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”. 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. Pierce. 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 not 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, or the other hand, is often attached to the nation 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”. ²

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 Chakravarthi 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 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 into 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”.³ 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”.

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 though. 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 nature 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 paves 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”.

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”. 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”.  

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”. 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”.  

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”. 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 unreflected position. Still in terms of consciousness, black consciousness is immanent in its own eyes.”

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 week 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 apart, 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”. 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”. 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 Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication of Rights of Women* (1872). Feminist theorist from Wollstonecraft 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, carrier impediments, political participation and income disparity continue to motivate feminist politic.

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 ‘feminity’ have become highly contested, most particularly or they relate to culture, life styles and choices of different woman 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 televiusal 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, there by 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 poststructuralist 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 live 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 or 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
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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 alone. 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 it 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 attempt to do is to dig in to then as they stand before us, unpacking them down to their elementary categories and even to their pre-categorical anticipation. It attempt to ‘un build’ 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 initiating 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 because 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 an inevitability of loss and alienation. Thus while, other postmodernists celebrate in the ascendancy of mediated and prolific popular culture, Baudrillard’s apocalypse in 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 regains over the communication networks is one of superficial saturation, of an incessant solicitation, of an extermination of intestinal and protective spaces”.14 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 place 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”. 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 though 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”, 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”. 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.”

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.
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