POSTMODERNIST THOUGHT ON POLITICS

Thai Tran Quang[1], Thach Dinh Ngoc[2], Thanh Nguyen Viet[3]
[1]School of Political Science, Can Tho University;
[2]Department of Philosophy, University of Social Sciences and Humanity, VNU-HCMC;
[3]Department of Political Theory, Vinh Long Engineering Educational University, VIETNAM

tqthai@ctu.edu.vn

ABSTRACT

In the search for a new direction, in Western philosophy a postmodernist trend has been formed, which is understood as a clear departure from the familiar motifs of the methodology. In terms of values, postmodernism deals with the shifting of global cultural values in two basic dimensions: from power to personal values, and from bodily security, economic growth to quality of life, human values.

The postmodernist viewpoint is expressed at all levels of ontology, epistemology and humanism. Politically, postmodernism brings with it the narrative thinking, 'breaking way', 'overcoming the stereotype', respecting differences, focusing on the image of 'fragmented' political people, 'non-centered', 'pluralistic mentality', analyzing the fundamental political issues such as power subjects, sovereignty, class-party relations, the nature of the state, the political value system in the open direction. It is against a universal strategy of thinking and action, in favor of strategies of thinking and action at the contextual, local level with a pragmatist point of view. With its own approach, postmodernist political thoughts have been penetrating the political disciplines, the agenda of contemporary political reality.

Keywords: Postmodernism, Power, Discourse, Virtual reality technology, Unique identity

INTRODUCTION

Political theories do not appear naturally, but are always subject to specific historical conditions, with the resonance of economic, political, cultural and social factors. In other words, each theory is a product of the times, so they also contribute to the common value system of that specific period of time with all the minds of their theorists.

In the ancient times, due to the omnipotence of philosophy in relation to other areas of knowledge, the problems of the political reality were seen as part of philosophical research - political philosophy. In ancient Greece, political philosophy was analyzed by Plato and Aristotle. They set norms and rules for organizing socio-political life in terms of slave society, the formation and development of towns. In ancient Rome, the political realm of social life was mentioned in Stoicism, especially in Cicero's writings. In ancient China, the topic of politics was the dominant part in the thought of Confucians, Law scholars, and the like.

Based on ancient heritages, political philosophy in general and political theories in particular continued to be supplemented and developed through the Renaissance and the Modernization period with big names such as N. Machiavelli, T. Hobbes, J. Locke, Ch. Montesquieu, J. J. Rousseau, and K. Marx. Topics of state power, national sovereignty, methods of organizing social-political life, the rule of law, democracy, balance of power, are probed deeply,

Copyright © 2023

thoroughly dissected on the rich materials of the Western European societies in the period of transition from feudal society to capitalist society.

The turn of the century from XX to XXI was marked by a major movement of world politics, those were the end of the Cold War associated with the collapse of the model of socialism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; the world power transfered from bipolar to unipolar; the boom of information technology and science has profoundly changed the mode of interaction and operation of socio-economic life, from which political life must change as a result. The political ideology of postmodernism somewhat depicts the context of contemporary political reality through problems of the impact of technology on politics, new manifestations in the relationship between discourse and power, the issue of maintaining the identity, civic identity, the issue of controlling technological power, the importance of narrative, micro, local politics, and so on.

In this article, after generalizing the formation and fundamental ideas of postmodernism, we focus on explaining the political issues through the postmodernist approach.

OVERVIEW ON THE FORMATION OF POSTMODERNISM AND ITS BASIC CONTENT

Postmodernism came into existence on the basis of the material conditions of the times. After the World War II, the world entered a new period of tension, those were the collision of development trends, of value systems, the geopolitical changes. The development of global capitalism gave rise to consumer society and a new sense of space-time imprinted with high individuality and fragmentation.

Meanwhile, the advent of high-tech media such as computers, television, movies, new forms of knowledge, urbanization and changes in the socio-economic system contributed to the formation of post-industrial society. In addition, the polarization and confrontation between the capitalist bloc and the socialist one and the tendency to colonial liberation created the need for social peace, security and justice. Movements in the struggle for human rights, for equality of gender, race and ecology in the heart of developed countries have shaken the political and social institutions which were camouflaged through slogans of freedom, progress, equality, and charity.

By the 70s of the twentieth century, the world growth rate slowed down. The competitions among developed capitalist countries, and the opposition of interests between capitalist countries and third world countries were the main causes of the crisis from 1971 to 1978. These unpredictable change of reality required adaptation of the subject to overcome obstacles in livelihoods. Postmodernism came into existence in such socio-economic context.

Under the influence of postmodernist trends and socio-political developments in France and Western Europe from the 1960s to 1970s, the French intellectual group included Jean Francois Lyotard (1924-1998), Jacques Derrida (1930-2004), Michel Foucault (1926-1984), Jean Baudrillard (1929-2007), Jacques Lacan (1901-1981), Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) and Félix Guattari (1930-1992) began to criticize contemporary political, social institutions and philosophical schools such as existentialism, phenomenology, psychoanalysis, structuralism, and neo-positivism. Although each one of them was interested in different fields of research, but the common point among them is the view that the above philosophical schools were no longer capable of explaining new events that emerged in multiple areas of contemporary society. The reason is that these philosophical schools were the product from the heart of modernism - the ideal system of the Enlightenment being in its declining phase. Those modernist pictures of the world, society and people were no longer compatible with the new realities. Their writings revealed a new perspective on the fields of philosophy, science, society, human beings, politics, language and culture through skepticism and strong criticism of modernism. These new ideas officially gave birth to postmodernism as a cultural trend covering many fields from the 1970s to the present.

Ontologically, postmodernism is an interdisciplinary cultural movement, so it is difficult to define its ontology as a philosophical schooli. However, it is possible to point out a common feature that covers the diverse manifestations of postmodernism, namely the rejection of "logos", the rejection of the immutable, the objective frames of reference, and the metaphysical foundations. According to J. Derrida, the history of metaphysics, like the history of the West, is the history of metaphors and metonymies. It is the matrix that determines Being as presence. The objectivity is arbitrary self-imposition in a web of conventions of a context. The world under the postmodernism is a multilateral synthesis of subjective realities, which is no longer the status quo real world but the simulated one, virtual reality. J. Beaudrillard argued that simulation is the real model of a surrealism without any origin or reality.

Epistemologically, postmodernism advocates that human beings cannot establish a stable, constant relationship between reflection and reality because reality is always in a state of constant change. No human reflection of reality is complete, absolute, or final. Reflection is the process of constructing language in the form of words, tables, diagrams, symbols, equations, and images by people. Cognitive subject plays a decisive role in making knowledge of the truth. Knowledge cannot accurately reflect external reality independent of cognitive tools because it only plays an active role in establishing what is real to the community. The practical effect of knowledge is more important than their equivalence to reality. The production of knowledge is an act of creation rather than of discovery. There is no single optimal method of perception, the advancement of knowledge is always the result of breakthroughs and creativities without following a certain pattern or predetermined roadmap.

Postmodernist epistemological critique on scientificism in that it is closely linked to power, and it has got many achievements in the modernization process. In order to highlight the internal basis of scientificism, postmodernist epistemology criticizes modernist foundation. Obviously the protection of the knowledge-foundation mainly includes the establishment of foundations for expanding the world of subjects for scientific research. However, Rorty argues that the fundamentalism is binding and exclusive because the need to get theory is also the need to get attachment and foundation. What postmodernist critique aims at, in the light of denial on fundamentalism, it rejects the trajectory of absolute notions of various truth claims. The knowledge-producing discourses are often indivisible, immutable, and therefore incompatible. The privileged ordering of various truths is always linked with persuasion and power.

Regarding human beings, postmodernism holds that each person consists of many egos with various identities. Each identity is formed from a relationship in an area such as family, gender, workplace, and consumption, it depends on specific circumstances. Each field of life affects the subject's individuality. The individual existence is fragmented and non-centered in its total abundance. Each person is a block of wishes and needs, and is governed by the fragmentation of space-time, involving many egos. The idea of individual fragmentation is a reflection of the diverse social picture of the times. Men live uncertainly in the intertwining spider web of psychological states and social mindsets. They are becoming "overwhelmed" by images, events, and intertwined social relationships as the result of the global media technology expansion.

The trend of globalization, paradoxically, makes the world open and cramped through a sense of space-time. The contraction of time and space results from technological achievements, while the experiences of different cultures influence the daily lives of most of the world's citizens. The postmodernist human beings are non-centered, irrational, plentiful, and uncertain subjects. In addition, they are dominated by a social characteristic of consumerism, being socialized into consumers with freedom of choosing a market place to locate themselves by spending goods or services as symbols of social status. In other words, postmodernism denies the idea of man's universal nature, and instead takes on the idea of the man produced by power relations, shaped by political techniques with the knowledge attached to it, a fragmented, non-centered man.

In the postmodern world, what constantly strikes human consciousness is not an image of status quo reality but a simulation, a multilateral, multilateral image of a hyper-reality - there everything becomes artificial. Faced with the surreal world, postmodern people find that there is no longer an ideal and permanent model of reality to work towards, but a multitude of temporary models of reality to choose from. Neither is there a fixed reality to approach, but a multitude of uncertain realities to deal with promptly. Postmodernism also takes away beliefs in certain universal laws covering the reality, and brings about beliefs in small, short, practical experiments and applications.

Culturally, postmodernism holds that the change of global cultural values is taking place in two basic trends. The first is the shift from pre-modern values that emphasizes traditional religious power to modern values that promotes legitimate secular power and towards a postmodernism that criticizes all extreme power while promoting individual autonomy. Postmodern cultural values endorse pluralism, freedom of expression and individual choice.

The second trend is the shift from values related to life security and economic development to human values and quality of life. Throughout human history, survival was mostly left to random factors until the end of the twentieth century, in many parts of the world, survival and prosperity of the majority of human beings were just guaranteed. Therefore, modern cultural values derived from the industrial revolution emphasize the search for material prosperity. Once survival and prosperity are guaranteed, people need turning to the values of happiness, quality of life, human rights, aesthetic environment, and so on. Among them, ecological value plays an outstanding role. In addition, postmodernism rejects cultural monopoly but emphasizes the uniqueness of value and equality between different cultures.

In general, postmodernism denies the view of the universal, spaceless and temporal nature of things. It does not acknowledge the ability to give universal foundations, absolute proofs of the truths and values, affirming the self-constructing capacity of knowledge, recognizing language is not only a characteristic of human existence but also a constructive dimension of human relations. Added to that it emphasizes the randomness and uncertainty of reality, at the same time shows a radical skepticism of social realities, and advocates history is not a linear process, but is multi-path, nonlinear, random, and open process.

The way of thinking and acting in postmodern conditions is a current topic in scientific, natural and social research, generating an important stimulus for the emergence of new achievements in the arts and science.

POLITICS FROM THE POSTMODERNIST POINT OF VIEW

Postmodernist political theory focuses on the theme of manifestation and exploration of modes of generating and reconstructing power relations of major structures in world politics, modes of legalization, and political action. It shifts interest from national, individual, class topics to those about the subject of action and knowledge, turning interest from "what" to "how" the political subjects validate the action while the power mechanisms are legitimized. James Derian and M. Shapiro write:

> *...Poststructural practice...seeks the way in which the subject - in the dual sense of the problem subject and the action subject - of international relations is constructed in and through world political discourses.* (Derian, 1989: ix-xi).

On the basis of emphasizing the inseparable connection between thinking about the world and action in the world, between theory and practice, postmodernist political theory clarifies the way of mediating between the two fields across various forms of practice about manifestation. It denies the dichotomy between theory and practice for theory as practice, and at the same time it rejects the view of the modernist subject of knowledge that transcends history because it advocates that:

> *...All observations and all theoretical systems ... are part of the world that we want to describe and interpret, and have an impact on that world.* (Edkins, 2007: 88).

Postmodernist political thinking advocates the 'pluralistic mindset', which does not accept the monopoly of any position, and doubts the political orientation of the universal theories and their stalemate when colliding with political realities. J. F. Lyotard writes:

> *...The great narrative has lost its credibility, no matter what form of unity is used, whether it is speculative narrative or liberation narrative. (*Lyotard, 1984: 37).

As the same with Lyotard, Ernesto Laclau writes:

> *...Dropping the myth of the foundations does not lead to nihilism, nor does the confusion about how an enemy attacks does not lead to passivity. Other than that, it leads to an increase in the necessary discursive and controversial interventions, since there is no metaphysical reality that simple language can reflect. To the extent that debate and discourse characterizes an open, social character, it becomes a source of great actionism and more radical liberalism. Humanity, who had always kneeled before the external forces - God, Nature, the inevitable laws of History - can now, on the threshold of postmodernism, self-acknowledge first as creator and builder of history yourself. The mythical resolution of the foundations - at the same time with the category of subject - promotes more strongly the possibility of liberation given by the Enlightenment and Marxism.* (Laclau, 1988: 79-80).

Postmodernism is critical of a subjective, biased approach to comparing different perspectives. Political communities are so rich, interconnected that they could not be simply categorized into classes. The socio-cultural context is always attached to the political structure, and the politics needs to be compatible with and reflect all the relationships that make up the historical context of the country. It fosters local political action because people are often more concerned with practical, concrete, side-by-side issues. It recognizes the historical specificity of the ideology and does not reject all ideologies, and at the same time advocates a type of political system not based on just one ideological foundation, but on intermediate association according to the pragmatic trend, promoting autonomy and solidarity, promoting values over laws than fundamental views, focusing on purpose than foundation. The pluralistic mindset allows for the public expression of consensus or disagreement over practical issues, thereby fostering autonomy and cooperation through a strategy that targets values instead of rules, specific goals instead of the ideal macro goals.

The dominant theme in postmodernist political theory is power. According to modernist thinking, it is the power to coerce based on the force of violence, but under postmodernism, real power is not the power to coerce but the power of cultural meanings and symbols. The society forms the pattern of the worldview and the boundary of action. Power is ubiquitous, not only in factories but also in schools, prisons, hospitals and many other institutions. M. Foucault writes:

> .*In terms of power… I dont understand the common ruling system operated by one element or one group over another, their consequences… across the entire body of society… It seemed to me. that the first thing to be understood is the variety of power relationships inherent in the domain in which they are run, and which constitutes its organization; the game through which resistance continuously transforms them, reinforces them, reverses them; this support of relationships of power finds each other, in order to form a chain or a system, or, on the other hand, distances, contradictions that separate them from each other; in the end, effective strategies, and their general paradigm or institutional crystallization transformed into national apparatus, into law-making, into social governing power. The possibility of power ... is not found in the fundamental existence of a central point, a unique sovereign space that will emit derivative forms and degradation; it is the moving background of power relations, which has been relentlessly motivated by their inequality, states of power, but always in place and unstable. The omnipotence of power: not purely because it groups things under strong unity, but because it is constantly being born, all the time, or more in every relationship between this point and the point. other. Power is omnipresent: it doesnt drown everything, but it comes from everywhere.* (Foucault, 1978: 121-122).

On examining the history of the power, M. Foucault came to deny the idea of history as a single-line route with a beginning and an end, instead emphasizing discontinuity and difference remained silent or be buried, forgotten, eliminated by the dominant interpretations of the past, thereby freeing historical oppressed voices from mainstream narratives. Discourse or ‘discursive establishment’ is a central concept of the Foucaultian genealogical method. Discourse is a set of opinions that make language for exchange, a method of expressing a particular kind of knowledge about a certain topic and limiting the scope of a topic. Foucaultian genealogy aimed at the disruption of the intellectual constructs that form individual and collective identities, rediscovering intellectual, historical disruptions, and inversions in the central concepts of politics such as sovereignty, power. This thought greatly influences thinking about power in that it is seen as possession that enhances the capacity of those who operate it and excludes those being operated by it. Power operation issues are tied to legalization and consensus issues.

M. Shapiro revises modernist discourses of political theory by overemphasizing the themes of power and justice but ignores their textuality. He rejects all discourses that distinguish different social spaces, he (Shapiro, 1992: 5) writes: ‘Discursive politics is inseparable from spatial politic.’ The relationship between spatial reality and discursive practice always exists in the phenomenon of discourse. The world is constructed as text so all access to reality is always mediated by interpretive practices. Society must be read as a text. The interplay between space and meaning is necessary for any postmodernist discursive analysis. Political theory is basically textual and reality is a textual phenomenon. He follows M. Foucault's method of genealogical explanation.

Following Derrida's poststructuralism, Der Derian argues that socially constructivist political discourses, in which some are forgotten, ignored while some are exalted, prioritized and dominant. Postmodernist political thinking aims to describe how the social orders depend on oblivion. According to him, postmodernist political thinking studies the relationship between power and the practices of manifestation which favor one truth over another, legitimizing and imposing one identity against another, one discourse is more important than the other. The task of postmodernist politics is to deconstruct through detailed interpretation of language, concepts, and texts that formulate prioritized discourses in international relations. This type of analysis undermines the strategies of forgetting what is often used to impose specific texts. Power is, therefore, implied and truly inseparable from the analysis of the imposition of texts. Poststructural analysis of texts has two forms: the first is the analysis of texts and their relationship to power according to the historical method, explaining the origin and substitution of discursive texts and this form is called 'genealogical analysis'; the second is to analyze how particular texts draw boundaries and create identities and reciprocal differences, called 'semiotics'.

According to the postmodernist political theorists, one of the most important problems in modern politics is the point of view of the mode that:

> *...Many issues and research topics in International Relations are not of epistemology and ontology, but of power and authority; they are a struggle to impose authoritative justifications for international relation.* (Devetak, 2005: 167).

M. Foucault argues that power is not possessed by existing entities such as individuals, nations, and classes, but denotes social relations, characterized by little confrontation between two enemies rather than the interaction between unequal and transformational relations. And power exists only when operated in this interaction. Moreover, power is productive in the sense that it does not obstruct or suppress that 'operating in the realm of possibilities.' (Foucault, 1997: 341). This requires the participation of power technology, the devices and means used to observe, monitor, shape and control individual behavior, operating in a variety of institutional contexts. Power should not be perceived from the perspective of repression, but as something positive that creates subjectivity and social capacities.

M. Foucault points to various practical manifestations of power. Its ultimate form is power before death, it is related to 'acquisition: things, time, body and life itself' (Foucault, 1990: 136). In modern times, ultimate power has been replaced by other power relations: disciplinary power and bio-power, which function through 'producing powers, nurture them, and manipulate them rather than aiming to obstruct, obey or destroy them' (Foucault, 1990: 136). Disciplinary practice found in barracks, prisons, and schools is based on a view of the body as a machine and aims to exploit the potentials, benefits, and productive forces of it.

Whereas the bio-power is not based on the human view as the body (man-as-body) but as the species (man-as-species), related to health, hygiene, birth rate, longevity and characteristics of species. The disciplinary power shapes the individual, the species, and the entities that coexist. The emergence of power creates a shift in the operating mechanism of ultimate power, from the means of exclusion to the means of opening and generating through the management and promotion of life.

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri advocated the post-modernization of the new form of the world order by returning to Michel Foucault's idea of bio-power, to Deleuxe and Guattari's on nomadism. The world order is not simply a conflict between sovereign states because states are no longer important actors in international politics. The new world order manifests in the way of forming political order among nations, within each nation and each individual. Foucault's concept of bio-power explains how the relationship between individuals and society, economy and government is formed, re-formed and ended. They relied on postmodernism to explain how the international order was formed, on the uncertain position and fragmented nature of the empire.

Inheriting M. Foucault's rebuttal against the nation's opposition to society, instead considering state as something imposed from outside, national power as a negative, repressive, postmodernist political theorists reject the national functional unity or bias in power relations. State and national power are not inherent attributes but are 'random outcomes of specific practices and of strategic interactions between diverse social dynamics within and outside the country' (Jessop, 2001: 156). Instead of seeing the state as an a priori, ontological existence, the postmodernist political theorists study the mode of generating national sovereignty as a coherent, purposeful subject through the continuous process of the transformation of national power.

The issue of sovereignty from the postmodernist standpoint deals with three distinct but interrelated phenomena: 'presence in the Derrida sense', 'autonomy in the political liberal sense', and 'national sovereignty'. Ashley clarifies how these three phenomena are historically and cognitively interconnected in modern times. Modern times are seen as regime of power in the Foucault sense that is 'the multifaceted regime of highly mobile intelligible practices - explanatory attitudes and practical tendencies...to interpretation and disciplined behavior' (Ashley, 1989: 269). Sovereignty paradigm mentions to 'a concrete interpretation, molded by history, widely circulated and practical about man as the ultimate existence' (Ashley, 1989: 269), and 'Man as the ultimate entity is perceived based on the metaphysical premise of the presence and the central discourse, which assumes "one source, one unified voice ... as the ultimate source of truth and meaning.' (Ashley, 1989: 261). The concept of sovereignty of the rational man plays a fundamental role in the claim of national sovereignty. Placed in the broad discourse and political agenda of modern times, sovereignty becomes the endpoint, where human reason, autonomy is provided for the power and the will to liberate humanity, attaching to the ultimate political community (modern nation) as the position of political life.

On the other hand, the postmodernist political theorists also focus on the discursive strategies of the arrangement, shaping the country, and simulating sovereignty through the modes of expression (using words, expressions, signified, images), highlighting country with presence, and a specific identity; exploring the way in which the enactment of domestic and foreign policies creates national-specific perceptions and builds identity of the ego. Based on J. Derrida's linguistic theory and Judith Butler's concept of identity, David Campell investigates how written and reorganized arrangements are made through foreign policies that operate in the name of American identity. Stemming from the premise that the state has no ontological status separated from the various activities that make up its reality, he investigates the way in which identity construction is achieved through the arrangement of boundaries, delimiting the inside from the outside, the ego from the other, the inner and the outer. As an ever-evolving project with no end product, a nation is built through coding, boundary positioning, and identity-generating practices.

Regarding postmodern conditions in world politics, Der Derian argues that this is a crisis that legitimizes Western society's rule. Modern society regains identity from cultural diplomacy and collective conflict from colonialism, the Soviet threat (formerly), the international terrorism. In the new conditions of world politics, the roots of identity have weakened and faded, especially since the end of the Cold War, which has created a new and more fragmented conflict. At the same time, national sovereignty has been significantly shaken by new technologies, the diversity of non-state actors, the incorporation of the external sector (the European Union) and internal decay (nationalism). In general, Western power is waning. The current crisis of legalization is combined with the crisis of political legitimization, national identity and traditional forms of practical knowledge.

In the context of the crisis, new political ideas emerged in an attempt to mediate and create new conflicts. It differs from the previous anti-diplomacy stance due to new power techniques and the new manifestation of dangers that create and mediate conflict at present conditions. These are surveillance techniques, politicizing speed and simulation. They are clearer and more extensive than previous techniques, more realistic in time than space and beyond. They are produced and maintained by the exchange of symbols rather than goods. J. F. Lyotard writes:

> *Knowledge in the form of information goods is indispensable to available production capacity, and will continue to be a major asset around the world. It is known that state nations will one day fight to control information, as they once fought for the territory and then to control access to and exploit raw resources and cheap labor. A new realm has opened up for commercial and industrial strategies, and political and military strategies.* (Lyotard, 1984: 5).

The emergence of a series of new technologies allows for a miraculous acceleration of speed compared to before, and the perception of distance has completely changed: the faster information is transmitted from sender to receiver, the distance geography decreases in significance. Politically, this affects the relationship between people, changing the jobs of A and the relationship between A and B because in strategic relations what makes sense is the speed of movement, weapons, information. Thus, the control and distribution of time becomes more important than geography, and speed becomes more important than space. J. D. Derian writes:

> *International relations are shifting from a realm defined by sovereignty, impregnable borders and rigid geopolitics to the realm of accelerating currents, disputed boundaries and - smooth politics. (Derian, 1992: 129-30).*

Politicization of speed changes the global political system, national sovereignty in terms of geography is eroded, how to determine national sovereignty from the time-speed perspective of information? Does blurring the line between real and virtual pose any political dangers? Der Derian proposed,

> *We need a virtual theory for military strategies, philosophical questions, ethical topics, and the political debates surrounding the future of war and peace. Every journey involves the processes of pre-visualizing the destination with initial dialogues and preparation. Choosing to believe or not believe what, where to go and who will meet, which will record and ultimately explain what is written, always involve intellectual processes and powerful dialogue. The quest for the virtual is a struggle between the original disappearing and that which can be produced endlessly. It is the fight for the sake: what interests are emerging in the growing virtualization world; which benefits obstruct, which benefit motivates the quest; And obviously, what benefits me is the opposite of what is possible for the reader. Most crucial is a dialogue about the origin of the self-interest, between states of existence, between a sense of self and reality and what a person begins and ends the journey*. (Derian, 2000: 771-788)

Emphasizing the role of postmodern political thinking in the context of the world being extensively facilitated by virtual reality technology, Derian writes:

> *Facing new virtual fields of economic penetration, technological acceleration, and new media, spatial stance, materialism, realism of realism and other traditional approaches do not. can begin to fully grasp the dangerous, temporal, manifest, non-positioning powers of virtualization. By tracing reincarnations of power in new latent forms, postmodernists make a starting point.*

> *They help us understand how information is produced, how metaphors, discourse and language in general can influence consciousness, digitize concepts, predict the future. But they also provide important tools for floating expression, resolving contradictory structures, freeing imagination. Because realities of international politics are constantly being produced, mediated, simulated by new digital means; due to the new media globalization increases the disturbance between the real and the virtual; due to the narrowing gap between truth-making sources and power; since meaning is floated and sucked into the media black hole of nonsense, a little postmodern can go a long way.* (Derian, 2000: 771-788).

With its own approach, postmodernist politics have been penetrating the political disciplines, the agenda of contemporary political reality. The British Labor Party's New Left line, the American Democratic Party's Identity Politics advocates individually designing their own political and cultural identities by fighting or associating. Increasing interests (emotional, sexual, creative...) blossomed with feminist movements, color, homosexual groups, environmental protection. Political parties, especially social democracy, have restructured and reoriented the idea to meet voters' demands on postmodern values, shifting from economic and political topics to topics of individual identity and culture.

The analysis shows that, politically, postmodernism is against universal thinking and action strategies, but in favor of strategies of thinking and action at the contextual, local, and practical approach. Postmodernist thinking is not only skeptical of the leadership of liberal political movements, but also their fundamental ideas, especially those originating in the Enlightenment. Anti-foundationist thinking combined with macro social changes have paralleled the mindset of rejecting the social, economic and political assumptions of modernist times, against the foundation of capitalism and liberalism. This makes postmodernist ideas and interests stand out in the social sciences. The combination of postmodernism and contemporary liberalism gives rise to a growing consensus on specific issues, resulting in the formation of postmodernist political thinking.

Postmodernist political thinking does not completely reject every idea that contributed to the foundation of social history, and valuable ideas of the past are still maintained, especially ideas which are critical of objectivity in closed systems. It does not believe in ideologies because of the stalemate of their political orientation, the ideologies that exhibit characteristics within the universal context, are signs of subjective thinking. Postmodernist political thinking is concerned with specific cases because "the universal" only aims at the absolute totality of all things, all ideas, people, events, space, and time. The ideologies cannot go beyond their subjective position and allow themselves to be popularly applied. Political systems possess a profound richness, which cannot be simplified into class, or any other political set concerned with the overall relationship that constitutes the social context at a certain country. Postmodernist political thinking promotes the implementation of political action on a local scale because people are more aware of the issues surrounding their particular lives.

Postmodernist thinking rejects the functional distinction between spheres of social life as well as the use of rational tools at all times; it does not accept low cultural (pop culture) discrimination and high culture. The issue of class is understood in a new sense: The leading class is and will be the class of decision-makers. This class is no longer made up of traditional political classes, but by a mixed class of business owners, high-ranking officials, the heads of professional organizations, trade unions, and rule, great religion. Postmodernism in its content richness can provide various explanations for the internal challenges in consumer society - the most fundamental characteristic of today's society.

With the emphasis on difference rather than synthesis, on diversity rather than unity, free will of choice instead of determinism, people in the postmodern world are socialized into consumers with the freedom to choose in the market to differentiate themselves from others by collecting as many goods and services as symbols of social status, distinguishing them from others. Man attains temporary social status and significance - a fragile state in the postmodern world filled with ideals and trendy ideology, with modern reforms and with whatever comes out trendy, there's nothing permanent in the postmodern world, so we have to constantly re-locate ourselves.

In addition, the strong development of science and technology, especially in information technology and biotechnology, is posing many new challenges in ethical values. Postmodernists do not deny the necessity of scientific progress, but are skeptical and warn of the danger of using scientific achievements against humans (obsession with ‘Hiroshima’ and ‘Nagasaki’, the Cold War, weapons of mass destruction, germ bombs). They think that we are technically capable to do something that does not mean we have to and that scientific progress should be based on the interests of humanity, but not some people, and on human values rather than pragmatic values.

CONCLUSION

Postmodernism is a cultural and spiritual product inevitably arising from the fundamental changes in the historical and material conditions of Western Europe and North America from the Second World War to the late 1970s and early 1980s. It is a critique of modernism, characterized by the rationalization and subjectization of all theoretical and practical activities. The limitations and shortcomings of the modernist mindset blossom, and people no longer put their faith in the universal power of rationalization and subjectization in the ideal of mastering nature and building a commune, fair and good assembly. The out-breaking disruptions overturn modernism's ideals, and the promises that don't come true, the disillusionments, and pessimism in the face of unexpected reality.

Postmodernism, from the ontological, epistemological to the human level is associated with the breath of life, with the hot spots of reality. It does not advocate for building a general, absolute, objective picture of the world and society, but instead it seeks theories according to which it is capable of bringing real practical effects on a small, local, and specific scale. In this sense, postmodernism is gradually becoming a new paradigm, existing next to the modernist one, both interwoven and complementing each other in the role of guiding human thinking and action in the West today. Postmodernist designs in the fields of social life bring unique features, and often highlight the thinking style.

REFERENCES

[1]. Ashley R. (1989). *Living on border lines: Man, poststructuralism, and war. In J. Der Derian & M. J. Shapiro Eds. International/intertextual relations: Postmodern readings of world politics*. New York: Lexington book.

[2]. Derian J & Shapiro M. Eds. (1989). *International/intertextual relations: Postmodern readings of world politics*. New York: Lexington Books.

[3]. Derian J., (1992). *Antidiplomacy: Spies, Speed, Terror, and War*. Oxford: Blackwell.

[4]. Derian J. (2000). Virtuous War/Virtual Theory, *In International Affairs*. Vol. 76. No. 4.

[5]. Edkins (2007). Poststructuralism. In M. Griffiths Ed. *International relations theory for the twenty-first century: An introduction.* London: Routledge.

[6]. Devetak, Burchill S., et al. Eds. (2005). *Theories of international relations*. New York: Palgrave.

[7]. Jessop (2001). Bringing the state back in (yet again): Reviews, revisions, rejections and redirections. In *International Review of Sociology*, 11(2).

[8]. Foucault M. (1978). *History of Sexuality*. Vol. I. Vintage Book: New York.

[9]. Foucault M (1997), Subject and power. In P. Rabinow Ed. *Power: Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984. Vol. III.* New York: New York Press.

[10]. Foucault M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: An Introduction*. Vol. I. New York: Vintage Books.

[11]. Laclau E. (1988). “Politics and the Limits of Modernity” in Andrew Ross, *Universal Abandon*. Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press.

[12]. Lyotard J. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. University of Minnesota Press.

[13]. Shapiro M. (1992). *Reading the Postmodern Polity: Political Theory as Textual Practice.* Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press.