

Individual and Society within the Post Modern Ethos

SEDRATA Yasser

Biskra University, Algeria

Abstract

This paper will address the notion of the incommensurable, subjective, and the relativistic tendency of the Post Modern epistemology in judging the social, cognitive, and the political identifiabilities. The legacy of Michelle Foucault and Jack Derrida, which came as a reaction against the entire Enlightenment project, has undermined which was considered as the basic referential testimonio that organize and stratify the epistemological patterns of thought, and gave rise to a new paradigmatic reciprocity that emphasized valuelessness, absence of univocity, and irrationality, in addition, to social, ethnic constructability, and partial subjective finality in holding truth judgmentality. In this paper, the researcher will territorialize the problematic within the triangle of: epistemological relativity, social egalitarianism, and the system of valuelessness that postmodern system calls for. In the light of the latter, we will try to raise the question that under the pretext of incommensurable objective truth, how can we establish an interrelated egalitarian cross cultural atmosphere that insures equal representation for all constituents of the society without conscious or unconscious ideological tendencies that Foucault and Leotard have argued about? Also, how the valueless system is manifested in social relationships, and to which extent is it considered legitimate reactionary counter-argument that is meant to perpetuate certain streamline of thought? The researcher will adopt an investigative qualitative method that analyses the aforementioned in the light of postmodern philosophy.

Keywords: Egalitarianism; Epistemology; Relativism; Subjective; System; Valueless.

Introduction

The Enlightenment Thinkers escorted their philosophical views and embedded them in the collective consciousness. They practised the freedom of thought and enabled the people to free themselves out of the clutches of the old feudalist ideas, which have exhausted them for ages. Consequently, Democracy was the fruit of this new spirit in the communal and intellectual atmosphere. The latter issue made the people decentralize the outdated political powers, and eventually launch a revolution at the level of thought and then at the level of the political arena. England's liberal revolution in 1688 began the trend. Modern political principles spread to America and France in the eighteenth century, leading to liberal revolutions there in 1776 and 1789. The weakening and overthrow of the feudal regimes then made possible the practical extension of liberal individualist ideas to all human beings. As a result, equality and abolition of slavery issues were floating on the surface. The human being is extremely valued and revered. People, no longer, are burdened with the original sin and hell fire/paradise dichotomy. This revolutionizing jolt shook the foundation of the human legacy since the beginning of history, and entirely re-shaped the maps of meaning in the public imagination.

The postmodern tendency was and still in a big hostility towards the entire Enlightenment project. It argues that the modern philosophy of the enlightenment perspective became totally untenable to hold the emerging prospects of our today's world. Because of its total reliance on reason, logic, and alleged credibility, the spirit of individualism and its offshoots in the fields of: politics, economy, religion, science, and social front should be reconsidered and more extremely should be eliminated. The individualist spirit should be replaced by the collectivist, communal frame that attributes the individual to his social and linguistic group, since, he is a product of this institution. Instead of the harmonious, reconciliatory medium that governs the international interests, there will be a doomed state of conflict and inconsistency in the expression of interests, since, truth is relative and everything is built upon a subjective scale which doesn't blatantly hold the ultimate perspective that describes its nature.

The Enlightenment philosophy undermined the established religious institutions when it called for the liberation of the human from the control of the church. It shifted the centrality from the heavenly towards the earthly being, from God to Man, the world is the kingdom and the backyard of the human wherein he enjoys his total freedom in living. Based on the latter premise, Man should be his own god, and his reasoning is his faculty to understand and govern his tasks. At that time, the leading thinkers were deists, having abandoned the old traditions of theism, they turned to place the Christian God in the realm of science as the ultimate creator, the architect who magnificently created the universe and finished his mission to leave the rest to Man to populate his creation. This Architect is a bloodless being that no longer plays a personal role in the lives of humans. He does not give guidance or establishes strictures and does not give meaning or moral preaches. He finished his mission.

Inevitable consequence of deism is the loss of faith. The latter issue leads to total freedom that involves the teleology of existence only within rational boundaries far from supernatural explanation of the noumenal and phenomenal realm. Therefore, in the 18th century an inclination and emerging embracement of the Naturalistic philosophy overwhelmed many of the rationalistic practitioners who sought refuge in the world of logic. For that, “When applied to human beings, such models posed an obvious threat to the human spirit. What place is there for free will and passion, spontaneity and creativity if the world is governed by mechanism and logic, causality and necessity?”(Hicks 26). Henceforth:

The Enlightenment thinkers taught, not a slave or servant of others. His happiness is his own to pursue, and by giving him the tools of education, science, and technology he can be set free to set his own goals and to chart his own course in life. But what happens, worried the early Counter-Enlightenment thinkers, to traditional values of community and sacrifice, of duty and connectedness, if individuals are encouraged to calculate rationally their own gain? Will not such rational individualism encourage coldblooded, short-range, and grasping selfishness? Will it not encourage individuals to reject long-standing traditions and to sever communal ties, thus creating a non-society of isolated, rootless and restless atoms? (ibid)

Through this current, schism was originated between the two sides of the human being, that is the spiritual and the rational. To act on the basis of logic, and define everything on logic, is a total new life that is meant for one to get involved in. In that respect, questions were raised by

the counter Enlightenment camp who thought that this new philosophy will eradicate the essence of Man and turn him to a mere machine.

The skepticism policy that overwhelmed the postmodern thought was undeniably a foregone conclusion of two centuries of intellectual debate over the veracity of many of the epistemological assumptions in and after the Enlightenment. Kant's huge influence over the waves of thoughts -that overtook the era- survived to be developed and eventually adopted by the coming generations which held it as double edged sword.

Methodological Framework

The researcher adopts an analytical, argumentative, dialogic, and descriptive approach towards the topic. We will approach the subject matter from an epistemological, philosophical perspective; wherein different philosophical theorizations are discussed. In this respect, Emanuel Kant's view in "The Critique of Pure Reason" is emphasized through the binary of Subjectivity/Objectivity that will be stressed and elaborated thoroughly. Kant's influence on the next generations of the 20th century thinkers is highlighted. Sequentially, Foucault and Lyotard's approaches and counter raids on the Enlightenment project will be manifested to show the chronological evolution that will be cited briefly and contextually. Hence, the accumulated weight of the Enlightenment philosophy was the nucleus around which the heated debates about the nature of the relationship between the individual and the society.

I. Territorializing the Epistemological Borders of Individual and Society

The vanguards of the postmodern movement have established new paradigmatic reciprocities within the intellectual sphere. Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Jean-François Lyotard, and Richard Rorty are the leading guards who draw the general guidelines of the Postmodern Epistemology.

Foucault has been always in favor of 'revision', in the sense that he criticizes the idea of imposing universal necessities to control the elements which describe truth, reason, or

knowledge. The latter per se is applied on the postmodern view in which its proponents insist that it does not give any truth and should build its foundations on the principle of uncertainty.

To view the world on the basis of the claim that states, “Reason is the ultimate language of madness”¹, it would be ultimately meaningless to speak about any truth or any established philosophical institution, and whatsoever, the said will be mere neurons articulated, then uttered, then received by other individuals, and consequently perceived and subjectified, eventually interpreted, and finally shared. The zone of relationships here is formulated by a set of subjective experiences which are manifested by the individuals who present their ethnicities, sexes, social classes, and cultures. None of those individuals possess the ultimate truth or knowledge, all of them are equal, because they express the same starting points that are exemplified in the aforementioned determinants.

The Enlightenment account of reason was the hotspot among which the postmodernists gathered around. Postmodernism’s insistence on the subjectivity of experiences, and the relativistic judgment upon the happenings of the noumenal and the phenomenal world, entrenched deep in the engineering of the brain’s episteme processes. The latter rose as rival against the legacy of the Enlightenment and stood to undermine this project that detached the human being from his essence.

The postmodern worldview stresses the notion of the absence of the presence of an independent existing reality. It holds the premise that the human being is socially constructed entity in the pathology of the universe. To speak about any given reality, we should understand that mankind are bound to certain determinants which define the patterns of constituting their world. Because humans are meant to act according to their entourage which they were raised and shaped by, reason is no longer valid source of defining reality. Objective truth is substituted by subjective determinant that worked to mold the absorbed system of thought inherited and preached by social linguistic operators. Postmodernism emphasizes the subjectivity, conventionality, and incommensurability of those constructions. The collectivist nature of the postmodern perspective asserts that the groups of different nations vary through race, sex, wealth, and culture which govern the individuals’ identities.

¹Foucault 1965, 95.

To examine any literary work through postmodern lens, one should know that this work is a subjective play created by the author, who represents his inner psyche, and his outer social and linguistic framework that he was constructed by. Henceforth, the role of the critic -as or who is postmodernist- is to deconstruct this formula of intersected racial, sexual, and class factors that likely will determine the mechanic formation of this work. To illustrate: Captain Ahab and Robinson Crusoe are but the exploitative authoritarianism of imperialistic patriarchalism and the insane drive of technology to conquer nature. Therefore, these tenets are among the sought criteria to judge any piece of literature within a postmodern view.

Because of the absence of any valid and objective reasoning in the making of any mutual ground in the postmodern account, the relationships of the groups will be highly predicated on the idea of the competing wills to solve any possible conflict, and therefore clash will turn to be a recourse. The power relationships will give birth to a ground of oppressor and oppressed. Postmodernism is interested in tracing the mechanisms of the oppression process, and therefore it looks to voice the oppressed in the face of the oppressor. Postmodernism, thus, voices the voiceless and bring it to the front. It works to decentre the system of dominance in the capitalist camp. The oppressed status of women, the poor, racial minorities, and others must be unveiled in the capitalist nations. The Rhetoric about progress and democracy, about freedom and equality are but the Trojan horse to perpetuate the submission versus domination relationship between the west and rest. Foucault deconstructs an aspect of this system by giving the example of the prison:

Prison is the only place where power is manifested in its naked state, in its most excessive form, and where it is justified as moral force. ... What is fascinating about prisons is that, for once, power doesn't hide or mask itself; it reveals itself as tyranny pursued into the tiniest details; it is cynical and at the same time pure and entirely 'justified,' because its practice can be totally formulated within the framework of morality. Its brutal tyranny consequently appears as the serene domination of Good over Evil, of order over disorder. (Foucault 1977b, 210)

Therefore this system that imposes its subjective prescription of morality is no more than an expression of power relationships that border guards the freedom of the individual who is under the pressure of the dominant Other. This exertion of violence is seen for example in the

American attack on Iraq in 1990s, which was under the pretext of spreading democracy, Lyotard insists that Saddam, Hitler, Mussolini, Franco all are but products of western departments and imperialism.²

For the cultural orbit, postmodernism scrutinize few assumptions which is seen as an intellectual ground that bases every cultural debate, Hicks summarized few of these aspects:

- Is the western canon a workable distillation of the best of the west literature?
- Whether the United States of America is progressive on liberty, equalities, and opportunities for everyone—or whether it is sexist, racist, and class-bound, e.g., using its mass market pornography and glass ceilings to keep women in their place.
- Whether social conflicts should be defused by encouraging the principle that individuals should be judged according to their individual merits and not according to morally irrelevant features such as race or sex.

Whether the liberal West is leading the rest of the world to a freer and more prosperous future—or whether its heavy-handed intrusiveness in foreign policy and its command of the international financial markets are exporting its McJobs to non-Western nations, locking them into the System and destroying their indigenous cultures.

-And whether, in general, liberalism, free markets, technology, and cosmopolitanism are social achievements that can be enjoyed by all cultures. (Hicks 18)

Egalitarianism in postmodern paradigm occupied a crucial stand, in the sense that it took pluralistic shape in relation to the equal representation of different culture. Accordingly, values are socially constructed, given the fact that all voices should be equally voiced and the subjective dimension of every set of system of values, none of these systems should be privileged or classed in superior or inferior realm. Therefore, none of the latter has the final truth or knowledge, since everything is relative and partial; Afghani, Zulu, European, Arab, West, East are all the same. Thus, disagreement will be met with disagreement, and later on to be resorted to force, since no logic prevails over another, and civilizations' dialogues will be met with antagonistic relationships.

² Lyotard 1997, 74-75.

Deconstructing reason, truth, and reality is an aspect of freedom in the age of the western dominance. The west has exhibited its power on the basis of this reasoning which legitimated its claimed truth. Therefore, the veracity of every promoted fact should be revisited and deconstructed because of its ideological permutations, for that Lyotard states, “Reason and power are one and the same” they “lead to and are synonymous with prisons, prohibitions, selection process, the public good”.³

The sword of power is in the hands of the alpha males, the brutal rich, and superior white man; these constituents of the society establish the rules of the game in the view of the postmodernists. The former holds the key of the box that contains the secrets of life. Women in the western logic, for example, are depicted pleasure, commodity, attraction, sexual desire fulfilment, they are meant to satiate the alpha male needs, and this is her worldly experience which shapes her psyche and eventually she expresses that experience. The latter is manifestation and celebration of inferiority that is inherited and acquired throughout the course of history.

The Modernist schema was mainly derived from the legacy of the Enlightenment philosophers. Francis Bacon, René Descartes, and John Locke and their peers are the formative masters who have raised the pillars of the modern world through their theorizations. They worked to centre the human being, and they stressed that he is the proud practitioner of reason. They reacted against the medieval worldview which imposed the belief in the supernatural and the centrality of God as the one and only source of the ultimate knowledge and truth. Modern thinkers stress human autonomy and the human capacity for forming one’s own character. Reasoning and science are the key towards unleashing the human magnificence, and they strongly celebrate the individual as the source and the nucleus around which the phenomenal world is gathered valuably.

Despite the different orientations of the pioneering philosophers themselves in defining the key issues of life, they –Descartes, Lock, and Bacon- agree on the principality of reason in handling what is perceived:

³ Lyotard in Friederich 1999, 46.

Once reason is given pride of place, the entire Enlightenment project follows. If one emphasizes that reason is a faculty of the individual, then individualism becomes a key theme in ethics. Locke's *A Letter concerning Toleration* (1689) and *Two Treatises of Government* (1690) are landmark texts in the modern history of individualism. Both link the human capacity for reason to ethical individualism and its social consequences: the prohibition of force against another's independent judgment or action, individual rights, political equality, limiting the power of government, and religious toleration. (Hicks 9)

To celebrate reason is to celebrate the individuality of the human being, and this gives him the freedom to express him/his self in the manner he believes it is expressive.

To talk about individualism, the concept of liberalism should be entailed. The issue of individuality in the western imagination gave birth to the freedom of expression in all sorts of life. Religion, politics, and culture are for the first time unlocked and freed to re-exemplify new orientations about the pathological epistemology of society.

II. The Place of Reason, Truth and Reality

The judgmentality of reason in determining reality triggered the debates during the enlightenment and after. For Kant, reason is an enveloped system of significations that recycles its own subjective products with inner mechanisms totally detached from any possible unrelated playing factors in the process of conceptualization. Reason is self-building organism that empirically determines the applicability of any process. It forms its own rules within the phenomenal dimension, and molds its own functions in parallel with its perceptive system. "Contrary to the "dogmatists" who had for centuries held out hope for knowledge of reality itself, Kant concluded that "[t]he dogmatic solution is therefore not only uncertain, but impossible."⁴ Hence, positing the rationality of reasoning within the realm of the phenomenal solely, will inevitably deny the noumenal existence of objects that are highly steeped in the religious extensions.

⁴ Kant 1781, B512/A484

The major key concepts and problematics that shaded the intellectual debate during the Enlightenment and after are: reason—objectivity, competence, autonomy, universality, and being an individual faculty:

Kant concluded that the sad experience of recent philosophy demonstrated that the most fundamental of them, objectivity, must be abandoned. The failures of empiricism and rationalism had shown that objectivity is impossible. For reason to be objective, it must have contact with reality. The most obvious candidate for such direct contact is sense-perception. On realist accounts, the senses give us our most direct contact with reality, and they thereby provide the material that reason then organizes and integrates into concepts, those concepts in turn becoming integrated into propositions and theories. (Hicks 30)

Taking into consideration that the senses are the means to transmit the outside experience, it becomes clear that those senses shall work the transmitted message within the brain that reasons subjectively. The latter will subjectify what was primarily, dialectically, objective—but the moment this outside experience was absorbed, it takes an inside subjective design that compels it to conform to the working system of reason. In this respect, a question will raise, to what degree our sensory system is reliable so that we trust its function at delivering the outside experience, knowingly, these senses are part of this internal factory that results the reasoning? Consequently, is reality something beyond our perceptual system that is determined by the senses? Based on the latter, the sensory delivery turns to be the result of a causal relationship with the external dimension. The latter activated the causal process and extended a thread of alerting material to the internal system, as a result, a fusion between an external dimension with an internal one takes action. However, the moment that this fusing process is established, the internal system overwhelms the perceived material and recycle it to take a subjective design. In addition, the perceptibility of the senses vary from one to another, and the very first delicious taste of a specific dish is different from the second and third time. Therefore, do the senses allow us to, consciously, know the reality? Is it an illusion or allusion? Truthful or partially truthful? These are few of the questions that made Kant and many other thinkers of the two camps restless and vigorous to find the answers for:

The empiricists had drawn from this analysis of sense-perception the conclusion that while we must rely on our sense perceptions, we must always be tentative with regard to our confidence in them. From sense-perception we can draw no certain conclusions. The rationalists had drawn the conclusions that sense-experience is useless as a source of significant truths and that for the source of such truths we must look elsewhere. This brings us to abstract concepts. The empiricists, stressing the experiential source of all of our beliefs, had held that concepts too must be contingent. As based on sense- perception, concepts are two stages removed from reality and so less certain. And as groupings based on our choices, concepts are human artifices, so they and the propositions generated from them can have no necessity or universality ascribed to them. (Hicks 31)

For both views, the empiricists and the rationalists prescribed the senses as the primary stage through which the experience passes. Nevertheless, the controversy was erected on the premise of the validity and the applicability of the perceived portions and how are they going to be defined and determined.

The realm of concepts is intersected or quietly jointed with the mechanisms of generating perception, in the sense that the process of absorbing the external material is done through the sensory alignments. Accordingly, the external material is conceptualized within this frame of internal system, since it had been re-claimed and re-named with reference to the patterns which form the individual's subjective, perceptive corpus.

Thus, by the time of Kant, the Enlightenment philosophers' account of reason was faltering on two counts. Given their analysis of sense-perception, reason seemed cut off from direct access to reality. And given their analysis of concepts, reason seemed either irrelevant to reality or limited to merely contingent truths. (Hicks 32)

Emmanuel Kant, therefore, flung his analysis of the reason/reality dichotomy and embraced the rationalists and empiricists theorization to build new hypothesis which will be the buttress for the postmodern epistemology.

The controllability of objects in determining the representations was an issue to be analyzed thoroughly for the empiricists and the rationalists. Judging the representation of objects on the basis of the objects' criteria, or judging it on the basis of the fact that it is infused with the perceptive system of the subject, is the nucleus around which this dilemma is

magnetized. However, the latter premise leads us to ask the question of whether the existence of the absence of the absence of the subject is considered as starting point on which this circle of transmission is built on? Is the subject a mere translucent layer that allowed the object to diffuse inside the perceptive system of the *self* (that is the subject) without any interference from its part? Did the object establish its existence inside the subject totally on the basis of the alleged objective reality? If so, then we will face the fact that the subject is no more than passive receiver of the objective reality, and that we should neglect the conscious self that is, agreeably, part of the subject formative patterns. In this respect, “Kant assumed—as had most thinkers before him—that objectivity presupposes naïve realism’s metaphysics of an identity-less subject.”(Hicks 25). Therefore, many counter enlightenment practitioners were critical of this hypothesis. For that, we find Kant backlashing this assumption by presuming that the knowing subject is involved in its conditioned processes which are definite and causal. The experiences of the subject are conditioned by these processes that turn it into an element that whirls inside “finite synthesis”⁵ as a result, we cannot say that the knowing subject is a hollow organism that is individually self-enveloped, detached and flatulent. Moreover, given the latter premise, it is clear that the object is not the sole responsible for making knowledge, since, the complexity that defines the finite synthetic processes is a major factor in making the production of the knowledge of the knowing subject. Thus, the experiences that the subject is conditioned by, will give an identity for this knowing subject. Hence, the reception of the objective material will, consequently, be, in its turn, conditioned by the identity of the subject, and the latter will determine the shape that the information is going to take. As a result, the subject will hold the upper hand for the recycling and production of the transmitted material.

To believe that our knowing subject has an identity, is to believe that this identity, inevitably, contributes in producing and making meanings. Universality and necessity are, thence, originated in the inner workings of the subject’s identity, and they turned to be functions which have become appropriated in the process of production and perception:

⁵ Kant 1781, A483/B511

Accordingly we have Kant's central project in the first Critique of tracking down fourteen such constructive functions of the subject: space and time as two forms of sensibility, and the twelve categories. As a result of the operations of those constructive functions, we can find necessary and universal features within our experiential world—because we have put them there. (Hicks 35)

There is an issue that was aroused from Kantian ground; that is the universality and necessity are but a mere production of a subjective factory, since the experiences and reason work hand in hand with daily activities, therefore, every creation of certain feature would be the inevitable result of inner and subjective process. Moreover, all objects within the boundary of our sensory system are represented through space and time which are constructed in our world of experiences. The latter in its turn is conditioned by our making or labeling of space and time. Hence, the representations are the ultimate representation of our constructive thoughts within our subjective system which re-worked the objective reality. In this respect, the debate will circle inside the phenomenal world because every production of experience is the result of our inner self subject which gave it a sense that appeals to senses. Consequently, the noumenal world will stay virgin unburdened with our thoughts processes making, because we only know what our senses tell us. However, outside our sensory realm we cannot assertively negotiate what is there, what is real, and what is right or wrong:

From Kant's perspective, that is a trade-off he was happy to make, for science's loss is religion's gain. Kant's argument, if successful, means that "all objections to morality and religion will be forever silenced, and this in Socratic fashion, namely, by the clearest proof of the ignorance of the objectors.... Reason and science are now limited to playing with phenomena, leaving the noumenal realm untouched and untouchable. Having denied knowledge, room was made for faith. For who can say what is or is not out there in the real world? (Hicks 36)

On this premise, our senses are not seen to be responding and registering reality, rather, they impose their patterns of definition on the subject, and consequently what we perceive is only what our system of senses give or shape for us. Therefore, what is shared as generalities and necessities is a manifestation of the mere subjective dimension of individuals, and hence,

what is established subjectively will be undermined subjectively. The latter is the main argument in the postmodern paradigm.

Kant was the decisive break with the Enlightenment and the first major step toward postmodernism. Contrary to the Enlightenment account of reason, Kant held that the mind is not a response mechanism but a constitutive mechanism. He held that the mind—and not reality—sets the terms for knowledge. And he held that reality conforms to reason, not vice versa. In the history of philosophy, Kant marks a fundamental shift from objectivity as the standard to subjectivity as the standard.... If the rules of the game have nothing to do with reality, then why should everyone play by the same rules? These were precisely the implications the post-modernists were to draw eventually. With Kant, then, external reality thus drops almost totally out of the picture, and we are trapped inescapably in subjectivity—and that is why Kant is a landmark. Once reason is in principle severed from reality, one then enters a different philosophical universe altogether. (Hicks 39)

For Hegel, the binary of subject and object was given a new shape, in the sense that the universe stands as the ultimate Subject that contains objects, and in the same time –we as individuals- are mouthpieces of our minds and in the meanwhile suppliers of our reality. In his terms, Hegel criticized the separative stance of the objectivists and the subjectivists in which the objectivists made the subject look like a mechanical device that reworks the objective dimension. However, if we take the ultimate or the whole big Subject as containing other partial subjects, this will generate a metonymic relationship between the constitutive segments of the Subject. In other words, the individual subject will be a microcosmic representation of the whole Subject which represents the universe, and henceforth, the subjective production of knowledge, activity, or experience will be expressive for the whole Subject that involves its objects as well. Hegel's influence over the 19th century philosophy revolved around the subjective dimension of reality creation, wherein, the truth is bound to time and space, and it is predicated on a relativist approach. In addition to the aforementioned, Hegel emphasized the contradictory nature of reality and truth and their unattainable evolution because they are conditioned by temporal and spatial frameworks. "Whatever the variations, the metaphysical themes of clash and conflict, of truth as relative,

of reason as limited and constructed, and of collectivism, were dominant. For all of their differences with Hegel, postmodernists adopt all four of these theses” (Hicks 51).

Heidegger was unquestionably the leading influence on the postmodern philosophers like Foucault and Derrida, who embraced his dichotomy of the noumenal and the phenomenal. Heidegger tried to continue the path of Hegel in phenomenology and aspired to blur the divide between the subject and the object which his predecessors longed to unriddle their enigmatic relationship:

Heidegger’s philosophy is the integration of the two main lines of German philosophy, the speculative metaphysical and the irrationalist epistemological. After Kant, the Continental tradition quickly and gleefully abandoned reason, putting wild speculation, clashing wills, and troubled emotion at the forefront. In Heidegger’s synthesis of the Continental tradition, we can see clearly many of the ingredients of postmodernism. Heidegger offered to his followers the following conclusions, all of which are accepted by the mainstream of postmodernism with slight modifications:

1. Conflict and contradiction are the deepest truths of reality;
2. Reason is subjective and impotent to reach truths about reality;
3. Reason’s elements—words and concepts—are obstacles that must be uncrusted, subjected to Destruktion, or otherwise unmasked;
4. Logical contradiction is neither a sign of failure nor of anything particularly significant at all;
5. Feelings, especially morbid feelings of anxiety and dread, are a deeper guide than reason;
6. The entire Western tradition of philosophy—whether Platonic, Aristotelian, Lockean, or Cartesian—based as it is on the law of non-contradiction and the subject/object distinction, is the enemy to be overcome. (ibid)

This epistemological ground was the main area that postmodernism has built its foundation on. In this vein, Heidegger’s view of seeking the truth in the noumenal realm was confronted with many evolving disputes which sought to neglect reality and its understanding on the basis of subject/object equation. Instead of the latter, clashing wills, relative creations, language unmasking, the spontaneous flow of emotions, indefinability, and the social

constructions are the pillars on which we should build our views over. Following this line, the idea of clashing wills played significant role in overshadowing the orientations of postmodernism inside the tunnel of Foucault and Derrida who embraced Nietzsche's perspective of power and its discourse.

Conclusion

From the previous we understand that the core idea is the total separation of reason from reality, Postmodernism has built many of its assumptions on this ground. This Kantian legacy is the torch that philosophers who, to a certain extent, embraced as a postmodern logic which was resulted from counter enlightenment criticisms and gave rise to big names starting from: Hegel, Heidegger, and Nietzsche, and finishing with Foucault and Derrida. Both Hegel and Kant have sculptured their views and gave rise to different schools of thought. Hegel was mainly concerned with the metaphysical dimension within the human experience, while Kant, as mentioned, centered his hypothesis on the binary of reason and reality.

The postmodern epistemology is, hence, the consistent expression of the consequence of rejecting the traditional tenets of the enlightenment and its counter raids. The pivots, on which the argumentations of both the pros and cons of traditional worldviews and perspectives stood on, have mainly revolved around: the objectivity and subjectivity dialect, the valuation system and its devaluation, disvaluing values, language and its power discursive implementations, profaning the basis of scientific inductions, un-claiming reality, placing the feeling at the headwaters of value chains, and most of them all: relativism as the absolute unchangeable factor that governs the phenomenal world.

The Postmodern garden was planted by the continuity of the different theorizations since the post enlightenment era. From Heidegger's centrality of emotions role, and through Marx's deep expression of rage, hatred against the proclaimed oppressor, and alienation. In addition to Nietzsche's power discourse and its implications, and finishing by Freud's individuals' Sexual desires orientations. All of those four melting-pots are the cornerstones which build the postmodern temple. Hence, having put the notion of centralizing the

spontaneous uncontrolled emotions at the fore will produce the indefinability of pathologies. In addition, the individuals' identities are the product of their group memberships; whether cultural, economic, racial, or sexual will foster their belongingness. The latter is strictly conditioned by relativistic stance that does not hold any definite distinction for the objective truth or reality, since as already claimed, every perspective is the expression of the subjective self. Consequently, to talk about reason is only to talk about the subjective dimension. Thus, no group holds the ultimate truth, and in the same time, no identity is privileged to theorize about the righteousness of perspectives. In other words, every individual or group hold the same degree to attest their beliefs and worldviews, but in the meanwhile, no group or individual will tell us the truth or allege to have rightness, since, there is no logic reasoning. In this matter, emerges the historical determinism which gives rise to the ideological assumptions of different individuals and groups, and the idea of the competing wills to survive will govern the subjective necessitarianism which make the different aspects of life.

Based on the latter, the language, for instance, will be more directed to implement a discourse of power for the powerful, and the rhetoric of mutual understanding will not be heeded because no one owns logic explanations of actions. As a result, political correctness will float on the surface, and the survival will be for the fittest. Kant in his "Idea for a Universal History" has strongly asserted that we are duty bound to live in a constant state of antagonism, "The means that nature uses to bring about the development of all of man's capacities is the antagonism among them in society."(Kant 20/31). Accordingly, the war is an obligation to proceed with the historical development of the human race. On the valuation of this inevitable conflict, from a Kantian view, estimating the degree and attributes of these conflicts does not necessarily involve them to standard definition that hovers within the eternal binary of Good and Evil, instead the judgmentality depends on subjective calculation that entails the specific culture's criteria of establishing meaning.

Reference

- Hicks, Stephen. 2004. Explaining Postmodernism: Skepticism and Socialism from Rousseau to Foucault. Tempe: Scholargy Publishing.
- Beiser, Fred. “Kant’s intellectual development: 1746-1781.” In Paul Guyer, editor, 1992.
- Cahoon, Lawrence E., editor. From Modernism to Postmodernism. Blackwell, 1996.
- Chisholm, Roderick. The Foundations of Knowing. Minneapolis: Harvester Publishing, 1982.
- Dewey, John. Reconstruction in Philosophy. Henry Holt, 1920.
- Engels, Friedrich. “Socialism Utopian and Scientific” [1875]. Translated by Edward Aveling. In The Essential Left: Marx, Engels, Lenin: Their Basic Teachings. Barnes and Noble, 1961.
- Foucault, Michel. The Archaeology of Knowledge [1969]. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. Pantheon, 1972.
- Foucault, Michel. “Discipline.” In James D. Faubion, editor, 1995.
- Foucault, Michel. Discipline and Punish [1977a]. Translated by Alan Sheridan. Pantheon, 1977.
- Herder, Johann. Letters for the Advancement of Humanity [1793-1797]. In David Williams, editor,