



Horizontal Polyecticism and Polyconstruction: the Newest Post-Modernist Approaches

Pratick Mallick

GUEST-LECTURER, DEPT. OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, POLBA MAHAVIDYALAYA,
POLBA, HOOGHLY (W.B.)

ABSTRACT

Post-modernism appeared as the newest approach when behaviouralism was in full swing. Post-modernism went against leaning to past tradition and concentrated to new creations completely independent of history. Yet, being varied and complicated in features, it sometimes proved to be paradoxical mainly due to minimum hierarchical limitations. Horizontal polyecticism and polyconstruction tried to take it out of that limitation by giving it proper sense of ahistoricism. Thus post-modernism undergoes a paradigmatic transformation within itself.

KEYWORDS : A-structuralism, Law of lawlessness, Horizontal Polyecticism, Polyconstruction.

INTRODUCTION

Post-modernism is basically a mute revolution in the way of thinking and ideas that are varied in nature irrespective of disciplines including social sciences. Therefore, the pure sciences, too, are significantly influenced by the concepts of post-modernism. Basically the ideas of post-modernism emerged roughly in the 1960s in by means of cultural aspects, which gradually spread its tentacles to almost all fields of exercises and studies. So, it is an enigmatic question as to which of the two—ideas and reality—came prior to which! In other words, it is really a cause of concern if at all post-modernism based upon the concept of post-modernity is truly dependent upon empiricism.

WHAT POST-MODERNISM IS ABOUT!

There is a common inquisitiveness about what it is about—concept or practice—or, does have micro or macro dimensional importance! There are several confusions about the impact base of post-modernism. In fact, "It [became] more and more difficult as the 1980s wear on to specify exactly what... postmodernism is supposed to refer to as the term gets stretched in all directions across different debates, different disciplinary and discursive boundaries, as different factions seek to make it their own, using it to designate a plethora of incommensurable objects, tendencies, emergencies" (Hebdige, 1988). It should be remembered that post-modernism is nothing but a challenge to any pattern; in other words, when one talks about any system or convention, by default one is supposed to have provided an acute latent bias towards the status quo. Therefore, by it is meant the retention of the old system and a dis-inclination to challenge it in order to herald a new pattern instead. Thus it is clear that post-modernism whether in ideas or reality wants some newness that has never ever been attempted. Many say that it is an attempt to continuously progress in such a manner that nobody would be able to predict the discourse of the progress as such. Therefore, it is unequivocally against the concept of renewal of the patterns or accepting the same only after necessary modifications. So, it can be said that post-modernism is actually a steady approach towards the justification as well as promotion of a kind of 'a-structuralism'. It can be also said that post-modernism is in practice the 'law of lawlessness' in terms of any constructive appearance. Also, post-modernism goes commensurable with the ideas of 'incommensurability'; that is, having no universal design or pattern and without any mode of totalization. However, there are still many who opine that by means of a-structuralism, it indicates to the existence of so many structures (Woods, 2010). Yet such view, too, does not go in contradiction with the basic tempo of the sense of a-structuralism in the sense that if a completely new structure comes up in place of the previous pattern, which may also become continuity. In this case, the question of meta-narrative depends upon the idealistic philosophy even of Hegel or materialistic philosophy of Marxism. To make it more comprehensive, it should be remembered that at the primary stage of evolution it assumes the version of a kind of anti-thesis as if going against the old fashion or pattern thought to be like a thesis, indeed. Therefore, unlike in Hegelian or Marxian dialectic concept(s), in post-modernism what matters is the existence of huge discrepancies among the structures or patterns to be, thereby, considered as based on the same floor of dimension what may be considered as horizontal polyecticism. What is found in the so-called dialecticism ever since Plato is the omnipresence of only two

ideas or concepts set in motion in a cyclic order of significance whereas in post-modernism there is only once the mode of conflict in a vertical sense does take place and, once that achieved, there is no more conflict among various patterns on vogue on an horizontal arena with each of them in operation independent of one another. Therefore, the ideas of a complete profile of post-modernism can be simplified as such that initially it takes to linear development and thereafter a horizontal development. In its discourse, post-modernism deals with the means of evading the dependence upon enlightenment of tradition. In this view, post-modernism heralds a completely new branch of direct activities rather than so much theorization as had been on vogue in times when there was a normal prevalence of responsibility to carry on the tradition ahead as if to further justify the necessity of the past in the present and in future well enough. Therefore, post-modernism can be briefly thought to be such an approach that accelerates the ideas of polyconstructionism.

POST-MODERNISM: AFTER MODERNISM OR NEO-MODERNISM!

There is a general misconception concerning the true attributive character of post-modernism whether or not as 'following modernism' or else like something very rarely termed as neo-modernism. First, it must be kept in mind that the prefix *post* is directly related to the senses of critically estimating modernism, apart from the omniessential potentials of stooping to the evolution over modernism. So, it can be expected to consider post-modernism as the revisioning of modernism in any way, be it supersession or replacement. So, it cannot be ruled out that post-modernism continuously relies upon modernism. As already said, post-modernism cannot be separated from modernism as an approach. The former rather explorably depends upon the latter in *inter alia* justifying the nature of pluralism that fails to achieve its true character in times of modernism. By Modernism bifurcating culture between the popular and the elite modes, it is indicated that any opinion or tendency is bipolar and symptomatic to a competition for supremacy, thereby, still leaning to the trying ideas of hierarchy. But post-modernism supports pluralism by proving the cause of the horizontal polyecticism as already explained above.

Briefly speaking, there is very seldom the exercise concerning the ideas of neo-modernism. In fact, in many cases, it is mistaken either with modernism as distinguished from the ideas of modernity or with post-modernism. Neo-modernism takes too much time and effort to be compatible with the cult of the new, so often mistaken for modernism, which gives rise to an endless series of mutually destructive trends. It seems to be perfect if neo-modernism be called neo-modernity. In other words, neo-modernity seems to be a long transitional period oriented to establishing the sense of progress and evolution, in whatever sense that be referred to. It can be also considered that neo-modernism is a philosophical approach oriented to finding out misgivings of modernism by post-modernism, particularly by the concept of universalism as well as the critical thinking which may be termed as the two indispensable factors associated with the ideas of rights and addressing the supremacy of certain arenas of culture over other types of culture. Thus neo-modernism has a moral code. However, whatever be its form or temporal mode of operationalization, one point is clear: post-modern-

ism and neo-modernism are so minutely different from each other that it is sometimes very much latent.

POST-MODERNISM: THEN AND NOW

When the ideas of postmodernism first emerged in an inchoate version of philosophy, the West was already influenced highly with the ideas of *behaviouralism*—then the newest urge to the political thinking. In social sciences a limitation in due course was felt; the lack of orientation of taking out anything new rather than only locating it. Further, it could not be successful much also because of subjectivity. Initially, this was a valid point to the earlier post-modernists who felt seriously uncomfortable with positivism—the scientific rationality that, maybe, is outside the old tradition, yet confined to the basic structural parameters of scientificism. It is also essential to keep in mind that social sciences almost completely failed to survive the attempt at the demise of theories. But in any case, was it similar to demise of theorization? The answer is *no*. The basic motto of *behaviouralism* is generalization or theorization that was declared to be on vogue, thenceforth. To the contrary, post-modernism seems to be sick of *theories* and, by means of anti-positivism, that of *theorization* mainly because it is difficult to effectivise the binary approaches. If it is thought always in light of the erstwhile post-modernists in terms of existence of the opposites, it ultimately does not intend to accept the practice of pluralism.

Now the most interesting question can be done here; if there is no theorization or generalization as detailed recently, then for the sake of argumentativeness can post-modernism be accepted as non-repetitive? Further, the society, although so many members thereof are ready to shrug off the old as backdated and partially out of the sense of doing something new, is still going on even in its façade along certain policies and principles which are not deviant from the past but near modification thereof. Then how is it possible for post-modernism to contribute to the progress of the society? The answer is that the post-modernists are sick of creating anything that must not last long. In other words, unlike the past creators who were particularly concerned with the longevity of their creations over so many decades or epochs, the post-modernists are not oriented to that approach. They rather think that unless one creation is taken over by the newer, progress is to be halted. There-

fore, for the sake of progress itself, any creation is to be made in such a way that it takes to another creation only to complement the former. So, out of it what can be inferred is that post-modernism relies upon the blurred emergence of mini-narratives instead of meta-narratives or the universalization of philosophic thinking. As indicated earlier, it creates the temporal hierarchisation. And it is basically also against the potentials of post-modernism due to indulgence in the application of the micro-binary pairs so much so that one fragmental sojourn initiates one solution and, again, such solution itself becoming the cause of the next fragmentation, the next cycle of *enthesiation* is initiated. Resultantly, though discontinued, any future cannot think independent of the past. Therefore, the concept of historicism still pervades, which is against the actual grain of post-modernism.

CONCLUSION:

RHETORIC OF HISTORY: POST-MODERNISM OR POLY-CONSTRUCTION

Post-modernism is constitutive of structures which can be called rhetoric (Shotter, 1993) and associated with daily lives. It, on one hand, deliberately goes against significance of historicism, if any, whereas *polyconstruction* as highlighted here through its justification of post-modernism, on the other, goes symptomatic of the proper sense of *ahistorical* deliberations. Therefore, *polyconstruction* along with *horizontal polyecticism* reiterates the trends of *neo-ideo-centrism* through transcendentalism of the reality arc. So, the solemnization of the concept of deconstruction still requires more to adjoin in order to give it a proper balance between the two poles claiming to be post-modern in their ultimate senses. Therefore, newer thinking is seriously required as the exercise of post-modernism in itself has become a matter of past, that is, history. In this case, it should be remembered that there is a close proximity between *ahistoricism* and end of philosophical *theories* when deliberations made by many philosophers claiming to be positivists like (Lipset: 1981) suggest no more requirement of theories as the necessity thereof had become obsolete.

REFERENCES

1. Hebdige, Dick (1988). *Hiding in the Light: On Image and Things*, Routledge, London; | 2. Lipset, Seymour Martin (1981). *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics*, The John Hopkins University Press, Expanded edition; | 3. Shotter, John (1993). *Cultural Politics of Everyday Life: Social Constructionism, Rhetoric and Knowing of the Third Kind*, Open University Press, Buckingham; | 4. Woods, Tim (2010). *BEGINNING POSTMOD-*

ERNISM, Viva Books, Second ed., New Delhi, First Indian Edition.