophy as a metaphysical form of ideology, practiced by a few professionals. Gramsci wanted to bring philosophy down to earth by signifying that most people were philosophers in so far as they engaged in practical activity, actually constrained by views of the world they inhabited. At a knock, Gramsci interpreted philosophy and reintegrated it in to the normal thought-processes of individuals. In the *Prison Note Books*, Gramsci endure a firm belief in the authority of the 'philosophy of praxis' as a body of enduring truth which "at the level of theory...cannot be confronted with or reduced to any other philosophy".<sup>12</sup> Meanwhile the philosophy of the praxis is the best dependable guide to human action, Gramsci considers philosophical activity as a universal system of education, as well as a developing process designed to create a system of Marxist social ideals to be achieved by all men in a society marked by advanced political and economic institutions. In Gramsci's view philosophy is a partisan, class determined enterprises since, in his words: "According one's conception of the world one always belongs to a particular grouping which is that of all the social elements which share the same mode of thinking and acting".<sup>13</sup> This shows that Gramsci blindly follows Lenin's dictum that 'modern philosophy is just as partisan today as it was thousand year's age'.



In Gramsci's stand, "It is essential to destroy the wide spread prejudice that philosophy is a strange and difficult thing just because it is the specific intellectual activity of a particular category of specialists or of professional and systematic philosophers".<sup>14</sup> It is this prejudice, Gramsci asserts that contributes to the reputation of philosophy as the domain of long, complex arguments and of extremely technical and metaphysical interpretations of man's existence, many a times discovered from social reality as we know it.

He did this, however, while retaining a threefold structure of political thought. There were individual philosophies created by philosophers; broader philosophical culture articulated by leading groups; and popular 'religions' of faith. The second type was an embodiment of hegemony, and displayed the features of coherence and critiques that hegemonic form among the masses, for which general conception of the world emerged in sudden and fragmented flashes. Importantly for Gramsci, each of these three levels of could be combined in changing propositions to produce a different ideological cocktail. The philosophical and the ideological began to evaporate the moment and the political thought was situated in the concrete world and directed at it.

Gramsci put an end to that, in most of its aspects, the common sense of the popular masses is incapable of truthfully knowing the world: "The popular element 'feels' but does not always know or understand".<sup>15</sup> This

insufficient system of things, Gramsci describes it because the common sense of the subordinate group is actually 'sedimentations' of the prevalent philosophy of the bourgeois ruling class. Gramsci considers that the strength of the capitalist system does not rest fully on the forced power of the bourgeois state; the interest of the bourgeoisie predominates, to a great extent, because of the ruling philosophy of the affluent classes which reflects the ethical or philosophical direction and the ideology of the class it serves. In the theory of hegemony, the conception of the world of the ruling class undergoes a complex procedure of vulgarization as it is filtered down to the subordinate class. The end of this process is the beginning of a philosophy of the masses – a popular common sense, widespread in the community of average ordinary man. With the increasingly far-ranging acceptance of popular common sense, the mass-man is subjected to an imposed morality, customs and behaviour which conforms to the rules established by the ruling institution of the dominating bourgeoisie class. In this type of society, the inferior groups follow the values of the bourgeois authorities. These values are generally instrumental in creating the limited and uncritical world view of the mass-man, who becomes a conformist to some conformism or other.

### **3.4.2 Gramsci on Ideology**

Gramsci raised ideology to the status of a different phenomenon worthy of, and open to study as with Mannheim. His concept of ideology

occupied a broad political arena that included moral and cultural norms and understandings, disseminated through the mass media and voluntary associations. In Gramsci's opinion "In according such transformation a distinction between the material transformation of the economics conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, aesthetic or philosophic - in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out".<sup>16</sup> The other important source for Gramsci's conception of the relationship between ideology and political power is Marx and Engels's *Communist Manifesto* (1848), where it is announced that 'the ruling ideas of the age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class'. This is the so called 'dominant ideology thesis, which suggests that the class which is economically dominant will try to impose its own peculiar way of seeing the world on society as whole.

By introducing the term 'hegemony' Gramsci means the interconnection of material and ideological instruments, through which the ruling class maintains its power. Hegemony is thus a form of praxis. This allows Gramsci to resolve the term 'ideology' for pure consciousness; and he propose to distinguish between historically organic ideologies, those which are necessary to a given structure and ideologies that are arbitrary, rationalistic, or "willed".<sup>17</sup> The former may be specific to an accurate

expression of that group's material interest. For Gramsci, the theories of ideologies are merely pale reflection of material influences.

In Gramsci's opinion "the bad sense of the word has become widespread, with the effect of that the theoretical analysis of the concept of ideology has been modified and denatured. The process leading up to this error can be easily reconstructed:

- 1) Ideology is defined as distinct from the structure, and it is asserted that it is not ideology that change the structure but vice-versa;
- 2) It is asserted that a given political situation is 'ideological' - i.e., that it is not sufficient to change the structure, although it thinks that it can do so; it is asserted that it is useless, stupid etc.
- 3) One of them passes to the assertion that every ideology is 'pure' appearance, useless stupid etc."<sup>18</sup>

Gramsci said, "To the extent that ideologies are historically necessary they have a validity which is 'psychological'; they 'organize' human masses, and create the terrain on which men move, acquire consciousness of their position, struggle etc. to the extent that they are arbitrary they only create individual 'movements', polemics and so on."<sup>19</sup>

So Gramsci reacts against the notion of ideology as the false consciousness, and he asserts "all ideological side by side with the assertion

that all systems have a historical validity, and are necessary (Man acquires consciousness of social relation in the field of ideology)".<sup>20</sup> This also involves a reaction against the belief that ideology is a mere reflection or material circumstances. The effect of these advances is to trust an immense importance to the sphere of ideas. In fact Gramsci points out, "material factors are only ever expressed developments in the history of consciousness can thus be more significant than economic change; it may be ruled out that immediate economic crisis of themselves produce fundamental historical events; they can simply create a terrain more favourable to the dissemination of certain mode of thought".<sup>21</sup> Because "a 'popular belief' and similar ideas are themselves material forces"<sup>22</sup> any revolutionary theory must deal with class conflict on the level of ideas at least as much as in the economic arena. In fact Gramsci is unwilling to distinguish between those two levels, preferring his notion of 'hegemony', which constitute a 'historical block', i.e., "unity between nature and spirit (structure and superstructure) unity of opposites and of distinct".<sup>23</sup> And crucially it was to be found at various levels of articulation. True ideology inclined to unity created to the consensus and solidarity at forged because the leading intellectuals through the attraction of their ideas, and directed the masses. The intellectuals, unlike Mannheim's did not dispense with ideology; his mission was to modify it in line with the needs of the time. Part of such a modification would reflect the common sense of the masses,

‘implicitly manifest in art, in law, in economic activity and in all manifestation of individual and collective life’.

Finally, Gramsci leaves us somewhat uncertain of the nature of ideology, but equips us with tools that enable us to proceed further. In his view the term “‘ideology’ itself must be analyzed historically, in the term of the philosophy of praxis, as a superstructure”.<sup>24</sup> He confusingly hesitated between the Marxist view of ideology as dogma and a brave attempt to release ideology from its negative connotations. He observed ideology as achieving unity within a ‘social bloc’- a cohesive social group – and held out hope for a total and hegemonious ideology that would attain social truth. Even more than Mannheim, a unified expression of the social world would develop out of ideological pluralism. But Gramsci had a good grasp of the concrete and diverse forms in which ideology presented itself, in particular of its qualitatively variable voices.

### **3.4.3 Hegemony: A Conceptual Analysis**

Consent, like several other terms of political theory, is capable of a multitude of ambiguities and meanings. Certain concept of consent as describing the relation of subjects with their government has been present throughout virtually the whole history of political thought. Historically the concept have functioned within a theory of political obligations; since its beginning, the notion of consent has been projected as a ground or

foundation of the right to exercise political authority, and as a moral limit on the extent and nature of that authority.

Pre-modern idea of consent had nothing to do with individual acceptance by each and every human being; nor did they express choice or deliberate authorization. They simply admitted that the authority of the ruler somehow follows, at least in part, from the fact that his subjects understood as a corporate community transcending individual preference—allow or a knowledge it. Such an assessment of consent was suitable to an organic conception of society, infused with the idea that every man has his appointed status and functions in a natural hierarchy. The problems of political ethics are problem owes to his community, his people, his lord, his king, the church or his God, by virtue of his role in the universal order. This model of society could not survive in the face of an advancing individualism, expressing itself theologically in Protestantism, economically in mercantile capitalism, and politically and philosophically in the theory of natural light and social contract.

In contemporary political and philosophical thought, ‘consent of the governed’ has been modified to take account of the earlier liberal definition and to express a new demand. ‘Consent’ has come to indicate the manner in which individual citizens ought to be individual directly or indirectly in the activity of governing, the manner, that is, in which political society should be organized and constituted. ‘Consent’, then has come to be observed as

specifying the nature or *resan de etre* of the whole system of familiar democratic institution. In its absorption in to modern liberal ideology, the concept has inclined to require a restricted, somewhat arbitrary meaning.

When Gramsci speaks of consent, he refers to a psychological state, involving some kind of acceptance – not necessarily explicit – of the socio-political order of certain vide aspect of that orders. A hegemonic order need not include liberal institution and practices; indeed, it may be oppressive in the strictest sense. Gramsci's concept of hegemony embodied a hypothesis that with a constant social order, there must be a withdrawal of agreement so powerful that it can counter at the division and disruptive forces arising from conflicting interests. And this agreement must be in relation to specific objects-persons, beliefs, values, institutions or whatever.

At times, Gramsci implies that consent in a hegemonic situation take the form of active committed, based on a deeply hold that superior position of the ruling group is legitimate. The fact of hegemony undoubtedly presupposes that account be taken of the interest of the groups over which hegemony is to be exercised, that the leading group makes sacrificies of an economic corporate kind. Consent - is an expression of intellectuals and moral direction through which the masses feel permanently tied to the ideology and political leadership of the state as the expression of their belief and aspirations. Hegemony, as Gramsci understood it, was not just a



tool of historical and social analysis; it was also a guiding concept for political practice.

The initiation for Gramsci's concept of hegemony is that a class and its representatives exercise power over subordinate classes by means of a combination of coercion and persuasion. For him the Hegemony is a relation, not of domination by means of force, but of consent by means of political and ideological leadership. It is the organization of consent.

#### **3.4.3.1 The Leninist Introduction**

The basics of the concept of hegemony were put by Lenin. The term hegemony was first used by Plekhanov and other Russian Marxists in the 1880s to indicate the need for the working class to lead an alliance with the peasantry for the overthrow of Tsarism. The Russian working class should, in alliance with the peasantry, act as the leading (hegemonic) force in the bourgeois-democratic revolution for the overthrow of the Tsarist autocracy. In this way the working class, then a small minority of the population, would be able to win the support of the great majority of the people.

#### **3.4.3.2 Hegemony Develops as a Concept**

Lenin considered hegemony as a strategy for revolution, a strategy which the working class and its representatives should adopt to gain the support of the great majority. Gramsci adds a new aspect to this by extending it to include the Practices of a capitalist class or its

representatives, both in achieving state power, and in sustaining that power once it has been achieved. Lenin perceived hegemony mainly in terms of an alliance of classes or parts of classes. Gramsci adds a very important new aspect with his notion of *national-popular*: a class can achieve national leadership, and become hegemonic, if it limits itself only to class interests; it must take into account the popular and democratic demands and struggles of the people which do not have a purely class character, that is, which do not arise directly out of the relations of production.

Gramsci defines that the Supremacy of a social group or class manifests itself in two different ways: 'domination' or coercion, and 'intellectual and moral leadership'. Gramsci distinguished between domination and 'intellectual and moral leadership': "A social group can, indeed must, already exercise 'leadership' before winning governmental power (this is indeed one of the principal conditions for the winning of such power); it subsequently becomes dominant when it exercises power, but even if it holds it firmly in its grasp, it must continue to 'lead' as well".<sup>25</sup>

This latter type of dominion constitutes hegemony. Social control, in other words takes two basic forms: besides influencing behaviour and choice *externally*, through rewards and punishments. It also affects them internally by moulding personal beliefs in to a reproduction of prevailing norms. This type of 'internal control' is based on hegemony, which refers to an order in which a common, social and moral language is spoken. In which

one concept or reality is dominant, informing with its spirit all modes of thought and behaviour. It follows that hegemony is the predominance obtained by *consent* rather than force or one class or group over other classes. And whereas 'domination' is realized, basically, through the coercive machinery of the state, 'intellectual and moral leadership' is objectified in, and chiefly work out through, 'civil society', the collective of educational, religious and associational institutions. Hegemony is achieved through the numerous ways in which the institutions of civil society operate to shape, directly or indirectly, the cognitive and affective structures whereby men perceive and evaluate problematic social reality. Moreover, this ideological dominance must have solid economic roots: if hegemony is ethico-political, it must also be economic, and it must also have its foundation in the significant function that the leading group exercises in the decisive core of economic activity.

#### **3.4.3.3 Passive Revolution**

In evaluating the war of position carried on by the two fundamental classes for hegemony, Gramsci identifies a basic difference between the strategy employed by the capitalist class and that which is appropriate for the working class. The strategy of the bourgeoisie has a special quality which he called *passive revolution*. He developed this concept out of his analysis of the *Risorgimento*, the movement for the unification of Italy in the mid-nineteenth century.

Gramsci proposes that a strategy of passive revolution is the typical response of the bourgeoisie whenever its hegemony is entirely threatened and a process of wide restructuring or reorganization is necessary to re-establish its hegemony or domination. A passive revolution is involved whenever relatively far-reaching modifications are made to a country's social and economic structure from above, through the agency of the state, and without depend on the active participation of the people. Social reforms which have been demanded by the opposing forces may be carried out, but in such a way as to disorganize these forces and damp down any popular struggles. It shows that the proper strategy for the working class is an *anti-passive revolution* established on the constant extension of class and popular-democratic struggles. Gramsci wrote, "The war of position demands enormous sacrifices by infinite masses of people".<sup>26</sup>

#### **3.4.3.4 Intellectual and Moral Reform**

The task of creating a new hegemony, in opposition to that of the capitalist class, can only be achieved by means of a transformation of popular consciousness, of people's ways of thinking and feeling, of their 'conceptions of the world', and of their standards of moral conduct. Gramsci compared this with the wholesale transformation of popular consciousness brought about by the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century and by the French Revolution. He adopted the term 'intellectual and moral reform' from the French writer Georges Sorel. In his opinion

“Every social group, coming in to existence on the original terrain of an essential function in the world of economic production, creates together with itself, originally, one or more strata of intellectuals which give it homogeneity and an awareness of its own function not only in the economic but also in the social and political fields”.<sup>27</sup>

#### **3.4.3.5 Common Sense**

In viewing the process of intellectual and moral reform, Gramsci was concerned to break down the separation between Marxism as a philosophy and people’s actual consciousness. He argued that ‘all men are philosophers’, because all men and women have some conception of the world, some set of ideas which enables them to make sense of their lives. But the way in which many people perceive the world, their philosophy, is often confused and contradictory, containing ideas absorbed from different sources and from the past, which tend to make them accept inequality and oppression as natural and unchangeable. Gramsci used the term *common sense* to denote this uncritical and partly unconscious way in which people perceive the world. Common sense is not to be seen in purely negative terms; it contains positive elements as well, and people’s practical activity, their resistance to oppression, may often be in contradiction with their conscious ideas. Common sense is the site on which the dominant ideology is constructed, but it is also the site for the resistance to that ideology.

### **3.4.3.6 Civil Society**

Capitalist society is understood as a complex system of relations between classes and other social forces, dominated by the struggle between the two fundamental classes, capital and labour. These social relations are embodied in different types of organizations and institutions including churches, political parties, trade unions, the mass media, cultural and voluntary associations. One set of institutions, the apparatuses which make up the state, are separated from all the rest in having a monopoly of coercion. All these social relations and the organizations which embody them are called by Gramsci *civil society*. The social relations that make the civil society are distinct from the relations of production, and the organizations within civil society are distinct from the apparatuses which make up the state. Civil society is the domain of class struggles and of popular-democratic struggles. Thus it is the province in which a dominant social class organizes consent and hegemony. It is also the realm where the subordinate social groups may organize their opposition and construct an alternative hegemony- a counter hegemony.

### **3.4.3.7 Historic Bloc**

A class which is advancing towards hegemony in civil society must also achieve leadership in the realm of production. It is only because the bourgeoisie acquires a significant control over the productive process that it can also become the hegemonic class in civil society and achieve the state

power. But the control of the capitalists over production has never been absolute; it has always been contested by the workers, and there have been struggles by them and their trade unions over the circumstances of work and over the terms for the introduction of new machines. The metaphor of base and superstructure is therefore unsatisfactory. It is misleading to think in terms of a sharp separation between a field of economics (production of surplus value) and a field of politics (struggle for state power). On the contrary, the social relations of civil society interpenetrate with the relations of production. Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks* contain several references to base and superstructure, the direction of Gramsci's thought, and his rejection of economism, is against it. He uses the term *historic bloc* to indicate the way in which a hegemonic class combines the leadership of a block of social forces in civil society with its leadership in the sphere of production.

#### **3.4.3.8 The Nature of Power**

Gramsci suggests that power is best understood as a relation. The social relations of civil society are also relations of power, so that power is diffused throughout civil society as well as being embodied in the coercive apparatuses of the state. Gramsci used the term *integral* state to describe this new conception of the nature of power, which he summed up as 'hegemony armoured by coercion'. It follows that the political struggle of the working class cannot be confined to the winning of state power, but has

to be extended to the whole of civil society. It is necessary to win a substantial measure of hegemony in civil society as a condition for gaining control over the state. The achievement of control over the state is only part (though a decisive part) of the transition from the existing system. Some thinkers like Hobswarn criticizes Gramsci that he is a Hegelian. But he try to resolve the existing power relations and its consequences.

### **3.5 Louis Althusser; out of State Apparatus**

Althusser is regarded as a major redefinition of ideology within the Marxist tradition. Althusser followed Marx in assigning the ruling ideology the role of ensuring the submission of the workers to the ruling class. That was achieved by disseminating the rule of morality and respect required to uphold the established order. Official 'apparatuses' such as the state, the church, and the military practical control over the 'know-how' that was necessary to secure repression and ensure the viability of the existing economic system. But Althusser departed from Marx in acknowledging that ideology was a 'new reality' rather than the obscuring of reality. He linked the ideological superstructure to the top story of a three- storied house. It was superimposed on the economic and productive base- the ground floor- and on the middle floor, the political and legal institutions. These were also part of the superstructure, but one that intervened directly in the base. Although the upper floor was held up by the base, they exercised 'relative autonomy'.



Althusser deeply examines the concept put forwarded by Marx in his German ideology, he says, “In the German ideology, this formulation appears in a plainly positivist context. Ideology is conceived as a pure illusion, a pure dream, i.e., as nothing less. All its reality is external to it. Ideology is thus although as an imaginary construction whose status is exactly like the theoretical status of the dream among writers before Freud”.<sup>28</sup>

Ideology merely considered as imaginary as semblance, by Marx, Althusser defines this as; “Ideology, then, is for Marx an imaginary assemblage (bricolage), a pure dream, empty and vain, constituted by the ‘day’s residues’ from the only full and positive reality, that of the concrete history of concrete material individuals materially producing their existence. It is on this basis that ideology has no history in the German Ideology, since its history is outside it, where the only existing history is, the history of concrete individual’s etc.”<sup>29</sup>

### **3.5.1 Ideology as ‘Representation’**

Althusser considered, “ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence. We commonly call religious ideology, ethical ideology, legal ideology, political ideology etc. So many ‘world outlooks’ of course, assuming that we do not live one of these ideologies as the truth (eg. believe in God, Duty, Justice etc. ) we admit that the ideology we are discussing from a critical point of

view, examining at as the ethnologist examines the myths of a ‘primitive society’, that these ‘world outlooks’ are largely imaginary. i.e., do not ‘correspond to reality’.<sup>30</sup>

### **3.5.2 Ideology has Material Existence**

Later with the study of Althusser the traditional way of understanding as base of superstructure model has been modified. Althusser actually brought forth a break in the interpretation of ideology by showing its materiality. Unlike the old beliefs, Althusser show that an idea becomes a matter since it has its existence only through certain material apparatus. Ideology has a material existence. “The ‘ideas’ or ‘representation’ etc., which seem to makeup ideology do not have an ideal (*ideale* or *ideelle*) or spiritual existence, but a material existence. I even suggested that the ideal (*ideale* or *ideelle*) and spiritual existence of ideas arises exclusively in an ideology of the ‘idea’ and of ideology, and let me add, in an ideology of what seems to have ‘founded’ this conception since the emergence of the science, i.e., what the practitioners of the science represent to themselves in their spontaneous ideology as ‘ideas’ true or false”.<sup>31</sup>

An ideology always exists in an apparatus, and its practices, or practices. This existence is material.<sup>32</sup> Althusser explains his views that “An individual believes in God or Duty or Justice etc., this beliefs derives (for everyone i.e., for all those who live in an ideological representation of ideology, which reduce ideology to ideas endowed by definition with a

spiritual existence) from the ideas of the individual concerned, i.e., from as a subject with a consciousness, which contains the ideas of his belief. This way, i.e., by means of the absolutely ideological ‘conceptual’ device (dispositif) thus set up (a subject endowed with a consciousness in which he freely forms or freely recognizes ideas in which he believes) the (material) attitude of the subject concerned naturally follows”.<sup>33</sup>

In this context Althusserian explanations of ideological and repressive apparatus become relevant. All ideas including religion, rituals and faith have direct relation with certain state apparatus. So the model of cultural interpretations based on economy superstructure binary is being further developed. Although economy is the fundamental aspect of life and ideology is not a mere reflection of it. Besides, ideology itself is capable of producing behaviour patterns, activities and the culture in general. So the interpretation of ideology as put forth by Althusser has become an inevitable part of culture studies. The very idea of culture and its various implications have certain relation with ideology. So Althusser’s definition of ideology as the representation of the relation is noteworthy. In society which is controlled by profit motive owing to capitalist interest actually paves way for certain kind of ‘interpellation’. So an individual is being interpellated in order to become a particular type of individual doing a particular kind of work. It is not the individual freedom of creativity which is the criterion of such position. On the other hand the individual is

ultimately formed by the interest disseminated through the ideology. With regard to this Althusser's ISA and RSA are to be explained.

### **3.5.3 State Apparatus**

The Repressive State Apparatus (RSA) was the dominating political force, but ideology developed a life of its own as the symbolic controller. The ideological state apparatus (ISA) were placed in religious, legal and cultural structure, in the mass media and the family and mainly in the educational system. One impact of Althusser in changing understandings of ideology was to know the diversity of its institutional forms- the multiplicity of ideological apparatuses as against the singularity of the illusion that Marx and Engels has directed.

Althusser recognizes the widespread dispersal of ideology beyond the public domain to the private. Political views of the world were present in all walks of life. Ideology was plural only the Marxist function of exercising integrated hegemonic power so as to maintain existing capitalist relations of exploitation. Althusser refused to formulate a theory of particular ideologies, nor was he interested in aspect of ideology that was unrelated to oppressive power.

An ideology has fundamental features irrespective of the historical forms specific ideologies adopt. It is one with which contemporary scholars of ideology have much sympathy. Althusser stated that 'ideology is

eternal'. By this he intended that individual inevitably think about the real conditions of their existence in a particular manner; they produce an imaginary account how they relate to the real world. Ideology was a representation- an image, of those relations. Ideology permits societies to imagine that such actions really do further the cause of freedom. It provides a view of their real world that explains it and reconciles them to it. Ideology does that by obscuring from a society the illusory and distorted nature of that representation. Ideology is inevitable because our imagination cannot avoid such distortions.

In Althusser's opinion ideology exists in a material form in social practice, or the institution he called social apparatus. From a Marxist perspective, this was an integrating statement, as it implied that ideologies were, unlike the position of the early Marx, located in the material-world- the world that mattered. The ideological understanding that propelled individual activities, even if those understanding were 'distorted' or imaginary representations they actually existed. Ideologies were not just the illusory expressions of a camera obscura reflecting the distorted consciousness of individual subjects, but an aspect of reality. Ideas existed in action, an observation Gramsci had made in a slightly different way. We had to respect the ideologically inspired provenance of individual action, even if we knew they did not reflect proper human relations. After all, those were specifically the actions were rituals on which the human imagination

conferred social significance. Football matches, harvest celebrations, political party conference, or religious worship. For Althusser, even thinking was a material practice, in that it actually took place. He referred to external verbal discourses (speeches and texts, one presumes) but also to 'internal' verbal discourse (consciousness). That insight further opened up the possibility for analysis of ideology to claim that political thinking was a central feature of the empirical regularities of political life. Althusser reaches the conclusion that, due to the fact that ideas are expressed and transmitted by material institutions, ideas are themselves material. Gramsci states, "the ideal and spiritual existence of 'ideas' arises exclusively in an ideology of the 'idea' and of ideology, and let me add, in an ideology, of what seems to have 'founded' this conception since the emergence of the science, i. e. what the practice of the science represent to themselves in their spontaneous ideology as 'ideas', true or false, of course, presented in affirmative form, this thesis is unproven. I simply ask that the reader be favourably disposed it, say, in the name of materialism. A long series of arguments would be necessary to prove it".<sup>34</sup>

The polemical commitment to naturalism which characterizes his work enables Althusser to slide from the presupposition that matter determines ideas into an assumption that ideas do not exist: "the existence of the ideas of (the subject) belief is material in that his ideas are his material actions inserted in to material practice governed by material rituals

which are themselves defined by the material ideological apparatus from which drive the ideas of that subject”.<sup>35</sup>

If ideas are material than the subject, which has ideas must, in fact, be an object. The very notion of an autonomous subject, like the concept of non-material ideas, is described by Althusser as ideological; “the category of the ‘subject’ is constitutive of ideology, which only exist by constituting concrete subject as subject... the existence of ideology and hailing or interpellation of individual as a subject are one and the same thing”.<sup>36</sup>

According to Althusser concrete individual subject was made to serve as carrier of ideology, thus serving the inevitability of its link with class. “Throughout this scheme we observe that the ideological representation of ideology is itself forced to recognize that every ‘subject’ endowed with a ‘consciousness’ and believing in the ‘ideas’ that this ‘consciousness’ inspires in him and freely accepts, must ‘act according to his ideas’ must therefore inscribe his ideas as a free subject in the action of his material practice. If he does not do so ‘that is wicked’”.<sup>37</sup> That is why; the very notion of ideology itself depended on the ideological concept of the subject – individual constituted by ideology as bearer of consciousness, will and agency. In other words, ‘ideology’ and ‘subject’ were naturally defining. Althusser express, “In every case, the ideology of ideology this recognize, despite its imaginary distinction, that the ‘ideas’ of a human subject exist in his actions, or ought to exist in his action, and if that is not

the cause, it lend him other ideas corresponding to the actions (however preserve) that he does perform”.<sup>38</sup>

The term, Althusser used to explain the relationship between subject and ideology, is ‘interpellating’ or naming. He stated, “Ideology Interpellates individual as subject. The category of the subject is only constituted of all ideology insofar as all ideology has the function (which defines it) of constituting’ concrete individual as subjects. Man is an ideological animal by nature”.<sup>39</sup> He adds, “All ideology hails or interpellates as concert subject, by the functioning of the subjects”.<sup>40</sup>

Althusser reproduced the abstractness of ideology, as well as its status solely as a group product. He empowered future students of ideology to appreciate that ideology is both something that happens in us and to us. In as much as it is in us, we sufficiently astute, we can acknowledge that we identify each other through ideology, as individual possessing certain features rather than others. The ambiguity of the term ‘subject’, Althusser argued, catches the essence of ideology beautifully. It refers to the free initiative of the individual, but also to the domination of the individual by a higher authority. For instance, being enterprenential, cowardly, caring-all those are particular features that our ideological imaginations deem important for one reason or another. These are all categories we apply in order to make sense of human action. They all define the characteristics of individual subject, thus placing them within a recognized social network.



They are linked to practices of which we approve or disapprove, but crucially- all those are permanent aspects of social life.

Althusser says, “Ideology exists before the individual. When the concrete individual ones along, ideology, has ‘always already’ determined specific set of rules, a particular subjectivity, in to which the individual will be slotted. This occurs through a process of ‘interpellation’ which basically means that a person will be systematically addressed or ‘hailed’ in such a way as to force him or her in to this pre-allocated ‘subject-position’. Nor is this process unique to twentieth century capitalism for ‘the same’”.<sup>41</sup> Ideology is not a historical phenomenon but it seems, cannot bear very much reality. For Althusser, ‘ideology’ is the imaginary way in which people experience their real lives, the ideal representation of a material process. Althusser calls the ideology ‘knowledge of ideology is generally used as an approximate term for materialism, whose task it is to explain the source of these ideas, and so reveal their role in maintaining the power of the capitalist class, or bourgeoisie’.

The initial task of any economic system, according to Althusser, is to reproduce its own conditions of production. This contains reproducing the kinds of people who will be able to participate in the process of production. The power of the modern capital state to do this is depend on two types of institutions; the ‘Repressive State Apparatus’ such as the police, law, court and army, and the ‘Ideological State Apparatus’ which include church, the

family, political parties, the media, and most importantly, the education system. As we might expect, the 'RSA' functions by 'violence', whereas the 'Ideological State Apparatus functions by 'ideology'.

### **3.5.3.1 ISA (Ideological State Apparatus)**

Ideological state apparatus is encompassed with numerous and different particulars, concepts and institutions. Throughout his investigation Althusser was very enthusiastic about the new form or understanding and functioning of ideological state apparatus. In Althusser understanding he means that "ideological state Apparatus a certain number of realities, which present themselves to the immediate observer in the form of distinct and specialized institutions. I propose an empirical list of these which will obviously have to be examined in detail, tested, corrected and recognized. With all the reservations implied by this requirement, we can for the moment regard the following institutions as ideological state apparatus.

- The religious ISA (the system of different church)
- The educational ISA (the system of the different public and private schools)
- The family ISA

The family obviously has the 'function' of an ISA. It intervenes in the reproduction of labour power. In different modes of production it is the unit of production and/or the unit of consumption.

- The legal ISA

The law belong both the (repressive) state apparatus and the system of ISA

- The political ISA (the political system, including the different parties)
- The trade union ISA
- The communication ISA (press, radio and television etc., )
- The cultural ISA (literature, the arts, sports etc.)”<sup>42</sup>

It is clear that there exists the ideological state apparatus at the same time where the repressive state apparatus prevails. It does not have any constant body same as the repressive state apparatus have. The most part of ideological state apparatus prevails in the private sphere of a society but the repressive state apparatus is functions and exists in the public sphere of the society. Repressive state apparatus is functioned by violence at the same time ideological state apparatus functions by ideology.

### **3.5.3.2 RSA (Repressive State Apparatus)**

In Marxist understanding the state apparatus (SA) contains different kinds of social or political institutions; namely the state, government army, police, courts etc. Generally these type of apparatus known as Repressive state apparatus that functions predominantly by force or violence. According to Althusser “the state Apparatus (SA) contains the government, the Administration, the army, the Police, the courts the prison etc. which

constitute what is known as the Repressive State Apparatus. Repressive suggest that the state apparatus in question ‘function by violence’- at least ultimately (since repression e.g. Administration, may take nonphysical forms)”.<sup>43</sup>

State itself as a repressive force in the reproduction of the labour force by using the violence and force. By using the repressive force state tries to get hegemony over the productive power the productive labour or the proletariat. Althusser says, “The state is explicitly conceived as a repressive apparatus. The state is a ‘machine’ of repression which enables the ruling class (in the nineteenth century the bourgeois class and the ‘class’ of big landowners) to ensure their domination over the working class, thus enabling the former to subject the latter to the process of surplus- value extortion (i.e., to capitalist exploitation)”.<sup>44</sup>

The ruling class has the control over the political power in a state and this ruling class uses the apparatus as they wish and it is very active in the ideological apparatus too. Both these RSA and the ISA functions and it paves the way or create smooth condition for the ruling class and its ideologies. Basically these types of ideological apparatus both by repressive and ideological functions or intervenes to create a condition for the exploitation through reproducing the productive forces in society “The state apparatus, which defines the state as a force of repressive execution and intervention in the ‘interest of the ruling classes’, the class struggle

conducted by the bourgeoisie and its allies against the proletariat, is quit certainly the state and quite certainly defines the base of the function”.<sup>45</sup>

There are different sorts of institution beside the state that also serve the state to control and regulate the society by using force or violence. In his words “This term means; not only the specialized apparatus (in the narrow sense) whose existence and necessity I have recognized in relation to the requirements of legal practice, i.e., the police, the courts, the prison, but also the army, which (the proletariat has paid for this experience with its blood) intervene directly as a supplementary repressive force in the last instance, when the police and its specialized auxiliary corps are ‘outrun by events’; and above this ensemble, the head of state, the government and the administration”.<sup>46</sup>

The main features of the repressive force are specified below and it functions basically by the force or violence, Althusser explains, “This is the fact that the (Repressive) State Apparatus functions massively and predominantly by repression (including physical repression), while functioning secondly by ideology. (There is no such theory as purely repressive apparatus). For example the Army and Police also function by ideology, both to ensure their own cohesion and reproduction, and the ‘values’ they propound externally”.<sup>47</sup>

Althusser expresses his view that both the repressive and ideological state apparatus are functions by violence and ideology. The police, army and the government are functions to protect their values by their own and hegemony or the reproduction of its ideology. Both the church and school have their own strict rules, punishments and marginalization people to control or protect their ideology. It is same in cultural ISA in the form of censorship or other forms of social control. In his view, “In the same way, but inversely, it is essential to say that for their part the ideological state apparatus function massively and predominantly by ideology, but they also function secondly by repression, even if ultimately, but only ultimately this is very attenuated and concealed, even symbolic (there is such thing as a purely ideological apparatus). Thus school and church use stable methods of punishment, expulsion, selection etc. to ‘discipline’ not only their shepherds but also their folks. The same is true of family.... The same is true of the cultural ISA apparatus (censorship, among other things) etc.”<sup>48</sup>

In particular, as a result of Althusser’s emphasis on the constructive role of ‘ideology’, significant doubt has been cast on the concept of ‘false consciousness. All terms of idealism, he argues are ideological. And yet it is impossible to imagine a society which did not think to some degree in idealist terms. It follows that ‘ideology’ is not an aberration or a contingent existence of history: it is a structure essential to the historical life of societies’.

Terry Eagleton is one of the important figures in the contemporary philosophical analysis and critical studies in the world who further enquire about ideology and culture. He was very much equipped within the field of culture and in ideology and the critical theories. Here he is critically examining the philosophical explanations about the concept of ideology and in his opinion “The word ‘ideology’ one might say, is a text woven of a whole tissue of different conceptual strands: it is traced through by divergent histories, and it is probably more important to assess what is valuable or can be discovered in each of these lineages that to merge than forcibly in to some Grand global theory”.<sup>49</sup> There are numerous explanations and definition prevailed in the society on the concept of ideology; and to indicate this variety of meaning, Eagleton in his book *Ideology* gives a list more or less at random some definition of ideology currently in circulation:

He explains, “On the one hand, ideologies are passionate, rhetorical, impelled by some benighted pseudo-religious faith which the sober technocratic world of modern capitalism has thankfully outgrown; on the other hand they are aired conceptual system which seek to reconstruct society from the ground up in accordance with some bloodless blueprint”.<sup>50</sup> It is true that people sometimes use the word ideology to refer to systematic belief in general, as when someone says they abstain from meat’ for practical rather than ideological reasons. “‘Ideology here is more or less

synonymous with the broad sense of the term ‘philosophy’ as in the phrase”.<sup>51</sup> Lastly he explains, “The term ideology, in other words, would seem to make reference not only to belief system, but to questions of power”.<sup>52</sup>

### **3.6 Culture as a Product of Dominant Ideology**

Ideology is the ruling idea of an epoch. It is the dominant form of thinking in other words the production of meanings determined by the ideology. Ideology is mere ideas. It is the idea of the ruling class. “The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas: i. e. the class which is the ruling material force of society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas, hence of the relationships which make the one class the ruling one, therefore the ideas of its dominance”.<sup>53</sup>

In every writings, it doesn’t matter whether it is philosophy or literature, ideology is a determining factor. It is the factor, which controls the writing as a signifying system like any other form of writing, philosophy, too exhibits both sides of culture. The one side in the support



given to the dominant culture and the other is the criticism levelled against the dominant culture. There are as many cultures as social organization. But there is a single hegemonic culture since the ruling force on the political power is in the hands of a single class. All other culture lies dominant beneath the ruling ideology. In every epoch there is a dominant form of social organization depending upon the material mode of production. Today we have global capital and global village, the offsprings of late capitalism, if we approve of the contention of Frederic Jameson.

## **References**

- <sup>1</sup> Drucker, H. M. (1974). *The Political use of Ideology*. London: Macmillan, p. 3.
- <sup>2</sup> Finer, S. E. (1970). *Comparative Government*. London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, p. 43.
- <sup>3</sup> Mannheim, K. (1954). *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc. London: Rutledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., p. 62.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid, p. 57.
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid, p. 49.
- <sup>6</sup> Ibid, p. 54.
- <sup>7</sup> Ibid, p. 49.
- <sup>8</sup> Ibid, p. 59.
- <sup>9</sup> Ibid, p. 60.
- <sup>10</sup> Ibid, pp. 50-51.
- <sup>11</sup> Gramsci, A. (2010). *Selections from the Prison Note Books*. Quintin Hoare & Geoffery Nowell Smith (Eds. and trans.). New Delhi: Orient Blackswan Pvt., Ltd., p. 245.
- <sup>12</sup> Ibid, p. 464.
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid, p. 324.
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid, p. 323.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid, p. 418.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid, p. 365.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid, p. 376.

- 18 Ibid.
- 19 Ibid, p. 377.
- 20 Ibid, p. 138.
- 21 Ibid, p. 184.
- 22 Ibid, p. 165.
- 23 Ibid, p. 137.
- 24 Ibid, p. 376.
- 25 Ibid, pp. 57-58.
- 26 Ibid, p. 238.
- 27 Ibid, p. 5.
- 28 Althusser, L. (2001). *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press, p. 108.
- 29 Ibid.
- 30 Ibid, pp. 109-110.
- 31 Ibid, p. 112.
- 32 Ibid.
- 33 Ibid, p. 113.
- 34 Ibid, pp. 165-166
- 35 Ibid, p. 169.
- 36 Ibid, pp. 173, 175.
- 37 Ibid, p. 113.

38 Ibid, p. 114.

39 Ibid, p. 116.

40 Ibid, p. 117.

41 Ibid.

42 Ibid, p. 96.

43 Ibid.

44 Ibid, p. 92.

45 Ibid.

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid.

48 Ibid, p. 96.

49 Eagleton, T. (2000/1991). *Ideology: An Introduction*. London and New York:  
Verso, p. 3

50 Ibid, p. 4.

51 Ibid, p. 5.

52 Ibid.

53 Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1964, 1968, 1970, 1976). *The German Ideology*. Moscow:  
Progress Publishers. p. 64.

## **CHAPTER - IV**

### **POSTMODERN TURN IN PHILOSOPHY**

Postmodernity is a manifold idea that refers to a diverse and important social and cultural changes that took place at the end of the twentieth century in many 'advanced' societies. In a wide sense rapid technological change, including telecommunications and computer power, shifting political concerns, the rise of new social movements related to gender, green, ethnic and racial focus, are involved in the postmodern discourse. It never has single definite meaning, but several, often diverse and 'relatively standardized' ones and signifies an effort to combine a number of diverse and ambiguous themes. The concept of postmodernity/postmodernism has its place in social thought because it leads us to certain significant social as well as culture changes took place at the end of the twentieth century.

Postmodernism is often understood as something that not just comes after the 'modern', but is based on a negation of the 'modern', a perceived abandonment, a break with or shift away from what characterizes the modern. Sometimes postmodernism is seemed as a dimension within modernism as a periodizing concept and as a particular cultural, intellectual style or orientation. As a periodizing concept – usually reflected to as

postmodernity – it is used as a brand for certain orientation in arts and architecture. In common, Postmodernism is to be viewed as a denial of many, it questions one's obligation to cultural 'progresses' as well as political structure. Postmodernists often refer to the 'enlightenment project' as a liberal humanist ideology that has come to dominate western culture since the eighteenth century that tried to bring about the liberation of mankind from economic want and political oppression

#### **4.1 Postmodernity: A Historical Survey**

The aim of enlightenment project was to eliminate uncertainty and ambivalence. Modernity was its result. Economic and political supremacy of Europe initiated new ways of thinking. According to Antony Giddens, "The growth of European power provided, as it were, the material support for the assumption that the new outlook on the world was founded on a firm base with both provided security and offered emancipation from the dogma of tradition".<sup>1</sup> Humanity has lost its faith in natural progress following the Second World War, but only to be revived artificially by massive scientific and technological development and an unprecedented consumer boom. Colonies became politically independent and the rate of migration increased. This chaotic flux began to question conventional ideas. The notion of modernity was developed as a totality of these changes. This came to an end by 1960s.

In Europe 1960s ensued significant political and cultural challenges. Tradition was questioned. New social movements sprang up. Progress through technological advancement and economic development appeared as the best path before humanity. Intellectuals argued over whether this was crisis or opportunity, and sought for new terms to describe emerging situation. 'Postmodernity' is one such term framed to address this new turn. 'Postmodernity', still depends on the collapse of modernity, has to do with putative social changes. Certain features of modernity are being magnified, and by contrast shrink others into insignificance, to produce new social and cultural forms. Postmodern debate has responded the question of how the cultural and social change informs each other. To understand social change one has to understand cultural change. The most common method to describe modernity-and thus postmodernity - is to focus on rationality seen as a guiding principle as well as an attained objective for the modern project. Rationality is embodied particularly in the certainty and accuracy of science and knowledge and the far reaching control and use of nature through this knowledge.

Postmodernism exists, as an idea or a form of critique in intellectual discourse developed from the condition of postmodernity. Since 1980s it initiated massive, anxious debates in a lot of disciplines ranging from geography to theology and from philosophy to political science. Postmodern perspective is worth following because it leads us to a series of

significant questions. It increases our sensitivity and helps us to view certain issues as problems to be confronted and obliges us to raise our eyes above narrowly technical and discreet issues and struggle with historical change on a grand scale. Generally 'Postmodernism', as a cultural and intellectual phenomenon, refers to the production, consumption and distribution of symbolic goods. It questions all key promises of the European Enlightenment. As Gary Wolker says, "postmodernism is about deposing the trinity of the Enlightenment-reason, nature and progress-which presumably triumphed over the earlier trinity".<sup>2</sup> In usual practice, postmodern may be seen in the blurring of behaviour between 'high' and 'low' culture; the collapse of hierarchies of knowledge, taste and opinion and the interest in the local rather than the universal. François Lyotard was the first thinker to formulate a clear and distinct idea about the state of knowledge in the newly evolving period of modernity. In this sense the postmodern stands for a particular epoch with its own feature in philosophy and culture. Frederic Jameson in his preface to *The Postmodern condition* had made it clear that it is the expression of a particular period in history.

#### **4.1.1 Origin of Postmodernism**

The first noted use the word 'postmodernism' is back in the 1870s, and although it proceeds to crop up periodically over the next few decades, sometimes with negative meaning. It is only in the latter half of the



twentieth century that it comes to take on the specific meaning of a reaction against modernism and modernity.

In the 1870s the English painter John Watkins Chapman proposed that any art going beyond impressionism, the revolutionary new art style of the period, would be definable as 'postmodern painting'. By 1917 'postmodern' was the term chosen by the author Rudolf Pennwitz to describe the new form of military style and anti-humanistic culture developing in Europe ravaged by war. In the 1920s and 1930s the term had more positive meaning the work of the American theologian Bernard Iddings Bell, for whom a postmodernist was religious faith indeed. The eminent historian Arnold Toynbee returned to the pessimistic application of the term, when in *A Study of History*, he spoke of the period from 1875 onwards as the 'postmodern age of Western history'; an age marked by cultural decline as evident in its two world wars. Eventually 'postmodern' began to take on the meaning of 'ultra-modern', with the architectural theorist Joseph Hudaut using it in a fashion to describe new buildings produced in the aftermath of the Second World War. Architectural theorist Charles Jenks is highly influential in the formation of the idea as it is seen today with his strong criticism of modern architecture, which he thought had lost touch with the general public. It was the so called 'interaction style', with its severe tower blocks constructed of concrete and glass, all

straight lines and lacking in ornamentation, with which Jenks particularly took issue.

Ecological movements developed over the later twentieth century were concerned about of technological advancements environment. 'Green' political parties were formed in many western European countries. Creative artists began to rebel against the structures of the modernist style and demanded abstraction in art and dissonant non tonal composition in music. Philosophers and cultural theorist reacted against theories such as structuralism, which reduced the world to a series of interlinked system with their own interest denies or 'deep structure'.

The ideas about postmodernism have been adapted virtually by every discipline. Each area has produced a lot of literature describing postmodernism in their own perspective. Taken on broad by many different fields, where it can refer to so many different things, meanings of postmodernism have multiplied. For an in-depth analysis of postmodernism we must have to visit the traditional understanding of modernity and its related areas.

#### **4.2 The Emergence of Modernity**

The term 'modern', derived from the Latin *modo*, simply means 'of today' or what is current, as distinguished from earlier times. It has been used in various periods and places to distinguish the contemporary from

traditional and in principle can refer to any sphere of life. It is still used in this local, contextually determined way: hence people refer to ‘modern English’ or ‘modern dance’. The concept of modernity found one of its first expression in the seventeenth-century debate between the ‘Ancient and the Modern’ in Swift’s the ‘*Battle of the Books*’, about literary style and the status of the classic and contemporary writers. ‘Modernity’ in contemporary intellectual discussions refers to the new civilization developed in Europe and North America over the last several centuries and culminated in the early twentieth century. ‘Modernity’ indicates that this civilization is modern in the strong sense that it is unique in human history.

In England modernity was more closely connected with the rise of modern science, and is best represented in Francis Bacon’s opposition to the wisdom of antiquity. By this time, modernity and the modern had already come to designate a particular kind of time consciousness defined by an orientation to the past and postulating an origin from which the present was both an origin and a distinction. For Christian thinkers of the early medieval age, the modern referred to the contemporary period of the early church. Modernity was thus defined in opposition to the pagan period. To be modern was to be contemporary, to witness the present moment. The idea of ‘the moment’ is central to the time consciousness of modernity and expresses a tension between present and past. The seventeenth-century discussion can be seen as a keen consciousness of the uniqueness of the

present moment. The moment of modernity exists in the space between present and past. The modern is not only an epoch, but is one that is formed out of a particular conception of history. The term ‘modernism’ is used in a famously ambiguous way referring to the philosophy or culture of the modern period as a whole and also to a much more historically circumscribed movement in the period between 1850 to 1950.

The idea of modernity is thus a projection and a depression at the same time and for this reason many of its formations embody nostalgia as well as utopianism. The idea becomes political in relation to its interpretation by early Christian thinkers defining their age as modern in opposition to the pagan. One way of understanding the relation of the terms ‘modern’, ‘modernity’, and ‘modernism’ is aesthetic as a form of art characteristic of high or actualized or late modernity a period in which social, economic, and cultural life in the widest sense were revolutionized.

#### **4.2.1 What is Modernity?**

‘Modernity’ is today described as ‘modernization’ or simply ‘development’ in the non-western world. The modern-western civilization is generally characterized by capitalism, a largely secular culture, liberal democracy, individualism, rationalism, and humanism. The term refers to the social order emerged after European Enlightenment. Modern world is marked by its unprecedented dynamism, its dismissal or marginalization of tradition, and by its global consequences. It relates strongly to belief in

progress and the power of human reason to produce freedom. Modernity can be seen in achievements such as science and technology or democratization of politics, it also attach profoundly the routines of everyday.

The idea of modernity was strongly present behind the development of Sociology in 19<sup>th</sup> century. ‘Modernization’ is often presented as a means of summing up of social and political processes associated with technology led economics progress. Technology uprooted agricultural workers and transformed them in to mobile industrial urbanites. Modernity questions conventions in science, economic growth, democracy or law and culture and unsettles the given self by constructing a new one.

#### **4.2.2 Achievements of Modernity**

In the last few decades profound and irreversible social changes took place in Europe altering everyday life. Our social relations have become stretched over time and space, connected by electro-magnetic signals and fibre-optic cables. The positive self-image given by modern-western culture to itself is drawn by eighteenth-century Enlightenment founded on scientific knowledge of the world and rational knowledge of value. This gives highest place for individuality, freedom and believes. Freedom and rationality will lead to social progress through virtuous, self-controlled work, creating a better material, political, an intellectual life for all. This

combination of science, reason, individuality, freedom, truth and social progress has, however, been questioned and criticized by many.

Enlightenment is legitimized by a rupture which has occurred in recent history with the beginning of modern times. The early modern idea of revolution, for instance, not only signified a radical break from the past and as embracing of the future, but signalled a cyclical conception of history by which the future was a returning and appropriation of the past. Immanuel Kant answers the question ‘Do we live in an enlightenment age? By saying ‘No but we do live in an age of enlightenment’. Kant clearly equated enlightenment with a particular way of thinking and one which exemplifies the spirit of modernity. In his words, “Enlightenment is mankind’s exit from its self-incurred immaturity”; ‘immaturity’ is the ability to use of one’s own understanding without the guidance of another. This immaturity is self-incurred of its cause is not lack of understanding, but lack of resolution and courage to use it without the guidance of another. The motto of enlightenment is therefore: *sapere aude!* have courage to use our own understanding”.<sup>3</sup> This is a very clear statement of enlightenment as an idea capitalizing the central ideas of Kant’s philosophy revolving around the themes of autonomy, critique, publicity. Enlightenment as a condition may have emerged out of the historical age of modernity, but is defined as much by opposition to the present as it is to the past.

For Hegel modernity is understood not only in relation with Enlightenment but to history also. Hegel's philosophy can be seen as a historicization of Kant's critique, for morality is deemed to be created in society and is articulated in human history. For Hegel, epistemology thus becomes social theory rather than just a theory of knowledge constructed in history. Here reality is constituted by knowledge which is critique. By critique Hegel means a form of knowledge that transforms its objects as opposed to being merely self-limiting as in Kant. In this way, knowledge and reality are dialectically shaped. Critical knowledge, then for Hegel is a form of knowledge, it is consciousness about the self. The result of Hegel's endeavour is a conception that stresses its internal ambivalence and struggles of modernity. Self, knowledge and power are severely delimiting, as they make their autonomy impossible.

The realization that modernity is inherently contradictory becomes more pronounced with Marx. Unlike Kant and Hegel Marx views modernity as a radical project of action. Since there is the realization that cultural idea and social reality are contradictory, modernity as a project is expressed less in the overcoming of an origin than in the struggle to overcome alienation and exploitation.

Modernism, strictly speaking, refers to development in aesthetic modernity, and is not normally applied to the other dimensions of cultural modernity such as cognitive rationality and morality. But some of the core

features of modernism are expressed in the writings of Marx and Engels, such as the vision of modernity as a dynamic force by which subjectivity and objectivity are formed, the fusion of consciousness with historical experience, the transformation power of consciousness, the confluence of politic and aesthetic in the expressive potential of creativity and violence.

As Karl Marx noted in the *Communist Manifesto*, “The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and with them the relation of production, and with them all the relations of society.... Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbances of all social relations, ever-lasting uncertainty and agitation, distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier one”.<sup>4</sup> Here Marx points at the societal scope of the changes taking place, changes that others have limited by terms such as ‘industrialization’. In truth, while ‘modernity’ may rather appear vague, it has the virtue of indicating the sheer magnitude of social changes consequent on industrial-capitalist-technological growth.

### **4.2.3 Alienation and Exploitation**

Karl Marx, though he welcomed modernity, was no friend of capitalism. The constant upgrading of technology, the dogged quest for market dominance, the increasingly global tentacle of capital are aspects of a system designed to divide between those who profit and those who has nothing to lose but their chairs. To Marx capitalism succeeded in driving a



wedge between capitalist and labourer, between labourer themselves-as they competed for job opportunities-and, more profoundly, between workers who are alienated from their own humanity. So capitalism is understood as a free purposeful activity with an insatiable lust for profit.

#### **4.2.4 New Technology and Society: Beyond Modernity**

In the smart-card controlled present day life technology expresses a demand for greater co-ordination and control of social process. Improvement and development through the application of new technologies are assumed. Many people still believe in equality brought about by technology. Modern social and cultural theories are being ripped apart by new structures of time and space associated with the development of information and communication technologies. Any failure to integrate the social aspect of new technologies to postmodern sociology will affect our understanding of the present world. At the same time, the belief that technological advancement necessarily promotes the progress of human civilization often exists as the undercurrents of postmodern social theories. This is false but to abandon progress need not be essential for showing commitments either to understand or guide technological development.

#### **4.3 Declaring the Postmodern**

The postmodern became significant during 1970s. It coincided with a crisis in capitalist civilization which brought about a transformative

resolution that is still immensely consequential. In the 1970s, architects began talking earnestly about postmodernism as a way to make up for the manifest deficiencies of modern architecture. Cultural critics also began to notice something strange going on in entertainment forms, particularly the emergence of the hyper real which unsettled the relation between representations of reality. It was relatively new as the centre of all these happenings was mass popular culture with trails of lineage from the tradition of counter culture of the 1960s. There are many other instances of the emergence of postmodernism in, say, literature and fine art. It seems that the declaration made concerning philosophy, architecture and entertainment are the most significant and exemplify much of what is at stake when considering modernity and postmodernity.

#### **4.3.1 Postmodern Philosophy**

The postmodern as a philosophical approach runs the risk of turning all social science in to literary criticism or making social research highly subjective, intuitive and preoccupied with the researcher his worries about text production. It can be tempting to separate postmodernism as a statement on the present society, culture and transformation of specific social institutions from postmodernism as a philosophy and intellectual style. One could also turn this around and say that social studies based on postmodern philosophy tend to produce a post-modernist social reality-

everything is turned in to hype-reality or rhetoric or is in a state of flux and indeterminacy.

### **4.3.2 Implications of Postmodernism**

There are five important postmodern themes in that four are objects of its criticism, and one constitutes positive method. Postmodernism naturally criticizes: presence or presentation (versus representation and construction), origin (versus phenomena), unity (versus plurality), and transcendence of norms (versus their immanence), it usually offers an analysis of phenomenon through constitutive otherness.

Presence refers to the quality of immediate experience and to the objects thereby immediately 'presented'. What is directly and immediately given as an experience has traditionally been constructed with representation (the sphere of linguistic signs and concepts), and construction (the products of human invention, perception or sensation or sense data). These have been considered, at various times, as immediate conduits, at reality, more reliable or certain than mental contents subsequently modified, represented, and altered by thought or language. Postmodernism questions and sometimes rejects this distinction.

### **4.3.3 Artistic Expressions**

In art forms postmodernism is usually the rejection of high modernism and its models by movements as diverse as pop art, photo

realism and Trans-avant-gardism. For the postmodern artist, there is nothing new about modernism's continuous quest for the 'new'. It is merely an assertion of the contemporary as the sole defining gesture of the modern.

At the same time, this plethora of artistic and cultural responses to modernism has come to be understood by many as a sign of some new socio- historical reality in the wake of a post-industrial world, where the classic economic forces of production and industrialization have made way for a service, information and consumer oriented economy. Postmodernity thus means a paradigm shift from the low tech-realm of smokestacks and loco-motives to the high-tech world of silicon chips and digital communication. Whether this brave new world represents a break with capitalism or merely a new phase of it remains a source of tremendous discussion and dissension among theorists of the postmodern. They are eager to draw correlations between the artistic revolt of postmodernism and our possible entry in to a new period of history and a new type of social organization.

#### **4.3.4 Hyper Reality**

A special case of the claims about radical changes is the idea of hyper reality- simulacra- replacing the 'real world', so that simulations take priority in the contemporary social order. This idea does not point at a particular period and the reasoning is based on sociological ideas. Clearly the notion of hyper reality calls for the expansion of mass media, and can

thus be seen as an attempt to say something about contemporary society as distinct from earlier periods. The idea of hyper reality shows any existing linguistic or represented systems as self-referential. Such systems are anchored neither in a socially produced objective world nor respect the excess of an outside. They produce the very same world that they appear to represent accurately. For example contemporary media and information system have the capacity to represent, an outside world. Such systems can dominate the scene with an array of reproduced imaginary words. The notion of hyper reality is not easy to demonstrate in a conventional empirical research program, although one can study hyper-real as 'real' phenomena in advertisements, media performances, brand names and activities.

#### **4.3.5 Language**

Many postmodernists reject a representational view of language. Language cannot mirror the reality 'out there', or people's mental state. Given the belief in the centrality of language and its active, constructing role, many advocates of postmodernism question and even deny the idea of a 'reality out there' or 'mental status'. Language is figural, metaphorical, undeniable, and full of contradiction and inconsistencies. Meaning is fixed, but precarious, fragmental and local. Instead of language being used to illuminate 'something', language in itself should be illuminated and 'deconstructed'. Linguistic tricks should be exposed, not in order to reach a

‘truth’, but in order to understand that there is no truth- with the possible exception of the statements just made. Science is seen as linguistic construction and thus should be explored. Paradoxically such enterprises are to be carried out with language and thus should be deconstructed and studied in terms of rhetoric. This alternative view of language is one of the significant aspects of postmodernism.

From this understanding on language, it partially follows that far-reaching theories called grand or master-narratives are problematic. We cannot talk about society, family, unemployment, child-caring, love or values in any general sense. A more sociological version of this moving over to the postmodernism as period camp-stresses that these narratives are unpopular at present. The philosophic version of postmodernism would stress the theoretical case against efforts to offer branded theoretical explanations. Master narratives are part of the tyranny of modernist ideology and are built upon a deeply problematic understanding of language.

#### **4.3.6 Consumerism and Beyond**

Changes within capitalism and industrialism following the post war consumer boom in the advanced societies produced what Bell called ‘post-industrialism’. These changes are now taken to be more significant as the material and social spring board for postmodern condition. So postmodernisation has to do with the altered industrial landscape with its

mobile, flexible production. This altered landscape codifies a new occupational structure that places services and so-called information workers in a majority, and a compressed world created by new technologies, new methods of production and new ways of social relationship. In this new social pattern the key motif is consumption, seen both as the cornerstone of a dominant cultural code and as a picture new social condition. What may be fairly obvious in a world of rock fans, theme parks, shopping malls and hip-hop seeps in to domains once thought somewhat beyond the market, such as science, religion, gender, ethnicity and the human body.

#### **4.3.6.1 Consumer Culture**

The postmodern is precisely related to a society where consumers' life style and mass consumption dominate the immediate life of its members. Some who still hold on to a hierarchy of values and cherish chronology suggest that reality itself is unsettled, undermined, so that, eventually, meaning itself evaporates.

Here consumption and a focus on the production of needs and wants are central. Everything is commodified, and this process is reinforced by constant TV advertising. An adequate fund to support consumer life style is presupposed along with sufficient leisure time to indulge in it. City is the suit of cultural shifts. The altered emphasis from economic and functional to cultural and aesthetic is clearly visible in urban areas. Consumer culture

may be connected with other more general cultural phenomenon. Intellectual and religious ones are subjected to the market, which resists 'authoritative' pronouncements and responses to it may help to correct a cultural climate conducive to religious revival.

Through mushrooming shopping malls, tightly targeted junk mails or the cacophony of commercial on TV, advanced societies are constantly reminded that they inhabit consumer culture. Shopping, no longer a necessary evil or a domestic chore, now exhibits itself as a leisure pursuit. Television and consumer culture supports each other although it is a mistake to impute simple causal status to the former. They have grown symbolically since the Second World War.

Definitely it is hard to find any cultural boundary in the markets of today. The rise of consumerism and of TV viewing have accelerated an 'impression' of reality, obscuring previously cherished differences between highbrow and lowbrow-between the culture of the elite and the culture of the masses. History becomes 'heritage' and the musty museum a 'hands on' multimedia experience. From TV ads to soap operas, mediated experience is involved in the construction of the self. The global and the local have never before interacted in such intense ways in routine, daily experience.

Postmodernism in novels, films, music and architecture is highly significant as a mirror held up to social and political change. For Marxists



like Frederic Jameson, postmodernism is unmasked as the cultural logic of late capitalism. The production of culture has been integrated in to commodity production in general, so that struggle once limited to production now spill over in to cultural sphere. Everything from the definition of taste to counter cultural movements of the 1960s could be understood under this rubric. Neither the decrease of the issues to the 'merely cultural' nor their diversion back in to modernist Marxism will be enough in this situation. Marxism can no longer supply all the answers. But they insist, sociology of postmodernity is still worth pursuing even one that still takes something from Marxism.

Cultural hegemony is redundant with consumer choice established as the market-lubricated axis on which system reproduction, social interrogation and individual life-words are smoothly revolve. 'Cultural variety, heterogeneity of style and differentiation of belief-system are become conditions of its success'

#### **4.3.7 Varied Voices**

Consumerism knows no boundaries. It neither respects domains once immune from its effects nor supports existing marks of cultural territory. So the symbolic decentring becomes a metaphor for postmodern consumer culture in general. Everything is fragmented, heterogeneous, dispersed, lured-and subject to consumer choices.

As the predominant ideal of the modern era gives way to the fluttering, varied voices of the possibility postmodern, so any hope of holding to a single being or a unified cosmos declines away. In scientific sense, the old certainties of method and experiment dissolve as reason based ‘truth’ is dismantled. Values and belief seem to lose any sense of coherence, let alone existing in the world of consumer choice, multiple media and globalized postmodernity. Hesitation, anxiety and doubt seem to be the price posed for that sense of choice. The seemingly liberating shift from fate to choice or from providence to progress appears to have a dark side, which veils the future spiral in to nihilism.

#### **4.3.8 A Critique of Economic Modernity**

Postmodernism is most readily well-defined as a set of response – cultural, political, intellectual – to perceived failure of modernism both as a vanguard aesthetic movement and as a common ideology of human progress forged in the fires and bellows of the industrial age. Given the absolute variety of modernism itself, various postmodernist responses to it from the middle of 1970s to early 1990s themselves are variable, even paradoxical and contradictory.

Postmodernity is best realized in a post-industrial America that also happens to be the primary locus for the cultural trends and intellectual discussions associated with postmodernism. The theoretical inspiration for its analysis as simultaneously aesthetic and historic break is primarily

drawn from the writings of a number of French thinkers whose works are commonly grasped under the rubric of post-structuralism, and more generally, that of critical theory.

#### **4.3.9 Postmodernism as a Grand Narrative**

From the wide characterization of modernism follows a strong feeling to use correspondingly extensive statements about it. One of the most interesting features of modernism and postmodernism is the attack on general frame works (grand narratives, totalizing discourses etc. ) combined with a preference for categorical statements especially on the nature of ‘modernism’ and on subjects such as language. Postmodernism criticizes modernism for a kind of intellectual imperialism, but many advocates of postmodernism are even more vulnerable to this type of criticism. This paradox can possibly be avoided if one says that the grand narratives of postmodernism about the nature of language, the individual, scientific knowledge, rationality, formal organizations and so on are explanations to the generally outstanding nature of the grand narratives.

A major difficulty in the discussions on postmodernism is the contradiction between taking postmodernism seriously as a philosophy (style), on the one hand, and understanding a ‘new’ social reality on the other (e.g., postmodern organization and postmodern society). From the position of postmodernism as a style of critical analysis which opens up ironies, inter-textually and paradoxes and takes the ambiguity of language

seriously, to attempt to diverse a theory of postmodern society (postmodernity) are essentially flawed efforts to totalize or systematize. The rejection of master narrative or language as representations means that it has become impossible to illuminate huge amounts of social reality. A possible defence for postmodernist would be to emphasize that they are less troubled by the possibility of contradiction and incoherence than their opponents.

There is, however, a better reason for people to want to associate themselves with postmodernism, and this is its usefulness for the mobilization of power. Given the broad terrain the postmodern label covers, it offers some protection against the tendency of people who pursue 'odd' agendas. Deviating from established tradition of rationality may lead to the fate of not being published or read even not to get employment. The common use of the term postmodernism means that it cannot that easily be neglected or marginalized so the more effectively one can spread the word, the better-protected one is against the powerful mainstream.

Postmodernism is sometimes celebrated as it questions dominant truths and challenges categories that are seen as oppression of claims about the current state of affairs and the formulation of political interests. Sometimes this leads to a peculiar mix of and even contradictory statements and positions. From a Postmodern perspective all such statements and positions may appear as a suitable text to be deconstructed, where the

categories 'women', 'interests', 'social relations' etc. would be seen as questionable elements in an effort to inscribe order in a messy and fluid world. Parker, recognizing that there are many version of modernism, with divergent politics and methodologies, describes the core of modernism as 'a rationalism that is unchallengeable and a faith that is ultimately possible to communicate the results of enquiry to other rational beings'. In contrast, Postmodernism suggests that this is a form of intellectual imperialism that ignores 'the fundamental uncontrollability of meaning'. Such a description captures the essential aspects of what some people talk about in terms of modernism and Postmodernism

#### **4.3.10 Loss of Foundation and Master Narratives**

Strong philosophical foundation makes the position one occupies strong. This grounding could be either in a metaphysical foundation like an external world in empiricism, mental structures in rationalism and human nature in humanism, or in a narrative, a story of history-such as class struggle in Marxism or survival of the fittest in social Darwinism or invisible hand of market economy.

As in the case of identity postmodernists take two different but compatible stances. One is categorical (valid throughout history and social centred) and the other is interested in recent historical trends (thus overlapping the philosophy/periodization distinctions). Following the first position, foundation and legitimating narratives have always been a hoax.

They have been used (usually unknowingly) to support a dominant view of the world and its order. Feminist for example, have argued that the historical narratives has always been his story. Empiricists appeal that the nature of the external world supported the force of their own concepts (and those borrowed from elite group), methods, interests, actions and reports in constructing that world. The significance of discourse and the inability of language to represent contribute to a general skepticism towards the legitimating (Meta) narratives supporting Western scientific thought since no privileged access to external realities can be granted. Lyotard showed the decline of the grand narrative of 'spirituality' and 'emancipation'.

The concept of postmodernity is geographically dispersed, so its 'history' migrates. Some European thinkers with American connections helped to spark postmodern debate. USA after all epitomizes the 'modernity' from which postmodernity derives. The prominent figures of this debate are Jacques Derrida, Michal Foucault, Frederic Jameson and Jean Francois Lyotard. The term 'postmodern' came in to popular usage after Jean-Francois Lyotard's *The Postmodern Condition* is published.

#### **4.4 Lyotard on Knowledge and Little Narratives**

Postmodernism as a philosophy or an intellectual style rejects conventional principles such a rationality, order and certainty. It is doubtful about categories and any idea of a constant meaning. Instead, ambivalence, variation, fragmentation, institution and emotion are celebrated as

guidelines for how we should understand the social world. Postmodernism as a philosophy would abandon its generalizing ambitions of social science and instead parasitically play with the ironies, incoherencies, inconsistencies and inter-textuality of social science writings. One of the best ways of describing postmodernism as a philosophical movement would be as a form of skepticism. Skepticism is a primarily negative form of philosophy, which sets out to undermine other philosophical theories claiming to be in possession of ultimate truth, or criteria for determining what count as ultimate truth. The term to describe such a style of philosophy is 'anti-foundational'. Postmodern philosophy provides us with the arguments and technique to make that gesture of dissent, as well as the means to make value judgments in the absence of such overall authorities.

Lyotard exposed the shifts in the ways in which knowledge and science are conceptualized and practiced. By means of evaluating the changes in the realm of knowledge he arrives at the conclusion that the suspicion towards meta-narratives is the mark of postmodernity. This incredulity results from scientific progress. Lyotard views these shifts as a necessary consequence of the developments in science and technology.

Lyotard's *The Postmodern Condition* (1979) draws the picture of a world beyond progress. It is hard, he observes, 'to see what other direction contemporary technology could take as an alternative to the computerization of society'. In this situation Lyotard's central point is that

the 'status of knowledge is changing'. But he complains that computerization of society fails to challenge the general paradigm of progress in science and technology to which economic growth and expression of social-political power appear as natural complements. Any meta narrative of progress can no longer be assumed. In Lyotard's view advanced societies are obliged to direct optimal contribution of higher education to the best performativity of social system.

New technology finds significant place in Lyotard's analysis. He insists, "along with the hegemony of computer comes certain logic, and therefore a set of prescriptions determine which statements are accepted as 'knowledge' statements".<sup>5</sup> So for Lyotard, power and its self-legitimacies have everything to do with data, storage and availability. Control is enhanced by the 'computerization of society'. By reinforcing technology, one reinforces reality and one's chances of being just and right increases accordingly. Reciprocally, technology is reinforced more effectively if one has access to scientific knowledge and decision-making authority. The main 'metanarrative' in question follows the Enlightenment line that science legitimates itself as the bearer of emancipation.

Science, once taken to be the touch stone of legitimate knowledge, has lost its assumed unity. As science grows in to disciplines and sub disciplines it becomes harder to maintain that they are all part of same enterprise. Each form of discourse is feared to generate what homemade



authority it can. Scientist must be much more modest than hitherto; far from stating definitely how things are, offers only opinions. The traditional sense of 'knowledge' thus discomposes. Lyotard does not go deep in to the sociological aspects of his argument, though he does refer to some economics and political factors that affect the status of knowledge. According to him "Postmodern knowledge is not simply a tool of the authorities; it refines our sensitivity to differences and reinforces our ability to tolerate the incommensurable. Its principle is not the expert's homology, but the inventor's paralogy".<sup>6</sup>

The growing field of science and technology studies has taken Lyotard's insights much further in an attempt to understand the growth of knowledge as a social and cultural process. The field embraces everything from macro-level studies of, say the military shaping of major technoscience projects, through its micro-scale analysis of how scientific decisions about how to proceed are actually reached within the laboratory. Such social influences turn out to be profound, subverting the sense that some sciences are as 'hard' as their proponents claim. According to Lyotard, the harvest has been repaired by the advent of computer technologies in the later twentieth century. This have helped shift the emphasis away from the issues of intrinsic value or purposes of knowledge to 'performativity', the efficiency and productivity of systems. Computer printers are trusted as indicators of 'reliable' date and become the guide for

analysis of research and investigation. Indeed Lyotard observe the rationales or purposes of knowledge are seldom sought beyond the immediate.

#### **4.4.1 Legitimizing Knowledge**

In Lyotard's text of 1979, *The Postmodern Condition* he says "I have decided to use the word 'postmodern' to describe that condition. The word is in current use on the American continent among sociologists and critics; it designates the state of our culture following the transformation which, since, the end of the nineteenth century, have altered the game rules for science literature and arts".<sup>7</sup> Lyotard's *postmodern condition* is indeed a policy document. His remark on science, technology and education makes it recognizably so. In his words, "Science has always been in conflict with narratives judged by the Yardstick of Science; the majority of them prove to be fables. But to the extent that science does not restrict itself to state useful regularities and seeks the tenth, it is obliged to legitimate the rules of its own game. It then produces a discourse of legitimates with respect to its own status, a discourse called philosophy".<sup>8</sup> On science and technology, Lyotard observes that the most significant development in the second half of the twentieth century happened with communication. Linguistics and application in various branches of knowledge, cybernetics and its relation to computing and management, digitalization, informatics, transfer, storage and retrieval, genetic coding and its implications in biological engineering

and medicine are the cutting edge of later-day science and technology. To him “Scientific knowledge is a discourse. And it is fair to say that for the last forty years the ‘learning’ science and technologies have had to do with language – phonology and theories of linguistics, problem of communication and cybernetics, modern theories of algebra and informatics, computers and their language, problem of translation and the search for areas of compatibility among computer languages, problems of information storage and data banks, telematics and the perfection of intelligent terminals”.<sup>9</sup>

Computer is at the heart of the post-industrial body politics, with enormous capacity for symbolic manipulation and accelerating the technological transformation of work and where ever possible, replacement of labour by machine. In his words, “Along with the hegemony of computer comes a certain logic, and therefore a certain set of prescriptions determining which statements are accepted as ‘knowledge’ statements”.<sup>10</sup> Economic transactions are increasingly driven by commodification of information-a fact which presents the universe with great challenge and possibilities.

For Lyotard postmodern condition is essentially epistemological; that means connected with production and legitimation of knowledge. In modern Western world, science has become the touch stone of knowledge. He says, “Knowledge is and will be produced in order to be sold, it is and

will be consumed in order to be valorised in a new production: in both case, the goal is exchange. Knowledge ceases to be an end in itself; it loses its 'use-value'".<sup>11</sup> Traditional knowledge was legitimized by the authority of religion. Science was the only one way of knowing and thus displacing this form. Science has the power to legitimize itself. Other ways of knowing according to Lyotard, generally take the form of narrative. For example, the great world of religion tells stories about the world and our places within it. Modern scientific knowledge has typically contested the authority of religion giving rise to disputes that have been resolved with more or less satisfactory turns. Lyotard sees science and narrative as simply in commensurable ways of knowledge. He says, "Knowledge (Savoir) in general cannot be reduced to science, or even to learning (connaissance). Learning is the set of statements which, to the exclusion of all other statements, denote or describe objects and may be delivered true or false. Science is a subset of learning. It is also composed of denotative statements, but imposes two supplementary conditions on their acceptability: the objects to which they refer must be available for repeated access, in other words, they must be accessible in explicit conditions of observations; and it must be possible to decide whether or not a given statement pertains to the language judged relevant by the experts".<sup>12</sup>

Lyotard identifies two major narratives that have legitimized modern science- narratives of emancipation and of speculation. The later makes it

clear that scientist holds the exclusive right and power to legitimize their own work: 'science for science sake'. Narratives of emancipation have stressed the social usefulness and purpose of science and modern knowledge generally and its speculative nature has never come to forefront. Its lack of justification according to social unity has made it extremely vulnerable. Emerging with European Renaissance of neo-classical thought and culture (Fourteenth, Fifteenth and Sixteenth centuries), progress (Nineteenth century) and analysis (Twentieth century) - in the conventional periodization of the history of ideas-big stories have been narrated about the growth of (scientific) knowledge and its power for improving human condition. Lyotard narrates the meaning of knowledge thus - "what is meant by the term *knowledge* is not only a set of denotative statements. Far from it, it also includes notion of 'know how', 'knowing how to live', 'how to listen' (Savoir faire, Savoir vivre, Savoir encounter), etc. Knowledge then is a question of competence that goes beyond the simple determination and application of the criterion of truth, extending to the determination and application of criteria of efficiency (technical qualification), of justice and/or happiness (ethical wisdom), of the beauty of a sound or colour (auditory and visual sensibility), etc."<sup>13</sup>

There is, then, according to Lyotard, a crisis of narrative legitimation of science and uncertainty about the prospects for human emancipation in the postmodern world. Under these conditions, how does science legitimize

itself? Scientific legitimation is achieved now according to the criterion of performativity, that is, 'the optimization of the global relationship between input and output'. The computer terminology of 'input' and 'output' is not incidental to this observation. Power over knowledge production takes on the character of cybernetic cost-accounting where what goes must be necessarily and demonstrably justified by what comes out. Lyotard talks of 'the mercantalization of knowledge' in 'the post-industrial society' where there is 'hegemony of computers'. This takes us in to 'the real world' of investment in research and development. Knowledge, according to the criterion of performativity, is thus reduced to instrumental value. That is affect, according to Lyotard, and he is not at all sentimental about the ways in which knowledge has been thought to be otherwise

Lyotard, however, does not entirely dispose with critique: he just sees it as being rather limited and localized in the postmodern world. This is partly evident in his notion of Paralogy: it must be distinguished from innovation; the latter is under the command of the system. Or at least used by it to improve its efficiency; the former is a move (the importance of which is not recognized until latter) played in the pragmatics of knowledge. The stronger the 'move' the more likely it is to be denied the minimum consensus, precisely because it changes the ruler of the game upon which the consensus has been based. Lyotard's own declaration of the postmodern condition with regard to the fragmentation and performativity of knowledge

may itself be viewed as a paralogy, a move that was created a local disturbances at first in the humanities and social science, the larger implicates of which are still not fully appreciated.

Lyotard relates this directly to the use of computers right at the end of the postmodern condition. For him, and anticipating many subsequent debates, the computer may be seen as the means of perfecting control in the market system or alternatively and simultaneously, a means of popular empowerment through access to information, and therefore, participated in the knowledge game.

#### **4.4.2 Postmodern Culture**

It also become evident that Lyotard own conception of ‘postmodern culture’ is not like this of all but, instead somewhat closer to the modernist impulse of avant-garde art. He states this view paradoxically or should use paralogy: ‘A work can become modern only if it is first postmodern. Postmodernism is thus understood not as modernism at its end but in the nascent state, and this state is contrast’. More over ‘the postmodern would be that which denies the solace of good form’ (1984:78, 81). Scientific knowledge then may have become postmodern but art, according to Lyotard’s appendix to *The postmodern condition*. The modernist project of endless inquiries, creating new ways of seeing, presenting the un-presentable, has not lost force it gathered at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries

Actually, Lyotard wanted to show the shift in the realm of knowledge production and subsequent calamity awaiting human race. Lyotard discuss the way in which knowledge turns inhuman. “It is at this precise moment that science becomes a force of production, in other words, a moment in the circulation of capital”.<sup>14</sup> Despite the pessimistic and a political conclusion Lyotard somehow positively referred to the epistemological crisis evolved in the present world. In several debates on postmodernism knowingly or unknowingly the economic aspect was ignored-and there was deliberate attempt to draw that Lyotard was a mere ideologue of right wing philosophy of Laizers-faire or an anti-socialist. Contrary to this statement, Lyotard derives his conclusion by evaluating the economic condition which created a crisis in the realm of epistemology. He writes, “the prevailing corporate norms of work management spread to the applied science laboratories: hierarchy, centralized decision making, team work, calculation of individual and collective returns, the developments of saleable programs, market research and soon. Centres dedicate to ‘pure’ research suffers from this les, but also receiving less funding”.<sup>15</sup> Lyotard, talks about a world, which transmits inhuman ideology in the name of science. The incredulity in science means the incredulity in the dominant order, which prescribes the measure of truth and untruth. The quote Lyotard: “The humanist principle that humanity rises up in a dignity a freedom through knowledge is left by the wayside”.<sup>16</sup>



Lyotard, who formulated the methodological shift in epistemology and he pointed out the limitation of postmodern itself. He wrote, “It should know how be clear methodological approach. I am not claiming that the entirety of social relations is of this nature - that will remain an open social origins to establish that language games are the minimum relation required for society to exist: even before he is born, if only by virtue of the name he is given, the human child is already positioned as the referent in the story recounted by those around him, in relation to which he will inevitably chart his course. Or more simply still, the question of the social bond, in so far as is a question, and is itself a language game, the game of inquiry. It immediately positions the person who asks, as well as the addressee and the referent asked about: the social bond. On the other hand, in a society whose communication component is becoming more prominent day by day, both as a reality and as an issue, is clear that language assumes a new importance”.<sup>17</sup>

Actually Lyotard wants to counter the newly evolving hegemony in knowledge and there by open up new cultural space for different communities. The following quote from Lyotard shows this beyond doubt. He says, “It is the entire history of cultural imperialism from the dawn of western civilization. It is important to recognize its special lines, which sets it apart from all other forms of imperialism: it is governed by the demand for legitimation”.<sup>18</sup> Lyotard discusses not only the meta-perspective strategy

of western science but also the organizational of even universities all over the world. Lyotard shows how the logic of modernity rise up and he is very much critical about substance.

#### **4.5 Foucault on Historicism**

The concept of new historicism has been developed during the 1980s as a reaction to the text-only approach. New historicists like formalists recognize the significance of literary text but they also evaluate the text with an eye on history. In this respect new historicism is not 'new' since majority of critics have focused on the historical context of a work and based their interpretations on the interaction between the text and history. But in another way new historicism varies from the historical criticism. It is informed by the poststructuralist and reader-response theories and by the concepts of feminist, cultural, and Marxist critics. They do not view history as linear and progressive and do not think in terms of specific eras with definite time frame. In this sense they are unlikely to propose that a literary text has a single or easily identifiable historical context.

New historicists tend to define the discipline of history more broadly than did their predecessors. They view history as a social science similar to anthropology and sociology, whereas older historical critics used to view history as 'background' of literature and social sciences as being properly historical. New Historicism obscured the line separating historical and

literary materials, showing that the production of historical plays by William Shakespeare was both a political act and a historical event.

New Historicism shares with cultural materialism the conception of culture as a material practice. Close analysis of the social, cultural and historical situation in which a text is produced and viewed is the starting point of New Historicism. The literary and non-literary discoveries are then placed in creative juxtaposition to show how power transactions permute the production of textuality of literature in a society.

New historicists are profoundly indebted to the writings of Michel Foucault. Foucault brought together incidents and phenomena from areas normally seen as unconnected, encouraging new historicists and new cultural historicists to redefine the limits of historical inquiry. Like Friedrich Nietzsche, Foucault refused to see history as an evolutionary process, a continuous development from cause to effect, from past to present toward the end. No historical event, according to Foucault, has a single cause but, each event is tied into a vast web of economic, social, and political factors.

Foucault is often labelled as a postmodernist and used by other postmodernist thinkers. He rejects the label and his suspicion towards all the contemporary talk about far-reaching changes and the inclination to overact to what one perceives as new era should provide a warning for

contemporary enthusiasts. When asked about postmodernism he said “here I think, we are touching upon one of the forms – perhaps we should call them habits – one of the most harmful habits in contemporary thought, in modern thought even; at any rate, in post-Hegelian thought: the analysis of the present as being precisely, in history, a present of rapture, or of high point or of completion or of a returning dawn etc. I think we should have the modesty to say to ourselves that... the time we live in is not the unique or fundamental or irruptive point in history where everything is completed and began again”.<sup>19</sup>

Foucault’s explorations into the nature of language, culture and power lead him to forms of self-conflict and the limits of his own conceptualizations. Against the primacy of economy, social structure and material condition, Foucault comes to argue that power is formed through ‘discourse’ as it operates in human relationship and is experienced at the frontiers of individual forms. The primary focus of his thought falls then on the liberating enterprises for the individual subject. In his poststructuralist phase, Foucault wanted to show that his attempts would not slide away in to some other forms of discursive hegemony were the intellectual would ‘speak for others’, leading them into the artifice of someone else’s freedom.

#### **4.5.1 Knowledge-Power Relation**

Power and knowledge are not embedded in social structure. Power is a process, a matter of exchange and always challenged. It is unstable,

processed and forever switching direction. People and structures do not possess power, they merely transmit and it is experienced at the level of the body of individual subject- the local level of 'microphysics'

For Foucault appearances of power are the outcome of fundamental power relations residing in the discursive formation itself- the combination of a set of linguistic distinctions, ways of reasoning and material practice that together organize social institutions and produce forms of subjectification. Knowledge for Foucault is 'a power over others, the power to define other' ordering and structuring the world formed by institutionalized knowledge. He adds, "There is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations".<sup>20</sup> Various forms of knowledge are in the service of power and function as instruments of discipline insisting normality by regulating individuals' self-perceptions and behaviour. Knowledge cannot be neutral. Power and knowing are parallel non-identical concepts. This constitutes and is constituted by discursive practice in particular historical period.

Foucault, inspired by Nietzsche, claims that will to know is intimately connected with will to power. Knowledge lies at the root of exercise of power, while the exercise of power – also produce knowledge. To place it another way, power becomes a central dimension not only of repressive knowledge but 'supportive' and 'progressive' forms of

knowledge also are associated with power, and operate in discipline-inspiring manner.

Ideas of archaeology and genealogy explain operations of history. History is replete with imprecise and capricious detests: elements, characters and issues which discontinue as often as they continue. According to Foucault post structuralism, power, knowledge and discourse are the central contingency of history. Foucault's basic methods are to examine historical periods which for him constitute the building blocks of cultural modernism. Particular phenomena like hospitals, mental institutions, prison, sexual technologies of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are examined using his historiography to shed a border light of modern culture. Power/knowledge and discourse/power binaries constitute culture. At one point Foucault claims that everything is discourse and power is everywhere. According to Foucault, then, nothing in culture exists that is not mediated in some way by the meaning making of discourse (language, image, etc.) and its corollary of power.

#### **4.6 Deconstructive Turn and Language - Derrida**

Philosophy, as a form of writing, is inherently equipped to go across the socially determined boundaries. It is the peculiarity of language, which makes it, both subservient to the hegemonic ideas and takes a counter position to given world view at once. So a deconstructive turn in philosophy helps us to examine the philosophical text and find out the

potential and lacuna in such texts. Christopher Norris explains that “Deconstruction is a constant reminder of the etymological link between ‘crisis’ and ‘criticism’. It makes manifest the fact that many radical shift of interpretative though must always come up against the limits of seeming absurdity. Philosophers have long had to recognize that thinking may led them inescapably in to region of skepticism such that life could scarcely Corry on if people were to act on their conclusion”.<sup>21</sup>

From Plato to Derrida philosophers interpreted the world in different ways. All such interpretations can be deconstructed and directed towards their own mystification. The deconstructive strategy in philosophy reflects contemporary resistance movements in philosophy. It provides techniques for philosophical intervention and inspires one to overcome biased structures. The techniques for re-reading important texts provide new epistemological and ontological continuation by directing texts against their own arguments.

Jacques Derrida opened up critique of western metaphysics in an entirely new fashion. As Richard Wordsworth says “Derrida’s negotiation with the western tradition claims that his thinking, rather than betraying a reduction of political possibility- a retreat on the margins of a political community at the ‘closure’ of metaphysics- amounts to an active transformation of the political field”.<sup>22</sup> His writings produced a large array of deconstructive reading in philosophy and literary criticism. Derrida not

only introduced a method of his own but also propounded a philosophy of his own.

Directed against the system building side of structuralism, it fights with the idea that all phenomena are reducible to functioning of the system. He demonstrates the instability of language and indeed of the system in general. Signs are not predictable entities, and there was never any perfect conjunction of signifier and signified to generate unproblematic communication – some ‘slippage’ of meaning always occurred.

Derrida suggests a critique of the ideal of representation by recalling the suppressed term (the defined term) that provides the style and thus allows the positive term to appear, to stand for an existing object. When the suppressed term is given values the dependency of the positive term on the negative is shown and a third term is recovered, which shows a way of world-making that is not dependent on the opposition of the first two. It means that one’s agreement with a particular text need not remain an agreement in all aspects. A humanistic text, for instance may turn anti women in its deconstructive reading. In a broad sense the text may be upholding humanism where as it hides male dominant ambition and presuppositions. In the same way with a deconstructive approach a feminist reading of a man-made text will reveal the gender prejudice inherent in the text. As a result, philosophy has become a re-reading rather than repeating the question of the ultimate truth. It is a two way process. On the one hand



old philosophical texts attaining new status a result of new reading and an emerging new philosophy bringing forth added vigour and energy for political and cultural intervention on the other. It thus becomes a reworking of the history of philosophy like postmodernism that reworks modernity. Deconstruction stands for an analysis that shows how a discourse undermines the philosophy it asserts or the hierarchical oppositions on which it relies by hiding the rhetorical operations behind the argument or key concept.

For Jacques Derrida it is a question of 'Texts'. He raises crucial quarries concerning what he calls the Western philosophical tradition. Cultural life involves texts we produce that intersect other texts in ways we cannot predict. The task of 'deconstruction' is to question persistently our own texts and those of others, to show that no texts are settled or stable. Thus logocentric stance of modernity is radically disrupted by stressing the indeterminacy of language. Deconstructive approach does not categorize texts as literary or philosophical and in its search it reveals the culture of society. The task of philosophy is actually to reflect the culture of which it is a part. It carries dominant ruling ideas as well as its oppositions. Deconstruction attempts to remove the demarcating line between the signifier and the signified. For Derrida there are "two heterogeneous ways of erasing the difference between the signifier and the signified: one the classic way, consists in reducing or deriving the signifier, that is to say

ultimately in submitting the sign to thought; the other, the one we are using here against the first one, consists in putting in to question the system in which the preceding reduction functioned: first and foremost the opposition between the sensible and the intelligible”.<sup>23</sup> The deconstructive method and practice in philosophy has produced essential changes in the approach towards studying texts.

Christopher Norris suggests, “Deconstruction draws no line between the kind of close reading appropriate to a ‘literary’ text and the strategies required to draw out the subtler implication of critical language”.<sup>24</sup> The deconstructive approach may be applied elsewhere, as a way of viewing distrust of tradition, or the free play of desire. From this perspective popular participation in cultural production becomes more than an option, such that texts are networked and recombined by their consumers. Boundaries between knowledge and world, or text and interpretation, no longer exist. The mind is always renewing and redefining the text it tries to contain. This implies that science can no longer presume on logical coherence or comprehension of truth. This is applied to social science also long driven by the disputes over positivist and hermeneutic-interpretative-approaches.

As Edward Said acknowledges it was Foucault and Derrida who constituted to the new awakening in philosophy. Said says “I shall argue that Derrida and Foucault propose not only to describe but also to produce

knowledge of what will fill neither in to the prefabricated moulds provided by the dominant culture nor in to the wholly predictive from manufactured by a quasi-scientific method. In both cases, dramatically different though each may be from the other, there is conscious effort to release a very specialized sort of textual discovery from the mass of materials, habits, conventions, and institutions constituting an immediate historical pressure".<sup>25</sup> Derrida's critique of modern tradition and metaphysics has created a shift of focus from the core to margin of culture and ideology. It has developed a new space in cultural studies which Edward said and many others all over the world have taken up in their own contexts.

A good number of postcolonial writings have emerged in different parts of former colonies. Philosophy of Africa, Latin America, Arabs and India come to play a decisive role. The western centre is being questioned and there is an upsurge of local philosophies in various parts of the world even when mono-culturation resulting from the process of globalization is getting momentum. Understanding of the dominant, hegemonic culture and philosophy has provided an occasion to boost the writing and reading of such marginalized philosophies. By deconstructing the high/low binary Derrida has created an occasions to use the cultural space appropriated by the force of domination. Deconstruction of hegemony and its idols produces new meanings. The deconstructive turn in philosophy, therefore is a deliberate ethical intervention to safeguard the interests of the oppressed

and marginalized in the history of civilization. It is meant to comply with any paradigm or cohere with any system.

We witness how the most important ideas of postmodern thought also link the social and cultural. The concept that modernity must be revalued, revised or rejected is not related with actual social condition created in the wake of increasing computer and screen-centred technologies or the conquest wrought by consumer capitalism. The global culture created by the spread of electronic technologies largely relate to the dominant western ideas.

Whether Derrida would accept or not, his concept of deconstruction has entered postmodern critique. Just as Lyotard's description shows how scientists have lost status, so Derrida indicates how authority itself has been warned-cannot impose their own meanings on their texts which are not theirs. Once the text out in to the open, it is extended by others' interpretations, spiralling endlessly beyond all efforts that might be made to tether the text to truth or to fixed meaning. The meaning of the texts is produced according to the nature of reading. It opens up the possibility for many problematising authentic meaning and interpretation. The texts themselves will provide the means for re-reading and new interpretation. In this sense Derrida strove to establish that there is nothing outside texts. As he practiced each text will produce its own contradictions and blind spots. It is interesting that while some understand this as all knowledge is

contingent, or that argument on meaning is impossible, Derrida himself strives to ensure that his own texts accurately reflect his views.

#### **4.7 Postmodernism – Logic of Late Capitalism – Jameson**

Frederic Jameson is anxious with the cultural expressions and aesthetics allied with the different systems of production. He is not concerned with the mechanism of change. Jameson draws from the fields of architecture, art and other culturally expressive forms to launch his thoughts. It is important to grasp postmodernism as a dominant cultural form indicative of late capitalism. Postmodernism is set apart from other cultural systems by its stress on disintegration. He asserts that there has been a radical shift in our surrounding material world and the ways in which it works. He argues that all position adopted in relation to postmodernism could be shown to project particular vision of history. “Indeed, the very enabling premise of the debate turns on an initial, strategic, presupposition about our social system; to grant some historic originality to a postmodernist culture is also implicitly to affirm some radical structural difference between what is sometimes called consumer society and earlier moments of the capitalism from which it emerged”.<sup>26</sup>

Rejecting historical moralizing, Jameson calls for genuinely historical and dialectical analysis: “The point is that we are within the culture of postmodernism to the point where its facile reproduction is as impossible as any equally facile celebration of it is complacent and

corrupt... it seems more appropriate to assess the new cultural production within the working hypothesis of general modification of culture itself within the social restructuration of late capitalism as a system".<sup>27</sup> Postmodern culture, from this position, is best understood as culture in general, including contemporary mass-popular culture, media texts and everyday experience conceived on the model of force fired on structures of feeling. That is a satisfactory means of understanding what is going on controlling now than a limited and elitist conception of postmodernism which is indistinguishable from the memory and resided trace of Avant-garde modernism.

Jameson's account of postmodernism highlights new experiences of space and time and in particular pastiche and schizophrenia. In the previous case he contrasts modernisms use of parody and quotation with the postmodern practice of pastiche. Parody, he suggests, plays on the uniqueness of style. It "seizes on (its) idiosyncrasies and eccentric ties to produce an imitation which mocks the 'original'",<sup>28</sup> but in doing so it retains an implicit linguistic norm against which the original is being judged. Above all, parody returns a subversive 'other voice'. An imitation of a unique personal style rests on assumption about the nature of the subject also, which 'since the post-structuralist decentring of the subject, are no longer held to be tenable. Pastiche while sharing many features of parody, is in a sense a neutral practice. Pastiche is symptomatic, contends

Jameson, of a general loss of historicity, and our incapacity to achieve aesthetic “representation of our own current experience”.<sup>29</sup>

#### **4.7.1 The Periodization of Late Capitalism**

For Jameson, the term postmodernism does not designate a particular style but rather a periodizing concept which serves to “correlates the emergence of new formal features in culture with the emergence of a new topic of social life and a new economic order”.<sup>30</sup> This new economic order began after Second World War, that is to say, somewhere around the late 1940s or early 1950s, for the United States, and in the late 1950s for Europe. The key transitional decade, though, is seen to be in the 1960s. Jameson describes this ‘post-industrial or consumer society’. This is the society of the media or the spectacle’, ‘multinational capitalism’, and finally ‘late capitalism’. Postmodernism holds many of the features of high modernism-for narrative forms like constant eclecticism and sense of parody but to see postmodernism as a contribution of modernism will fail to grasp the reconstruction, these feature have undergone and above all will fail to take account of the social position of the older modernism.

Jameson writes, postmodernism and modernism, “the two phenomena would still remain utterly distinct in their meaning and social function, owing to the different positioning of postmodernism in the economic system of the late capital and beyond that, to the transformation of the very sphere of culture in contemporary society”.<sup>31</sup> In modernism the

domain of culture seemed to have retained an oppositional stance and critical distance towards capital. But postmodern culture has become fully assimilated in to commodity production in general, annulling its oppositional and critical stance. Postmodernism, then, is what Jameson calls a cultural domination, a notion that allows for “a range of very different, yet subordinated, feature”.<sup>32</sup> These include the remaining characteristics of modernism as well as emergent characteristic of postmodern culture.

Jameson’s periodization is ambiguous. Identifying the period with the era of post-Second World War is equating it with Mandel’s periodization of late capitalism and from late 1960s and early 1970s equate with Mandel’s second phase of stated accumulation, or possibility a new long wave. In his introduction to *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* Jameson tries to clarify this point. “Thus the economic preparation of postmodernism or late capitalism began in the 1950s, after the wartime shortage of consumer goods and sphere parts had been made-up, and new products and new technologies (not least those of the media) could be pioneered. On the other hand, the psychic *habitus* of the new age demanded the absolute break, strengthened by a generational rupture, achieved more properly in the 1960s”.<sup>33</sup>

Jameson goes on to argue that the founding moment of crisis for both the economic and cultural sphere was the oil crisis of 1973. In other words,



Jameson is proposing that we have to respect the 'semi-autonomy' of each distinct level—the economic, the psychic and the cultural. He acknowledges the reproduction of underlying tendencies of postmodernism by micro-groups and various 'minorities' since it "is essentially a much narrower class-cultural opportunities serving white and male dominated elites in the advanced countries".<sup>34</sup> Jameson even goes so far as to acknowledge that postmodernism is specifically North American cultural phenomenon, but with the rider that it is the first timely 'global' North American cultural phenomena. He asserts that postmodernism is the cultural expression of the deep structural dynamics of global capitalism and more specifically the cultural expression of the third machine age.

Unlike many other postmodernists Jameson tries to reveal that postmodernism does not mark the emergence of a new historical epoch but it is the intensification and restructuring of the social and productive relation of capitalism. For Jameson the term postmodernism does not designate a particular aesthetic or discrete style but rather a periodising concept, which serves to 'correlate the emergence of new formal features in culture with the emergence of new type of social life and a new economic order'.

He scientifically unearths the new types of invasion and colonization of Nature and unconscious. New forms of colonization is implemented through strategies like destruction of pre-capitalist Third world agriculture

by the Green revolution, and the rise of the media and the advertising industry clearing the way for a uniform culture of the world. Neither the postmodern economy nor the postmodern culture is to hitherto uncommodified areas that have brought forth unprecedented change in the realm of culture.

Postmodernism is a popular label for a rather broad spectrum of artistic and intellectual orientation, as well as claims about a range of novel social trends and forms. In the present context is Postmodernism as a way of grasping the unique features of contemporary (Postmodern) society and /or specific social institutions. A greater interest is to use Postmodernism as a philosophical/theoretical perspective. There are good reason not to mix these two project prematurely, although occasionally Postmodern theorizing may facilitate sensitive inquiry in to what are fragmented contemporary identities or a social world 'made up' of freely floating images.

E. P. Thomson (1993:201) follows a similar path, arguing that when concepts move away from their original fields and are widely dispersed, 'modernism and Postmodernism become conceptual catch-all's, conflicting quite distinct social processes'. Quite often Postmodernism represents intellectual imperialism, despite the claims to the contrary. The frequency with which the word is used creates the impression that it stands for something 'real' and significant.

Postmodernism is a successfully marked label. It is not the only word that is ever consumed or used to refer to a wide range of diverse phenomena or positions. This does not shield use of the word Postmodernism from accusations that it is extraordinarily problematic. The problem is not the word itself, but its institutionalization to emerge problematic intellectual moves.

On the other hand, people with a postmodern inclination may have considerable carrier problems in fields strongly dominated by conventional epistemologies, so the other side of this imperialist political move is the counter action as part of a defensive project. As with all phenomena, as advocates of postmodernism will have it, there is no single self-evident or best interpretation. The gathering of a variety of streams under the Postmodern label may be seen as a matter of marketing, as self-contradiction (as Postmodernism disfavour grand narratives), as a political move assembled strength against the dominant forces of the dark (modernism) or as something one should not.

## **References**

1 Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequence of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, p.  
48.

2 Wolker, G. (Eds.). (1997). Public Administration and Postmodernism. *American*  
*Behavioral Scientist*. 41:1, p. 9.

3 Kant, I. (1970). *An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment, Kant's*  
*Political Writings*. H. B. Nisbet (trans.). Hans Riss, (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge  
University Press, pp. 54-60.

4 Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1968). *Communist Manifesto*, New York and London:  
Monthly Review Press, p. 7.

5 Lyotard, J. F. (1979). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*,  
Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 4.

6 Ibid, p. xxv.

7 Ibid, p. xxiii.

8 Ibid.

9 Ibid, p. 3.

10 Ibid, p. 4.

11 Ibid, pp. 4-5.

12 Ibid, p. 18.

13 Ibid, p. 18.

14 Ibid, p. 45.

15 Ibid, pp. 45-46.

16 Ibid, p. 34.

- <sup>17</sup> Ibid, pp. 15-16.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid, p. 27.
- <sup>19</sup> Foucault, M. (1988). *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and other Writings, 1977-1984*. p. 35.
- <sup>20</sup> Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Colin Gordon (Eds.). Random House Incorporated, p. 27.
- <sup>21</sup> Norris, C. (1996). *Deconstruction, Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Routledge, p. xi.
- <sup>22</sup> Berardworth, R. (1996). *Derrida and the Political*. New York: Routledge, p. xiv.
- <sup>23</sup> Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and Difference*. London and New York: Pearson Education, p. 282.
- <sup>24</sup> Norris, C. (1996). *Deconstruction, Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Routledge, p. 22.
- <sup>25</sup> Said, E. (1991). *The Word the Text and the Critic*. London: Vintage Edition, p. 182.
- <sup>26</sup> Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. London and New York: Verso, p. 55.
- <sup>27</sup> Ibid, p. 62.
- <sup>28</sup> Jameson, F. (1985). *The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern – 1983-1998*. London and New York: Verso, p. 113.
- <sup>29</sup> Jameson, F. (1991). *Op. cit.*, p. 21.
- <sup>30</sup> Ibid, p. 113.
- <sup>31</sup> Ibid, p. 5.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid, p. 4.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid, p. xx.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid, p. 318.

**CHAPTER - V**

**PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF  
POSTMODERNISM**

There is a common belief that philosophy is a strong and difficult matter, because it is the definite intellectual activity of particular category of specialized or of professional and systematic philosophers. To start with, philosophy wants exposed that all men are 'philosophers', by describing the limits and characteristics of the 'spontaneous philosophy' which is proper to everybody. This idea of philosophy prevails in (1) language itself, which is a totality of determined notions and concepts and not just of words grammatically devoid of central; (2), 'common sense' and 'good sense'; (3), popular religion and therefore, also in the whole system of beliefs, superstitious, opinion, ways of seeing things and of acting, which surface collectively under the name of 'folklore'.

According to Gramsci, spontaneous philosophy is inherent even in daily affairs of human interaction. On the other hand, philosophy in the second sense evolved as a part of specialized thinking in almost all part of the world. People often confused the second level of philosophy with the first, which Gramsci called as spontaneous philosophy. A worker in automobile workshop repairs the vehicle without any academic training. In

the same way human beings in common, express philosophical outlooks without any academic training. At the same time philosophy evolves as a part of academia which serves certain purposes. Philosophy is always related to its own history as culture is related to the history of culture. Sometimes it remains as mere speculations without any practical speculation, without any practical implication and on some other occasions it imparts practical implication. Nowadays philosophy is real as a part of the academic similar to the other subjects and it deals with almost all aspect of life.

Philosophy brings about changes in the way we look at the world and from time immemorial philosophy has been playing this role. Marx's criticism was that philosophy has only here to interpret the world; actually Marx wanted to draw attention to the accepting nature of ideology and its penetration in to all realm of life. Still the role of philosophy in determining the approach towards culture is very unique and the criticism that it has just interpreted the world seems doubtful. A close analysis of philosophy's influence on culture will prove its role in changing the approach towards life and all that belongs to it. Philosophy in the East as well as in the West has used enormous pressure upon the society by presenting new perceptions. Until the dawn of postmodernism the philosophers had failed to imbibe the spirit of philosophical texts. This failure essentially, resisted from the blind faith that philosophy is beyond culture. At the present



academicians and common mass have become serious about culture and the relation between philosophy and day to day life should become the important fact.

Greek philosophy, after Aristotle turned from speculative metaphysics to ethics. But Hegel in spite of his originality in thinking remained merely in the realm of speculation. Perhaps this limitation of his immediate predecessors would have followed Marx to give too much importance to the practical aspect of philosophy. Marx sought to bring about change in the direction of intellectual debate from theological to life-world. Marx wrote: "The task of history, therefore once the world beyond the truth has disappeared, is to establish the truth of this world. The immediate task of philosophy which is at the service of history, once the holy form of human self-establishment has been unmasked, is to unmask self-estrangement in its unholy forms. Thus the criticism of heaven turns in to the criticism of law of the earth, and the criticism of theology in the criticism of politics".<sup>1</sup> Marx's approach towards philosophy brought forth an 'epistemological break' as Louis Althusser calls it. Marx wanted philosophy descend from heaven to earth, in the sense that it should get rid of the theological realm and embrace the real sphere of life where human beings confront life-world.

The shift in approach was not limited to philosophical issues; on the contrary influence of the new approach was universal. Almost all branches

of human science began to imbibe the spirit of these kinds of methodological shifts. At the same time a good number of thinkers and critique of culture continued to depend upon the paradigm of modernity in spite of their commitment to Marxist way of analyzing culture. Neither the case of life style nor in the paradigm of knowledge, thinkers could uphold the various traditions that prevailed all over the world. They even despised such culture either as savage or inhuman. In spite of their good efforts to homogenize culture, the Western culture rise above all, thereby is subjecting the rest of the world economically and militarily. Academics and critics used the word postmodernism in different ways – as many as possible – and appear to create certain confusions in the operations. Various ‘meanings’ ascribed to postmodernism are clear in a sense with many arguments raised under its use. The more confusion and slipperiness associated with the term, it conforms that postmodernism is a phenomenon to be reckoned with. The term postmodernism never rest in the same form, it spreads over every related areas of human understandings and texts. By engaging within these areas and circumstance it produces or redefines the truth and culture of society.

### **5.1 Semiology: Saussure–Barthes**

Saussure (1859-1913) spread out many of the arguments and interests of C. S. Peirce. Saussure’s work proceeds from the basic idea that the relationship between symbols (signs) and the things to which they refer

(represents) is arbitrary. Saussure's project, therefore, is to explain the operation of language, particularly through its relationship with culture. Saussure perceives language as the principle agent in the foundation and formation of structures. According to Saussure, therefore society, culture and meaning-making are contingencies of language and language structure. Language is perceived in terms of rational, totalistic and orderly frames which integrate the multitude of complex association and relationships describing human experience. Saussure, again like the early Wittgenstein, offers as a science of language. The science provides universal explanations for the formation of language across all cultures and contexts. Saussure's 'semiology' seeks to clarify, that is, the principles underlying the formation of any language within its given context. While these contexts vary across culture, the principles which organize human language do not.

For Saussure, the operations of language can only be understood in terms of the system of that given language. A system or set of structure will determine the discrete relationship between words and their functions in the sentence (syntax). A word has no meaning except through its relationship to other words and hence its deployment within a system of words. In Saussure's terms, 'language has neither ideas nor sounds that exist before the linguistic system, but only conceptual and phonic difference that issue from the system'. A given culture will have a particular need to discriminate between two or more objects or experience.

### **5.1.1 Structural Anthropology: Claude Levi-Strauss**

Beginning with a similar interest in language system, the French Anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss adopted Saussure's semiology for the analysis and clarification of culture. In certain, Levi-Strauss wanted to describe the unconscious frameworks or formations which bind and defined so-called 'primitive' culture. His analysis explores a wide range of cultural practices, including language, rituals, mode of dress, art works, myth and language. As with Saussure, Levi-Strauss realizes these practices as expressions of the essential culture. Perhaps the most resonant and certainly most frequently visited dimensions of Levi-Strauss's work relates to his account of myth. Myth however, should not be conceived in terms of 'untruth' or an unscientific account of spiritual reality. For Levi-Strauss, in fact, myths functions like language whereby individual myth must rely on the while system of myths in order to produce their meaning.

Levi-Strauss was mainly interested in the narratives modelling of the human mind and how the world is understood through those fundamental structures. Specifically, he believes that all myths share a common structure, one which divides the world into binary oppositions: good/bad, culture/nature, inside/outside, male/female, and material/spirit. One of the functions of myths, therefore, is to resolve these contradictions in narratives.

### 5.1.2 Roland Barthes and the Semiological Moment

Roland Barthes's work is often regarded as the relation between structuralism and post-structuralism. In precise, Barthes seeks to explain the ideological foundations of contemporary myths, arguing that particular narratives are so frequently represented in culture that they are 'essentialized' or 'naturalized' as absolute and common sense truth. In *Mythologies* (1973), *The Fashion System* (1990) and *Elements of Semiology* (1967), Barthes maintains faithfulness to scientific semiological principles as he describes the complex chain of cultural operation that produce signification.

In his later works, Barthes stresses the process of signification, arguing that meaning continue to accumulate over sign through what he calls 'connotation'. That is a sign might have its literal, primary or 'denotative' meaning, but through the operation of signification further layers of meaning are attached as connotation of the original. Words are literal, but their operation in contact produces meaning that may be psychologically, emotionally or ideologically changed. The word, 'black' for example, as a literal meaning, but further meanings connoted by the word's disposition in specific cultural, social and political contexts. These are what Barthes calls the secondary level of meanings. While these meanings may be unstable over time, at any given movement they will be attached to specific system of knowledge and socially constructed truth.

When the word, 'black' is attached to a person from a specific ethnic racial and social background, it may be connoted in terms of crime, vilification, prejudice or hatred.

For Barthes, these accretions of meanings constitute cultural myths. This myths or 'sacred-order semiological system' may also be understood as ideology. These predominant ideas, narrations and representations which are support dominant socio-cultural structure. For Barthes contemporary cultural myths form a fabric of belief upon which politics are built. A number of critics have pointed out that Barthes doesn't fully distinguish between myth and ideology, claiming that the two concepts seem to be entirely interchangeable. He does, however, point to the polysomic nature of signs. That is, their capacity to carry alternative meanings. Let's consider again the word 'black' and its attachment to a human type. As noted, the word may be used in support of a dominant ideology, a set of 'myths', or narrative which identify whiteness as the norm or standard for the developed, advanced world. Whiteness is often attached to the notion of goodness, purity, clarity, and enlightenment. Blackness, on the other hand, is often attached to the notion of darkness, poverty, marginalization, and so on. The white culture remains as the dominant ideology or paradigm on TV and in contemporary film. Whiteness orders itself in terms of success, legitimacy and beauty.

News stories very often present blackness in terms of crime, sexuality or physical performance. In several respects, black is associated with a narrative of essential nature. Blackness appears in the sporting pages of the newspapers. In film blackness is related to street crime, or as the sacrificial partner of a (benevolent) white hero-cop. Blackness is often anti-authority, presented through narratives of bodily excise and a wildness resistant to bourgeois standards constitute, Barthes world claim, the polysemy of the concept. Popular music has been particularly rebutted in its challenges to the ideology and mythology. Surrounding blackness, though in all media there are opportunities for repositioning the term's cultural connotations. Black people themselves have sought to redeem these connotations rebuilding their own identity as black. 'Young gifted black', 'black power', 'black music', 'black style', 'black liberation'-all expressions designed to challenge the prevailing order.

## **5.2 Post-colonial Intervention and the Postmodern Ideology**

The term colonialism is significant in defining the specific forms of cultural explanation that developed with the expansion of Europe over the last 400 years. Although many earlier civilization had colonies, and although they perceived their relation with them to be one of a central impression is relation to a periphery of provincial, marginal and barbarian cultures, a number of crucial factors entered in to the construction of the post-renaissance practices of imperialism. Edward Said offers the following

distinction; “‘imperialism’ means the practice, the theory and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distinct territory; ‘Colonialism’, which is almost always a consequence of imperialism, is the implanting of settlements on distant territory”.<sup>2</sup>

Colonial invasion was based on the power of superior arms, military organization, political power, and economic wealth. It was also based on a complex related variety of cultural technologies. Colonialism not only has had cultural effects that have too often been either ignored or displaced in to the inevitable logics of modernization and the word itself a cultural project of control. Colonial knowledge both enabled colonial conquest and produced by it; in certain important ways, culture was what colonialism all about. Cultural forms in newly classified ‘traditional’ societies were reconstructed and transformed by and through colonial technologies of conquest and rule, which created new categories and oppositions between colonized European and Asian, modern and traditional west and east, even male and female. Without colonialism, culture could not have to be so simultaneously, and so successfully, ordered and orderly, given in nature at the same time that it was regulated by the state. Even as much of what now recognize as culture was produced by the colonial encounter. Culture was also produced out of the allied network of processes that laid nations in the first place.



If colonialism can be understood as a cultural formation, so also culture is a colonial formation. But culture was not simply some mystifying means for colonial conquest and rule, even as it could not be limited within colonized space. Culture was implicated both in the means and ends of colonial conquest, and it was invented in relationship to a variety of internal colonialism. Colonial theatres extended beyond the shores of tropical rivers and colonized spaces, emerging within both metropolitan context and the civil lines of colonial societies. Cultures become essential to the formation of classes in society, the naturalization of gender division in Western bourgeoisie society, and to developing discourses of race, biology and rationality.

Culture itself, is an object of knowledge and a mode of knowledge about certain objects, was formed in relation to colonial histories. It is all the more difficult to recognize the ways in which specific cultural forms were themselves created out of colonial encounters. This task becomes even more discouraging when realizes that these cultural forms become central to the growth of resistance against colonialism. Especially in nationalist movement that used Western notions of national integrity and self-determination to justify claims for independence. In turn, Western colonized nations did not simply explicit colonized nations economic profit, but depended upon the process of colonization and colonial rule for securing the nation-state itself; developing new technologies of state rule,

maintain and deepening time of reform and democratization. Western control over the expansion of world capitalism, even attaining global cultural hegemony in areas ranging from fashion to the novel-bringing both colonialism and culture back in home.

Colonialism can be perceived both as a historical movement stated in relation to European political and economic projects in modern era and as a way for domination and violation. Culture can be seen both as a historically constituted domain of significant concepts and practices and as a regime in which power achieves its ultimate apotheosis. Related together, both colonialism and culture can be seemed to provide a new world in which to deeply a critical cartography of the history and effects of power. These enquiries are leads to the new realm of knowledge and practice like post-colonialism; actually it is a fight against the established dogmas.

### **5.2.1 Post-Colonialism: Questioning the Colonial**

Post-colonialism normally deals with the effects of colonialism on culture and societies. As initially used by historians and philosophers after the second world war in terms such as the post-colonial state. ‘post-colonial’ had a clearly consecutive meaning naming the post-independence period. However, from the late 1970s the term has been used by literary critics to discuss the several cultural effects of colonization. The enquiry of the controlling power of representation in colonized societies had initiated in the 1970s with texts such as Said’s, ‘Orientalism’ and led to the

development colonialist discourses to theory in the works of critics such as Gayatri Chakravathi Spivak and Homi K. Babha. The term later widely used to signify the political, linguistic and cultural experience of societies that were formed European colonies and it shape and form opinion and policy in colonies and metropolitans.

European imperialism picked up a number of forms in different time and place and forward both through conscious planning and dependent occurrence. As a result of the growth of imperial expansion there is an immensely prestigious and powerful imperial culture found. It is itself appropriated in projects of counter-cultural resistance, which drew upon the different indigenous local and hybrid process of self-determination to duty, erode and sometimes displace the prodigious power of imperial cultural knowledge. Post-colonial literatures are a result of this interaction between imperial culture and the composite of indigenous practices. As a result, 'post-colonial theory' has existed for a long time before that particular term was used to describe it. The term 'post-colonial' is resonant with all the ambiguity and complexity of the many diverse cultural experiences are implicated.

Post-colonial societies are still subject in one way or another to overt or subtle form of neo-colonial domination, and independence has not solved this problem. The growth of new elites within independent societies, often supported by neo-colonial institutions; it resulted the growth of internal

divisions based on racial, linguistic or religious discriminations. The present unequal treatment of indigenous people installer/invader societies- all these state to the fact that post-colonialism is a continuing process of resistance and reconstruction. Post-colonial notion contains debates about experience of various kinds, mitigation, slavery, suppression, resistance, representation, difference, race, gender, lace. It is reactions to the powerful masters discourses of imperial Europe such as History, philosophy, and linguistic and the fundamental experience of speaking and writing by which all these come in to being.

Post-colonial 'theory' has been created in all societies in to which the imperial force of Europe has introduced, though not always in the formal appearance of theoretical texts. The effects of imperialism occur in various kinds of societies including those 'settler/invader' societies in which post-colonial contestation is just as strongly and just as ambivalently engaged as it in more visibly decolonizing state and regions. By the term 'post-colonial' we do not imply an automatic; or a unified and unchanging process of resistance but a series of relation and articulation without which the process cannot be properly addressed.

The important and inevitable future of post-colonial studies laid in its relation to globalization. The inter-connection works in two ways: it cannot understand globalization without understanding the structure of global power relation that flourishes in the twenty first century as an

economic, cultural and political legacy of Western imperialism. Postcolonial theory is very useful in its analysis of the strategies by which the 'local' colonized engage large hegemonic forces.

### **5.2.2 Centre and the Margins**

'Post-colonial' has to be positioned is in the engagement with issues of cultural diversity, ethnicity, gender, racial and cultural difference and power relations within term. Actually it is a consequence of an expanded and more subtle understanding of the dimensions of neo-colonial supremacy both forcefully and ideologically. The discussion about the modernity and the emergence of postmodernity had given new way to contemporary philosophical understanding. It is a post-colonial understanding and the thought that questioned all the suppressed ideologies of colonialism and existing imperialism. In modernity and its theoretical practices were principally concerned or rounded with the concept of centre and they never come to an understanding anything outside or nothing outside the text or structure. Modernity never tries to break the boundary and not even bothered or considered about the margins and their struggle for existence. The centre is always strong whether it is religion, caste, class, state or other such forms. It has only limited concern about the notion of margins but it is very relevant in social consciousness forming. The subjects or notions which are marginalized will always try to disrupt the chain of their control

and always move to get free from the so called social and philosophical understandings.

So the new postmodern philosophical tools and concepts and its shattered ideology or perspectives help out the marginalized groups and it gives rise voice to raise the problems and the realities that they are face yet. This is why the postmodern ideology has relevant in this contemporary specific historical era where globalization and the market force are having the upper hand in society. Definitely these ideologies questioned the existing social concepts and prevailing conventional understandings of philosophy and the life activity. It questioned or problematized the subject like gender equality, ecological crisis, class and caste problem, problem of the marginalized, nation and identity crisis, white and black, high culture and popular culture, voice of the unheard and socially marginalized sections. Post-colonial readings, postmodern understanding and the deconstructive methods are very much interested or helpful for this sort of social movement. Deconstruction has introduced and conducted a critical enquiry in a new way of looking in to the margins of any text; naturally this provides readers to develop or try to break the conventional ideas and ever try to break the limit and initiated to go beyond the centre. In literature as well as in philosophy deconstructive readings produce hitherto hidden or unknown fact not as a result of the readers/critics bias as alleged by some but on the basis of evidence from the text itself. Instead of bias it is 'infinite

responsibility' to "distinguish between two disadjustment, between the disjunctive of the unjust and the one that opens up the infinite symmetry of the relation to the other, that is to say the place for justice".<sup>3</sup> Actually it replaces or criticizes all the conventional understandings and predominant political theories. These kinds of enquiries and deconstructions in each and every field of social structure produced new understanding and consciousness about the undermined reality. Naturally the question of gender, ethnicity, identities, marginalization etc., are acquired the ability to speak in the academic and social life.

### **5.2.3 Voice of the Unheard**

Who are the victims in a society? Who are living in the margins? The answer to these questions depends upon the nature of dominant culture and hegemonic structure of the society. In a capitalist economy where male domination is overtly visible women become victims. And in the same capitalist society labourer become mere instruments to produce goods and in a colour centred society white become dominant and black for the slavery. Civilized and barbarians, West and East, or cultured and uncultured and in the political spree the power is concentrating in the hands of the few and majority is ruled by the minority. The existing world is demarcated and structured through this kind of hegemonies and cultural power. The deconstructive or postmodern turn in philosophy, therefore, is a deliberate ethical interference to safeguard the interest of the oppressed and

marginalized in the history of civilization. It is not meant to comply with any paradigm or adhere with any system. On the contrary, its interest is to hide the actual 'plague' that corporate the common sense. Philosophies of postmodernity do not stand for a single principle of deconstruction or incredulity of metanarrative. On the other hand there are philosophers who claim to be the champions of postmodernism and merely propagate an ideology to nullify any kind of political and cultural intervention. Through these kinds of approach or critical enquiry we have the philosophies of the marginalized or oppressed and theories of dominant ideologies are deconstructed and there should be a philosophy form the soul.

#### **5.2.4 Thoughts of the Marginalized**

The post-colonial studies and deconstructive philosophy developed as a result of postmodern approach create an intellectual atmosphere to critical colonial and rational hegemonies in social life. It helped to produce struggle against the dominant culture and to justify the struggle against Zionism and imperialism. It also helped to dig out the thoughts of several marginalized theorists all over the world.

Every part of the world, people agitate against cultural discrimination on the one hand and on the other hand against economic oppression. Both struggles are essentially corresponding whereas the classical approach pushes one away from the other. Frederic Jameson writes about such a condition as follows; "A roomful of people, indeed,



solicit us in incompatible direction that we entertain all at once; one subject position answering us of the remarkable new global elegance of its daily life and forms; another one marvelling at the spread of democracy, with all those new ‘voices’ sounding out of literature silent parts of the globe or inaudible class, other more querulous and ‘elitist’ tongues reminding us of the incompetence of late capitalism, with its delirious paper money construction rising out of sight, its debt, much too weak and primitive a term and probably too ‘totalizing’ as well, particularly since it is now no longer a matter of the breakups of some pre-existing older organic totality, but rather the emergence of the multiple in new and unexpected ways, unrelated utterings of events, type of discourses, modes of classification and compartments of reality”.<sup>4</sup>

In all social sphere of life marginalization of certain people exists as a result of the hegemony of the dominant culture. Antonio Gramsci states of three different levels or type of hegemony. In one level, hegemony rests on the ideological unity of the economic, political and intellectual elites along with ‘aversion to any intervention of the popular masses in state life’. Therefore it results in the formation of an ever broader ‘ruling class’. The imperialism of the present which represents globalization in the realm of economy and culture-fosters such hegemony that the broad mass of organic intellectuals knowingly or unknowingly supports domination. However, philosophical intervention of the postmodern kind along with popular

disgust towards the oppressive order has produced certain resistance movement throughout the world. Certainly Marxism opened up a political space for evolving against economic domination whereas postmodernism prepared the space for the last decades of twentieth century the world become what Jameson calls as 'simulacrum'.

### **5.2.5 Diaspora**

Diaspora does not seem at first to be the sphere of post-colonial studies until examines the deep impact of colonialism upon this movement. The most extreme consequence of imperial dominance can be seen in the radical displacement of people through slavery, indenture and settlement. In recent times the movement can be seen to be a consequence of the disparity in wealth between West and the world, extended by the economic importance of imperialism and rapidly opening a gap between colonizers and colonized. The movement of refugees, in particular, has often reignited racism (and orientalism) in many communities could wide. Diaspora does not simply refuse to this movement but also to the vexed question of identity, memory and home that such movements produces.

### **5.3 Fanon's Intervention: A Cultural Turn**

Fanon questioned the European liberal humanist view of the subject, arguing that is the colonial situation, the nation, the tribes' people, the masses, the peasantry, and so on. These all are entirely dehumanized by the

violence of colonial reality and its discourses that they seem unable to articulate their own thought. Fanon is not simply a critique of colonial discourse, understanding that the colonized and colonizer are caught up in a complex web of relations; and though silent. The native is not completely silent colonialism wills itself to be totalitarian and the basis of a new way of life, but in contradiction its hegemony is based purely on force. It always prefers the military option-going to great lengths to separate the native and the European. And so it turns out that colonialism is not, in fact, is omnipresent as it first appears. Culture that has been destroyed, but just importantly they have examined.

Fanon was a critique of European racism and African decolonization is a period of radical possibility after World War II. Fanon's contribution in the realm of culture did pave the new way for a third world approach to fight colonialism. Identities turn out to be an important philosophical or cultural issue when certain people feel that they are either regarded or ridiculed. In the present world the feeling of neglect and ridicule is on the growth and hence the questions of identity make its appearance as an important point on which philosophical discussion all over the world develop.

Fanon's effort to escape the trauma produced in the minds of the natives and its essential result was an indication towards the future especially in relation to the colonies of the West. Fanon writes in the

*Wretched of the Earth*, “Perhaps we have not sufficiently demonstrated that colonialism is not simply content to impose its rule upon the present and the future of a dominated country. Colonialism is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native's brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of the oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures, and destroys it”.<sup>5</sup>

As a psychiatrist Fanon’s primary concern was the patient before him. He could see the mental world of the people of the colonized country to which he also belonged. In that way Fanon’s effort was to unravel the causes of psychological trauma the black natives were put to. As Fanon discuss in his *Black Skin White Masks?* The ‘Europeanized’ sought to reject the past of the natives and they got the status of ‘civilized’ by ‘aping’ and becoming mere parasites. Either they accept the westernization process or they feel the agony of lesser culture. Fanon writes, “Culturing Euro penalized but racially black African, they suffered a crisis of identity when rejected by the British on whom they moulded themselves”.<sup>6</sup> In reality, they inflicted upon themselves the trauma of high/low binary in culture.

At present, globalization and economic liberalization has often produced a reduction of nation-state to impose of transnational organization and networks of global capital. In quite a different time Fanon claimed that the end of colonialism would be truly expressed in the reformation and recreation of a vibrant national culture which had its basis in revolutionary

transformation rather than ethnic identity, with a future constructed by all who wanted to play a positive part. For Fanon, anti-colonialism was limited as united front against a common enemy. His attempt was to address this by developing new concepts and initiating new forms of communication and 'political education' which is the postcolonial society would be agitated from the bottom up. He says, "For my part, I refuse to consider the problem from the standpoint of either - or. . . What is all this talk of a black people of black neutrality. I am a French man I am interested in French culture, French civilization, the French people. We refuse to be considered 'outsider' we are fully part of the French drama".<sup>7</sup>

In fact Fanon's methodology in *Black Skin, White Mask* is fairly straightforward; race becomes the lens through which relations and theories of the time are judged. The honesty of his approach is illustrated in his description of the 'lived experience' of the Black who 'has two dimensions' 'two ways of being', one with his fellows and the other with the 'white man'. In other words, Black behaves differently among white than among Blacks. The behaviour is not ontological but a product of subjectivity, no reciprocity. The Black is simply an object among other objects.

The specific subject of Black skin is the desalination of the Alienation who, mired in a 'dependency complex', wishes to term white. Fanon's conceptualization of alienation is essentially medical, neurosis, but he employs it in a social context. Black skin can be seen as a thorough

examination leading in many ways to the same conclusion, namely the necessity of uprooting the condition that causes alienation. He says, “I have been led to consider their alienation in terms of psychoanalytical classification. The Negro’s behaviour makes him akin to an obsessive neurotic type, or, if one prefers, he puts himself in to a complete standard neurosis. In the man of colour there is a constant effort to run away from his own individuality, to annihilate his own presence”.<sup>8</sup> Desalination calls for annihilation, the ripping away of the mask and a reintegration of the human being presence. Because the Black needs white’s approval, it is impossible to defend against the lack of reciprocity through ego withdrawal. Consequently the black’s behaviour – which is not necessarily neurotic – appears neurotic.

Fanon’s effort to get of the mind of the inferiority complex is at first psycho analytic but this he immediately declares that because the Black’s alienation is not an individual question, his approach will be ‘socio-diagnostic, entailing immediate negation of social and economic realities’. The Black is a ‘crucified person’, maintains Fanon, who ‘has no culture, no civilization, and no long historical past’. These striped existences bring back the Black an inferiority complex. Such a complex is created in every people experiencing the death of their own local cultural originality.

Civilization is solely French and the Antilleans’ culture not only places one geographically and socially, but it is a way of thinking. The

racial gaze of the white seal the Blacks in to a 'crushing object hood' 'look a Black', says the French child to its mother. It objectifies and seals the Black face as a Black. The white others part the Black together as a photogenic object which expresses the repressed desire of European society.

Fanon states, "In the remotest depth of the European unconsciousness and inordinately black hallow has been made in which the most immoral impulses, the most shameful desire lie dormant. And as everyman climbs up towards witness and light, the European has tried to repudiate this uncivilized self, which has attempted to define itself. When the European civilization came in to contact with the black with the savage people, everyone agreed: Those Negros were the principles of evil".<sup>9</sup>

For Fanon the world of master and slave contains, because instead of an open conflict, the white master acts as God and 'grants' freedom. He says, "There is not an open conflict between white and black. One day the white master, without conflict recognized the Negro slave".<sup>10</sup> Fanon add that the Black does not become a master, but a 'slave who has been allowed to assume the attitude of the master', at a moment when there are no longer supposed to be master or slaves. In Black/ white context, a Black consciousness that posits itself as self-criterion, even if does not physically construct colonialism, can to a degree transcend the colonial mind set. Black consciousness, Fanon writes in Black skin "is its own follower' and

at the same time the very dialectic of internalization bring necessity in to the foundation of my freedom drives me out of myself. It shatters my un-reflected position. Still in terms of consciousness, black consciousness is immanent in its own eyes.”<sup>11</sup> Throughout the history of western colonization there is evidence of cultural hegemony whether it is in the name of colour or economic and other socio-cultural aspects. Colonialism hangs around here and made the people mere slaves by giving the idea that some colour is cultured and others marked as evil. So when one gets economic prosperity naturally they also try to become the ‘cultured’ in European sense. The localized or indigenous cultural conscious was destroyed and replaced it with the West. Naturally it leads to new colonization or indirect colonization through consumer culture or cosmetic industry. Essentially it produces the ideology that west is good and others have to achieve the goodness of the West. It shows that the process of colonization was still engaging in its agenda through new philosophy.

#### **5.4 Postmodernism and the Postcolonial World: Homi K. Bhaba**

If the interest in postmodernism is limited to a celebration of the fragmentation of the ‘grand narratives’ of the post enlightenment rationalism then, for all its intellectual excitement, it remains a profoundly narrow enterprise. The wider significance of the postmodern condition lies in the awareness that the epistemological ‘limits’ of those ethno-centric ideas are also enunciatively boundaries of a range of other dominant, even



dissident histories and voice-women, the colonized, minority groups, the bears of policed sexualities.

In contemporary years some of the most interesting discussions of postmodernity have come from a number of critics working on the border of post-colonial and postmodern theory. In the introduction of Homi K. Bhaba's influential work, the *Location of Culture*, he explains the discussion over the notion of culture and the contemporary world.

Bhaba clearly suggests here that seeing the experience of a postmodern condition as exclusively located and experienced by the inhabitants of the so called first world, that is to say largely Western or westernized industrialized and capitalist countries or region, the concern of postmodernism might usefully be thought through the experience of colonialism and postcolonial negotiation and struggles. Babha suggests that what are commonly viewed a characteristically postmodern concern might easily be found in the context of colonial and anti-colonial narratives and histories from the postcolonial world. Its proposals are based around the peculiar narratives and identities that colonialism produces both for colonizer and colonized.

### **5.5 Nation and Nationalism**

In particular the modernism or the modernist thought and period is famous for the destruction of landlordism and the emergence of

independent nation state concept. The concept of nation state is a product of modernity. Nation, State and its functionaries are formed and developed in the modernist context. Philosophies of this period also have the similar ideological background and it relied on the concept of centre. When it considers the matter of state and its functions there is knowingly or unknowingly marginalize the weak section of the society and will not look in to the notion of cultural diversity. States have the full power to rule and rebuild the nation and nationalism. The power becomes the force to regulate all the affairs of the state including the culture. So the rule in modernity is the rule of those who have the power to rule the rest of the masses as mere victims or passive inhabitant of the ruling ideology. This was prevalent and dominating force for years. Naturally it was questioned by the new ideologies like deconstruction, neo-colonial philosophies and ideologies. They are generally named as postmodernism by the American intellectual group. Actually it is a condition after modernism. But this theory worked out in this theoretical framework and dig out all the difference and its relevance in the changing society. With the new realization of power and it's decentring of people who were in the margins got much position in society. Regional difference such as language, beliefs, dress code, food, and custom also came under this scrutiny. This helped the marginalized section or sidelined strata to come in to front with their philosophy and world view.

## 5.6 Questioning of Gender Justice

The relation between ‘women’- a cultural and ideological composite constructed through diverse representational discourses (scientific, literary, juridical, linguistic, cinematic etc.). And ‘women’-real, material subjects of their collective histories – is one of the significant questions the practice of feminist seeks to address. This relation between women as historical subject and the re-presentation of women formed by hegemonic discourses is not a relation of direct identity, or a relation of correspondence or simple implication; it is an arbitrary relation setup by particular culture.

The similarity of women as a group is produced not on the basis of biological essentials, but rather on the basis of secondary sociological and anthropological universals standards. In any feminist analysis, women are considered as a singular group on the basis of a common oppression that which women together in a sociological notion of the ‘sameness’ of their oppression. This results is an assumption of women as an always-already constituted group, one which has been labelled ‘powerless’, ‘exploited’ ‘sexually harassed’ etc. Women of today are still being called upon to stretch across the gap of male ignorance, and to educate men as to our existence and one needs. This is an old and primary tool of all oppression to keep the oppressed occupied with the master’s concern.

The colonizer separated between male and female bodies and represented accordingly. Men were the main target of policy, and as such,

they were the nature and so were visible. The colonial process was sex-differentiated insofar as the colonizers were male and used gender identity to determine policy. However, race and gender categories perceptibly derive from the preoccupation in Western culture with the visual and physical aspect of human reality. The progress of women as an identifiable category defined by their anatomy and subordinated to man in all circumstances, resulted, in part, from the imposition of a patriarchal colonial state. For females, colonization was a twofold process of racial inferiorisation and gender subordination.

### **5.6.1 Feminism and the Construction of Subjectivity**

Movement against these kinds of oppression and subordination was questioned and deconstructed the social consciousness by the influence of the new theories that were evolved in this period. Feminism has its origins in the politics, meant at changing existing power relations between women and men. Its starting point, as Maddie Humen points out, is “the understanding that, all societies which divide the sexes in to different cultural, economic or political spheres women’s are less valued than men”.<sup>12</sup> As a social and political movement, therefore their theoretical developments have been bound up with demands for political change. The emergence of ‘second wave’ feminism, the term now usually used to describe the post-1968 women’s liberation Movement, was marked by new political groupings and campaigns organized around abortion, legislation,

demands for legal and financial equality and against pornography and sexual violence against women. But its areas also marked by the publication of ambitious theoretical work such as Kate Millette's *Sexual Politics* and Shulanith Firestone's *The Dialectics of Sex* (both in 1970). Both works offered themselves as texts of revolution.

Feminism is of vital interest to post-colonial discourses for two main reasons. Firstly, both patriarchy and imperialism can be seen to use similar form of domination over those they subordinate. Hence the experiences of women in patriarchy and those of colonized subject can be parallel in a number of respects, and both feminist and post-colonial politics oppose such dominance. Secondly there have been strong debates in a number of societies over whether gender or colonial oppression is the more important political factor in women's live. Feminism, like post-colonialism, has often been concerned with the ways and extent to which representation and language are crucial to identity formation and to the construction of subjectivity.

Feminism has always involved with the 'master' discourses with which it has found itself allied, whether they are discourses of modernity or postmodernity. The common and perhaps most general understanding of feminism is that feminism is about equal right for women. In addition feminism isn't just about equal right for women. Feminism is a critical project. It looks at all aspects of life to identify those elements that might

be oppressive and suggest alternatives. These movements' primarily known as first and second wave feminism and it begins in 1948 and 1960. In that the first wave focused on women gaining status as human being with full civil, intellectual, social, economic and legal rights, the second wave turns to look at other sources of oppression.

### **5.6.2 Early Feminism**

The situation was observed by the fact that it was very difficult for women to attain an economic independence, and marriage was one of the few ways in which women could secure their future life. All the property that belonged to the wife and all property that she received, automatically become her husband's. The financial arrangements of a marriage thought-out is, wife would bring a 'dowry' with her which was a substantial amount of property (money, valuable lands) as she and her family should put together. In return for the dowry, the husband provide the life with a 'jointure' the purpose of which was to maintain her for the rest of her life. Child bearing was a major part of the wife' role, be it to provide male heirs to her husband's lands and titles or to provide a source of labour.

Early feminism had its aim about women's equality, through admission to those sphere from which they had been excluded. At the same time she was excluded from the sphere of rational thought and intellectual discourse too. In the first place, it becomes clear that to expand such models to include women simply would not work, for women's exclusion is

not an accidental omission but a central structuring principle of all patriarchal thought. As Simon de Beavour pointed out in 1949, women in western thought has represented the other that can conform man's identity as self, as rational thinking being. The concept of self, she writes, "can be produced only in opposition to that of not-self. To constitute himself as subject, a man has made women as others; she is the incidental, the essential as opposed to the essential. He is the subject; he is the Absolute-she is the other".<sup>13</sup> Second, even if women be included within these discourses women only in terms framework which could discuss women only in terms of a common, male refined humanity not specifically as women's.

#### **5.6.2.1 First Wave feminism**

Modern feminism originates with Mary Wolstencraft's *Vindication of Rights of Women* (1792). Feminist theorist from Wolstonecraft has seen cultural construction of feminity as a primary source of women's oppression. Wollstonecraft writes that women have been reduced to 'insignificant objects of desire'; the category 'woman' is constructed in opposition to that of 'human'. From its beginnings, feminists has seen 'ideas, language and images as crucial in shaping women's (and men's life'). It has been concerned both to analyses and interacts on the construction of knowledge, meaning and representations. It has also been

engaged in the struggle to find a voice thorough which such knowledge might be expressed.

Nineteenth century feminism goes forward very much as a response to specific difficulties individual encountered in their lives. By the end of the century, major reforms had been accomplished, but the terms, 'feminist' and 'feminism' had only just began to be used. The two cases helped her long standing concern about the legal position of married women, while the growing number of single middle-class women looking for economic independence as an alternative to marriage drew alteration to their limited employment option. The first wave refers to the suffragette movement, which was seeking primarily to have women's political rights inscribed into the democratic process. The suffragette movement was part of a general middle-class agitation that began during the nineteenth century.

#### **5.6.2.2 Second Wave Feminism**

The second have occurred from the 1960s, where specific legislative and social processes excluded women from full and equal participation in public life, work and culture. This phase of agitation begins as the 'women's liberation movement' and evolves into the common terms of feminism. For Betty Friedan, writing the *Feminine Mystique* in 1963, feminism was dead. For those who followed her analysis of the 'problem that has no means' by taking up the challenge of naming and defining women's oppression, the relationship of this emerging 'new feminism of



women's liberation' to the 'old feminism of equal rights' was more complex.

The third wave refers to the current period, women's rights are now enhanced in legislation in western developed nations; within this legislative framework, however, the 'culture' and its ideologies remain fundamentally 'patriarchal', sexist and prejudiced against women. Men and male interests still dominate the culture, and women have to confront implied limits or their social and economic progress. Issues such as work, family balance, sexual assault, career impediments, political participation and income disparity continue to motivate feminist politics.

Modern feminism is often dated to the French Revolution. The basic objective of Feminism may still be the liberation of woman from gender-based oppression. However, the meaning of 'oppression', 'liberation' and even 'femininity' have become highly contested, most particularly as they relate to culture, life styles and choices of different women and female communities across the globe. The influence of post-structuralism, post-modernism, post-colonialism, psychoanalytic theory and new modes of political and cultural analysis has undermined several core assumptions of earlier models of feminism.

### 5.6.3 Feminism and Philosophy

Feminist philosophy began steadily in the United States during the 1970s generated by the unique questions and perspectives of first wave feminist on equality and, to some degree, second wave feminist on identity and gender hierarchy. Prime stage and crucial aspect of feminist philosophy contains in developing critique of the existing philosophical concern. Feminist critique in philosophy contains questioning the dominant interpretation in philosophy privileged by the western canon of philosophers. Questioning the way in which that canon has been defined by way of the exclusion of women, and exposing the mass-colonialist biases in specific philosophical conceptions and arguments. Conceptions of public and private life, equal right, the role of the family and material thought in political philosophy are among those critical for bias.

The association between feminism and modernity is not a straight forward one. Critics note the relationship of women to modernity and social theory as a modern project is one riven with contradiction and ambiguities. The failure of thinkers of modernity for feminism has been their inability to come to grip with 'difference' adequately. Feminism's critique of modernist metanarratives has been thrum in to relief by feminism's engagement with postmodernism.

Postmodernism and post-structuralism, with their stress on 'deconstruction' and 'difference', reinforced critique that had already been

directed at the 'essentialism', 'ethnocentrism' and 'whithericism' of branches of feminist theory. The problematic nature of terms such as 'patriarchy', 'women' and 'oppression' was for those 'at the margins' of feminism further highlighted in the debates within the feminist movement started at first by women of colour. The common use of 'black' as a concept was shown to take any cultural and historical specificity in the way it had come to use in Britain. The usage of 'black' had a political dimension and was used in a 'generic' sense to apply to groups who shared an experience of colonialism and racism.

Second wave feminists' theory failed to address the fact that there are different 'sites of oppression' and potentially different 'site of struggle'. It is at this level of analysis that Prof. Sylvia Walby (1990:16) maintains, 'postmodern critics have made some valuable points about the political danger in theorizing gender inequality at too abstract and general level'. She notes that sites of oppression for women of colour may be different from those of white women, and this may change the basis of gender inequality. As a movement, feminism has been concerned at the two key issues. First, it is to win citizen rights such as voting and equality before the law. Second, to influence cultural representation and norms in ways that is beneficial to women. Feminists have constructed a range of analysis and political strategies which to intervene a social life in pursuit of the interest of women.

#### **5.6.4 Black and Post-Colonial Feminism**

Black feminist have pointed out the difference between black and white women's experiences, cultural representations and interests. They have argued that colonialism and racism have structured power relationships between black and white women, defining women as whites. Gender interests with race, ethnicity and nationality produce different experience of what it is to be a woman. In post-colonial context, women carry the double burden of being colonized by imperial power and subordinated by colonial and native men.

#### **5.6.5 Women and High Modernism**

Kate Millett (1971), claims that the period from 1930 through to the 1960s constitutes a general reversal of the sexual liberation of the previous century, which had ended in the granting of universal suffrage. For Millett and other feminists of the 1960s and 1970s this 'decline' of feminism represents a certain slacking of focus, a sense in which the war had probably already been won. The emergence of consumer capitalism during the early part of the twentieth century had shifted the force of capitalism during the consumption women's labour had continued to be exploited, but with the emergence of the household as primary cultural unit, women were also being conditioned in to the role of domestic consumers. Advertising and the new electrical communication media were creating new cultural space for the exploitation and oppression of women-not only were women

targeted and positioned by product marketers as the source of and stimulant of new forms of household consumption, the sexualized image of a woman's body become a central motive in the new televisual culture.

#### **5.6.6 Feminism and Postmodernism**

Both feminism and postmodernism argue that the 'grand' or 'master' narratives of the Enlightenment have lost their legitimating power. Both argue that Western representations- where in art or in theory-are the product of access not to truth but to power. Women, as owners point out, have been represented in countless images throughout Western culture, often as symbol of something else-Nature, Truth, the sublime sex-but have rarely seen their own representation accorded legitimacy.

That postmodernism has sought to deal with feminist critique by offering itself as a 'framing discourses' for feminism is a point made by a number of feminist theorists. They have pointed to the fact that postmodernism's debate with or deconstruction-modernism has been conducted pretty well exclusively within and by the same constituency as before: white, privileged men of the industrialized west. It is a constituency which, having already had its enlightenment, is now happy to subject that legacy to critical scrutiny. In this debate the contribution of humanism, while acknowledged to be a key factor in destabilizing modernism's concept of a universal 'subject', is of necessity (re) marginalized.

### **5.6.6.1 Questioning the Structuralist Understanding**

Structuralist feminism has a tendency to homogenize the supreme and cultural continually of the respective condition of male and female. Post-structuralism questions the permanency of meaning process, thereby forming doubt over the opportunities and basis of structuralist arguments.

Power is considered as a formation in language and knowledge, as a matter of process and unstable exchange, rather than as a fixed and inherent faculty of structure. For feminist analysis, this means that the social construction of gender can no longer be perceived as a necessary outcome of social structure. The symbolic constitution of male and female is problematised as the categories themselves become contingencies of uneven and unstable language processes. Poststructuralist feminism, therefore, could no longer accept the feminist project which ought to overthrow the old structure of male-female and replace them with new ones. Rather poststructuralist feminism had to dissolve the fixed position of structure in total and open the question of gender to a general deconstruction.

Post-structuralist feminism, that is, needs to focus on the personal and unstable dimensions of power without reducing the complexities of sexuality to essentialist or generic statement. This means that post-structuralist feminism could not make broad claims about the way 'men' look or the way particular representation gratify a patriarchal system. Post-

structuralism attempts to dispense with the notion of 'system', as it dissolves generic and structuralist statements like 'women' are nurturers. Post-structuralism can then go on to explore the possibilities of new language formation, but without certainty or stability. The emphasis on language games and the immediate and personal experiences of language disinclines post structuralism from a direct assault on the structure of power. That is power is analyzed at the level of personal, the individual body and individual subjectivity.

#### **5.6.6.2 The Problem of Representation**

While opposing the possibilities of a biological essentialism which can be abstracted as a reason for subjugation, the French post-structuralists search for another brand of subjectivity. In many respect, the feminist theoretical complexity parallels broader difficulties within post-structuralism itself, most especially as it attempts to translate its notions of discourse and power in to political strategy.

As it merges with cultural studies, feminism has contracted the issue of how women are represented in texts, and how those text functions at political level. A good number of feminist cultural analyses have tried to reconcile the structuralist and poststructuralist approaches to the question of representations. In its efforts to present a genuinely political account of representation feminist cultural studies has offered a range of arguments about the absence, presence and nature of these representational discourses.

These arguments continue to inform and disturb contemporary textual analysis. They can be summarized as follows:

- (a) Women are historically absent/excluded from public discourses because men have controlled the facilities of representations. This means that women are absent because men like to tell their own stories about their own interests and object of desire. The classical feminist argument suggest that structuralist forces operate to exclude women from full participation while the contemporary textual analysis are make an attempt to amend this theoretical exclusion, it is still obvious in the arts, politics, business and commerce.
- (b) On the other hand, women are actually present in public discourse but this presence is not acknowledged because women's discourses have been seen as 'intention' to men's; men in fact, control the mechanisms of acknowledgement. Women actually tell their own stories, but the text are more locally disturbed, more personal or not appealing to man's market and popular cultural consumptions. The significance and value of these texts (novels, poems, conservatisms, short films, family photos, etc.) are not seen as important by hegemonic cultural discourses controlled by men. Women will not participate, for example, in the aggressive, adversarial political institution that have been established by men, women's politics are more personal and quotidian involving creature and community participation.



- (c) Men are not able to represent women accurately because they are not corporally or experimentally capable of knowing what it is to be a 'women'. This is the French poststructuralist feminist approach discussed about women and their experience of their lives and bodies are unique and can be only adequately represented by women themselves. The completion of women's own body and through artistic representation women are essentially different and must be given the means of expressing that difference.
- (d) It must follow that men and women experience their lives differently. As only women can genuinely represent that female experience, women should be absent from representation by men and men should be absent from representation by women. This extreme poststructuralist perspective suggests, further, that each subject and subjective experience is unique, casting doubt on the whole enterprise of representations.

So naturally these kinds of new exposure in the field of knowledge and understanding boosted the social consciousness and it gave us remarkable experience about reality. In truth the reality is not what we are seeing but what we understand. The new theoretical innovation including postmodernism in the field of culture and philosophy helped to evaluate or to make concern about the social reality.

## **5.7 Ecology and Politics**

As with issues of cultural identity are the global issues of environmentalism. The destruction of environment has been one of the most damaging aspects of western industrialization. Fact is that the ascent for modernization had entitled developing countries in to the destruction of their own environments. Post-colonial societies have taken up the civilizing benefits of modernity, only to find themselves the 'barbaric' instigation of environment damage. While the roots of the contemporary environmentalism may lie in colonial damage in both settler colonies and colonies of occupation, neo-colonialism, often in association with the colonial past, countries to produce clashes of interest between 'the West and the Rest'. For instance, area of land and food security and the well-being of humans and rare animal species may be at odds.

## **5.8 Critique of Phenomenology**

Phenomenology is the study of human experience and of the ways things present themselves to us and through such experience. Edmund Husserl (1889-1939) was the founder of phenomenology, and that his work *Logical Investigation* can justly be considered the initial statement of the movement. Phenomenology influenced many other philosophical and cultural movements, such as hermeneutics, structuralism, literary formalism, and deconstruction.

### **5.8.1 Phenomenology and the Issue of Appearances**

Phenomenology is a significant philosophical movement because it deals so well with the problem of appearances. The issue of appearance has become part of human question from the beginning of philosophy. The sophist use of appearance through the magic words, and Plato responded to what they said about these is very relevant. In science, then, appearance have been used and magnified enormously produce not only by words spoken or written by one person to another, by microphones, telephones, movies, and television; as well as by computer and internet, and by publicity and advertising.

In contrast with this postmodern understanding of appearance, phenomenology, in its classical form, insists that parts are only understood against background of appropriate whole. Phenomenology insists identity and intelligibility are available in things, and that ourselves are defined as the ones to whole such identities and intelligibilities are given.

The term closely associated with phenomenology is intentionality. The essential doctrine in phenomenology is the teaching that everyday act of consciousness we perform, every experience that we have, is intentional. It is essentially 'consciousness of' or an 'experience of' something or other. The phenomenological notion of intentionality applies mainly to the theory of knowledge, not to the theory of human action. These philosophical and scientific understanding of consciousness have become quite widespread in

our culture; and the egocentric predicament they force us in to sense us great unease. Phenomenology shows that the mind is a public thing that is acts and manifests itself out in the open, not just inside its own confines.

It gets us out of doors and restores the world that was lost by the philosophies that locked us in to our egocentric predicament. Phenomenology recognizes the reality and truth of phenomena, the thing that appear. For phenomenology, there are no 'mere' appearances, and nothing is 'just' an appearance. Appearance is real; they belong to things. Phenomenology allows us to recognize and restore the world that seemed to have been lost when we were locked in to our own internal world by philosophical confusions. Things that had been declared to be merely psychological are now found to be ontological, part of being of things. Pictures, words, symbol, perceived objects, state of affairs, other minds, laws and social conventions are all acknowledged as truly there as sharing in being and as capable of appearing according to their own proper style.

### **5.8.2 The Three Formal Structures in Phenomenology**

There are three structural forms appear always in the Phenomenological analysis. Those are (a) the structure of parts and whole, (b) the structure of identity and a manifold, and (c) the structure of presence and absence. The three are interconnected, but they cannot be reduced to one another. The first two of these structures are themes that have been developed by many earlier philosophers: Aristotle has much to say about

parts and whole in the *Metaphysics*, and Plato and the Neo-Platonic thinkers, as well as the scholastic, explore the idea of the identity within difference, the one in many.

#### **5.8.2.1 Reason Truth and Evidence**

The transcendental ego is the agent of truth. It exercises the agency in many contexts: in speech, picturing, reminiscence, practical conduct, political rhetoric, clever deception, and strategies manoeuvre. A special way of exercising the power to be truthful of course is science. Whether science is empirical or rhetoric, and whether it is focused on one region of being or another. In science, simply to find truth of things; the scientific enterprise is an attempt to justify to show the way things are, apart from how they can be used or how we might wish them to be. Success in science does not mean victory over other people or the gratification of our various desires; it means purely and simply the success of objectivity, the disclosure of how things are.

Philosophy is a scientific effort, but it is different from mathematical and the rational and social science; it is concerned not with a particular region of being, but with truthfulness as such. With the human conservation, the human attempt to reveal the way things are, and the human ability to act in accordance with the nature of things; ultimately, it is concerned with being as it manifests itself to us.

In science and philosophy it searches for truth for its own sake, apart from any other benefit it might bring. Both endeavours to try to reach the highest degree of exactness appropriate to the matter at hand, and not satisfied by which is just enough to get a particular job done. Philosophy attempts to recover the original sense of things by a kind of archaeology, a form of thinking that accepts the cultural and categorical things present in our world and tries to dig through the strata of this categorical sedimentation. It tries to trace back the evidences that were layered once upon the other in our intellectual history; it tries to get back to the point when the primitive differentials took place that established what we now have given to us. It strives to move backward through the genetic constitution that lies within the categorical formation we inherit.

This philosophical archaeology, moreover, is not a form of empirical history, and it does not find its primary source in ancient texts, even though it has to make use of history and texts. Its primary source are the categorical and cultural things that we directly encounter, and what it attempts to do is to dig in to them as they stand before us, unpacking them down to their elementary categories and even to their pre-categorical anticipation. It attempts to 'unbuild' them.

Philosophy depends, then, on the fact that we attained truth but not the whole truth in the natural attitude. There would be no philosophy if we attained truth at all, if we did not have some right opinion and science.

Philosophy reflects on what such a rational attainment means. But there would also be no philosophy, no search for wisdom, if we know everything, if there were no hideousness, no vagueness obscurity error, and ignorance. The phenomena of darkness condition the possibility of light, and it also conditions the possibility of philosophy, which reflects on what light and darkness are. Darkness itself comes to light as much as it can, in philosophy. If it were to try to eliminate the darkness, it would become rationalism and would be an attempt to replace the rational attitude instead of contemplating it.

### **5.8.3 Phenomenology in the Present Historical Context**

Both Descartes and Hobbes try to replace the natural attitude by the philosophical. They think that philosophy can not only clearly but also replace the knowledge proper to pre philosophical thinking. This belief in the power of philosophical reason, along with this doubt about other forms of experience, is typical of modernity. Phenomenology understands philosophy very differently. It believes that pre-historically intelligence ought to belief intact, that it has its own excellence and truth, and that philosophy contain. Thus while Phenomenology originates with modern philosophy, it also takes a distance from it.

## **5.9 Philosophy – Modern and Postmodern**

Modern philosophy has two components: political philosophy and epistemology. In both these components, modern philosophy well-defined itself, in its origins, as a revolution against ancient and medieval thought. Machiavelli, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, prided himself on initialling new modes and orders in political life, and Francis Bacon and Descartes in the early seventeenth century, declared that they were introducing new ways of thinking about nature and human mind. Ways which require that we abandon our inherited and common sense conviction and take up a new method of directing our minds in the search for knowledge.

Phenomenology has nothing directly to say about the political dimension of modernity. Modernity involved not only a new conception of political life, but also a conception of the mind. In the classical writings of modern philosophy, are told that human reason must take possession of itself. Reason cannot accept what it inherits from the past or from others. Reason learn to conduct itself according to new procedures, new methods that will guarantee certainly and truth. All the sciences must be built up again on new and better foundation. Reason must even develop a method that will allow it to test our sense perception and make it possible for as to distinguish between the true and the false impression made on our sensibility.



During the first centuries of its influence, modernity expressed itself as rationalism. The name given to this period of its history and the style of thinking was the Enlightenment. Modernity promised a purely rational political society and a secure, scientific development of human knowledge. But more recently after initial proclamation made by Nietzsche, it has become more and more clear that the heart of the modern project is not the exercise of reason in the service of knowledge, but the exercise of a will, the will to rule, the will to power. As this might become more and more evident, modernity fades away and postmodernity takes over. Postmodernity is not a rejection of modernity, but the following of the deepest impulse in it. At the moment in our academic and cultural life, the natural sciences are still serving the project of classical modernity, but the humanities have been given over quite entirely to postmodernity.

### **5.9.1 Question of Real or Reality and Hyper Reality**

Hyper reality is a term associated with the effects of mass culture reproduction, suggesting that an object, event and experience so reproduced replaces or is preferred to its original: that the copy is 'more real than real'. In the writings of the French social philosopher and commentator on postmodernism, Jean Baudrillard (1929) hyper reality is associated especially with cultural tendencies and a prevailing sensibility in contemporary society. Hyper reality is closely related to the concept of the simulacrum: a copy or image without reference to an original. In

postmodernism, hyper reality is the result of the technological mediation of experience, where what passes for reality is a network of images and signs without an external referent, such that what is represented is representation itself.

For Baudrillard, this new epoch is dramatically symbolized by the arrival of new temporal and spatial conditions, a highly mediated reality or 'hyper reality' which renders all former social themes and accounts absolute. In arriving at this conclusion, however, Baudrillard seeks to understand its implication. The new mediated reality is double-edged, bringing together the ecstatic possibilities of unrestrained communication and an inevitability of loss and alienation. Thus while, other postmodernists celebrate in the ascendancy of mediated and prolific popular culture, Baudrillard's apocalypse is both hedonistic and anxious.

### **5.9.2 Simulacra and Hyper Reality**

Structuralist and poststructuralist theories might accept a place of 'reality', even though it may be highly mediated and barely relevant, Baudrillard extends Umberto Eco's notion of hyper reality, arguing that all is simulation – the imitation of an imitation. This proliferation of 'simulacra' renders the real inert, dispenses with the representational imaginary, and entirely destroys the need for empirical theories of knowledge. The hyper real is 'more real than real': something fake and artificial comes to be more definitive of the real than reality itself.

Examples include high fashion (which is more beautiful than beauty), the news ('sound bites' determine outcomes of political contests), and Disneyland. A 'simulation' is a copy or imitation that substitutes for reality. Again, the TV speech of a political candidate, something staged entirely to be seen on TV, is a good example. A cynical person might say that the wedding now exists (for many people) in order for videos and photos to be made – having a 'beautiful wedding' means that it looks good in the photos and videos!

In hyper reality there is no private space, no depth, sexuality and communication must always and persistently be experienced at the surface: "unlike this organic, visceral, carnal promiscuity, the promiscuity that reigns over the communication networks is one of superficial saturation, of an incessant solicitation, of an extermination of intestinal and protective spaces".<sup>14</sup> This state of communication defers for Baudrillard the fundamental conditions of culture.

For Baudrillard there can be no hierarchy of ordinal position, no battles between differently placed and empowered groups. Power is always and forever played out in the simulation of hyper reality. For this reason, he can claim in all seriousness that the Gulf did not like peace not only because the images were a manipulation of coded interests, but because there were no actual diversaries, no real challenge, no essential dispute in power. Baudrillard's postmodernity propose little political or cultural relief from

this pessimistic vision indeed. In the delights of his own linguistic and theoretic excesses, being 'seduced' by the imaginary and decedent sexual allusion, it never allowed to release ourselves from the sense that the present and culture itself have already dispersed into the waste of history .

Baudrillard presents hyper reality as the terminal stage of simulation, where a sign or image has no relation to any reality whatsoever, but is "its own pure simulacrum".<sup>15</sup> The real, he says, has become an operational effect of symbolic processes, just as images are technologically generated and coded before we actually perceive them. This means technological mediation has usurped the productive role of the Kantian subject, the locus of an original synthesis of concepts and intuitions, as well as the Marxian worker, the producer of capital through labour, and the Freudian unconscious, the mechanism of repression and desire. 'From now on', says Baudrillard, "signs are exchanged against each other rather than against the real",<sup>16</sup> so production now means signs producing other signs. The system of symbolic exchange is therefore no longer real but 'hyper real'. Where the real is 'that of which it is possible to provide an equivalent reproduction', the hyper real, says Baudrillard, is "that which is always already reproduced".<sup>17</sup> The hyper real is a system of simulation simulating itself.

### 5.9.3 Language and Culture

Generally Language treated as a given process of communication and as a simple matter of message transmission: a message and its effects on an audience could be simply measured by the ‘application of objective’, statistical method. The Frankfurt School also applied a transmission model, though messages were intrinsically ideological: media message always carried the political interests of the elites who created them. The material and political privation of the masses was legitimated through the ideology of mass produced texts.

Descartes, for example explains that knowledge is only possible through the removal of doubt, and by the application of universal principles expressed through a universal language, specifically the language of mathematics. The social sciences, developed during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, also adopted principles of reason and universalism. The studies of C. S. Peirce (1839-1914) and early Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951) provided a basis for ‘science’ of linguistic and, in particular, the emergence of the concept of ‘sign’ as a universal unit that underpins all language and language function. According to Peirce, a sign is something that stands for something else in the mind of individual. A sign may construct or ‘equivalent sign’ or a developed sign’ in an individual cognition. Pierce recognizes that the sign of an object will necessarily produce a further sign for the individual; he calls this the interpretance of

the original sign. A sign is not just a public notice like ‘keep off the Grass’ or ‘Enter’; it is a symbol which signifies for the reader some form of meaning. A sign, therefore, might be smoke indicating fire, a word or a visual image. A red traffic light indicate stop; the word ‘cat’ refers to a fully creature with four legs and an appetite. The reason why sign can present meaning is because they belongs to and operate with a system.

Early in his writing career, Ludwig Wittgenstein was also concerned in the universal principles which govern the operations of language. The particular, Wittgenstein was interested in the possibilities and limits of language, specifically as the world of phenomena is translated into a universal truth- a philosophical proposition. In the commonly cited of his writing, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicas* (1922), Wittgenstein ‘explains’ the process of translation, arguing that the logical forms of language must necessarily operate to reproduce the logical forms of the ‘life world’. “In a proposition a situation is, as it were, constructed by way of experiment... one name stands for one thing, another for another thing, and they are combined with one another. In this way, the whole group – combined like a tableau vivant – presents like a state of affairs.”<sup>18</sup>

Wittgenstein’s later work on ‘ordinary language’ diverges significantly from the earlier analysis of logical forms. In many respects the earlier stage supports the structuralist approach to ‘language games’ is closely allied to a post-structuralist paradigm. Wittgenstein’s great

contribution to the development of cultural theory is specifically defined as cultural theory of language and centres on his understanding of the importance of context and the imprecise nature of it.

#### **5.9.4 Deconstruction and Cultural Studies**

Derrida's deconstruction is no longer analogous to Barthes's 'deconstruction', in that it cannot and will not offer an alternative. Since no alternative is possible, Derrida's work has limited political interests, most especially when compared with ethics of Barthes or Michel Foucault.

Many critics have condemned his resistance to direct political and contemporary cultural engagement arguing that the elliptical nature of his analysis produces a witty but redundant form of rhetorical sophistry. This sophistry, because of its resistance to real world profiles contributes to the formation of a destructing and reactionary political field. Other cultural critique, however, have been seen enormous political in deconstruction for the location and exposure of the ideology which formations through language, most especially through terms of textual representation. In particular, cultural politics has used 'deconstruction' as a method to illuminate the normative values that inform representation of gender, race, ethnicity and sexual aesthetics.

The transformation of Derrida's ideas and methods for the analysis of popular culture is sometimes attached to the notion of postmodernism. A

good many of the discourses which celebrate postmodernism deploy various versions of Derrida's key concepts: deconstruction, difference and logo-centralism. Most particularly, this form of postmodernism uses these concepts to position itself against the prevailing standards of modernism: postmodern analysis deconstructs the high arts, scientism, hierarchical homogeneity and logo-centrism of modernism.

The present value situation is closely related to the postmodern developments in culture. Postmodernity is an economic, cultural and philosophical turn in the world. It is not a phenomenon confined to the West. As the development in science and technology is devastating and all-embracing the new phenomenon cannot be limited to the west alone. A radical shift from modernity is observable in every nook and corner of the world. During the period of modernity most of the changes were limited to certain developed countries. Unlike the period of modernity postmodernity prevails all over the world.

Postmodernity is the present state of existence especially in respect of culture. All the traditional questions and answers need to be reformulated in order to understand the real issue of the present world. Postmodern is not merely the incredulity towards meta-narratives as Lyotard shows. It is also about a new global economy taking over and subjugating many nations of the world. To the ever increasing realization of the present world, the processes of globalizing economy bring about new developments in culture.



The new economic policies dictate a single criticism all over the world not only with regard to the economy but also in respect of culture and philosophy. To globalize the economy means to globalize culture. It happens because of many reasons and in many ways.

As a theory and practice everything influences the field of knowledge and culture. Male domination in the realm of gender and white domination in the case of knowledge are two universal cultural issues. There are similar issues, which people identify and fight against in the contemporary world. Such as the issues of language, the West and the East demarcation, political and ideological domination over the third world and its culture, cultural imperialism and other forms of such hegemonies are subjects for the philosophical enquires. Truly, philosophy has nothing to do with practices in the sense that it yields 'profit over people'. On the other hand philosophies always bring forth practice as it leads a hand to emancipate people from the chains of cultural domination. Philosophy critically analyzing the cultural domain and social life of a give structure and dig out the reality. This contemporary theories and practices are very necessary and it also incorporates the marginalized or depressed sections of a society.

## References

- <sup>1</sup> Marx, K. (1844). *A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. Paris: Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher,.
- <sup>2</sup> Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. Vintage Books, p. 3.
- <sup>3</sup> Derrida, J. (1994). *Of Grammatology*. Gayatri Chakravarty Spivak (trans.). Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, p. 22.
- <sup>4</sup> Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. London and New York: Verso, pp. 171-172.
- <sup>5</sup> Fanon, F. (1963). *Wretched of the Earth*. Constance Farrington & Grove Weidenfeld (trans.). New York: Grove Press, p. 210.
- <sup>6</sup> Fanon, F. (1986). *Black Skin, White Mask*. Cherk Lam Markmann (trans.). London: Pluto Press, p. 2.
- <sup>7</sup> Ibid, p.
- <sup>8</sup> Ibid, p. 60.
- <sup>9</sup> Ibid, p. 190.
- <sup>10</sup> Ibid, p. 217.
- <sup>11</sup> Ibid, p. 135.
- <sup>12</sup> Sim, S. (Eds.). (2011). *The Routledge Companion to Postmodernism* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). London and New York: Routledge, Tylor & Francis Group, p. 24.
- <sup>13</sup> Beauvoir, de S. (1949). *The Second Sex*. H.M. Parshley (trans.). London: Vintage Books, p. 2.
- <sup>14</sup> Baudrillard, J. (1983b). *Simulation*. New York: Semiotext(e).Inc., p. 131.
- <sup>15</sup> Baudrillard, J. (1981). *Simulacra and Simulation*. Sheila Faria Glaser (trans.). Michigan: University of Michigan Press, p. 6.

<sup>16</sup> Baudrillard, J. (1993). *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. Iain Hamilton Grant (trans.). London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: SAGE Publication, p. 7.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, p. 73.

<sup>18</sup> Wittgenstein, L. (1922). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, London and New York: Wilhelm Wald's Annalen der Naturphilosophie, 4. 031.

## CONCLUSION

The dissertation actually made an attempt to find out and analyse the relation between philosophy and culture with the intention of establishing the link between the two. In this effort the history of philosophy as well as the history of human culture was examined with the help of the tools provided by philosophy itself. In this regard the role of philosophy and the cultural arena were scrutinized and to a great extent it is made possible to find and establish their relation. The relevance of such a relation becomes unique especially in the present context when human enquiries and theorizations are not only belittled but also marginalized for want of immediate economic profit. Philosophy could never be evaluated merely in terms of monetary benefit since it acts as the very basis of human freedom. In this endeavour the attempt was not only to find the relation between the two but also to reveal the function of philosophy itself.

Philosophy as a branch of knowledge has been interpreting the nature and culture from ancient period onwards. It is the quest of knowing the unknown which inspired man to think consistently and formulate the knowledge in different ways. It is not merely the need or necessity which persuaded man to philosophize but the eagerness and enthusiasm to understand the world. Here, in this study 'the world' stands for the life-

world as conceived by Husserl or the world as conceived by Marx. It means that it includes the surroundings of man, his/her relation with nature and the way he/she progresses towards freedom. So naturally it is the ensemble of all signs of nature and culture. The signs constructed and construed by man and the signs which exist even without being produced by her/him. Hence it is clear that here the life-world stands for whatever is knowingly or unknowingly related to man. It may be physical or meta-physical. It may be individual or social. It may be subjective or objective. Since philosophy as a discourse embraces all these aspects of life-world its relation with culture is inevitable.

The epistemological and ontological concerns of human beings bring forth new and better understanding of different phenomena. At the same time it does not mean that it enables man to get rid of philosophical quest for knowledge. The eternity and infinity are two inevitable factors which leaves lots more yet to be known. In the history of human culture each stage created the impression that man has reached the peak of the universe. With the advent of modern technology and science man even boasted himself/herself that everything is under him/her. It consequently created an anthropomorphic world view. However man comes to realize that the unknown phenomena are more than what is known. So, critical enquiry leading to philosophical interpretations becomes part and parcel of human culture.

The philosophical discourses have implication in religion, politics and even scientific approaches. Human social situation is in many ways inextricably related to culture. Any society is known in the name of culture. Mostly it is related to language. But it need not be always in terms of language. In the case of linguistic identity it becomes wider in some cases and narrower in some other cases. At the same time religion, colour, gender and caste become cultural identities. The Jews does not stand for the White even though most of them are White. Similarly the West does not signify women. So the identity in terms of culture always depends upon the interpretation. It is somehow philosophizing.

As Fredric Jameson mentioned as far as the demarcation from one society and other remains, culture becomes even a tool to identify the people. So it is the 'other' who is more aware of the culture as an identity. The Western culture is closely related to the philosophical discourses prevalent in the West. Likewise The East also manifests the philosophical attitudes in the culture. By exploring the relation between philosophy and culture we may be able to transcend many of the misapprehensions. A closer analysis of the relation shows that philosophers have been not only interpreting the world but also changing it with their interpretation.

Culture is what signifies a social message. It is a social construct. Actually it is something part of philosophy as well. From Plato onwards intellectual dialogues pertaining to man and world, culture and nature, good

and evil, truth and false, beauty and ugly, polity and justice are discussed. It includes not only the knowledge but also the unknown. However the horizon of philosophy is so wide that it has been exalted. In culture actually human effort is to make solid life possible. It includes language and all that belongs to communication. On some occasion philosophy becomes part of culture and culture part of philosophy.

In the period of modernity there was struggle in the field of culture, which took place in the name of renaissance. Actually renaissance in the west was a phenomenon closely related to fulfilment of justice. It was an epistemological issue as well as ethical concern. It was epistemological since it wanted to break the tradition of keeping knowledge away from the public. In this regard the tradition related to feudal life had deliberately created a mystic aura around 'knowability'. Antonio Gramsci realized the kind of hegemony which ruled the kingdom of knowledge. As we know even from Francis Bacon there was effort to bring forth clear and distinct ideas as it was envisaged by Descartes. However the modernity and the liberal ideas prevalent in Europe could not overcome the mystic aura remaining in the realm of epistemology.

In the realm of culture the effort of each community is to maintain their social life and uphold social justice, at the same time the ruling class always wants to keep up the supremacy of certain ideology to subjugate the people. Accordingly the majority are always culturally inferior in any



society. Aristotle in spite of his vast erudition could not see the injustice inherent in slavery and gender inequality. Similarly in the history of philosophy we find many canonical texts with justification of several kinds of social injustices. So the problem concerning justice in society becomes very complex. It is simultaneously related to culture and philosophy. Aristotle justified slavery in a society which supported a culture having slaves and owners. So the reflection of culture is always part and parcel of philosophy. It is in this sense Marx criticized philosophers for their failure to understand the inverted nature of consciousness. Later we find good number of thinkers like Gramsci, Althusser, Lacan, Deleuze, Slavoj Zizek, Raymond Williams, Foucault, Derrida, Terry Eagleton, Frederic Jameson and many more undertaking the responsibility of criticizing philosophical and cultural spheres of social life. Hence both culture and philosophy advances towards better understanding.

Actually culture is not different from philosophy because every cultural product such as art or literature expresses philosophical aspects of human life. Philosophy as an autonomous branch of life exists as far as it is capable of yielding new concepts. At the same time philosophy becomes a way of life since it acts as the 'weltenshaang'. The relation between philosophy and culture is dialectical. In any society the major cultural products exhibit the dominant philosophy of the period. During the period of modernity the cultural products and important philosophical texts

expressed similar perspectives. Similarly when Marxism and the related doctrine of class struggle disseminated throughout the world, both philosophical cultural texts represented the same message. Likewise the philosophy of existentialism had its impact or vice versa in literature and art. Even in the case of later cultural products such as cinema we find a kind of mutual dependence between philosophy and films.

In the period of postmodern developments the textual readings became an important critical tool in the hands of philosophers and writers. The philosopher like Derrida and novelist like Calvino used the same way of approaching reality by reading dominant texts. Really the recent development in reading showed the way of erasing the demarcation between culture and philosophy. Plato had claimed superiority of philosophy over culture. Modern philosopher also followed the path of Plato to hail philosophy as a superior kind of knowledge. The deconstructive turn really opened up a new vision showing how the texts are actually 'writing' whether it is philosophy or literature. The demarcation between different discourses disappears with the concept of writing. A symbol inscribed on a tree or stone in Indus Valley culture and a story written by contemporary writer is not different from the perspective of writing. In other words it is being inscribed and thereby it conveys a meaning depending upon its reading. In this sense in the history of philosophy and culture, reading becomes the most important performance

which produces meaning in any society. It is the dominant meaning which describes a phenomenon. A symbol or icon becomes superior or inferior depending upon the way of its reading. It is in this sense; Derrida considers a word like an 'orphan'. The orphan grows according to the parental care or situation where he /she would reach. Similar is the case with any symbol or icon which generates meaning according to the textual practice. So the deconstructive turn actually paves the way to understand both culture and philosophy from a new perspective. Their mutual relation depends up on their material potential to generate meaning. In so far as it is relating to the ruling ideology and its power to control the subjects and to reign over the society is undisputable. The line of demarcation between philosophy and culture is really getting problematized in the new context. Derrida's journey through western philosophy claims a ways for us to dig in to the realities and bring to light the pitfalls yet unknown to or hidden from philosophy.

As Derrida shows, philosophy too belongs to writings. It is something, which needs special attention because like other writings philosophy also entails the potential inherent in writing. As he shows irrespective of the genre, writings act as a reality. It is in the form of language that we confront writing. 'Language is as old as consciousness, language is practical, real consciousness's that exist for other men as well, and only therefore does it also exist for me; language, like consciousness, only arises from the need, the necessity of intercourse with other man'.

In the present thesis the effort was to go through the history of philosophy and culture and find out their interdependence. Unlike other knowledge forms philosophy is found to be inevitably related to culture. So the economy based analysis or profit centred prioritization is irrelevant with regard to philosophy. As an indispensable part of life the topic should survive despite the hurdled in the present world.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acuff, F. G., & Allen, D. E. (1973). *From Man to Society – Introductory Sociology*. Oklahoma State University, Lloyd A Taylor Philip University, The Dayden Press Hinsdale, Iflions.
- Althusser, L. (2001). *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press, Aakar Books for South Asia, 2006.
- Alvesson, M. (2002). *Postmodernism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Aquinas, T. (1942). *Summa Theologiae*, Oates and Washbourne (trans.). Burns, London: English Dominican Fathers.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (Eds.). (1995). *The post-colonial studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (Eds.). (2004). *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. London and New York: Rutledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Bacon, F. (2000). *The New Organon*. Lisa Jardine & Michael Silverthorne (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Barker, C. (2008). *Cultural studies, Theory and Practice* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore: SAGE Publication.
- Barker, E. (1967). *Principles of Social and Political Theory*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Barker, E. (Eds.). (1962). *Social Contract: Essays by Locke, Hume Rousseau*. USA: Oxford University Press, see introduction.
- Barnard, A., & Spencer, J. (1996). *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. London: Rutledge, p. 136.
- Baudrillard, J. (1981). *Simulacra and Simulation*. Sheila Faria Glaser (Trans.). Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Baudrillard, J. (1983b). *Simulation*. New York: Semiotext(e).Inc., p. 131.
- Baudrillard, J. (1993). *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. Iain Hamilton Grant (trans.). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publication.
- Beauvoir, de S. (1949). *The Second Sex*. H.M. Parshley (trans.). London: Vintage Books.
- Berardworth, R. (1996). *Derrida and the Political*. New York: Routledge.
- Bertens, H., & Natoli, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Postmodernism – Key figures*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Berys, D. & Lopes, M. (Eds.). (2001). *The Routledge Companion to Aesthetics*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Bogomolov, A. S. (1985). *History of Ancient Philosophy - Greece and Rome*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Brooks, A. (1997). *Post-feminism - Feminism, Cultural Theory and Cultural Forms*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Cahoone, L. (Eds.). (1996). *From Modernism to Postmodernism – An Anthology*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Conford, F. M. (1941). *The Republic of Plato*. London, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cooper, J. M., & Hutchinson, D. S. (Eds.). (1997). *Plato's Apology, Plato's Collected Works*. Indianapolis/ Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Cuzzort, R. P. (1969). *Humanity and Modern Sociologist Thought*. New York: HOH, Rinehart and Winston.
- Danaher, G., Schirate, T., & Webb, J. (2000). *Understanding Foucault*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publication.
- Datta, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Socratic Movement in Philosophy*. New Delhi: Rajat Publication.
- Delanty, G. (2000). *Modernity and Postmodernity, Knowledge, Power and the Self*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: SAGE Publication.

- Deol, D. (1976, 1982). *Liberalism and Marxism: An Introduction to the Study of Contemporary Politics*. New Delhi, Bangalore and Jullundur: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and Difference*. New York: Pearson Education Publishers.
- Derrida, J. (1994). *Of Grammatology*. Gayatri Chakravarty Spivak (Trans.). Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1929). *Experience and Nature*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Dewey, J. (1987). *Art as Experience*. Carbondale: Southern Illusion University Press.
- Dews, P. (1987-2007). *Logic of Disintegration*. London and New York: Verso.
- Drucker, H. M. (1974). *The Political use of Ideology*. London: Macmillan.
- Dunning, W. A. (1931). *A History of Political Theories* (Vol. 3). London: Macmillan.
- Durant, W. (1926). *Story of Philosophy*. New York.
- During, S. (1993-2001). *The Cultural Studies Reader* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Eagleton, T. (2000). *The Idea of Culture*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.



- Eagleton, T. (2000/1991). *Ideology: An Introduction*. London and New York: Verso.
- Fanon, F. (1963). *Wretched of the Earth*. Constance Farrington and Grove Weidenfeld (trans.). New York: Grove Press.
- Fanon, F. (1986). *Black Skin, White Mask*. Cherks Lam Markmann (trans.). London: Pluto Press.
- Featherstone, M. (1991). *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. London, Newbury Park and New Delhi: SAGE Publication.
- Finer, S. E. (1970). *Comparative Government*. London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press.
- Foster, M. B. (1975). *Masters of Political Thought (Vol. 1). Plato to Machiavelli*. Delhi, Bombay, Madras, Calcutta: Oxford University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Colin Gordon (Eds.). Random House Incorporated.
- Foucault, M. (1988). *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and other Writings, 1977-1984*.
- Freeden, M. (2003). *Ideology: A very short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

- Frost Jr, S. E. (1972). *Master Works of Philosophy* (Vol. 1). New York, London, New Delhi, Singapore: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Gambles, S. (2001). *The Rutledge Companion to Feminisms and Post-feminism*. London and New York: Rutledge, Taylor & Fancies Group.
- Gant, B., & Lopes, D. M. (2001). *The Rutledge Companion to Aristotle*. London: Routledge.
- Gare, A. E. (1995). *Postmodernism and the Environmental Crises*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Gaut, B., & Lopes, D. M. (Eds.). (2001). *The Routledge Companion to Aesthetics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Geertz, C. (1965). The Impact of the Concept of Culture on the Concept of Man. In J. Platt (Eds.) *New Views of the Nature of Man*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gibson, N. C. (2003). *Key Contemporary Thinkers Fanon - The Postmodern Imagination*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequence of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giles, J., & Middleton, T. (1999). *Studying Culture - A Practical Introduction*. U.S.A: Blackwell Publishers.

- Gramsci, A. (2010). *Selections from the Prison Note Books*. Quintin Hoare & Geoffery Nowell Smith (Eds. and trans.). New Delhi: Orient Blackswan Pvt., Ltd..
- Green, A. (1972). *Sociology* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). US: McGraw-Hill-Inc.
- Gupta, N. (2004). *Cultural Studies*. Worldview Publication.
- Halliwell, S. (1987). *The Poetics of Aristotle* (trans.). Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Hamilton, E., & Cairns, H. (Eds.). (1961). *The Collected Works of Plato: Including Letters*. U.K.: Princeton University Press.
- Hawkes, D. (2003). *Ideology*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1975). *Aesthetics: Lecture on Fine Arts*. T. M. Knox (trans.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Herskovits, M. J. (1948). *Man and His works: The science of Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Ethnographic Arts Publication.
- Hobbes, T. (1996). *Leviathan*. John C.A. Gaskin (Eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jameson, F. (1985). *The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern – 1983-1998*. London and New York: Verso.

- Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. London and New York: Verso.
- Jameson, F. (1998). *Marxism, Hermeneutics, Postmodernism*. Cambridge: Sean Homer, Polity Press.
- Johari, J. C. (1979). *Contemporary Political Theory, Basic Concepts and Major Trends*. New Delhi, Bangalore and Jullundur: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
- Joseph, P., & Leisure (1952). *The Basis of Culture*. New York: St. Augustine Press.
- Joseph, S. (1998). *Interrogating Culture*. London, Thousand Oaks, and New Delhi: SAGE Publication.
- Joseph, V. (1981). *Femia Gramsci's Political Thought Hegemony, Consciousness, and the Revolutionary Process*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kant, I. (1951). *Critique of Judgment*. J. H. Bernard (trans.). New York: Haffner.
- Kant, I. (1970). *An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment, Kant's Political Writings*. H. B. Nisbet (trans.). Hans Riss, (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 54-60.

- Kant, I. (1973). *Critique of Judgements*. James Creed Meredith (trans.). Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Kearney, R. (1994). *Modern Movements in European Philosophy*. U.K: Manchester University press.
- Kellner, D. (1989). *Jean Baudrillard: From Marxism to Postmodernism and Beyond*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Levi-straws, C. (1993). *Structural Anthropology* (Vol. 1). Claria Jacobson (trans.). New York: Penguin Books.
- Lewis, J. (2008). *Cultural Studies, the Basics* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). LOS Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore: SAGE Publication.
- Lyon, D. (2002). *Concept of Social Thought Postmodernity* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New Delhi, Mumbai, Chennai and Kolkata: Viva Books Private Limited.
- Lyotard, J. F. (1979). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- MacIver, R. M. (1955). *The Modern States*, Oxford: The Oxford University Press.
- Malinowaski, B. (1931). 'Culture' in *Encyclopedia of Social Science* (Vol. 4). New York: Macmillan.
- Mann, D., & Dann, G. E. (2004). *Philosophy – A New Introduction*. Wadsworth Incorporated Fulfilment.

- Mannheim, K. (1954). *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc.  
London: Rutledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Marx, K. (1844). *A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. Paris: Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1964, 1968, 1970, 1976). *The German Ideology*.  
Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1968). *Communist Manifesto*, New York and  
London: Monthly Review Press.
- McGurgan, J. (1999). *Modernity and Postmodern Culture*. Buckingham and  
Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- McLeod, J. (2007). *Beginning Post Colonialism*. Manchester and New  
York: Manchester University Press.
- Meredith, J. C. (1973). *Critique of Judgments* (trans.). Oxford: The Clarendon  
Press.
- Milner, A., & Breowitz, J. (2003). *Contemporary Cultural Theory* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.).  
Jaipur and New Delhi: Rawat Publication.
- Moore, B. N., & Bruder, K. (1996). *Philosophy: The Power of Ideas*.  
London, Toronto: Mayfield Publishing Company.

- Nash, K. (2000). *Contemporary Political Sociology - Globalization, Politics and Power*. U.K: Blackwell Publishers.
- Nielsen, K. (1995). *On Transforming Philosophy: A Metaphilosophical Inquiry*. Boulder, CO: West View Press, A Division of Harper Collins Publishers.
- Nietzsche, F. (1968a). *Twilight of the Idols*. R. J. Hollingdale (trans.). London: Penguin.
- Nietzsche, F. (1974). *The Gay Science*. W. Kaufmann (trans.). New York: Vintage.
- Norris, C. (1996). *Deconstruction, Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pande, G. C. (1999). *The Meaning and Process of Culture*. Allahabad: Rakaprakashan.
- Pandit, S. (1978). *Perspective in the Philosophy of Culture*. New Delhi: C. Chand & Company Ltd.
- Pepinean, D. (Eds.). (2004). *Philosophy – The Illustrated Guide to Understanding and Using Philosophy Today*. London: Duncan Baird Publishers.
- Rengaramanujan, P. (1996). *Marxism Ideology & Literary Criticism*. New Delhi: Mahak Publishing Pvt. Ltd.

- Ross, R. (1957, 1962). *Symbols and Civilization, Science, Morals, Religion, Art*. New York and Burlingame: A Harbinger Book Harcourt Brace and World Inc.
- Ross, W. D. (trans.). (1908). *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ross, W. D. (Trans.). (1924). *Aristotle's Metaphysics*. Oxford: Kessinger Publishing.
- Rundell, J., & Mennell, S. (1998). *Classical Readings in Culture and Civilization*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Russell, B. (1912). *The Problem of Philosophy*. London, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Russell, B. (1961). *A History of Western Philosophy*. London, Oxford: UN Win University Books.
- Said, E. (1991). *The Word the Text and the Critic*. London: Vintage Edition.
- Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Sapire, E. (1949). Culture, Genuine and Spurious. In W. Mandelbauns (Eds.), *Culture, Language and Personality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.



- Sapire, E. (1999). *Collected Works*. New York: Mouten de Gruyter Gmbtt & Co.
- Sarukkai, S. (2012). *What is Science*, India: National Book Trust.
- Scholz, S. J. (2011). *Feminism*. Oxford: One World.
- Sehlins, M., & Service, R. (Eds.). (1960). *Evolution and Culture*, Michigan: Michigan University Press, p. 53.
- Sharma, C. (1960). *Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited.
- Sharma, R. (1996). *Fundamentals of Sociology*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distributers (p) Ltd.
- Sim, S. (Eds.). (2011). *The Routledge companion to postmodernism* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). London and New York: Routledge, Tylor & Francis Group.
- Simon, R. L. (Eds.). (2002). *The Blackwell Guide to Social and Political Philosophy*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Simons, H. W., & Billig, M. (Eds.). (1994). *After Postmodernism, Reconstructing Ideology Critique*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: SAGE Publication.
- Sokolowski, R. (2000). *Introduction to Phenomenology*. UK, USA: Cambridge University Press.

- Sorokin, P. A. (1962). *Social and Cultural Dynamics* (Vol. 1). N. J: Englewood Cliffs, Bedminster Press.
- Spencer, H. (1881). *Principles of Sociology* (Vol. 1). Harvard University: D. Appleton and Company.
- Thilly, F. (2003). *History of Philosophy*. New Delhi: SWB Publishers.
- Tillich, P. (1968). *Biblical Religion and search for Ultimate Reality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tylor, E. B. (1871). *Primitive Culture* (Vol. 1). London: J. Marry.
- Upadhyaya, V. S., & Pandey, G. (1993). *History of Anthropological Thought*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
- Vishawanathan, G. (2002). *Power, Politics and Culture - Interview with Edward Said*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Wallas, G., & Raj, H. (2003). *Comparative Politics*, Op. Cit. New Delhi: India Oscar Publication.
- Ward, G. (1997-2003). *Teach Yourself Postmodernism*. London: Hodder Headline Ltd.
- Williams, R. (1958-1982). *Culture and Society - Coleridge to Orwell*. London: The Hogarth Press.
- Williams, R. (1976). *Keywords*. London.

Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and Literature*. London: The Oxford University Press.

Windelband, W. (1956). *History of Ancient Western Philosophy*. New York: Dover Publication, Inc.

Wittgenstein, L. (1922). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, London and New York: Wilhelm Wald's Annalen der Naturphilosophie, 4. 031.

Wolker, G. (Eds.). (1997). *Public Administration and Postmodernism. American Behavioral Scientist*.

Yudice, G. (2003). *The Expediency of Culture*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

### **Malayalam Books**

Damodharan, K. (1973-1998). *Bharatheeyachintha*. Kerala: State Institute of Languages.

Dileepkumar, A. V., Ajayakumar, N., Pavithran, P., Jacob, S. & Sunil, P. I. (2000). *Samskarapadanam -Charithram, Sidhantham, Prayogam*, Kalady: Malayalamsangam

Dileepraj (2001). *Navacharithravadham*, Kotayam: DC Books.

Govindhapillai, P. (2010). *Oru Samskarika Charithram*. Kerala: State Institute of Languages.

- Jorge, C. J. (2010). *Samakaleena Sahithya Sidhanthangal*. Calicut: Lipi Publication.
- Pokker, P. K. (1998). *Derrida – Apanirmanathinte Thathwachintha*. Kerala: State Institute of Languages.
- Pokker, P. K. (2008). *Agolavalkaranakalathe Marxism – Frederic Jameson*. Calicut: Progress Publication.
- Pokker, P. K. (2010). *Prathyayashasthram – Louise Althusser*. Calicut: Progress Publication.
- Ramachandran, P. P. (2002). *Foucault – Varthamanathinte Carithram*, Kerala: State Institute of Languages.
- Raveendran, P. P. (2002). *Samskarapadanam Oru Aamugam*. Kottayam: D. C. Books.