Roida Rzayeva Oktay

The Challenges of Contemporaneity
Postmodernity and Multiculturalism

Springer

SpringerBriefs in Philosophy

Roida Rzayeva Oktay

The Challenges
of Contemporaneity

Postmodernity and Multiculturalism

☘ Springer

Roida Rzayeva Oktay
Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences
Baku
Azerbaijan

For Z.G.

Contents

Chapter 1
Introduction

Abstract Today's sociocultural situation can be characterised as an abolition of "the classical" model of culture and the cult of high samples. The necessity for the formation of a new narration for the present is felt. The replacement of a dominating intellectual paradigm meant the transition from one cultural context to another, which is always characterised by a transformation of cultural codes and systems of values. All these dimensions, as well as the polysemanticism of the notion of "postmodernity," cause both cultural and socio-philosophical analyses of postmodernity and its indicators in societies. Therefore, the need for an integrated approach to the problems of social changes requires an interdisciplinary arrangement of studies. The concept of "interdisciplinarity" is one of the main features of a modern scientific and intellectual activity. Thus, philosophy allows us to contemplate a problem alongside some sciences, being some kind of adequate language for understanding the specificity of the subject of study.

Keywords Interdisciplinarity · Postmodernism · Alternative modernity · Philosophy · Culture · Language-key

On considering modern realities, we can state an emergence of the postmodernist paradigm used for the interpretation of a social entity exceeding the limits of modernity.

Today's sociocultural situation can be characterised as an abolition of "the classical" model of culture and the cult of high samples. The sociocultural approach considers social changes as a result of cultural conditions.

The necessity for the formation of a new narration for the present is felt. Besides, when the modern and European areas cease to be identical, there emerges the matter of the definition of contemporaneity, and connected with this the "wearing" of the concept of "modern" (Göle 2008, 165). In this case, it is a matter of constituting the "various modifications of modern" (Allard 2002, 61), or the alternative modernities as equivalent to the modern.

The concept of "alternative modernity" is based on the assumption of the presence of the new experiments that can change the definition of "the present".

The alternative modernity, without being limited to different cultural trajectories, puts in the agenda the creation of the difference, overcoming the existing model of contemporaneity. In this context, it can be a bearer of novelty. However, at the same time, as a notion of continuous systematic transformation it is weak (Göle 2008, 163).

The replacement of a dominating intellectual paradigm meant the transition from one cultural context to another, which is always characterised by the transformation of cultural codes and systems of values.

In this light, the principle of "value revaluation" (Nietzsche), or the revision of values, acting as a characteristic feature of postmodern, becomes topical. It is also the value of a "postmodernism syndrome". This transformation is expressed in changes of cultural, religious norms, and outlooks on macro- and micro-levels, that is, social, personal, etc.

In the context of value transformations the efforts are directed at designing a new culture based on a multicultural understanding of society, causing value pluralism.

Interdisciplinarity

All these dimensions, as well as the polysemanticism of the notion of "post-modernity," cause both the cultural and socio-philosophical analyses of post-modernity and its indicators in societies. Therefore, the need for an integrated approach to the problems of social changes requires an interdisciplinary arrangement of studies. The concept of "interdisciplinarity" is one of the main features of a modern scientific and intellectual activity (*Mejdistsiplinarnost v naukakh i filosofii* 2010, 6).

One more aspect of the cultural analysis is the revealing of the specificity of a given culture. In particular, this point is of great importance to the cultures with a synthetic structure (the world-outlook features, traditional institutes).

The detection and interpretation of the features contradicting the major paradigms and tendencies of a given culture, which at the same time are peculiar to and in a certain way correlated with them, are directly connected with the above-stated level.

In the process of global transformation, a sociocultural background acts as one of the significant indicators of modern realities. At the same time, interdisciplinary research requires a language key. So, philosophy, as a sort of meta-language, serves as a method of understanding the sociocultural whole and its aspects at the junction with a number of sciences, constituting the system description of an object. Thus, philosophy allows us to contemplate a problem jointly with some sciences, being some kind of adequate language for understanding the specificity of the subject of study.

In the context of social changes, interdisciplinary research is understood not only as a description but also as an assignment of frameworks of possible sociocultural transformations, as an analysis and prognostication of possible development

prospects based on specific features of the analysed "ground," and the peculiarities of the prevailing discourse.

Postmodernity is also important from the point of view of studying an attitude of society, and more precisely the reasons causing its variability (Rzayeva 2011, 89). The changeability of the public consciousness is caused by the variable perception of stereotypes depending on the sociocultural ground.

The above-stated parameters also express sociological and cultural dimensions, in which the postmodernist indicators are considered. The cultural dimension is, to a certain degree, connected with the psychological ones.

References

Allard, E. (2002). Sonitelniye dostoinstva konseptsii modernizatsii. http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/188/689/1231/006.ALLARD.pdf.

Göle, N. (2008). *Melez Desenler İslam ve Modernlik Üzerine*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 3. Basım.

Mejdistsiplinarnost v naukakh i filosofii (2010). Otv. redaktor I. T. Kasavin. M.: IFRAN.

Rzayeva, R. O. (2011). Kültürel Yönleriyle post-Çağdaşlık ve Türk Dünyası (Türkiye Örneği). In *9. Uluslararası Türk Dünyası Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi*, 16–17 Haziran 2011 (pp. 87–91). Bakü, Azerbaycan.

Chapter 2
A Conceptual Framework
for Postmodernism

Abstract Some general concepts and ideas characterise postmodernist discourse.
This is what you might call an analytical tool or *apparatus criticus*. Though, as a
whole, it is impossible to assert the absolute accuracy of the borders between the
concepts mentioned below, it is however necessary to underline the standard
mission of the concepts used for the characteristics of a postmodernist paradigm, in
particular, the terms "postmodernism", "postmodern", "postmodernity", "post-
modernisation", and "postcontemporaneity". If postmodernity is focused on the
social and political reflections of this philosophy in a society, postmodernism is a
cultural and intellectual phenomenon. Hence, we can speak about a condition, that
is postmodern, and about postmodernism as the intellectual phenomenon. The
postmodernist philosophy in this measurement creates a theoretical basis, or, in
other words, a basis of postmodernism. Hence, postmodernism is a philosophical
and ideological projection of postmodernity. Summarising the positions, it is pos-
sible to notice that postmodernism expresses a philosophical measurement that the
postmodern and postmodernity are social, and that postmodernisation is a social
and economic measurement of a concept that, in our opinion, testifies to the
interdisciplinary character of the phenomenon "postmodernism" and its complex
character.

Keywords Concept · Narratology · Derivatives · Postmodernism ·
Postmodernity · Postmodernisation · Postcontemporaneity

Some general concepts and ideas characterise postmodernist discourse, and are
what you might call an analytical tool or *apparatus criticus*.

Though on the whole it is impossible to assert the absolute accuracy of the
borders between the concepts mentioned below, it is however necessary to
underline the standard mission of the concepts used to characterise a postmodernist
paradigm, in particular the terms "postmodernism", "postmodern", "postmoder-
nity", "postmodernisation", and "postcontemporaneity".

Postmodernity literally means "after modernity", and symbolises a new condi-
tion that the modern society and culture enters. In this new condition the forms of

technology and information have changed, consumption has replaced manufacture, image has replaced a reality, and a fragmentation has replaced the whole, meta-narratives have begun to be refused, and popular culture has started to occupy a leading position (Sarıbay 2001, 5).

As a whole, postmodernity is characterised as a postcontemporary condition or a condition of postcontemporaneity that is, in turn, independent of the comprehension of the given fact and its art development (Rubtsov 2011).

The term "postmodernity" is used in several different senses. The widest use of postmodernity—in particular referring to postmodernist art and architecture—is defined as a condition of the postmodern (that follows the modern or has arisen as a reaction to it). It is also used for the description of a period in architecture that began in the 1950s as a reply to the withdrawal from the categorical division of styles, and a reaction to ideas about "high" and "low" art and the global village.

In philosophy and critical theory, postmodernity expresses a situation or conditions in society that have arisen after the modern. Many theorists of postmodernity consider postmodernity as the historical situation specifying the end of modernity (defined as the period/condition identified with the Industrial Revolution and the Enlightenment).

Postmodern means the postmodernist condition of a society, a consequence of information technology, globalisation, differentiations of lifestyles, hyper-consumption, chaotisation of the financial markets and public benefit, obsolescence of the nation state and the traditional course of life (Turner 1996, 83; 1999, 51).

The postmodern is characterised as the phenomenon creating the inevitable postcontemporaneity (Rubtsov 2011).

If postmodernity is focused on the social and political reflections of postmodernism in a society, postmodernism is a cultural and intellectual phenomenon. Along with a postmodernist condition, which is the expression of economic, political, and social measurements, there is a postmodernism that is an expression of positions and approaches that have arisen as a reaction to modernism in architecture and other art forms, as well as philosophy, religion, society, and culture. Hence, we can speak about a condition that is postmodern, and about postmodernism as the intellectual phenomenon.

In this connection, it is also defined "as a trend in creativity and a reflection", which is characterised by self-identification and special language (Ibid.).

If postmodernity describes a condition of existence or a condition, or is connected with institutes and changes in conditions (Giddens 1990), postmodernism expresses aesthetic, literary, political, and social philosophy. The problem of postmodernity, in a Lyotardian interpretation, is a problem of expression of thought, first of all in such spheres as art, literature, philosophy, and policy (Lyotard 1986, 118). The postmodernist philosophy in this measurement creates a theoretical basis, or, in other words, a basis for postmodernism.

The term "postmodernism" connected with the term "postmodernity" expresses the currents and philosophy that have arisen as a reaction to modernism or in

response to a condition of the postmodern. Postmodernism means the philosophical criticism of "great narratives" (Turner 1999, 51).

Thus, if the postmodern condition testifies to the general condition that has arisen in connection with social, economic, and political orderings appearing after the Second World War, postmodern philosophy shows a philosophical/theoretical background of positions and tendencies in postmodernism.

Hence, postmodernism is a philosophical and ideological projection of post-modernity (Bolay 2003, 63).

Postmodernism is not directed at a concrete ideology, doctrine, or philosophy. In the main, the theoretical ground on which all doctrines and philosophical ideas are constructed is problematised.

Modernism corresponds to the cultural phenomenon and meaning of modernity (modern); postmodernism corresponds to postmodernity (postmodern). According to one of the approaches, the formulation and legitimation noted in philosophical measurement is called postmodernism, and a distribution in non-Western societies is called postmodernisation (Sarıbay 2001, 5).

The term "postmodernisation" designates the new shape of modernisation, which doesn't mean a change of identity in which course there is no loss of national sociocultural bases (e.g., Japan and Southeast Asia). However, this problem profile is beyond our research.

Summarising positions, it is possible to notice that postmodernism expresses a philosophical measurement that the postmodern and postmodernity are social measurements, and postmodernisation is a social and economic measurement of a concept that, in our opinion, testifies to the interdisciplinary character of the phenomenon of "postmodernism" and its complex nature.

The concept of "interdisciplinarity" is one of the main features of a modern scientific and intellectual activity (*Mejdistsiplinarnost v naukakh i filosofii* 2010, 6).

The given attitude of postmodern is expressed in a "decomposition of a principle of legitimacy of knowledge": "this decomposition proceeds in speculative games, weakening communications of encyclopaedic structure in which each science should take the place … Disciplines disappear, and the interpenetration of sciences occurs on their borders that lead to an occurrence of new territories". The noted position removes the idea of delimitation as areas in one discipline, and creates joint disciplines including the way classifying natural sciences and the humanities; "thus the assertion of the narrative nature of any knowledge by postmodernism deprives their differentiation of the intra-scientific basis" (Mojeyko and Mayboroda 2001, 80).

The absorption of knowledge from others, including the natural sciences, when an analysis subject becomes an unexpected and sporadic fluctuation initiated by disorganisation, chaos, and disorder observed in social and cultural realities, makes a basis for postmodernist paradigms (Kravchenko 2007, 38).

The idea of interdisciplinarity contacts an epoch of delegitimation and the empiricism caused by it. The attitude to knowledge is seen in that of the owners of a material towards those who receive its results. Owing to "brainstorming", they

influence productivity positively without having a meta-narrative or a meta-language for an expression of the purpose of knowledge and its purposeful use.

The interdisciplinary approach to postmodernism results from a postmodernist complex. Along with a cultural postmodernism, it consists of a philosophical-theoretical (actually the Method) component known as deconstruction, where it is possible to note linguistic (Derrida), epistemological (Lyotard), social (Deleuze, Guattari, Baudrillard), and power-political (Foucault) aspects. The historical measurement of deconstruction is seen in poststructuralism, and postmodernism as the social theory is seen in radical pluralism (Grechko 2000, 171).

Hence, the integration function of postmodernism focuses on a dialogue between disciplines and, accordingly, the "frontier nature" caused by its formation "on philosophical borders", which, according to Derrida, are seen in the above-mentioned (Mojeyko and Mayboroda 2001, 81).

Postmodernism, being beyond culture, is shown in all spheres of public life. Differing from modernism in a certain case, or in a positive or negative sense, it covers all political and material/social changes, and both intellectual and theoretical products and cultural practices.

All these measurements, as well as the polysemanticity of the concept of the "postmodern", cause the cultural, sociological, and philosophical analyses of the postmodern and its indicators in societies. Hence, the necessity of the complex approach to problems of public changes demands the interdisciplinary establishment of studies.

Cultural character is caused by its occurrence first in art, and then in other spheres.

Postmodern theories cause the analysis of a social reflection of the postmodern without actually being sociological, and "incorporate achievements of a variety of disciplines—anthropology, mathematics, social synergy, linguistics, and especially semiotics including not only language, but also other sign and symbolical systems, etc" (Kravchenko 2007, 640).

Hence, the interdisciplinarity of the postmodern, in our opinion, may be dictated by such typological signs as the synthetical character or syncretism, and its conceptual apparatus.

As follows from the above, in our opinion, postmodernism focuses on the social sphere.

The original tradition of the social analysis in the 1980s–1990s, incorporating new areas of scientific research, began to represent a conceptual (postmodernist) discourse, and was used with regard to many spheres not differing in the unity and heterogeneity of problematics.

The obviousness of the influence of postmodernist theories on modern sociological thought explains the initial interest in socially significant problems (Ibid., 641).

The social reflections of the postmodern expressed in such spheres of a society as religion, policy, culture, and the economy make up the basic apparatus of discourse.

Besides those noted, there are also sociological, religious, political, and economic measurements of the postmodern. The focus of our analysis is on the indicators of the postmodern measured in social, philosophical, cultural, religious, and political projections of what will be questioned further.

Postmodernism characterises an axiological accent on the philosophical comprehension of a problem of language. In the postmodern, its role in culture is reinterpreted. The use of the methodological apparatus of linguistics for an explanation of a social reality is typical of postmodernists, in particular Foucault and Derrida.

At the same time, we can see that postmodernism has a language. A certain set of concepts and terms, among which are "especially postmodernist" ones that accept specific semantic colouring in a postmodernist context, is characteristic.

In a postmodern lexicon the syntax, semantics, and pragmatics are attributed, "a specific character of mutual relations between elements; type of connection between signifier and signified; a special character of use in speech practices" (Rubtsov 2011).

One of the important concepts of postmodernism is the discourse. In Foucauldian interpretations, the discourse is, "first of all, the certain establishment causing a mode of existence of objects". The discourse in this sense has a similarity to the concept of context (Foucault 2002, 285).

At the same time, a dialogue of argumentation is also called discourse. If we consider consensus as an unattainable horizon it will not represent the end of a discussion, only one condition. In this case, the discussion comes to an end in paralogy.

The term "episteme", coined by Foucault in a philosophical way, is a wider concept rather than a discourse representing a system of thinking and scientific theorising characteristic of the concrete historical period. According Foucault, episteme, which in translation means "knowledge", is a vision. At the same time, it is close to the meaning of a problematics concept.

"Concept" and "narrative" are the other concepts of a postmodernist narratology.

Postmodernism, the postmodern condition, and the philosophy of the postmodern, or, in a more specific sense, poststructuralist philosophy, can be considered in different senses and contexts. It is possible to emphasise the scientific, philosophical, cultural, social, religious, anthropological, and economic measurements of postmodernism.

References

Bolay, S. H. (2003). In C. C. Aktan (Ed.), *"Postmodernizm" modernite'den postmodernite'ye değişim*. Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi.

Foucault, M. (2002). Vlast i znaniye. In *Intellektuali i vlast*: *Izbranniye politiceskiye statyi, vistupleniya i intervyu*. M.: Praksis.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Grechko, L. K. (2000). Intellektualniy import, ili O periferiynom postmodernizme. *Obshestvenniye Nauki i Sovremennost, 1*, 166–179.

Kravchenko, S. A. (2007). *Sotsiologiya: Paradigmi cherez prizmu sotsiologiceskogo voobra-jeniya*. Moskva: Izdatelstvo "Ekzamen".

Lyotard, J.-F. (1986). *Le postmoderne expliqué aux enfants*. Paris: Galilée.

Mejdistsiplinarnost v naukakh i filosofii (2010). M.: IFRAN.

Mojeyko, M. A., & Mayboroda D. V. (2001). Binarizm. In *Postmodernizm Ensiklopediya* (pp. 78–81). Minsk: Interpresservis: Knijniy dom.

Rubtsov, A. V. (2011). Architektonika postmoderna: Vremya. *Voprosi filosofii*, *10*. http://vphil.ru/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=401&Itemid=52 (accessed November 10, 2011).

Sarıbay, A. Y. (2001). *Postmodernite, sivil toplum ve İslam*. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.

Turner, B. S. (1996). Oryantalizm postmodernizm ve Din. In Y. Aktay (Ed. & Trans.), *Tezkire* (pp. 9–10), Bahar.

Turner, B. S. (1999). Oryantalizm Postmodernizm ve Din. In *Postmodernizm ve İslâm, Küreselleşme ve oryantalizm* (pp. 36–57). Ankara: Vadi Yayınları.

Chapter 3
The Postmodern and Culture

Abstract Culture penetrates into all spheres of people's activity, and through it humankind is basically renewed. Therefore, culture is at the centre of all global transformations. Cultural standards play a vital part in the specificity of any community, reflected in the cultural experience of any country as "a local civilization" as well as in the subcultures. Therefore, the analysis of a community generates a need to understand its cultural standards. Understanding culture makes up the kernel of both present and future cultural paradigms. Postmodernism is the concept connected with culture. One of the important specifications of the postmodern is the fact that everything has acquired the cultural character in the present time. Postmodernism conditions the coexistence of various cultural fragments expressing the specificity of thinking about contemporaneity.

Keywords Culture · Postmodernism · Fragmentariness · Cultural pluralism · Subjectivities

Culture penetrates all spheres of people's activity. Therefore, cultural standards play a vital part in the specificity of any community. Cultural standards play a vital part in the specificity of any community, reflected in the cultural experience of any country as "a local civilization" as well as in the subcultures. Therefore, the analysis of a community generates a need to understand its cultural standards.

Through culture, humankind is basically renewed. Therefore, culture is at the centre of all global transformations. Understanding culture makes up the kernel of both present and future cultural paradigms.

Postmodernism is the concept connected with culture. Modern times are characterised as the epoch of "the cultural hegemony", "the dominance of culture" that directs attention to the various texts of culture and makes the problem of the coexistence of cultural parts more topical.

Postmodernism conditions the coexistence of various cultural fragments expressing the specificity of thinking about contemporaneity.

Postmodernity specifies cultural pluralism and cultural variety. The revaluation of values (Nietzsche) is characteristic of a postmodern situation. A transformation of the present system of values, aims and behaviour models is observed.

The epoch of active pluralism and fragmentation is defined as a situation of the postmodern. The postmodern is perceived as a state of radical pluralism, while the postmodernism is its concept (Welsch 1992).

Fragmentariness and pluralism of the reality are caused by subjectivities coming into the foreground, cultural identities (Demirci 2000, 94), and upholding ways of life. Accordingly, diversities bring the idea of coexistence of various truths and ways of life up to date (Tüzün 1994, 72; Tüzer 2005, 188).

One of the important specifications of the postmodern is the fact that everything has acquired the cultural character in the present times. It justifies the right of everyone to live in their cultural world or convert their own vital style into some cultural world. It also means that the public conflicts have replaced "the cultural wars" that lead to the decentralisation of the subject and the hyper differentiation of spheres of values by being multiplied towards to the partition of international boundaries (Sarıbay 1995, 9–10).

References

Demirci, F. (2000). Modernite sorunsalında postmodernite. In *Düşünen Siyaset*, Birikimler I, Düşünce Dergisi. Sayı 15 (pp. 83–108) Aralık: Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Sarıbay, A. Y. (1995). *Postmodernite sivil toplum ve İslam* (Vol. 2). Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Tüzer, A. (2005). Postmodernizmin Din Adına Düşündükleri. In *Düşünen Siyaset Düşünce Dergisi*, Sayı 21, Aralık 2005 (pp. 185–93). Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Tüzün, H. (1994). Postmodernizm. In *Siyasal Araştırmalar* (Vol. 1). Ankara, yaz.

Welsch, W. (1992). "Postmodern". Genealogiya i znacheniye odnogo spornogo ponyatiya. In *Put*. M., (Vol. 1).

Chapter 4
The Postmodern

Abstract "Postmodernism" is an often-used term in a periodical of humanities trend. The phenomenon of the "postmodernism" is now in the focus of philosophical interest, first of all because it expresses some kind of philosophising that is characteristic of modern culture. Postmodernism has a number of parameters (ontological, gnoseological, aesthetic, and historical-cultural). On the basis of the ontological aspect, there is a comprehension of hopelessness on the failure of any reforming programs. In postmodernism, the social world will consist of local fragments and cultural worlds, and this means a plurality of alternatives of development with uncertainty and a multi-variant approach. Thus, two distinctive features of postmodernism are the decomposition of the unity inherent in the modern, and pluralism. If earlier the world attitude was influenced by ideological systems (religion, history, science, Marxism, liberalism, etc. which J.-F. Lyotard calls "metanarratives"), providing its integrity, now there is a transition from unifying monocultures to a cultural variety of cultures of equal value. Owing to this, cultural fragmentation or multiculturalism becomes a characteristic feature of the society of the postmodern.

"Postmodernism" is an often-used term in a periodical of humanities trend. The phenomenon of the "postmodernism" is now the focus of philosophical interest, first of all because it expresses some kind of philosophising that is characteristic of modern culture.

The origin of the term "postmodernism" is rooted in "The Crisis of European Culture" ["Die Krisis der europäischen Kultur"] by Rudolf Pannwitz (1917), published during World War I. Later, in 1947, it gained a cultural sense in the book "A Study of History" by Arnold J. Toynbee. In the 1980s, first of all due to the works of Lyotard, who discussed postmodernism on the philosophical level, this term gained the status of a concept. Postmodernism marks a new milestone in the development of Western civilization, which is the end of its domination.

Leading Western political scientists, such as Habermas, Bauman, and Bell, interpret postmodernism as a cultural result of neo-conservatism, the symbol of the post-industrial society, and the external symptom of the deep transformations of the socium, expressed in total conformism along with ideas of "the end of history" (F. Fukuyama) and aesthetic eclecticism (*Kulturologiya XX vek: Ensiklopediya* 1998, 130).

Postmodernism, having arisen as the phenomenon of the spiritual life of the West in the 1980s and 1990s, overcame the borders of Western society and began to be distributed, generating different non-Western forms. Cardinal changes of the social-cultural situation, which have taken place both in Western and non-Western societies, have revealed the problematical character of that picture of the reality (or episteme, according to Foucault), which exists during this or that epoch and makes an initial and main idea of postmodernism. Postmodernism has a number of parameters (ontological, gnoseological, aesthetic, and historical-cultural). On the basis of the ontological aspect, there is a comprehension of hopelessness in the failure of any reforming programs. A violent alteration of the existing reality is treated as a characteristic feature of modernism, which has exhausted itself. At the same time, the scepticism concerning the world transformation is connected to the refusal of an establishment of a hierarchical order in it. In this case, theories and concepts are inapplicable (according to Baudrillard, the event always outstrips the theory) (*Sovremennaya zapadnaya filosofiya* 1991, 238). For example, according to postmodernism, all societies and cultures cannot develop in the line of ascent, and the same forms cannot be inherent in them. In postmodernism, the social world will consist of local fragments and cultural worlds, and this means a plurality of alternatives of development that is their uncertainty and a multi-variant approach.

Thus, two distinctive features of postmodernism are the decomposition of the unity inherent in the modern, and pluralism. If earlier the world attitude was influenced by ideological systems (e.g., religion, history, science, Marxism, and liberalism, which Lyotard calls "metanarratives"), providing its integrity, there is now a transition from unifying monocultures to a cultural variety of cultures of equal value. Owing to this, cultural fragmentation or multiculturalism becomes a characteristic feature of the society of postmodern. In this case, on the basis of the ethnocultural identity first of all, a number of local identities are formed. This process can be caused by the social heterogeneity of the society (e.g., elite-people, city-village), the presence of different elites, and different ethnic groups. Owing to the above-stated gradation, we can speak about the polymorphism of culture, plurality, the variety of cultural forms, and the differentiation of values inherent in the given culture.

This is a process of retreat from principles of the organisation of the "modern" society adhering to "the cultural vertical centre-periphery," both on the micro (national) and macro (world) levels (*Slovar terminov: Sotsiologiya* 1994). In this case, a significant amount of subcultures (class, ethnic, youth, etc.) coexists in the modern society alongside the prevailing (dominating, mass) culture. That is, formations inside the general culture have their own systems of values, customs, and norms inherent in big social groups. Covering a number of values of the dominating

culture, as features specific only to it, subcultures do not resist the dominating or prevailing culture. The rising of mass culture is connected to processes of socio-cultural modernisations in the second half of the twentieth century, with a transition from an industrial to a post-industrial society (the information stage of the technological development). Thus, it is based on the achievements of the most up-to-date technology. Characteristics of mass culture are freedom of spirit, the deviation from narrow Euro-centrism to "universal humanity," and new technologies (*Kulturologiya XX век: Ensiklopediya* 1998, 19–20).

Such "getting along together" constitutes the coexistence of the prevailing (dominating, mass) culture and a significant amount of subcultures, producing a value-normative consensus in the society. Meanwhile, multiculturalism in the postmodern society makes the existence of a complete culture problematic (*Slovar terminov: Sotsiologiya* 1994).

The replacement of Euro-centrism by global polycentrism acts as the consequence of multiculturalism that is the decline of the hegemony of the West and the rising of the new global social order. We have already faced the idea, for example in O. Spengler's book *The Decline of the West* [*Der Untergang des Abendlandes*], that the blossoming of Western European culture has come to an end, explaining it as its having entered the civilization phase, and therefore it cannot provide anything original to the fields of spirit and art (Spengler 1993, 1998). Because adherence to the modern was the dominating feature of spiritual appearance in the West, the crisis of the universality of the modern began to be treated as the crisis of Western rationalism for the modern, in the opinion of theorists of the postmodern (e.g., Derrida, Lyotard, Foucault, and Baudrillard), and has exhausted the historical potential and not predicted the "new." In this sense, the postmodern, the epoch of postmodernity, is opposed to the modern, the epoch of modernity.

References

Kulturologiya XX vek: Ensiklopediya: V 2-ch t. (1998). Sankt-Peterburg: "Universitetskaya kniqga". http://www.philosophy.ru/edu/ref/enc/index.html.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1989). *The postmodern condition. A report on knowledge*. Oxford.

Pannwitz, R. (1917). *Die Krisis der europaeischen Kultur*. Nürenberg: H. Carl.

Slovar terminov: Sotsiologiya (1994). www.chem.msu.su/rus/teaching/sociology/dic.html.

Sovremennaya zapadnaya filosofiya (1991). Moskva: Politizdat.

Spengler, O. (1993). *Zakat Evropi*. Per. s nem. V 2-ch t. T.1. Moskva: Misl.

Spengler, O. (1998). *Zakat Evropi*. Per. s nem. V 2-kh t. T.2. Moskva: Misl.

Toynbee, A. (1991). *Postijeniye istorii*. Per. s angl. Moskva: Progress.

Chapter 5
The Postmodern and Consciousness

Abstract The problem of the correlation of the postmodern and consciousness can be considered in the following measurements: contemporaneity and consciousness, contemporaneity and the postmodern, the postmodern and consciousness, interference of two concepts and consciousness in the postmodern context, and the consciousness of the postmodern. Contemporaneity is a state of consciousness. It derives the strength of truthfulness not from historicity, but from urgency. The postmodern situation in each concrete society is characterised by the historical and cultural parameters, accordingly the sociocultural differences of public consciousness. Hence, a variability of a reflection of the postmodern shows in a public consciousness when approaching the given problems causes the reference to experience the tendencies in a concrete society. Today, speaking about the dynamics of the development of public consciousness, it is possible to notice the renunciation of stereotypes of the past and a movement towards both cultural and political plurality. The given tendency is expressed in the break from the modern and the movement towards the postmodern. The above-mentioned testifies to the variability of answers to the challenges of the present in non-Western countries as a consequence of the sociocultural ground's individuality and the dynamic and reflective essence of public consciousness expressed in the social phenomena and ethoses, in particular, in the postmodern tendency as an indicator of its modification and development.

Keywords Postmodernism · Consciousness · Contemporaneity · Historicity · Urgency · Deconstruction · Non-western societies

Postmodernism, as a specific philosophy of the cultural consciousness of modernity, is an epoch in the development of both social reality and consciousness. Consciousness is an important tool for comprehending the relationship between philosophy and society.

During the contemporary epoch, not only do the tendencies and processes observed in society become actualised, but also how they are perceived by that society and the reflection on the public opinion are important. The flexibility of

the sociocultural dynamics is represented in the multipolar nature of public consciousness.

Consciousness mirrors the external world. Besides the reflection of the lifestyles of people, it can at the same time define it. It is possible to say that consciousness defines the lifestyle, as the latter determines it.

Consciousness, as a product of natural evolution, has a dynamic procedural nature and is therefore changing in accordance with the social facts. In the "ordinary" historical periods, the burden of habits, a monotonous life, and traditions with an instinct of self-preservation that date back to ancient times leave an imprint on human consciousness and it persistently maintains the fidelity to the experience. However, during "extraordinary" historical periods, when the public and moral system as a result of tension caused by intolerable pressing, starts "to collapse," the masses start to critically analyse the world in which they are born and doubt beliefs and convictions that are carried out by them through their lifetimes. The price of progress (development) is the struggle of the "new" against the "old," life against death, the future against the past (Grant and Woods 2007).

Hence, the public consciousness reflects all the tendencies and ideas contained in the contemporary society. The study of any factor in an isolated form, without links and dynamics, does not correspond to the nature of society and consciousness. Some moments of the contemporary tendencies can be analysed only in abstract form while others via their ability to be represented. However, this does not make the task of seeking the common denominator less important.

Today, public opinion has become topical because it is the determining factor of the political and economic life of a society, and the criteria of the modern epoch (Doktorov 2005).

The problem of the correlation of the postmodern and consciousness can be considered in the following measurements: contemporaneity and consciousness, contemporaneity and the postmodern, the postmodern and consciousness, the interference of two concepts and consciousness in the postmodern context, and consciousness of the postmodern.

Ideas as products of the mind and, in general, all the intellectual, spiritual phenomena are defined as consciousness. Consciousness, having a dynamic essence, can be considered in its correlation with time, namely with the present.

Contemporaneity and Consciousness

Contemporaneity is a state of consciousness. It derives the strength of truthfulness not from historicity, but from urgency.

According to Habermas, the problem of constructing contemporaneity arises in consciousness; accordingly, the latter is a reflective comprehension of the new world view (Gritsanov 2001, 435).

In the present period the interaction, interosculation, and mutual transformation of identities are observed. The historically developed cultural variety in the context

of modern transformations causes the requirement of the new philosophy of interaction and mutual understanding of representatives of the different nationalities, cultures, and religions for a deviation from stereotypes and standards of the modern.

The postmodern acts as one of features of contemporaneity.

Contemporaneity and the Postmodern

The epoch of "culture domination," or "cultural hegemony," proclaiming a sociocultural variety, provokes the cultural heterogeneity, which acts as an important component of a picture of the postcontemporaneity world.

In the light of new realities, the postmodern acts as a characteristic feature of the present. Against the devaluation of former values and reference points, the postmodern, with its diversity of values and mosaic nature, causes a new contextualisation. Such tendencies as a pluralistic nature and fragmentariness, observed today, bring up to date and popularise the postmodern, as its substantial kernel is seen in a basic pluralism.

Thus, the "postmodern" signifies a modern cultural condition, and the concept "postmodernism" a condition of mentality realising it. Proceeding from this, postmodernism, expressing the specificity of the modern epoch, causes and brings up to date the postmodernist world vision, acquiring the paradigm status.

The consciousness in the postmodern gains a special sense and a role that causes the necessity of revealing the interference of two concepts and consciousness in a postmodern context.

The Postmodern and Consciousness

The tendencies observed in the present period cause a search for new senses both in Western and non-Western societies. As a consequence, the necessity for a new paradigm reflecting a different worldview is felt. Against the non-realised potentialities of the modern, until recently serving as an almost unique universal cultural reference point, a search for a new ideological platform for the characteristic of new realities and moods is conducted. Postmodernism acts as one such ideological platform reflecting the new phenomena and worldview in modern societies.

The postmodern situation in each concrete society is characterised by the historical and cultural parameters, accordingly the sociocultural differences of public consciousness. Hence, the variability of reflection of the postmodern shows in public consciousness when approaching the given problems, and causes the reference to experience the tendencies in a concrete society.

At the same time, the sociocultural ground is extremely informative from the point of view of the postmodernist indicators' analysis at a level of consciousness,

creating the intellectual background initiating both modernity and late modernity. Consciousness is the plane of comparison and juxtaposition, in which both post-modernity and modernity may be comprehended, at the same time as late modernity.

The given approach to the problem is dictated by the consciousness of the postmodern as based on the interpretive mind deducing the bases of knowledge from the empirical being, the daily ordinary vital practice, and the circumstance that, as a factor of postmodernity, "the formation of the non-hierarchical episte-mology and semiotic ontology" (Lipovetskiy 1997, 120) is marked.

The form of communications embodying the controlling of consciousness arouses it, and also concentrates attention on certain problems.

In light of the noted tendencies in the cultural consciousness of modern societies, the "postmodern," as an alternative to the historically exhausted epoch of the modern and/or an interpretation of a sociological reality which is beyond the modern, is brought up to date.

Each tendency and/or process has its own "consciousness," perception of reality, phenomena, worldview, and logic, including a logic of perception. Hence, each can speak about the consciousness of the postmodern, which is also different from that of the modern.

Consciousness of the Postmodern

The postmodern reality is expressed in that it results, to a certain degree, from the higher derivative of reality, and for this reason is not imaginary, only symbolic. A symbol is a hyperreal phenomenon. Such reality cannot be created in a natural space. Owing to that, the natural space is excluded; the communication of reality with consciousness will not be based on a mere abstraction or alienation. Such an understanding of reality will be received by the abstraction of the internal reality by consciousness. In this case, it should be supposed that the communication that a person establishes with time is not consecutive. At the initial stage there is, in the true sense, a possible subdivision of the measurement of time, and the replacement of reality by superreality. In this case, the projection of the past, i.e. memory onto intellect, becomes almost impossible. However, it is absolutised. This absolutising, that finds expression in the absence of roots, is transient. In such a formation arises not only nomadism, but also the absence of a root/body (incorporeity) (Kahraman 2007, 160).

One of the main principles of the postmodern is radical plurality; accordingly, the consciousness of the postmodern is plural.

Today, speaking about the dynamics of the development of public conscious-ness, it is possible to see the renunciation of stereotypes of the past and a movement towards both cultural and political plurality. The given tendency is expressed in the break from the modern and the movement towards the postmodern.

The Consciousness of the Postmodern is Dialogical

In this measurement, Bakhtin's statement that consciousness only exists when there are two consciousnesses is brought up to date. Namely, in consciousness the phenomenon of the relation—the accent of new thinking—with its subsequent "materialisation" (realisation) in behaviour is reflected.

Today, the realisation of the creative potential of cultural pluralism is seen in a dialogue of various traditions, including alternative ones.

The renunciation of a hierarchical order or any systems of priorities in life rather obviously finds the dialogical essence of the postmodern. At the same time, the proclamation of plurality and the competition of paradigms by postmodernism cause the plurality of the vision of the postmodern (Welsch 1992, 132).

Postmodernism assumes a new mind—an interpretive one that searches for the knowledge bases not in metaphysics, but in communications, intercourse, and dialogue. Accordingly, postmodernism is communicative thinking; the postmodern is an openness and a dialogue.

Postmodernism, in the majority of cases, is a conscious dialogue with the past (Sim 2006, 382) that has something directly in common with postmodernist pluralism, including all the past and the present, as well as modernism (Tsareva 2007, 279).

The deconstruction is connected to the basic signs of the postmodern that reveal the correlation between consciousness and deconstruction.

Consciousness and Deconstruction

In a situation when the truth becomes secret and is consumed and absorbed, it is reproduced in the conditions admissible by the system; the deconstruction does not appear as a revelation of truth or a repeated definition. On the contrary, the deconstruction, by means of demonstrating only parts of a whole system and the internal communications, justifies the integrity of the system. From this point of view, the logic of deconstruction is seen in studying the consciousness comprehending the whole. Therefore, in this approach the concept of "deconstruction" emphasises how consciousness comprehends the truth, but not in a direction going from consciousness to object (Kahraman 2007, 153; Laclau and Mouffe 1986).

In other words, the deconstruction does not analyse the process of comprehending an object by consciousness and the actual value of this action; to a greater degree it underlines a category between consciousness and object. The concept, from the a priori deconstruction, decides what form an object or concepts imbue consciousness. Thus, the deconstruction is not about consciousness, or about the object (Kahraman 2007, 154).

In Conclusion

In light of the above-noted, the studying of development concepts of the public consciousness against the background of contemporaneity challenges represents the importance for singling out the historical and cultural parameters of a postmodern situation in non-Western societies. Accordingly, the sociocultural differences of the public consciousness thereby show the variability of a reflection of postmodernist displays in the public consciousness depending on the experiences and tendencies in the different societies.

It is necessary to see that the public consciousness is the initiator of the social acts, i.e. it provokes the social transformations and is multivariate and multifaceted.

The question of the adequacy of reflecting the real nature of the objective processes in the consciousness of people always remains open. However, the statement of transition to "the reflexive modernity" (Katsuk 2003, 781) makes the consciousness and its importance more topical than ever. The priority attitude of postmodernism to the problem of consciousness is regarded as its positive feature; "postmodernism changes the consciousness of the people for a deeper understanding of the essence of the real and own 'the I'" (Tsateva 2007).

The above-mentioned testifies to the variability of answers to the challenges of the present in non-Western countries as a consequence of the sociocultural ground's individuality, and the dynamic and reflective essence of public consciousness expressed in the social phenomena and ethoses, in particular in the postmodern tendency as an indicator of its modification and development.

References

Doktorov, B. (2005). Iz istorii oprosov obshestvennogo mneniya. 24.03.2005, Razgovori, Baza dannich FOM, Fond "Obshestvennoye mneniye". http://bd.fom.ru/report/cat/sci_sci/sotsiologiya/gur050310.

Grant, T., & Woods, A. (2007). Bilincin Geriden Gelmesi, 01–06–2007. http://www.pcforumlari.com/bilincin-geriden-gelmesi-t24724.html.

Gritsanov, A. A. (2001). Modern. In *Postmodernizm. Ensiklopediya,* 435–6. Mn.: Interpresservis; Knijniy dom.

Kahraman, H. B. (2007). *Postmodernite ile Modernite Arasında Türkiye 1980 Sonrası Zihinsel, Toplumsal, Siyasal Dönüşüm*. İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı.

Katsuk, N. L. (2003). Postmodernistskaya sotsiologiya. *Noveyshiy filosofskiy slovar*. Mn.: Knijniy Dom. Biblioteka Gumer—filosofiya: 781. http://www.gumer.info/bogoslov_Buks/Philos/fil_dict/611.php.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1986). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.

Lipovetskiy, M. (1997). *Russkiy postmodernizm. Ocherki istoricheskoy poetiki*. Ekaterinburg: Ural. gos. ped. un-t.

Sim, S. (Ed.), (2006). *Postmodern Düşüncenin Eleştirel Sözlüğü* (M. Erkan, & A. Tutku Trans.) 1. Baskı, Ankara: ebabil Yayıncılık.

Tsareva, N. A. (2007). K otsenke postmodernizma v sovremennoy rossiyskoy filosofii. In *Analitika kulturologii.* http://analiculturolog.ru/index.php?module=subjects&func=viewpage&pageid=279.

Welsch, W. (1992). "Postmodern." Genealogiya i znacheniye odnogo spornogo ponyatiya. In *Mezhdunarodnyy filosofskiy zhurnal, Put.* (no. 1) Moscow.

Chapter 6
The Postmodern and Contemporaneity

Abstract Today, one of the essential tendencies is the interpretation of the modern world in the focus of the new cultural and social form that is postmodern. In general, postmodernism is interpreted as a breakaway from many cultural imperatives that form the basis of life in the West. To some extent, it proceeds from the idea that the modern does not justify hope. In this prism, the analysis of contemporaneity and the postmodern as two correlated paradigms that also to some extent oppose one another is actualized. "The local" and "the global" act as two sides of the postmodern that change into each other. The postmodernist theory, cancelling the rational and common subject of the modernist theory, replaces it in the social and linguistic aspects of the fragmented subject. In this connection, we should note that postmodernism not only notes the fact that the contemporary culture has a diverse structure, but also suggests evaluating this diversity and pluralism as positive events.

Keywords Postmodernity · Contemporaneity · Modernity · Novelty · Subject · Object · Pluralism

Today, one of the essential tendencies is the interpretation of the modern world in the focus of the new cultural and social form that is postmodern. In this connection, a necessity for a more careful analysis of the discourse of modernism has arisen, as in view of the postmodernist idea it (modernism) gains a little more content and meaning, along with the purpose of detecting what attitude corresponds to the society of the postmodern. Is it true that postmodernism is a general frame of mind bearing a seal of disappointment in the ideals and values of the Renaissance and Enlightenment, which no longer inspire the world?

In the 1960s to the 1990s, the use of such terms as, for example, "contemporary," meaning not simply "modernity," but the "modernity of today," was observed even more often. The theorists and analysts of cultural processes defined these terms as "novelty" and "topicality." The prefix "post-" began to distinguish these terms from the culture of modernism (i.e. postmodern, post-humanism, post-historical) (*Kulturologiya XX vek: Ensiklopediya* 1998, 344).

In recent times, people started to use the word "postmodern" while characterising the modern times. In general, postmodernism is interpreted as a breakaway from many cultural imperatives that form the basis of life in the West. In this prism, the analysis of contemporaneity and postmodern as two paradigms which are to some extent correlated while still opposing one another is actualised.

At the same time, it should be noted that the postmodern emerges against the background of the crisis of the modern. The postmodernist approach means irony, destruction, and the criticism of Western values, ideologies, civilizations and the culture (Erdem 2005, 107). To some extent, it proceeds from the idea that the modern does not justify hope.

The "local" and the "global" act as two sides of the postmodern that change into each other. The expression of "duplicity" in sociology, and subsequently depersonalisation, the loss of individuality, constitute the state of dullness and colourlessness (inexpressiveness) that complicates the process of identification; i.e. in its sense of interpretation via some direct or indirect identification with something else, leading to the hybrid, mixed identity. In philosophy this occurs in the various forms of relativism that come to extreme nihilism and subsequently, absurdity. In religion it leads to pluralism; i.e. reducing any kind of religious forms to the "religious" dimension and the "religiousness," the forms of neo-secularism (Kaplan 2005, 144). Also, it is possible to say that all those who characterise the postmodern have the same opinion in relation to the fact that the modern world is going through a deep crisis (Jearniere 1994, 23).

While thinking about the situation in the context of "the crisis of the hierarchy system of the world outlook as a whole" (Lipovetskiy 1997, 117), a state this stage obtained from the modern societies within, note that the subject has disappeared because it is not able to explain the object (i.e. the societies where the intellectuals live) via the existing scientific notions and methods (Adanır 2005, 45). The process of deriving all objects from their own nature prescribed by metaphysics, with its "principle of kindness" that converts the objects into the reflection of a subject, is not productive now because the world, in the opinion of Baudrillard, cannot be considered from the position of the subject (*Sovremennaya zapadnaya filosofiya: Slovar* 1991, 45). The postmodernist theory, cancelling the rational and common subject of the modernist theory, replaces it in the social and linguistic aspects of the fragmented subject (Baran 2005, 115) and makes this new "type of philosophical thought—the philosophy making without subject" (*Sovremennaya zapadnaya filosofiya: Slovar* 1991, 238).

In this connection, postmodernism not only notes the fact that contemporary culture has a diverse structure, but suggests evaluating this diversity and the pluralism as positive events. The postmodernists indicate that the existence of a historical way of thinking and style in the future is better than oppression by "the terror of standardization" (Van Der Loo and Van Reijen 2003, 265). Thus, "postmodernism in the globalising world can develop various proposals and reactions to different economic, cultural, and local situations." (Timur 1996, 56).

In Conclusion

The "past" and the "contemporary" (the modern) do not refer to the timeframe formed by the chronological calculation, but the space divided by some intellectual microclimates. In this space, the "past" becomes topical in the nostalgic feelings for a past which cannot be returned, while the "modern" (the contemporary) seeks for the present to become obsolete through the inevitable future. In this case, the first gives a summary of the incontestable values of the past and obliges a man to remain "in the silent subordination" to heteronomy, while the second proposes a withdrawal from "the silent subordination" and "the courage to use the consciousness" via the autonomy that denies the heteronomous compulsion. The discussion about the modern times for this reason is a political clash, because both positions appeal to the hegemony of imagination. However, the position of the modern times is formed by the "contemporary" (the modern) because its "rule" is not a force wishing to confirm itself via its own sanctions, but a struggle that defends via the "critical activity"—the independent reality of a man from the common stereotypes. In this context, contemporaneity is changing. However, this temporality is not the result of a shaky position; it is the result of a well-thought-through choice of the modern man who stands on "the boundaries" for self-analysis. This choice is "located" on the boundaries to distance itself from the universals of the past and does not freeze the temporary results of seeking the universally accepted truths (Ilgaz 2005, 61–62). Due to this reason:

> This historical ontology has obliged us to turn our back upon all projects that pretend to the globality and radicalism. The experience shows that the intention to sort out of the modern system and give the program of a new society as a whole, a new mode of thought, a new culture, worldview leads to nowhere except the reproduction of dangerous traditions.
>
> (Foucault 1999)

In this political struggle, the thinking about the dialectical dynamism of contemporaneity in the timeframe means distorting this dynamism. If the modern (contemporaneity) can in the process be frozen as a "thesis" that forms the antithesis of the "postmodern" that attempts to be characterised in various configurations at the price of rephrasing in the form of the contemporary Islamic radicalism or the anti-educational attitudes that strain the situation, making the freedom in the conditions of illusive ideas of it possible can be suggested as the postmodern antitheses. However, it is clear that this dialectical process will be synthesised "in its most dangerous traditions," because the antithesis (the religious radicalism or the postmodernism of anti-educational circles) attempts to impose its "generality" on the thesis (the modern), which is perceived as frozen in time, the "common." The true dialectics of the modern times make it (the modern) contemporary by, on the one hand, dividing the space of one intellectual microclimate in the timeframe, and, on the other hand, becoming surmounted by the studies over "frontiers" and through expansion. The spatial dialectics of contemporaneity (the modern) mean self-transformation, not via the external imposing, but the critical activities (Ilgaz 2005, 61–62).

According to Eco, each epoch has a postmodernism of its own. In our opinion, each epoch also has its modern times, or an understanding of them, in any case.

The degree or level of modernity of this or another society should be defined by its ability to address its challenges, e.g. the challenges of the modern times, because the modern and the contemporary, in a Habermasian interpretation, are the things that favour the objective expression of the spontaneously updating reality of the time spirit. The social realities demonstrate that those standards considered "contemporary" in the modernity and that played the role of guidelines have become untenable today. In accordance with the laws of development, it is normal to see a tendency to seek new guidelines instead of the old and exhausted notions to explain the new realities. A new order or a new context envisages a new conceptual apparatus. However, in order to enable the latter to stand for good, it needs time. It is still unknown how well postmodern and its derivatives fulfil or will be able to fulfil this mission, because the postmodern has also emerged from the crisis of the modern and the detection of its "grave errors." If the postmodern as the re-interpretation of the modern is done, then it can also reflect the postmodern. Accordingly, the modernity of tomorrow can be formed in the crisis of the postmodern that is in line with its character as a, "non-manageable increase of complexity" (in a Lyotardian interpretation). Showing how it will look or attempting to trace its shape are impossible even today, because it will be defined by our "today" and "tomorrow," which all of us "experience" and will "experience"; that is, the time and the development itself.

References

Adanır, O. (2005). Modern Dünyaya Özgü bir Düşünce Simülakrı. *Düşünen Siyaset, Düşünce Dergisi,* (21), 43–50. Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Baran, A. G. (2005). Postmodernizmin Özne ve Akıl Kavramlarına Yönettiği Eleştirilere Eleştirel bir Bakış. *Düşünen Siyaset, Düşünce Dergisi*, (21), 113–30. Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Erdem, T. (2005). Postmodernizmin "Öteki"si Hangi "Öteki"? *Düşünen Siyaset, Düşünce Dergisi*, (21), 101–12. Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Foucault, M. (1999). *Chto takoye prosvesheniye?* Elektronnaya biblioteka kulturologii. http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Culture/Fuko/chto_prosv.php.

Ilgaz, T. (2005). Eskiler ve Modernler Bitmeyen (Siyasi) Tartışma. *Düşünen Siyaset*, (21), 53–62. Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Jearniere, A. (1994). Modernite Nedir? (K. Tutal, çev.). *Modernite Versus Postmodernite*, der. Küçük, 16–23. M. Ankara: Vadi Yay.

Kaplan, Y. (2005). Antikite'den Postmodernite'ye: Tanrısız Araziden İnsansız Arazi'ye Paganizmin Serüvenleri. *Düşünen Siyaset,* (21), 139–69. Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Kultirologiya XX vek: Ensiklopediya: V 2-kh t. (1998). Sankt-Peterburg: "Universitetskaya kniga". http://www.philosophy.ru/edu/ref/enc/index.html.

Lipovetskiy, M. (1997). *Russkiy postmodernizm. Ocherki istoricheskoy poetiki*. Ekaterinburg: Ural. gos. ped. un-t.

Sovremennaya zapadnaya filosofiya: Slovar. (1991). Sost.: Malakhov V.S. i V.P. Filatov M.: Politizdat.

Timur, T. (1996). *Küreselleşme Krizi*. Ankara: İmge Yayınevi.

Van Der Loo, H., & Van Reijen, W. (2003). *Modernleşmenin Paradoksları* (Çev. Canatan, K.). Istanbul: İnsan Yayınları.

Chapter 7
Modern—Postmodern: The Parallels

Abstract The correlation problem of postmodernism and modernism is not definitely solved in philosophy. The widespread point of view on drawing a parallel between them is also interpreted differently. Some supporters of the postmodernism and modernism relationship consider that the basic conceptual theses of postmodernism were formed due to the non-viability of modernism. There are some interpretations of postmodernism, among which it is possible to note the postmodernism characteristic as a transition to something essentially different and its estimation as the continuation of modernism. The connection between postmodernism and modernism and their philosophical bases can be considered in a number of discourses, each of which discloses the various aspects of the problem. One more prism through which the parallel between postmodernism and modernism can be drawn is a dialogue where the dialogic nature of postmodernism is opposed to the monologicality of modernism. The other prism of postmodernism includes poststructuralism, and modernism is identified with structuralism. Proceeding from the above-stated, it is possible to see that "modernism" and "postmodernism" are not identical, but closely connected with each other conceptually. The given theses cause the necessity of the philosophical analysis of the given concepts, modernism and postmodernism, with regard to the different approaches and deducing the pivotal parallels between their basic regularities.

Keywords Postmodernism · Modernism · Philosophy · Culture · Society · Parallels

The correlation problem of postmodernism and modernism is not definitely solved in philosophy. The widespread point of view on drawing a parallel between them is also interpreted differently. Some supporters of the postmodernism and modernism relationship consider that the basic conceptual theses of postmodernism were formed due to the non-viability of modernism.

In this measurement, it is necessary to draw a parallel between modern and postmodern.

There are several interpretations of postmodernism, among which it is possible to note the postmodernism characteristic as a transition to something essentially different and its estimation as the continuation of modernism. Seeing the relationship between postmodernism and modernism is caused first of all by the prefix "post-," which refers to the condition following the one given; i.e., the term "postmodernism" literally means what happens after "modernism." The given connection can be interpreted as genetic.

The connection between postmodernism and modernism and their philosophical bases can be considered in a number of discourses, each of which discloses the various aspects of the problem.

In particular, postmodernism is considered as the cultural logic of late capitalism, as an explanation of the cultural structure of a post-industrial society, an original style of art, an "identity philosophy," and the criticism of a modernist problem and the Enlightenment. All these discourses are based on various approaches to it.

In some cases, the postmodern is defined as the denial of the modern or its overcoming.

However, the rupture frequently characterising the communication of modernism with postmodernism is also defined as a continuity, but a negative one (Inglkhart 1997, 23).

Along with those discussions concerning whether postmodernity is a historical continuation of modernity or a rupture within it, the obviousness of it being a serious criticism of modernity is affirmed (Bulaç 1995, 231–9).

Postmodernity is the opposition to what is inherent in modernity, as a product of the Enlightenment in particular, such as humanism denying all that does not originate from man, rationalism denying all that is outside of reason, and universality rejecting any value unable to go beyond the scope of local frameworks (Sarıbay 1995, 13–14).

Postmodernism, as the philosophical discourse offering a radical criticism of a modern society, as Foucault and Derrida note, and postmodernity, criticising a position of modernity based on a hypothesis about objectivity, universality, the independence of rational science provided by modernity and based on the subject from social acts, put forward the idea that the concept of the modern personality lies in modernity itself. Bringing the concepts of various individuals to that of "the modern personality," to the degree in which it neglects the diversities and originalities, is normalising and disciplining, not releasing. Namely, these critics make up a postmodernism basis (Demirci 2000, 92–3).

In this meaning, postmodernity is interpreted not as a rupture with modernity or its negation, but as its connection, and even some kind of reconstruction or restoration; i.e. not as a total rejection of modernity but, on the contrary, an updating of those parts that in the historical process have found unsuccessfulness and insufficiency. At the same time, postmodernity is characterised as some kind of a step back, as a deviation, sharpening the extremes (Cangızbay 1996, 124–6).

The given approach is correlated with the postmodernism characteristic as "the copying of contemporaneity." The insufficiency of postmodernism, in this case, is

seen in how it does not reflect a position of "now," in the absence of a correlation with "the present." In this measurement, postmodernism is interpreted not as a new epoch but as the copying of some lines according to the challenges of the present, and the prefix "post-" specifies a reconsideration of the new European cultural evolution's classical stage by postmodernism (Lyotard 1994, 103).

Postmodernism is perceived as a certain frame of mind of the crisis period (Ilyin 1998, 270; Lipovetskiy 1997; Mankovskaya 2000). Nietzsche (1995) also writes that each epoch in due time approaches a crisis threshold that, as a result, causes a reconsideration of a present condition.

In this definition, the statement that any epoch has its own postmodernism, and therefore cannot be a fixed chronological phenomenon but only a certain spiritual condition, is brought up to date (Eco 1999, 636).

The given interpretation correlates with the interpretation of postmodernism as a transitional period, characteristic of all epochs in the future, and also during the transition from the present to the future (Grechko 2000, 167). Though there is an opinion that it is connected with the past, not with the future (Nikitina 2004: 113), it is associated with its refusal of ideals and the values of modernism affirming progress and freedom.

However, postmodernity, in putting dots (i.e. indicating an incompleteness) after universality, development (progress), rationality versus modernity, which gains a repressive character, recognising all localities, and accepting the universal reality, turns itself to another incompleteness. Discussions are conducted concerning how much this situation reflects reality. This approach can be summarised as follows—if modernity is "excessiveness," then postmodernity is an "extreme" (Demirci 2000, 107).

Characterising postmodernism as a criticism of a modernist problematic and the Enlightenment, it is necessary to say that it is characterised by pluralism and, unlike any anti-modernism, includes modernism.

It is possible to see the uniform ideological tradition, causing the genetic relation of modernism and postmodernism, in the views of G. Bataille, G. Deleuze, F. Guattari, M. Foucault, J.-F. Lyotard, and J. Derrida (Tsareva 2007).

In particular, in Derrida's interpretation postmodernism is the final defeat of the modernism type of worldview, which is the opposite of modernism, the end of which is the beginning of postmodernism (*Arkhitektura i filosofiya* 1986, 93).

According to Lyotard, one of the founders of philosophical postmodernism, postmodernism is a part of modernism. The postmodern is located not after the modern and not against it; the postmodern was already contained in the modern, but in a hidden form (Lyotard 1994, 103).

At the same time, as a uniting factor of modernism and postmodernism, the deep, typological relationship based on the idea of a total and revolutionary break from the old world and its history is underlined (Tsareva 2007). The given approach contradicts the idea that postmodernism, in most cases, is a conscious dialogue with the past (Sim 2006a, 382). Pluralism, which has something directly in common with the postmodern, includes all the past and the present.

First of all, the given tendency is observed in that postmodernism, without breaking its link with the previous culture, is aimed at preserving spirituality as a guarantor of culture's existence. However, it is noticed that R. Barthes's struggle against the power of language, G. Deleuze's schizoanalysis, and J. Baudrillard's simulacrums contradict the given aim (Tsareva 2007).

The idea is put forward that, at the heart of postmodernism, are two basic notions of modernism: the Marxist idea of a jump "from a kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom," and ideas of "before-," "out of-," and "super-present" of the Freudian libido, or the pleasure principle (Davidov 2001, 10).

Postmodernism is considered as a stage in the history of modernism, integrally connected with its basic qualities which it develops to a logic limit (Andreyev 2001, 292–334), i.e. as a continuation of modernism (Eco 1999, 636).

At the same time in this measurement characterising the relation of modernism and postmodernism, a differentiation is made; i.e., it is noticed that though the postmodern appears "after the Early modern period," it is as a matter of fact in no way "after modern" (Welsch 1992, 109).

However, the characteristics distinguishing postmodernism from the philosophy of modernism are also put forward. Basically, two moments are accentuated. The first is connected with the negation of metaphysics as a "possible form of uniformity." This is a critical attack as regards all empirical beings dependent on the Absolute, which realises its will through social and political structures. Postmodernism's preference for democratic mass culture proceeds from the negation of the integrity of life by postmodernism, not only in a sphere of material human life, but also in spiritual one, based on the conditionality of the "higher" spirituality by the inequality of people by the degree of spiritual development and certain relations of power and submission (Evlampiyev 2003, 167).

Between modernism and postmodernism, a differentiation is also made by virtue of the following features: if modernism has aimed at a search for definiteness and firm bases, postmodernism is aimed at everyday life, radical pluralism, and uncertainty. The sources of the given vision are seen in the search for a true ideal and super world model by modernism, rejecting the realities of the existing world, while postmodernism aspires to the replacement of a model of reality by reality itself (Inglkhart 1997, 23).

One more prism through which the parallel between postmodernism and modernism can be drawn is a dialogue where the dialogic nature of postmodernism is opposed to the monologicality of modernism.

The postmodernist society is pluralistic. The postmodern is also a dialogue of tradition and innovation, and "cultural polyphony." Postmodernism assumes the new mind is an interpretive one that searches for the knowledge bases not in metaphysics, but in communications, contact, and dialogue (Rzayeva 2012, 556). In this measurement, dialogism represents itself as a postmodern principle.

The other prism consists of when postmodernism includes poststructuralism, and modernism is identified with structuralism.

Is the postmodernism phenomenon independent? The same question may arise in respect of poststructuralism. What are the conceptual connections between them?

Can every concept be considered separately, and as an analysis subject? An analysis of the parallels between the mentioned phenomena is made, during which the parallels between poststructuralism and postmodernism, and the genetic relationship of deconstructivism and poststructuralism with postmodernism, are revealed.

Postmodernism includes poststructuralism and is even identified with it. Poststructuralism is characterised as the successor of structuralism, which has undergone a process of transformation, and updating its initial postulates (Ilyin 1998, 270; Lipovetskiy 1997; Mankovskaya 2000). In especially philosophical comparativistics, concerning this question we can speak about the deconstructivism of postmodernism. Jacques Derrida's deconstruction became the strongest expression of the poststructuralist ethos.

Poststructuralism, acting on a general methodological basis, a grounding on which the deconstructionists and postmodernists were lining up their conception, has defined the thinking and worldview lines, characterising a postmodern condition.

According to Lyotard, postmodernism and modernism in an infinite sequence in time replace each other, forming cyclic cultural history. From this it follows that postmodernisms also existed in the past (Sim 2006b, 15). For example, it is noticed that the postmodern of Aristotle is seen before the appearance of the modern, as well in Diderot denying all previous "great narrations." In the postscript of *The Name of the Rose* by U. Eco, postmodernism is defined as a certain spiritual condition of society, and it is noticed that the features of postmodernism can be found in the culture of any epoch, even that of Homer (Eco 1999, 636).

This notion has, to a certain degree, something in common with J. Habermas's point of view that modernism, as the project of eternal updating, also exists in a modern cultural paradigm, and that it has not been completed.

From this point of view, concepts of a modern postmodernism are regarded as a development and transformation of the modernism culture. Proceeding from the noted, postmodernism is interpreted as a transitive type of culture that has arisen on a modernist basis and uses its language and concepts, excluding its consideration from the total revision of the heritage of the previous epochs (Tsareva 2007).

At the same time, in spite of the fact that theorists of postmodernism, criticising modernism, mark that postmodernism has found "the death of the high mod-ernism," which remains in the past as its "normal innovations are exhausted," and could not "realize the utopian ambitions" (Lyotard 1989, 9). We are inclined to say that postmodernism is, nevertheless, a specific modern appearance of mod-ernism, and its specific features were produced during the historical develop-ment and at the cost of mod-ernism.

In Conclusion

Proceeding from the above-stated, it is possible to see that "modernism" and "postmodernism" are not identical, but closely connected with each other conceptually. Both are an integral part of the characteristic of modernity and make up

the present cultural context. The given theses cause the necessity of the philosophical analysis of the given concepts with regard to the different approaches and deducing the pivotal parallels between their basic regularities.

References

Andreyev, L. D. (2001). Chem je zakonchilas istoriya vtorogo tisyacheletiya? *Zarubejnaya literatura vtorogo tisyacheletiya*. 1000–2000, 292–334. M.: Visshaya shkola.

Arkhitektura i filosofiya. Intervyu s Jakom Derridoy. (1986). Leningrad-Parij: "Beseda".

Bulaç, A. (1995). *Din ve Modernizm*. İstanbul: İz Yay.

Cangızbay, K. (1996). *Sosyolojiler değil Sosyoloji*. 1. Baskı. Ankara: Öteki Yay.

Davidov, Y. V. (2001). Patologichnost "sostoyaniya postmodernizma". *Sotsiologiceskiye issledovaniya, 11*, 3–12.

Demirci, F. (2000). Modernite Sorunsalında Postmodernite. *Düşünen Siyaset* Birikimler I, Düşünce Dergisi, Sayı 15, Aralık 2000: 83–108. Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Eco, U. (1999). *Zapiski na polyakh "Imeni Rozi"*. Folliant: In Imya Rozi. SPb.

Evlampiyev, V. V. (2003). Neklassicheskaya metafizika ili konets metafiziki? Evropeyskaya filosofiya na rasputye. *Voprosi filosofii, 5*, 159–171.

Grechko, L. K. (2000). Intellektualniy import, ili O periferiynom postmodernizme. *Obshestvenniye nauki i sovremennost, 1*, 166–179.

Ilyin, I. (1998). *Postmodernizm ot istokov do kontsa stoletiya*. Intrada: Evolutsiya nauchnogo mifa. M.

Inglkhart, R. (1997). Postmodern: menyayushiyesya tsennosti i izmenyayushiyesya obshestva. *Politicheskiye issledovaniya, 4*, 18–28.

Lipovetskiy, M. (1997). *Russkiy postmodernizm. Ocherki istoricheskoy poetiki*. Ekaterinburg: Ural. gos. ped. un-t.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1989). *The postmodern condition*. Oxford: A Report on Knowledge.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1994). Perepisat sovremennost. *Stupeni: Filosofskiy jurnal*, *2*.

Mankovskaya, N. B. (2000). *Estetika postmodernizma*. M.: Vseross. gos. in-t kinematografii.

Nietzsche, F. (1995). *Unfashionable observations* (R. T. Grey, Trans.). Stanford.

Nikitina, I. V. (2004). O vremenakh, o nravakh. Maski massovoy kulturi. *Chelovek, 12*, 73–80.

Rzayeva, R. O. (2012). K voprosu o dialogichnosti postmoderna. *Dialog kultur v usloviyakh globalizatsii* / Materiali Bakinskogo foruma, posvyashennogo pamyati Geydara Aliyeva. M.: "Kanon+" ROOI "Reabilitatsiya".

Sarıbay, A. Y. (1995). *Postmodernite Sivil Toplum ve İslam, 2*. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Sim, S. (2006a). *Postmodern Düşüncenin Eleştirel Sözlüğü*. (M. Erkan, & A. Tutku, Trans.). 1. Baskı, Ankara: ebabil Yayıncılık.

Sim, S. (2006b). Postmodernizm ve Felsefe // *Postmodern Düşüncenin Eleştirel Sözlüğü*. Stuart Sim (Çev.: M. Erkan, A. Utku), 1. Baskı, 3–15, Ankara: Babil Yayıncılık.

Tsareva, N. A. (2007). K otsenke postmodernizma v sovremennoy rossiyskoy filosofii. *Analitika kulturologii*, No 8. http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/k-otsenke-postmodernizma-v-sovremennoy-rossiyskoy-filosofii. Accessed Feb 2010.

Welsch, W. (1992). "Postmodern." Genealogiya i znacheniye odnogo spornogo ponyatiya. *Put, No 1*: 109–136. Moskva.

Chapter 8
Postmodernism: A Critical Discourse

Abstract The modern world endures a number of the crises, such as that of mentality. The characteristic features of the postmodern are deconstruction, radical plurality, relativity, eclecticism, fragmentariness, the replacement of reality by simulacra, structurelessness, and an unsystematic character, which are put forward as the basic catalysts along with other arguments. As a whole, postmodernity is also characterised as a transition from the categoricity of positive science in modernity to a generalised uncertainty. Within the limits of the noted criticism it is possible to single out the following positions: a criticism of postmodernism as a criticism of modernism, a criticism of postmodernism through the opposition of postmodernism to modernism, an identification of postmodernism with modernism and the meta-narrative, a criticism of postmodernism as an illusion of polyculturality and pluralism, and also as a historical epoch. The criticism of modernism by postmodernism was a starting point for the criticism of postmodernism. Basically, postmodernism is criticised through modernism by means of its language and concepts.

Keywords Postmodernism · Discourses · Criticism · Modernism · Mentality crisis · Relativity · Deconstruction

The modern world endures a number of the crises, such as that of mentality. The characteristic features of postmodern are deconstruction, radical plurality, relativity, eclecticism, fragmentariness, the replacement of reality by simulacra, structurelessness, and an unsystematic character, which are put forward as the basic catalysts along with other arguments. As a whole, postmodernity is also characterised as a transition from the categoricity of positive science in modernity to a generalised uncertainty.

Various approaches in the criticism of postmodernism stand out against the mentioned phenomena.

Within the limits of the noted criticism it is possible to single out the following positions: a criticism of postmodernism as a criticism of modernism, a criticism of postmodernism through the opposition of postmodernism to modernism, an

identification of postmodernism with modernism and the metanarrative, a criticism of postmodernism as an illusion of polyculturality and pluralism, and also as a historical epoch.

The Criticism of Postmodernism as a Criticism of Modernism

The criticism of modernism by postmodernism was a starting point for the criticism of postmodernism. The criticism of modernism was regarded as a weak or negative side of postmodernism. Herein, the postmodernist arguments collapse.

The Opposition of Postmodernism to Modernism

Basically, postmodernism is criticised through modernism by means of its language and concepts.

The first criticisms of postmodernity are tentative. It is noticed that a mentality, criticising the characteristics of modernity, is paradoxical, not rejecting, and it is necessary to call this "neo-modernism" instead of "postmodernism." However, if a total rejection of modernity is present, then it should be called not postmodernism, but "nihilism." Postmodernism can only throw new light on modernism (Sarıbay 1995, 108–9).

An Identification of Postmodernism with Modernism

In a number of approaches identifying postmodernism with modernism, its Western origin and its serving the interests of the West are noted, in particular as an argument of its spreading to non-Western societies. The given approach creates a basis in a greater degree of the non-Western criticism of postmodernism.

In particular, from the point of view of non-Western cultures there is practically no difference between modernism and postmodernism, as both serve the interests of the West (Erdem 2005, 111).

The identification by postmodernism is also projected on its criticism where it is criticised by analogy with modernism, in parallel with it.

In particular, it is noticed that if by the term "postmodernism" only one of many philosophies following "modernism" is meant, then the philosophical value of the term "modernism" should be defined as, first of all, it will cause other generalisations since it is impossible in philosophy to make generalisations in the name of "modernism" (Öymen 2005, 133).

The impossibility of the characteristics of postmodernism as absolutely new is asserted by means of the groundlessness of the definition of modernism as a complete separation with the past and an absolutely new stage.

An Identification of Postmodernism with a Metanarrative

One of the approaches to the criticism of postmodernism is its identification with a metanarrative.

Postmodernity, criticising the grand narratives, and putting forward new criteria, formulates them in the constructions doubtfully similar to these grand narrations.

To a certain degree, postmodernism has turned into an original metanarrative (there is a certain postmodernist line concerning many philosophical issues).

Postmodernism as an Illusion of Polyculturality and Pluralism

One of the important arguments put forward by anti-postmodernists is the illusiveness of the polyculturality and pluralism of postmodernism. In particular, it is noticed that postmodernism, revealing the temptation of polyculturalism and pluralism, leaves behind only a prevailing and unfair economic-cultural system and the authorities, and creates a deceit and illusion of polyculturality, reducing all cultures and traditions to one area (Serdar 2001).

Unlike the criticism of postmodernism as an illusion of the plurality in non-Western criticism, the idea of parity in a pluralistic discourse of postmodern is subjected to criticism.

Criticism of Postmodernism as a Historical Epoch

One of the criticised aspects of postmodernism is that it rejects historicity, defined as the doctrine capable of foretelling the destiny of humanity (*Sosyal Bilimler Akademisi* 1990: 91), appealing to historical definition ("post-," i.e. after).

Without the abolition of such artificial terms as "Antiquity," "Middle Ages," "Modernity," and "Postmodernity" it is impossible to understand philosophers and their philosophies. In the history of philosophy it is impossible to generalise philosophical currents (Öymen 2005, 132).

In each noted epoch, there are always various philosophical currents, and it is impossible to identify each period with one type of philosophical mentality and, proceeding from this, to divide the various periods from one another. There is no one element typical of each epoch and that did not exist in another; also, in the divided periods, combinations and crossings always took place. In philosophy, in the joining of epochs, and in each of the noted periods, there were coincidences, intersections, and divisions (Ibid.).

In other words, in the history of philosophy there is always a certain duration and continuity; it is therefore impossible to assert that there are sharp and radical sections; if the last took place, not between epochs, and between philosophers. For this reason, the terms expressing the noted periods cannot pretend to be something more, except for expressing a certain duration (Ibid.).

Hence, implying a philosophy of a certain duration under the term "postmodernism," for example the generalisation of the philosophy of the twentieth century, is impossible, as there were other philosophical currents like logic positivism and existentialism which can't be identified with the philosophies of authors considered as representatives of "postmodernism" (Ibid.).

Basically, the emphasis is on the vagueness of the concept of "postmodernism," the absence of distinguished boundaries, the analogousness to other philosophical conceptions, the impossibility of a distinction from the philosophies of different epochs, and, on the whole, the absence of specifics.

In Conclusion

In the context of the above-mentioned it is possible to see that, as a whole, criticisms of postmodernism are reduced to the following:

Postmodernity is neither an historical period nor a political or cultural tendency with well-defined characteristic features.

The given position is caused by the criticism of modernity and the problems caused by it, such as deadlocks and errors.

Against the above-stated, there appears, along with the Western criticism, the non-Western criticism of postmodernism, caused by a specific perception of postmodernism in the non-Western projection.

As a whole, the analysis of formulations, conclusions, orientations, arguments, and approaches concerning the criticism of postmodernism, undergoing certain modifications, indicates that the authors, who do not accept postmodernism as, generally, a new condition appearing as postmodernity, regard it as a special stage or period within modernity.

A criticism of postmodernism is caused by going beyond the scopes formatted by the modern through a prism of its categorical apparatus.

References

Erdem, T. (2005). Postmodernizmin "Öteki"si Hangi "Öteki"? *Düşünen Siyaset*, *Düşünce Dergisi*, (21), 101–112. Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Öymen, Ö. K. (2005). Felsefede "postmodernizm" karamının anlamsızlığına dair bir manifesto. *Düşünen Siyaset Düşünce Dergisi*, (21), 131–135. Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Sarıbay, A. Y. (1995). *Postmodernite Sivil Toplum ve İslam*. 2. Baskı. İstanbul: İletişim Yay.

Serdar, Z. (2001). *Postmodernizm ve Öteki Batı Kültürünün Yeni Emperyalizmi* (G. Kaçmaz, Çev.). İstanbul: Söylem Yayınları.

Sosyal Bilimler Akademisi. (1990). 4. C., İstanbul: Risale Yay.

Chapter 9
Contemporaneity and Dialogue

Abstract In an articulation of the modern philosophical problematic, dialogue acts as the important factor in generating the subject-subject communications. Modern realities require an expanded understanding of the dialogue caused by the new contextualisation and globalisation. Tolerance and patience in relation to another person become urgent in the context of a changed culture. The tolerance system is grounded on the principle of equality. "Another person" or the "Other" is a natural and organic medium for tolerance; it is possible to recognise the others on the basis of agreement, understanding, and cooperation. The tolerant mentality is the acceptation of an existence of differences as a general being though dialogue as an admittance of one's self with their contradiction. Such a statement of the problem causes a socio-philosophical understanding of two categories. Gender culture is an inalienable part of a dialogue culture. On a modern stage of the development of society, in conditions of its complicated social transformation, gender relations, as a specific kind of relations in society, require new approaches. Through a search of the semantic bases for dialogue, the philosophy of dialogue goes beyond the limits of negation or search for the general bases and is aimed at understanding through variety.

Keywords Contemporaneity · Postmodern · Philosophy · Dialogue · Tolerance · Other · Philosophy of dialogue · Dialogue culture · Gender culture

In an articulation of the modern philosophical problematic, dialogue acts as the important factor in generating the subject-subject communications. Modern realities require the expanded understanding of the dialogue caused by the new contextualisation and globalisation. Interaction, interosculation, and the mutual transformations of identities are observed. Through a search of the semantic bases for dialogue, the philosophy of dialogue goes beyond the limits of negation or a search for the general bases, and is aimed at understanding through variety.

Postmodern: A Thematisation of Woman

Postmodernism is a new intellectual phenomenon. Postmodernity, literally "after modernity," symbolises a new condition into which the modern society and culture enter (Sarıbay 2001, 5).

Postmodernity is a condition expressed in the tendencies of each sphere that forms the human consciousness. Therefore, it is possible to consider postmodernity as an original reality creating a modern society and consciousness in each segment (Kahraman 2007, 8).

A thematisation of woman acts as one of the important indicators of the postmodern. The given premise is connected with the actualisation of *Another* (*Others*) in the postmodern, i.e. women, the black, etc.

The postmodern, paying attention to *Another*, reinterprets the "text" of a history-society in the context of differences and cultural plurality (Rzayeva 2014, 298).

Each *Another* is different in different historical conditions and has importance and various functions for the subject (Gülerce 2005, 16). Secondly, in each situation in the different historical conditions, a reaction from a position of the subject is different. For example, *Another* is consciously oppressed; it is pushed to the subconscious; it is consciously ignored; it is eliminated; it is replaced by another neutral situation; its force is exaggerated, idealised; the force is underestimated; it depreciates; it transforms into the purpose of the non-desired values, which act antithetically to desire; it is supervised; it is identified; its is excessively identified (Ibid., 17).

In modernism, a man acts as the subject, with a woman as the object. According to the postmodernist vision, several subjects can exist, or be absent, and a levelling of the distinctions between the subject and object can be observed.

To explain this, postmodernists state that apologists of differences testified to the divided past, when the greatest part of the global population was slighted and oppressed by a minority consisting of white, Western-hemisphere, well-educated and economically strong men. The world of differences of the postmodern opens the possibilities for exercising votes from the oppressed ones in the struggle against the tested injustice (Grant 2006, 21).

The middle-aged white man symbolises the ideal person of modernism.

In this connection, an opposition, according to which the non-correspondence to the above-stated scheme is divergent as "different" ("difference") or, more precisely, "others," herein taking a postmodernist colouring as "another" or "others," is a category of the postmodern and postmodernism recognizing of *Another* (Uğur 1992, 40), the attention to *Another* a deviation from the intolerance and monologism of the modern (Lozgacheva 2006).

It is noted that postmodernism, acting as "a frame discourse," shows interest in feminist criticism (Thornham 2006, 38).

In the present period, an interosculation of roles (Vakhrushina 2011, 58) stating that it is also possible to refer to the postmodernist conception is observed.

The idea of self-actualisation is significant for many modern conceptions about a person, including postmodernist ones.

The concept of "self-actualization" covers all system of the life activity of a person. The process of self-actualisation and self-realisation is possible through the self-determination of the person, including the professional sphere. In the modern social, economic, and cultural conditions of society development, there is an accelerated process of women's personality development, not only as custodian of family life, but also as a professional worker.

In the present period, the transformation of the traditional roles of a woman as the organiser of the mode of life or the mistress, wife, mother, and tutor of children is observed. The value of a woman is more and more defined by her professional successes. The modern society does not see the leading value in motherhood as being pushed aside by other values, such as professionalism, or the search for material welfare (Ibid.). It is possible to also refer to the postmodernist conception.

Uncertainty about the Enlightenment and postmodernist religious conceptions, concerning questions of female identity, rationality, and independence, becomes the topic of discussion for philosopher-theologian-feminists (see, for example, Anderson 1988). Does postmodernism carry the threat of undermining many tendencies that were realised by the Enlightenment for women? Women may not wish to refuse some modern values. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the steps taken towards a statement and protection of female identity in a society as independent, rational, and moral actors were very valuable and important against the various forms of pressure, taking place in sexual, racial, social, material, and economic realms (Anderson 2006, 64).

The problem of the source of the self-actualisation of the modern woman is brought up to date in a situation when under the influence of social and economic changes a revaluation of value system takes place (Vakhrushina 2011, 58–9). The given prism also has something in common with postmodernism, with its value syndrome and such features as the loss of meaning.

Women in Science

It is noticed that one of the specific features of modern science is its feminisation. In each country, this process proceeds under the influence of national factors and has specifics.

The position of women in science depends on many factors. Besides an economic situation, they are subjected to the general technological level, sociocultural traditions, and system of legislation of this or that country. The share of women in science as a whole and, in particular, in its elite structures appears where the legislation surely equalises them with men in opportunities for education, employment, and career development (Proskurina 2002, 73).

It is known that there is a classification of scientific disciplines depending on the correlation of the share of men and women, i.e. on the basis of sex. "Male," "neutral," and "female" sciences are singled out. Of course, this division is rather conditional (Mirskaya and Martinova 1993, 694; Proskurina 2002, 75–6).

It is necessary to underline that the similar distribution of disciplines (it is remarkable that they, conditionally, keep their "sex" in all developed countries of the world) reflects only the situation that has developed for today, i.e. the greater or smaller general share of females in them. Nevertheless, this real state of affairs, being reflected in the consciousness of scientists, perceives as a stable and wide-spread stereotype according to which there are adequate and inadequate disciplines for a female mind (Proskurina 2002, 76).

From the cognitive point of view, female participation has different conceptual suppositions and a logic of research than the man's, allowing for an expansion of the possibilities of scientific search (Ibid., 77).

"The sex is a rupture. However overcoming a sex is confirming a sex, instead of negation, there is a creative combination of sexes" (Berdyayev 1989, 25).

The given vision, i.e. demand for dialogue, also has something in common with postmodernism, as at the basis of postmodernism are the ideas of dialogue and pluralism.

The above-mentioned makes it possible to assert that the position of women in the conditions of a changed sociocultural context of the postmodern including women in science has changed.

Gender Culture in the Scope of the Philosophy of Dialogue

The various sociocultural challenges of contemporaneity actualise the formation of a culture of dialogue, of which gender culture is an inalienable part. On a modern stage of development of society, in conditions of its complicated social transformation, gender relations, as a specific kind of relation in society, require new approaches.

The philosophy of dialogue also includes a gender problematic along with such components as tolerance, culture, philosophical interaction, ethical aspects of the communication process, and "interdisciplinary dialogue."

The basis of a gender problematic is presented by political, socioeconomic, and cultural contradictions of the gender role and identification of the person observed in society.

In the contemporary epoch, the revealing of a gender problematic is possible through a revaluation of the values of the world outlook.

The historically developed cultural variety in the context of modern transformations causes the requirement of a new philosophy.

Gender culture may be analysed from the point of view of tolerance and "Other," the actual concepts of the modern period. Tolerance and patience in relation to another person become urgent in the context of a changed culture. The reciprocal

tolerant relation means understanding "the Other." The tolerant mentality is the acceptation of an existence of the differences as a general being, though the dialogue is an admittance of one's self with their contradictions.

On the whole, the principle of tolerance as a condition of social life allows for the analysis of tolerance as the self-esteem of the person and respect for *Another*, a strong internal principle of regulation of the gender relations implanted in the personal freedom of women and men. The influence of the tolerance principle on gender relations is shown in all spheres of human life, forming the mentality of women and men by means of a positive interpretation of "otherness," and the recognition and elimination of a rightful hierarchy in the construction of gender relations. Also, it answers new challenges of time. Such a statement of the problem causes a socio-philosophical understanding of two categories.

In gender relations, a matter of tolerance is also based on the cultural traditions of the concrete society.

According to one of the approaches, theoretical substantiations of various forms of tolerance are considered from the point of view of rationality. Four forms are chosen: indifference, respect, compromise, and critical dialogue (the unique productive form) (Lektorskiy 1997, 49–50). It is considered that critical dialogue, as the functional form of interrelation, is most important for gender relations in a modern society.

Tolerance has gained the status of a global sociocultural problem observed in all the spheres of society, and one of the main universal values of a modern society. And, in the contemporary period, its role has increased to the significance of the norms treating the general universal values.

So, at last, in the subjective approach (Munye 1999, 70–72; Loginov 2001, 64–7; Kemerov 2001, 16–17; Kerimov 2001, 24–27) at the heart of tolerance in the attitude towards *Another*, principal importance is attached to the idea of a distinction. Also, this idea is important for the consideration of the problem of modern gender relations.

There are researches (Kuramshev 2001, 85–7; Ladikina 2001, 57–82) about the communication of these two socio-philosophical categories of tolerance and gender.

At all levels of the social organisation, tolerance acts as one of the most important sociocultural influences on the interrelations forming a life activity together, including the gender system.

The feature of tolerance is that it is always needed whenever differences, contradictions, and moments of unlikeness of the manifestations in accordance with the definite criteria are talked about. For example, gender difference comes out as such a criterion. This point of view, which has grown out of a combination of rational and value approaches, can also be used for expanding the content of the definition of "tolerance."

The tolerance system is grounded on the principle of equality. "Another person" or "Other" is a natural and organic medium for tolerance; it is easy to recognise the others on the basis of an agreement, understanding, and cooperation. The "Other," which does not require comparison or prevailing, comes out as an integral

characteristic of being, without which both individual and public advancement are impossible.

Equality is comprehended as an impossibility of modelling by the subject of itself and the environment on the basis of the standard characteristics of psychophysical, moral, economic, political, gender and others. For this reason, the equality of distinctions legalises difference, variety, and pluralism.

At the same time, dialogue helps in following gender equality as dialogue of the members of society, men and women as cognitive-intellectual, psychological bases supplementing and stipulating each other. The purposes directed at the maintenance of gender equality and progress afford opportunities not only for mere harmony but also for the development of the attributes of the modern social society.

The above-mentioned actualises a determination of culture criteria and foundations of the world outlook (aspects of cognition, psychology, and communication), including "dialogics." In this question, philosophy, including philosophy of dialogue as a necessary instrument for comprehending the multilayer dialogue in the modern world, plays an important and irreplaceable role.

In a philosophy, the gender problematic is analysed in different aspects; for example, dialectic as a basis of the gender approach, an anthropological aspect of a gender problematic, aesthetic and ethical aspects, a gender problematic in the history of philosophy, etc. (Azimov n.d., 1, 2).

The gender problem is considered as an expression of unity and the struggle of opposites of an ontological dichotomy of man and woman. From the ontological point of view, the biological, social, and moral dichotomy of society analyses the interdependence of female and male bases. One more aspect of a gender problem in philosophy is the ethics of human relations in gender measurement (Ibid., 2).

Gender relations as one kind of public relations, the basis of which comprises the organisational principle "man/woman," gets into all spheres of public life and refers to the essence of public changes at the present stage of society development. Gender, as one important aspect of the social organisation, to a certain degree builds relations hierarchically between women and men (interpersonal, group, and institutional) and makes a special model of synthesis on their basis, where bases of characteristics of possible social changes are founded.

In Conclusion

Tolerance acts as a condition of the formation of modern gender culture. Social gender tolerance is a set of individual tolerances, and it leads to not deleting distinctions between men and women, and equal acceptance of these distinctions in their unique individualities.

References

Anderson, P. S. (1988). *A feminist philosophy of religion: The rationality and Myths of religious belief*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Anderson, P. S. (2006). Postmodernizm ve Din. In S. Sim (Ed.), *Postmodern Düşüncenin Eleştirel Sözlüğü* (Çev. M. Erkan & A. Utku), 1. bs.: 59–66. Ankara: ebabil Yayıncılık.

Azimov, A. B. (n.d.) Genderniye aspekti filosofii. http://education.gender-az.org/Files/4.3rus.pdf.

Berdyayev, N. A. (1989). *Eros i lichnost*. Prometey: Filosofiya pola i lyubvi. M.

Kahraman, H. B. (2007). *Postmodernite ile Modernite Arasında Türkiye 1980 Sonrası Zihinsel, Toplumsal, Siyasal Dönüşüm*. İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı.

Kemerov, V. (2001). Politsubyektnaya sotsialnost i problema tolerantnosti. In *Tolerantnost i politsubyektnaya sotsialnost,* 16–17, Yeкaterinburg.

Kerimov, T. Kh. (2001). Problemi tolerantnosti i sotsialnaya geterologiya. In *Tolerantnost i politsubyektnaya sotsialnost*, 24–27, Yeкaterinburg.

Kuramshev, A. V. (2001). Genderniye roli i tolerantnost. In *Molodej XXI veka: tolerantnost kak sposob mirovospriyatiya*, Pod. red. Z. Kh. Saraliyevoy, 24–27, N.Novgorod: Izdatelstvo NISOTS.

Ladikina, T. A. (2001). Gendernaya samoidentifikatsiya lichnost i tolerantnost. In *Tolerantnost*. Materiali Letney shkoli molodikh uchenikh "Rossiya – Zapad: filosofskiye osnovaniya sosiokulturnoy tolerantnosti", 57–82. Yekaterinburg.

Grant, I. H. (2006). Postmodernizm ve Politika. In S. Sim (Ed.), *Postmodern Düşüncenin Eleştirel Sözlüğü* (Trans. M. Erkan & A. Utku), 1. bs., 17–30. Ankara: ebabil Yayıncılık.

Gülerce, A. (2005). Postmodernist Düşünen Siyaset Açısından Türkiye Toplumunun Özneleşmesi. *Düşünen Siyaset* Düşünce Dergisi, Sayı 21, Aralık 2005: 11–29. Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Lektorskiy, V. A. (1997). O tolerantnosti, pluralizme i krititsizme. *In Voprosi filosofii, 11*, 49–50.

Lozgacheva, Y. (2006). Diskussiya o znachenii ponyatiya "postmodern". http://www.zaharov. znautvse.com/study/seminar_43c.htm

Loginov, A. V. (2001). Tolerantnost, politsubyektnost i sotsialnaya metafizika: postanovka problemi. In *Tolerantnost i politsubyektnaya sotsialnost,* 64–67. Yekaterinburg.

Mirskaya, Y. Z., & Martinova, Y. A. (1993). Jenshini v nauke. *Vestnik RAN*. Avgust 1993 g., t. 63, No. 8.

Munye, E. (1999). Personalistskaya i obshnostnaya revolutsiya. In *Manifest personalizma*, 70–72. Москва.

Proskurina (Yavorovich), M. M. (2002). *Feminizatsiya nauki kak sotsilogicheskaya problema*, 72–77. http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/152/470/1217/009.PROSKOURINA.pdf.

Rzayeva, R. O. (2014). 'Alternative' modernisms in the discourse on postmodern. In G. Raţă, H. Arslan, P.-L. Runcan, & A. Akdemir (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary perspectives on social sciences* (pp. 293–301). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Sarıbay, A.Y. (2001). *Postmodernite, Sivil Toplum ve İslam*. 3. Baskı. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.

Thornham, S. (2006). "Postmodernizm ve Feminizm." In S. Sim, *Postmodern Düşüncenin Eleştirel Sözlüğü* (Çev. M. Erkan & A. Utku), 31–43, 1. bs. Ankara: ebabil Yayıncılık.

Uğur, A. (1992). Postmodernizmin Siyasetle İlişkisi Üzerine, *Defter*, *18*, Ocak–Haziran.

Vakhrushina, M. O. (2011). Samoaktualizatsiya sovremennoy jenshini v semye kak psikhologicheskaya problema. *Molodoy ucheniy*. No. 4, T.2, 57–59. http://www.moluch.ru/archive/ 27/2992.

Chapter 10
Modernisation

Abstract In the process of development, every society feels the need for adaptation in accordance with constantly changing cultural conditions. Consequently, the process of modernisation is observed at all historical stages of development of society, since it is a development, and it is a necessary condition for the existence of every system. In every socium, this process is carried out differently depending on local specificity, which makes the variance of ways of development conditional. Consequently, cultural changes can be realised in different ways. The process of transformation is accompanied by contradictions and complexities because it presupposes changes. However, the moment, which in the classical variant of modernisation is examined as the process of the unification of cultures, brings about some confrontation of these concepts, because "identity" is the ability of the maintenance and succession of cultural standards. The main thing is that the essence should be preserved in a culture and its transformed forms.

Keywords Modernisation · Society · Culture · Transformation · Development · National self identification · Identity

Modernisation consists of a combination of uniform process, a uniform direction and the necessary result (Parsons 1971). The modern society is considered a result of this process; i.e., the present was formed according to certain parameters, and the society, which corresponds to them, was considered modern.

It is necessary to note the difference between the concepts of "modernisation" and "modern (contemporaneity)." The latter comprises universality. Modernisation is the name of the trajectories of the different countries, proceeding from their histories and cultures. In other words, it is possible to state that modernisation is plural in itself. However, the history of countries' modernisation does not coincide completely with the definition of contemporaneity (Göle 2008, 162–3). However, the modernist line is a general feature of non-Western societies.

In the process of its development, every society feels the need for adaptation in accordance with constantly changing cultural conditions. Consequently, the process of modernisation is observed at all historical stages of development of a society, since

modernisation is a development and necessary condition for the existence of every system. In every socium this process is carried out differently depending on local specificity, which is conditional upon the variance of ways of development. However, in choosing this way or the other, one often proceeds from those schemes or others, offering countries with common or identical peculiarities the same "model" of development or modernisation that is inexpedient because every society possesses its own historical and cultural peculiarities, distinguishing it from others and providing its independence and originality. In this case, the use of common schemes becomes apparent in the character of modernisation and the sociocultural ground, and the society undergoes a "cultural crisis" or "crisis of values." The so-called "models" of modernisation usually step forth by way of such schemes, being both independent ways of development, and different fundamental principles of one ideological phenomenon accompanying a common process, in particular Westernisation, and overtaking modernisation, post-modernisation, neo-modernisation, and others.

Born in the process of historical development and the evolution of Western society, having involved the whole world, and by virtue of expansion and thanks to being the dominating paradigm, "modernity" influenced many countries and societies, being interpreted as Westernisation, modernisation brings about changes in different spheres of social life (policy, economy, family, religion, art and other).

Through history there have been many examples of Westernisation. Westernisation acts as part of a more general process—modernisation. However, Westernisation is not an immutable condition of a process of modernisation. We also want to note that the originality of each culture causes multi-alternativeness and the specificity of modernisations. Cultural, social, and political modernisations are observed as separate components of this process. The process of modernisation should be considered as a complex process.

The process of transformation is accompanied by contradictions and complexities because it presupposes changes. When transformations are carried out on a cultural basis (beliefs, convictions, values, ideologies, morals, languages, traditions, customs), the process takes its painful course. After all, it is difficult for society to reject or, at least, reconsider and modernise what is related to consciousness and intellectual and psychological activity, in particular rejecting traditions, even if they are obsolete. Hence, during social transformations and development, the modernisation of public consciousness is accompanied by a number of crises: "the cultural crisis," "the crisis of identity," "the crisis of values," "the crisis of modernism" (the psychological crisis and the crisis of traditionalism) and others.

At the same time, it should be noted that crisis on any level does not make the presence of crises on other levels conditional, but presumes the possibility of its impact on others.

The analysis of modernisation is connected to the national self-identification process. Changing the national identity of a modernised culture is considered a characteristic of modernisation.

Thus, the process of modernisation touches upon that sphere of spiritual life that forms national identity. It appears from this interpretation that common principles reside in modernisation and "national identity," and in particular development.

However, the moment, which in the classical variant of modernisation is examined as the process of unification of cultures, brings about some confrontation of these concepts, because "identity" is the ability of maintenance and the succession of cultural standards.

However, contradictions appear, as noted above, between the classical interpretation of this process and "identity," because modernisation, especially if interpreted as Westernisation, bringing about the loss of national originality, is adduced against arguments, whereas the contemporary interpretations of modernisation, in particular postmodernisation, presume both maintenance that is a handover of cultural standards from generation to generation, reforms, and the cultivation of innovations. In our view, the successful realisation of modernisation by some countries, in particular those of southeastern Asia, is a bright example of such a "challenge," which is interpreted as the "challenge of Asia" or a return civilised wave.

Analyses in the coordinates of the paradigm of East-West relations have recently become popular. In this relation, the definition of national identity in countries with so-called "synthesised" (East-West) structures is a pressing question. Turkey is considered to be a bright example of those countries with a similar structure of society. Therefore, the search for Turkish identity, as well as other Eurasian countries, is realised as a foreshortened East-West. Going from there, the placement of Turkey between the East and the West takes on a special significance. If we take into account the unequal manifestation of the "Western phenomenon" in society, then in Turkey the problem of modernisation is drawn into the sphere of "national identity." In this case, when a cultural map is rich in many religions persuasions, sects, ethnic groups, etc., as well as their interpenetrations, it is difficult to speak about national affiliation or identity. Therefore, the problem of "national identity" is typical not only for Turkey. From this point of view, being tested by the Middle East realities, the one-sided evolution of modernisation theories breaks up (Aydın 2000, 236–40). Under the above-mentioned, the definition of the "national (civilized) identity" of Turkey is a pressing problem in Turkish social thought.

Religion also plays an important role in the formation of national identity. In the civilised conceptions, religion is often considered as an important factor, determining a civilised identity, strengthening its role promoting the "rescue" of the civilisation, being in decline. A similar statement about Western civilisation was made by A. Toynbee.

Religion, in particular Islam, is a component of the cultural heritage of modern Eastern societies, among which we rank the Turkish one. It is accepted that Turkish culture is not classically Islamic; however, at the same time it cannot be called Western or European, for it is impossible to deny the presence of elements of Eastern culture. Thus, in different proportions, depending on the country, religion represents a national-cultural platform when cultural specificity is presented through a synthesis of the traditional, the modern, and the East and West. The significance of the religious factor depends on confessional specificity, and the peculiarities of the social functioning of religion. In Turkey, Islam is an important component of a cultural image; therefore, the analysis of different phenomena of social life, in

particular modernisation, is connected with the necessity of the manifestation of the religious factor.

It is also worth noting the classical confrontation of East and West giving birth to contradictions that bring about an objective resistance of the sociocultural ground. They often flow from the conflict of interests and values of West and East. In particular, some maladjustment and chaos are observed in the cultural reforms experienced by the concrete society related to influence, contradicting the national culture.

Truly, vacuum and chaos, caused by the society rejecting foreign cultural values, underlie factors, upsetting the state of stability of a society. In accordance with this point of view, it may be noted that a stable and happy (healthy) social order is possible on conditions of addressing the cultural value origins. It is not possible to deny the necessity of rational cultural changes to rest on a definite basis. Otherwise, it is obvious that unconscious and reactive resistance will do no good.

Consequently, cultural changes can be realised in different ways. The main thing is that the essence should be preserved in a culture and its transformed forms. Otherwise, the realisation of cultural changes at the price of rejection from the national and spiritual image (identity), and individuality cannot give positive results.

Rather than a literal adoption of achievements in a cultural sphere, the ability to adopt and interpret them is important. A presence of notions, called spiritual or national culture, in the cultural basis must not be rated as an obstacle on the way to universality (global prevalence).

Our use of the Turkish example is related to the circumstance important for modern Azerbaijan in order to forecast perspectives of development, standing from some identity of the cultural image. Azerbaijan possesses a sufficiently long "independent" history of modernisation, which periodically paralleled the Turkish one without the presence of contact. Here, it is necessary to note such important stages of history as the Soviet period for Azerbaijan and the Ottoman period for Turkey, especially the Kemalist period. In order to trace the dynamics of the modernisation process in Turkey and Azerbaijan, it should be noted that the intellectual trend at the beginning of the nineteenth century (A. Bakikhanov, M. Akhundzade, I. Gutkashenly, G. Zardabi) can be called one of essential stages of the process of modernisation in Azerbaijan. The slogan "Turkism, Modernisation, Islam" once created a formula of national identity in Azerbaijan and Turkey. If this slogan was linked with the name of Ziya Gökalp in Turkey, in Azerbaijan it was linked with the name of Ali bey Huseynzade (who spoke out before Gökalp) and reflected the three-colour flag of the first democratic republic in the East.

In Conclusion

Therefore, it is rather expedient to speak about personal modernisation, the study of which is attended by a number of circumstances related to essential features of the cultural figure.

Separating people from their cultural stems and making ethnic memories silent are practically impossible. Even in the most "modernised" (depending on how this word is understood) representative nation, these stems are from time to time "rambled." Moreover, a question appears over whether this should be done, and if the world community would become a homogeneous, monotonous, faceless mass. However, it does not mean that one should not modernise traditions in accordance with constantly changing cultural conditions, for involvement in the global process of cultural transformation is a necessary condition for existence for the development of a society in the constantly changing contemporary world. An optimum combination of the best-modernised traditions of local cultures with achievements in the modern world can promote the development of cultures in accordance with demands of the time, and can also be the best expression of spiritual potential. The selection and carrying out of the innovations most suitable for a given ground can guarantee their vital capacity in existing realities.

References

Aydın, S. (2000). *Modernleşme ve Milliyetçilik*. Istanbul: Gündoğan Yayınları.
Göle, N. (2008). *Melez Desenler İslam ve Modernlik Üzerine*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 3. Basım.
Parsons, T. (1971). *The system of modern societies*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Chapter 11
Postmodernisation

Abstract For an analysis of the concept of "postmodernisation" it is necessary to determine how it should be considered—as a "continuation" of modernisation, "the present stage" of modernisation, or the refusal of modernisation. If modernisation is the transition from the traditional society to the modern, postmodernisation is the transition from the modern society to the postmodern. Modernisation has been often considered through the prism of "the challenge of the West and the world's answer," in which the basic idea that there is a sample of the West and the changes of the non-Western world are reactions to its existence. If modernisation is usually treated as a transition from the traditional society to the modern, postmodernisation does not assume a radical refusal of the past. Today, one of the important tasks is the development without presupposing the change of identity in the course of which the loss of the sociocultural basis will not take place. Thus, postmodernisation is a modern form of modernisation, a new form of changes when they are seen in the combination of the past, the present, and the future. With a careful analysis of postmodernisation the synthesised character is found, which also distinguishes it from classical modernisation. It is impossible to reproduce mechanically the experience of the already modernised countries. That is, we think postmodernisation is a modern form of the classical modernisation, as the situation developed in the world testifies to the impracticability and inexpediency of passing classical modernisation by countries.

Keywords Postmodernisation · Modernisation · Transition · Continuation · Traditional society · Modern society

Postmodernism (or "postmodern") literally means that which is after "modernism" or contemporaneity. However, the concept of "modernity" also has no fixed definition as the concept of "a modern society." We can also note the same about the term "postmodernisation." Nevertheless, this term has an important meaning as a certain conceptual sense is laid on it, according to which the process being referred to as modernisation is no more the latest event in the modern history of mankind,

and social transformations today develop in completely the other direction (Inglekhart 1999, 268).

For an analysis of the "postmodernisation" concept it is necessary to determine how it should be considered—as a "continuation" of modernisation, "the present stage" of modernisation, or the refusal of modernisation. If modernisation is the transition from the traditional society to the modern, postmodernisation is the transition from the modern society to the postmodern.

Modernisation has been often considered through the prism of "the challenge of the West and the world's answer," in which the basic idea is that there is a sample of the West, and the changes of the non-Western world are the reaction to its existence. Samuel Huntington claims that the generalised image of modernisation and Westernisation to some extent exists as the answer of non-Western countries. According to the conception of "a call—an answer," the call is an external influence capable of creating an internal pulse of development in the country (Huntington 1996, 75).

Does the development always mean a refusal of sociocultural bases and is it an obstacle for modernisation? The new "appearance" of modernisation, called post-modernisation, is a theoretical attempt to combine the incompatible. If modernisation is usually treated as a transition from the traditional society to the modern, postmodernisation does not assume a radical refusal of the past.

An important feature of postmodernisation indicating a distinction from modernisation, more exactly from its most widespread form of Westernisation, is a circumstance that it is not realised under conditions of the presence of a sample when the Western European models of modernisation are directly borrowed. In this case, the specificity of the sociocultural ground is taken into account, and the local culture and historical traditions are kept. Hence, these changes (transformations) take place without the dependence or direct influence of the West.

Today, one of the important tasks is development without presupposing a change of identity, in the course of which the loss of the sociocultural basis will not take place. This is a necessity, for a new concept describing a new transition to the future has emerged. Until a certain time, it was considered impossible, but today it is possible to speak about a "version" of the development not destroying its own culture. In this case, the Japanese and south Asian experience should be mentioned, which has avoided some painful processes that are considered characteristic of modernisation, for example, changing the national identity of a modernised culture. This often means that the countries of Asia, in particular Japan, are important for the analysis of the countries with a Euro-Asian or Asian location. However, it is necessary to note "that the success of Japan and Southeast Asia Asia, as a whole, has appeared as the experience destroying the perceptions of the social science about the society" (Fedotova 1997). This proceeds from the perception of the traditional Asian society as being transformed with difficulty, according to M. Weber's definition.

Thus, nowadays development is understood as organic modernisation carried out on the basis of experience and choice; that is, the transition to the postmodernity.

Hence, we can note that "modernization without Westernization" (Huntington 1996) is possible.

Thus, postmodernisation is a modern form of modernisation, a new form of changes when they are seen in combination with the past, present, and future. That is, as J. Habermas marks, postmodernisation is connected with the concept of time that never stops in its "modernity," which is always filled in with a certain (positive or negative) content, and ties together the past and the future, tradition and innovation. Therefore, he considers modernity as an uncompleted project (Habermas 1992, 40–2).

With the careful analysis of postmodernisation, a synthesised character is found that distinguishes it from classical modernisation.

During modernisation, innovations are opposed to elements, which are traditional for the given culture. From the methodological point of view, it is necessary to note that the traditional is modernised in the Eastern society not by itself, but in synthesis.

Synthesis (from that Greek meaning "with" and "placing") corresponds with such terms as "dialogue of cultures," "communication of cultures" (V. Bibler), and "concert of cultures" (G. Pomerants), and means the interaction of cultures of different regions, countries, and nations for their mutual enrichment.

The tendency for extending the interference of cultures is especially important in the washout of distinctions between "own" and "other's." Today it is rightfully possible to speak about the existence of a universal culture, which, as against the world culture as sets of various cultural formations, represents the uniform integrated system of the universal culture (Konrad 1972; Bibler 1989).

In the postmodern society, synthesis takes place in the preservation of the specificity of ethnonational traditions alongside the development of achievements of the advanced societies in the spheres insufficiently advanced in the sociocultural system, forming an example of a mixed, non-uniform society. Diverse specificity, a mixture of genres, and polystylistics are characteristics of the postmodern.

Synthesis is objectively an inevitable public compromise. It is natural that each of the sides aspires to win. However, the general tendency is such that the final result of coexistence and struggle is usually the transformation of the traditional into the modern (*Evolutsiya vostochnikh obshestv* 1984, 12). At the same time, it does not mean that there is an extinction of the traditional. As a result of the analysis of different approaches to the process of modernisation, it is indicated that modernisation is not the destruction of the traditional, its obligatory condition, the traditional, is not always a closed, mutually exclusive system, and consequently synthesis (Tipps 1973) is possible. Traditional elements are present in the developed society, not separately, but part of specificity of the society, becoming the integral components of the given culture. This takes place when the society experiences postmodernisation, in this case when the multicultural modernisation is realised with respect for the culture of national minorities, and the granting of equal conditions for the development of dominating and non-dominating cultures. In the cultural policy, the developed (industrialised) countries adhere to the policy by

which the growth of cultural variety and cultural pluralism promotes the strengthening of this process (Kravchenko 2000, 384).

Postmodernisation is "a preferable variant" of modernisation because it can simultaneously be transitioned from traditional and modern conditions into the postmodern, avoiding some processes of the development typical for the Western model, in particular, changes of the Western identity (Fedotova 1997). At the same time, global changes in the world social development, contradictions of modernisation (the change of identity as the problem of modernisation theories conflicts with human rights in belonging to other cultures), and imperfections of "models" of modernisation, in particular, "catch up" or "secondary" models (meaning a "change" of a model without taking into account the peculiarities of the modernised country) have led to a situation under which postmodernisation began to represent a compromised variant in the created situation.

However, in the definitions of postmodernisation there are some contradictions, and inconsistent disagreements. As an example, it is possible to give its formulation used above that the postmodernity is: (1) a break with modernity (as J. Habermas thinks, while at the same time criticising modernity); and (2) its continuation (Z. Bauman agrees with both the first and second circumstances). Some scientists neither try to prove nor deny these points of view, appealing by the circumstance that no society has entered postmodernity so far, it is not yet clear what its potentialities are, and there is a probability that it is also be a new "model" (version) of modernisation and a deviation from it (Ibid.). The account of the experience of Asia in studying modernising processes as consequences of innovative activities, and development on the basis of cultural bases, is not expedient. We are inclined to connect these contradictions with the "novelty" of the term and with an insufficiently settled terminological toolkit. According to some analysts, this term "postmodernisation" is used extremely rarely, "meaning as a way and an orientation of the development of the entire world, and, first of all, an explanation of the essence of processes in Southeast Asia Asia" (Ibid.).

However, it is impossible to ignore the fact of an opportunity of the development on the basis of tradition.

In Conclusion

It is impossible to mechanically reproduce the experience of the already modernised countries, and it is not vital for today. The contemporary alternative variants of modernisation, developing according to the internal potential of the modernised society, are the witnesses of the deviation from the specified tendency. That is, we think that postmodernisation is a modern form of the classical modernisation, as the situation developed in the world testifies to the impracticability and inexpediency of passing the classical modernisation.

References

Bibler, V. S. (1989). Kultura. Dialog kultur (Opit opredeleniya). *VF*, No. 6.

Evolutsiya vostochnikh obshestv: sintez traditsionnogo i sovremennogo. (1984). Pod red. N. A. Simoniya и L. I. Reysnera … Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literaturi izdatelstva. M.: Nauka.

Fedotova, V. G. (1997). *Modernizatsiya "drugoy" Yevropi*. Moskva: IFRAN. http://www. philosophy.ru

Habermas, Y. (1992). Modern—nezavershenniy proyekt. *Voprosi filosofii*, No. 4.

Huntington, S. (1996). *The clash of civilization and the remarking of world order*. N.Y.

Inglekhart, R. (1999). Modernizatsiya i postmodernizatsiya. *Novaya industrialnaya volna na Zapade*. Pod red. V.Inozemtseva. M.

Konrad, N. I. (1972). *Zapad i Vostok: Statyi*. M.

Kravchenko, A. I. (2000). *Kulturologiya: slovar*. Moskva: Akademicheskiy proyekt.

Tipps, D. (1973). Modernization theory and the comparative study of societies: A critical perspective. In *Comparative studies in sociology and history*, Vol. 15, No. 2. Cambridge.

Chapter 12
Non-western Contemporaneity and the Postmodern

Abstract The intellectual-spiritual realities of modern life cause a reconsideration of the modernist theories and practices, including those in a postmodern situation. A postmodernist discourse is motivated by the modernity crisis, rejecting its monistic understanding. Under the influence of globalisation, postmodernism extends over "non-Western societies." The analysis of the postmodern in its relation to the modern, as well as the "non-West" concerning the "West," assumes the detailed and comparative analysis of "languages," cultural pools, and the historical processes connected with noted concepts, i.e. differentiating terminology. The postmodernist theorisation of the dichotomy "West-non-West" obviously causes a discursive analysis, in the following contexts in particular: dialogue, an image of the *Other*, the claim on knowledge, a deconstruction, the subject-object relations, and the economic prism. The postmodern in the non-Western interpretation is characterised by the whole palette of the specific parameters inherent in non-Western modernity and becomes complicated in its ambiguous understanding and self-reflection.

Keywords Non-west · Alternative contemporaneity · Postmodern · Innovation · Continuity · Alternative modernisms · Local modernity · Plural modernities · Multiple modernities

What are the characteristics of the different specificity of non-Western contemporaneity?

As the basic characteristic, it is possible to see that non-Western contemporaneity represents a surprising conglomerate of continuity and innovation. At the same time, the world outlook is the simultaneous affinity and extraneity of both Western and Eastern psychology, i.e. the duality of perception.

The Non-west as an Alternative Concept

Can "non-Western contemporaneity" be considered as an alternative concept?

The concept "alternative contemporaneity (alternative modern)" on the one hand refers to Western contemporaneity, and on the other prepares a legitimate basis for searches of "alternative" contemporaneity. It is based on the assumption of a presence of new experiments, which can change the definition of "contemporaneity." The alternative contemporaneity, without being limited to different cultural trajectories, puts the creation of difference and the overcoming of the present model of contemporaneity on the agenda. In this context, it can be a novelty carrier. However, at the same time a weakness is its notion about continuous, systematic transformation. The concept of "alternative" indicates on the one hand the criticism of Western contemporaneity, even the refusal of it, and on the other a more political, voluntary model of change. The present phenomenon has not been subordinated to political actions or more complicated, multi-layered ones, developing with many actors and by means of mixing. On the other hand, to the degree to which the concept of "alternative" also introduces a search of "authentic" difference, it may bear the imposing ideas and actions as well (Göle 2008, 163).

The concept of "extra contemporaneity" is sometimes used in relation to "non-Western contemporaneity." To some extent, this concept has something in common with the concept of "excessive Westernisation." A similar tendency (extra contemporaneity) is considered as characteristic of non-Western societies owing to such indicators as fetishisation of the present, and its transformation into demonstrative desire. It can also be connected with the concepts forming Western contemporaneity transferring to other societies, carried out in an exaggerated form and acquiring new maintenance (Ibid., 170–1); i.e., it is possible to speak about the "change of semantic filling of implanted foreign cultural samples" (Gavrov 2003).

This concept "non-West" is considered problematic because it can mean "opposition to West" or unmodern societies. In addition, there is an observed complexity and even frameworks of differentiation of the fact of modernisation from desire to Westernise, as in the nineteenth century modernisation was identified with Westernisation (Göle 2008, 164).

The intellectual-spiritual realities of modern life cause a reconsideration of the modernist theories and practices, including those in a postmodern situation. A postmodernist discourse is motivated by a modernity crisis, rejecting its monistic understanding. Under the influence of globalisation, modernism emerges in a greater number, among which non-Western modernisms present "alternative" modernisms to the West, i.e. the non-Western interpretation of contemporaneity acts as an alternative concept. The given situation assumes the detailed and comparative analysis of "languages," cultural pools, and the historical processes connected with the noted concepts, i.e. differentiating terminology.

The national sociocultural tradition causes variability of "modernising" processes in the world. This idea has laid down a basis of the concept "plural modernisms" (Eisenstadt 1987, 2000, 2002; Arnason 2002, 2003; Allard 2002). The given concept

has been used in relation to "non-Western" societies, alongside the non-Western world (Eisenstadt 1999, 14), thereby constituting the inapplicability of the "West European matrix" to it.

The term "non-Western contemporaneity" itself correlates to a number of terms and concepts, such as "plural modernities/multiple modernities," "an alternative modernity," "a local modernity", and "extra modernity."

The concept of "multiple (plural) modernities" introduces a new multi-trajectory and cultural-dependent narration of contemporaneity, instead of a uniform trajectory and its extra cultural expression (*Multiple Modernities in an Era of Globalization* 1999).

The concept, revealing the distinctions observed within the modern Western world itself, criticises the monistic explanation of contemporaneity (Göle 2008, 162).

The concept of "non-Western contemporaneity" has arisen from an idea about plural modernities and their variability in the non-Western world, in the countries outside of Europe and North America (Allard 2002, 61; Eisenstadt 2000, 2002; Arnason 2002, 2003). Though as a whole, "non-West" is the collective name for societies outside of the "West." It is necessary to note the convention of any significations, including divisions into "East" and "West."

Do the different local grounds and cultural pools with "peculiar" systems of values create the alternative variants of contemporaneity?

Huntington's statement about how globalised contemporaneity in the West and contemporaneity have ceased to be identical, corresponding with the aforesaid, contradicts his thought that other societies are modernised too, but as they could not become Westernised cannot be considered as the modern. The given position is based on the idea that beyond the West there cannot be contemporaneity. On that thesis, the potential sources of collisions that represent insuperable civilization differences are constructed.

The given position proceeds from the idea of binarity of West and East, and to a certain degree from the mental division. In our opinion, what is sometimes characterised by the concept "weak historicity" (Göle 2008, 167) is ignored in the designation of an interrelation of non-Western societies with contemporaneity. There is a different historical way of the "West," shown in how the "East" did not pass through the stages of development the "West" once did (such as the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Enlightenment).

The analysis of approaches testifies that Eastern societies do not bear in their structures the necessary preliminary conditions for achievement of the level of Western societies, and for this reason have been compelled to search for any example or model within their limits. In addition, the model of the West, which has provided it a certain place in the world and is frequently interpreted as right, given by history, is characterised as a product of its development. "The made choice is rather a product of the balance, which has arisen between various societies today, than their natural development" (Sezer 2005, 64).

However, the thesis about the clash of civilisations is more and more characterised as an outdated view of the changes in relations between the West and contemporaneity (modernising) (Göle 2008, 160).

The given statement of a question causes theoretical calls.

There is a point of view according to which the Western contemporaneity (modern), leaving universal and progressive ideals, should retreat into its geography and shell. The given position characterised as "Western" at the same time denies the West as a model for others and as having a monopoly over the present (Ibid.).

The circumstance that henceforth the present is not a monopoly of only Western (in the sense of Europe and America) societies complicates the answer to the question "What West?" (Ibid., 167). After all, there are images of "West" and "East" implanted in mentalities. And just as "non-West" is frequently used as a collective concept for the characteristic of non-Western cultures, the West represents an integrated concept, and with a generalised character. Can we speak about the general identical modern in the Western world (Allard 2002, 61), or can we also speak about its multifaceted nature?

At the same time, in opposing the "West" to the integrated "non-West," it is necessary to notice that non-Western contemporaneity is also heterogeneous.

It is necessary to notice that societies with the synthesised combination may be characterised by eclecticism, since cultural codes can contradict each other.

The research of non-Western cultures "from within" by anthropologists has initiated the cultural relativity. The other societies began to be considered as self-checked and self-asserting "organic" forms. A consequence of this is the essential moral relativity—there is no objective criterion according to which they define what is correct and what is not in each culture, and estimate in two different cultural/moral systems (Sim 2006, 317).

The postmodernism and/or the new philosophy proceeds from the idea that a consequence of the metaphysical idea was the change of one great idea by "local" characters (Ibid., 358). The themes of "plural modernities" and "alternative modernities" were brought up to date against this background.

The new social forms are reflected in a public consciousness and cause the formation of new "local modernisms." The postmodernist indicators of a postmodern condition observed in a society cause the sociological parameters of the philosophical analysis of postmodernist indicators.

This makes it possible to speak about the ambiguous nature of modernity. Postmodernism is a triumph of difference (Ibid., 256). These distinctions are found depending on the historical experience and geography of each society (Yılmaz 2005, 155).

The given approach assumes the discursive and interdisciplinary analyses, since the indicators of "alternative" modernisms are fixed in the first place on the sociocultural ground that conditions the analysis with sociology, cultural science, and philosophy, and which acts as a language-key of interdisciplinary research.

The concept of "local contemporaneity" is oriented towards the surroundings, *Another*, and individual practices, approaching an understanding of the new forms of hybridisation and introducing us to the speculative field, having not become a subject of conversation (Göle 2008, 163). However, there is a point of view that it is

difficult to speak about "locality" owing to the direct interrelation of a modern society, the mobility of people, and, in particular, the conditions of globalisation. The given approach proceeds from the idea that the social, spatial mobility of people is one of the classical components constituting modern (contemporaneity).

"Alternative" Modernisms in the Discourse on the Postmodern

What is the relation of the alternative modernisms in postmodernist narratology to the modern and its identification with the "West"?

In this connection, a question arises:

> Postmodernism attaches importance to the various cultures existing in the world, doesn't it? Whether the various outlooks, identity and etc. are for them (postmodernists) the indicators of the common world wealth which is necessary and should be developed or different outlooks, various cultures or all distinctions are the properties, which postmodernists try to eliminate? If differences are accepted, to what degree and how, why they will be accepted?
> (Erdem 2005, 108)

Here, it is possible to note some duality in the way postmodernism both attaches and does not attach importance to the various cultures. It attaches importance because the different cultures, owing to authenticity and exoticism, have the potential to be presented on the market as an alternative to the consumer. It does not attach importance because different cultures, no more than "filler," are dissolved in Western culture by almost clearing the content of symbols and ceremonies. The different cultures or all differences are not features they try to (directly) eliminate (Ibid., 109).

The postmodern condition is characterised by breaking totality, destruction, and fragmentation.

The plurality of modernist styles can be comprehended in postmodernism, which represents an alternative vision/theorisation of the world.

Postmodernism sends a challenge to all global, universal outlooks with political, religious, and public characters (Rosenau 1998, 25).

As a matter of fact, the postmodernist idea does not proceed from an idea of their categorical acceptance or refusal owing to their fidelity or an inaccuracy. It recognises the value of the judgements of these adherents' ideas, however, each taken separately opposes promotions of the views and beliefs by them as uncontested models (Beriş 2003, 500).

The postmodern philosophy gives the error and the empirical preference over a priori and the exact, heterogeneity instead of unity, fragmentariness instead of unity, and also plurality (Sim 2006, 358).

In Conclusion

The philosophical basis of the postmodern in the non-Western societies is caused by the search for an alternative of the Western modern and scepticism concerning the bases on which the Western thought is constructed, while in the West it is represented as critical introspection, and self-destruction.

On the whole, the approaches, despite their abundance, are reduced to modernity as globalised and localised, i.e. the experience of the contemporaneity, which has received definition through Western geography, history, and culture, extending over the different geography, appearing in the new cultural pools, and is expressed again in different languages.

In the postmodern, alternativeness and plurality are brought up to date. Hence, modern realities testify to the interconditionality of discourses on the multiplicity of modernisms and the postmodern.

References

Allard, E. (2002). *Somnitelniye dostoinsta konceptsii modernizatsii*. http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/188/689/1231/006.ALLARD.pdf.

Arnason, J. (2002). *The peripheral centre: Essays on Japanese history and civilization*. Rosanna: Trans Pacific Press.

Arnason, J. (2003). *Civilizations in dispute: Historical questions and theoretical traditions*. Boston: Brill.

Beriş, H. E. (2003). Moderniteden postmoderniteye. In M. Türkone (Ed.), *Siyaset*. Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1987). *European civilization in a comparative perspective*. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.

Eisenstadt, S. (1999). *Revolutsiya i preobrazovaniye. Sravnitelnoye izucheniye tsivilizatsiy*. Per. s angl. A. V. Gordona pod red. B. S. Yerasova. M.: Aspekt Press.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (2000). Multiple modernities. *Daedalus, 129*, 1–29.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (2002). *Reflections on multiple modernities. European, Chinese and other interpretations*. In D. Sachsenmaier, J. Riedel, & S.N. Eisenstadt (Ed.), Boston:Brill.

Erdem, T. (2005). Postmodernizmin "Öteki"si Hangi "Öteki"? *Düşünen Siyaset, Düşünce Dergisi*, Sayı 21, Aralık 2005 (pp. 101–112), Ankara: Lotus Yayınları

Gavrov, S. H. (2003). *Natsionalnaya kultura i modernizatdiya obshestva*. M.: MGUKI. http://window.edu.ru/library/pdf2txt/244/66244/37946/page5.

Göle, N. (2008). *Melez Desenler İslam ve Modernlik Üzerine*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 3. Basım.

Multiple Modernities in an Era of Globalization. (1999). *World congress of the international institute of sociology* (pp. 11–15). Tel Aviv: Temmuz.

Rosenau, P. M. (1998). *Posrmodernizm ve Toplum Bilimleri*. Çev. Tuncay Birkan. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.

Sezer, B. (2005). *Osnovniye problemi turetskoy sotsiologii*. Almati.

Sim, S. (2006). *Postmodern Düşüncenin Eleştirel Sözlüğü*. (M. Erkan, & A. Tutku, Trans.). 1. Baskı, Ankara: ebabil Yayıncılık.

Yılmaz, M. (2005). Atatürk'ün Modernleşme Modeli. In *Atatürk ve Çağdaşlaşma*—belgeler ve görüşler. Ankara: AKDTYK, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi.

Chapter 13
The Postmodern and Religion: A Discursive Analysis

Abstract In modern society, a transformation of the sociocultural functions of religion is observed. One of the approaches in the social-religious sphere is the interpretation in light of postmodernism. In particular, the condition endured by religion is characterised as "postmodernist." The given condition can be interpreted by an involvement of the gnoseological, ontological, and sociological components. Postmodernity assigns an interpersonal place for religion. The given tendency testifies to both pluralistic religious consciousness and an individualisation of religion which, according to the statement of many researchers, are characteristic features of a modern society. At the same time, the break from religious totality and the variety of religious practices, conditioned by individualisation characteristic of the postmodern, deconstruction, the desacralisation of religion, and pluralistic religious consciousness, are observed. As noted above, one of the features of the postmodernist condition of religion is its politicisation. Hence, the analysis of sociocultural functions of religion reveals the features of its transformation in the postmodern situation, in particular, through the consideration of representations of the postmodern in the socio-religious sphere, points of contact between the postmodern and religion, and a strengthening of the tendency of self-expression by means of various identities as a result of the influence of the postmodern, including the religious.

Keywords Postmodern · Religion · Discourse · Gnoseological · Ontological · Sociological · Desacralisation · Deconstruction · Politicization

In modern society, the transformation of the sociocultural functions of religion is observed. One of the approaches to studying in the socio-religious sphere is an interpretation in the light of postmodernism. In particular, the condition endured by religion is characterised as "postmodernist." The given condition can be interpreted with an involvement of the gnoseological, ontological, and sociological components.

The idea of the discursive analysis is representative owing to revealing the contextual points of contact of postmodernism with religion, and also the

determination of fluctuations in the spectrum of these concepts. The given approach finds a connection—to a certain degree a mediated one—between the noted concepts as well as a variability of conceptual fields in which the given concepts can be "read."

Any public system arises as the gnoseological validity (Kahraman 1992). Social epistemes, as a result of the concurrence of certain circumstances, certainly influence the onward march of history. They underline and are an example of an important rupture with the past (Kahraman 2007, 52).

What significance does the postmodern get from the point of view of religion?

One of the most obvious features of postmodernity is its affording an opportunity to return to religion (Sarıbay 1995, 87), causing the statement that postmodernity is characterised by the original "religious Renaissance." At the same time, the break from religious totality and a variety of religious practices, conditioned by the individualisation characteristic of the postmodern, deconstruction, the desacralisation of religion, and pluralistic religious consciousness, is observed.

Postmodernity assigns an interpersonal place for religion. In this meaning, a special sphere is given to religion, and postmodernity, showing interest in this specific sphere, at the same time stimulates the religious revival (Sarıbay 1995, 93–4). Hence, in the postmodern a religious tradition released from a modernist captivity is one of its tendencies, and the postmodern gives the chance to practise religion (Brajnikova and Brajnikov 2006).

Modern societies generate a new variety of religious practices that are frequently interpreted as a withdrawal from a unification of society and obligatory standards, the development of which was characteristic of the modern. The given tendency testifies to both pluralistic religious consciousness and an individualisation of religion that, according to the statement of many researchers, is one of the characteristic features of a modern society.

One more tendency is that religion ceases to reflect the religiousness of people, and in the postmodernist world religion performs a function of some personal "behavioural code" rather than a shared way of life and culture (Sarıbay 2005, 176), correlating with a symbolical representativeness of the postmodern in the religious sphere.

In the light of the above-mentioned, the tendency for a definition of itself by means of religious identity is amplified.

Religiousness appears to a considerable degree as an external attribute of behaviour rather than a value guideline by which the person is guided during the realisation of religious requirements (Ibid., 180).

In a postmodern society, religion acquires certain peculiarities that are indicative of its postmodern condition, one of the manifestations of which is the symbolistic and political representation of cultural diversity. Thus, the formation of a certain identity as self-expressed through a symbol is observed. Such identity serves as a manifestation of *Other* in a modern society.

The tendency for the reference to religion to give a chance for solving a self-identification problem is observed.

Dynamism, introduced in the religious sphere by the late modern, together with such concepts like "tradition," "identity," "belonging," and "(new) community," reveals itself after reconsideration. Hence, in the context of these phenomena, the place of "religion" in the postmodernity context can be established. These tendencies are often characterised as one of the measurements of the postmodernist process (Kahraman 2007, 51–2).

Is a so-intensive penetration of religion and, in particular, Islam, in daily practice a postmodernist phenomenon, or is it another measurement, level, or something modern?

The religious revival observed in modern societies is interpreted as a situation arising "against the crisis of atheistic rationality and modernist pragmatism." (Brajnikova and Brajnikov 2006). Modernism provided the disappearance of religious beliefs by means secularisation, and postmodernism, rejecting this understanding, disagrees that the religious revival will lead to the disappearance of secularisation (Sarıbay 1995, 93–4). The refusal of "one," accordingly, means a rejection of "another" (Touraine 1995, 23–4). In this sense, modernity is both a rupture, rationalisation, secularisation, and laicism. At the same time, the idea that if the basic feature of Western thinking—the fundamental paradigm of secularity as a phenomenon issued in the process after the Renaissance and Reformation together with modernity—then postmodernism as a new-secular one is put forward (Demirci 2000, 85).

The deviation of religion from the integrating function in the postmodern is interpreted as its leaving a social scene and its replacement by secularism. However, owing to the thematisation and actualisation of religion in the postmodern along with a challenge to religious totality, the given situation began to be defined as neo-secularism.

Hence, we can speak about expressions of neo-secularisms, caused by the coexistence of both paradigms of secularity and religiousness, co-operating according to the original logic of the postmodern—coexistence of a miscellaneous.

A situation that some characterise as the introduction in "a post-secular" epoch is not actually a refusal of religion, and only underlines its acquisition of the public form, and thus its politicisation (Sarıbay 2005, 177). In particular, a similar tendency of the "religionisation" of a policy is observed in non-Western countries today.

The strict postmodernist contextual epistemology destroys the traditional notion about religion. It is observed that postmodernist arguments are used in favour of religion and as a shield against others (Tüzer 2005, 192).

The whole world in the 1980s became the witness to two essential phenomena in a religious sphere. The first was a strengthening of religion in comparison with the preceding decades and the acquisition of a new measurement by it, and the second was a strengthening of political and public influence beyond the religious, in particular an Islamic lifestyle (instead of Islam) (Kahraman 2007, 50).

As noted above, one of the features of the postmodernist condition of religion is its politicisation.

It is considered that "Islamism" derives its strength from the politicisation of religion, and from its confrontational relations with the social and political spheres (Göle 2008, 21).

The important element providing the reinforcement of Islam (the Islamic tendencies) is a collapse of modernity as the authoritative, centralistic discourse and practice and all that is connected with it, in particular ideologies and all that it is possible to attribute to metanarratives. That is the political Islam that was developing in the vacuum created by modernity.

There is such point of view that, in the 1980s there was a change connected with the conceptualisation of time in Islam. Even in the politicisation of Islam, it is seen as the transference of Islam to the modern times (Göle 2008, 12).

Hence, it is possible to see that the dynamics of changes concern not only the political sphere. The cultural dynamics are more flexible and multi-layered, and their influences are shown in the remote prospect, although this does not make them less important (Ibid., 15).

Here, it is important to consider religion as an indicator and means used for the creation of a new cultural identity rather than identifying a problem with religion at this stage (Kahraman 2007, 68).

In a situation of crisis of the modern, religion gives a chance to fill the vacuum in the world outlook, taking responsibility for bringing a meaning to life. In our opinion, this gives reasons for a religious revival (or "religiousness growth") in the postmodern society. Thus, the religiousness growth in modern societies appears mainly as an expression of change of the status, role, and functions of religion and religious behaviour.

In Conclusion

The above-mentioned tendencies in the religious sphere have something in common with such core postmodern principles as deconstruction, radical plurality, and eclecticism.

Hence, the analysis of the sociocultural functions of religion reveals the features of its transformation in the postmodern situation, in particular through a consideration of the representations of the postmodern in the socio-religious sphere, points of contact between the postmodern and religion, and a strengthening of the tendency of self-expression by means of various identities as a result of the influence of the postmodern, including the religious within the scope of postmodernist-religious problematics.

References

Brajnikova, Y., & Brajnikov I. (2006). Pravoslaviye i postmodern: illuzii i perspektivi. Istochnik: _@020O.RU – "RELIGIYA i SMI". http://www.religare.ru/2_30780.html. Accessed June 22, 2006.

Demirci, F. (2000). Modernite Sorunsalında Postmodernite. In *Düşünen Siyaset Birikimler I*, Düşünce Dergisi, Sayı 15, Aralık (pp. 83–108). Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Göle, N. (2008). *Melez Desenler, İslam ve Modernlik Üzerine*. 3. Basım. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları,

Kahraman, H. B. (1992). *Yeni Bir Sosyal Demokrasi İçin*. Ankara: İmge Yayınevi.

Kahraman, H. B. (2007). *Postmodernite ile Modernite Arasında Türkiye 1980 Sonrası Zihinsel, Toplumsal, Siyasal Dönüşüm*, 2. Baskı, İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı.

Sarıbay, A. Y. (1995). *Postmodernite Sivil Toplum ve İslam*, 2. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Sarıbay A. Y. (2005). Dinin Postmodernleşmesi. In *Düşünen Siyaset*, Düşünce Dergisi, Sayı 21, Aralık (pp. 175–184). Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Touraine, A. (1995). *Modernliğin Eleştirisi*, Çev. Hülya Tufan, 2. Baskı, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yay.

Tüzer, A. (2005). Postmodernizmin Din Adına Düşündükleri, In *Düşünen Siyaset* Düşünce Dergisi, Sayı 21, Aralık (pp. 185–193). Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Chapter 14
Postmodernist Indicators in the Public Consciousness of Non-western Societies

Abstract In postmodernism, the social world consists of local fragments and cultural worlds. Also, it means the plurality of alternatives of development in their uncertainty and many variants. So, postmodernism is connected with the interest in the local, not the universal. The new tendencies in the public consciousness influence the public thought of non-Western countries. However, these forms of expression are caused by the specificity of these societies, in particular the socio-cultural ones. The analysis of the postmodernist indicators in public consciousness, which is the initiator of social behaviour, is important owing to the answers to modern challenges caused by the individuality of the sociocultural ground. There are countries in which the non-Western specificity is complicated by a viewpoint of "the East-the West." It is possible to consider them as countries with synthesised structures; the features characteristic of both those and others are inherent in them, and also assumes the world outlook synthesis. Here, the coexistence of two versions of sociocultural existence (Traditions-Modernity) is observed. The Eurasian countries combine different moral value purposes. Their grounds make the interference and interpenetration of ideas possible. An investigation of the development of public consciousness is important for forecasting the alternative perspectives of each society's development.

Keywords Postmodernism · Postmodernist indicators · Consciousness · Non-western societies · Azerbaijan · Turkey · Synthesis · Traditions · Modernity

Today, the refusal of stereotypes of the past and a movement towards both cultural and political plurality are characteristic of the dynamics of public consciousness. A revaluation of the past, in particular the projects and narratives assuming globality and universality, testifies to an occurrence of postmodernist indicators in non-Western countries.

Postmodernism, being beyond culture, becomes apparent in all spheres of public life. It develops various offers and reactions according to different economic, cultural, and local situations in the globalised world (Demirci 2000, 103).

Modernity is defined as the historical predecessor and a necessary condition of postmodernity owing to what is considered characteristic of Western countries, rather than non-Western.

In postmodernism, the social world consists of local fragments and cultural worlds. Also, it means the plurality of alternatives of development of their uncertainty and variants.

That is to say, postmodernism is connected to the interest in the local, not the universal.

All tendencies in society are reflected in consciousness.

The new tendencies in the public consciousness influence the public thought of non-Western countries anyhow. However, their forms of expression are caused by the specificity of these societies, in particular the sociocultural ones.

Relying on a large-scale discourse of originality, which is the most essential feature of the present (Topçuoğlu and Aktay 1999, 10), causes a consideration problem in the example of a concrete type of society such as the Turkic one, to some extent referred to as non-Western societies.

At such a reconstruction of the problem, an analysis of postmodernity in an example of a concrete society begins with an answer to the question of to what extent modern conditions have been realised in a concrete society, and a postmodernist tendency may be regarded in the public consciousness as its development.

In this case, the presence of the premodern along with the modern is characteristic not only of non-Western countries, but of the world as a whole. The reflection analysis of the postmodernist indicators in public consciousness, which is the initiator of social behaviour, is important owing to the answers to modern challenges caused by the individuality of the sociocultural ground.

Having analyzed the concepts of Turkic societies' public consciousness, it is possible to see the similar tendencies, in particular through the example of the Azerbaijani and Turkish societies. The most obvious area where parallels may be observed consists of the sociocultural grounds of these societies. They also, as a whole, are peculiar to the development dynamics of the public consciousness of non-Western societies. However, there are also specific features characteristic of the Turkic societies, causing the expression form of the postmodernist tendencies. As such factors, it is possible to note Islam and traditions, and also the synthesised structures of these societies. As for the Turkish society, one might state that it is a living embodiment of the cultural-historical synthesis.

The non-Western specificity of some countries is complicated by a "the East-the West" viewpoint. In this case, the special value acquires the definition of their place between the East and the West (for example, Turkey and Azerbaijan). It is possible to consider them as the countries with synthesised structures; the features characteristic of both those and others are inherent in what assumes the world outlook synthesis. Here, the coexistence of two versions of the sociocultural existence (Traditions-Modernity) is observed. In particular, Turkish society is characterised as forming a bridge between the East and West, being neither completely East nor completely West, and in close contact with the West through Byzantium, i.e. the

Eastern Roman Empire (Türkone 2006, 85). The given combination can be characterised as eclectic since their cultural codes conflict with each other.

In Eurasian countries, the synthesis of East and West combines different moral-value purposes, their grounds making it possible for the interference and interpenetration of ideas. In synthesised societies, cultural dynamics are expressed by an inter-transition and interlacement of the impulses of "modernism" and "traditionalism" emerging alternatively and reflected in every possible complex of intermediate and combined configurations, conditioning a variety of manners and the ideology of its members.

Certain features are peculiar only to bearers of the given culture. In particular, in some Turkic societies the synthesised consciousness in which the coexistence of elements of both "Western" and "Oriental" cultures is observed. Here, of course, they mean the conditional division of these cultures, and specific features characteristic of each of them. The peculiar features of each of these cultures are the characteristics entering into the conceptual oppositions of "the traditional-the modern," "the secular-the religious," and "the national-the international." In cultures with the underlined synthesised character (structure), the coexistence of these cultures is observed to a greater degree. Here, it is necessary to note the circumstance that there are no "pure" cultures, but rather the coexistence of various, even opposite elements is observed in each, but with a domination of the specific elements typical for them. The given character causes the coexistence of various psychological features.

For example, Azerbaijan is a country with an active participation in the integration processes going on throughout the world. At the same time, Azerbaijan, whose sociocultural ground is a coexistence of the East and the West, is an example of society with a synthetic structure (organisation) of culture (its world outlook peculiarities, and traditional institutes).

In particular, the overlapping of the antinomies "traditionalism and modernism," "secularism and religiousness (religiosity)," and "national and international" is inherent in the Turkish society. This synthesis is eclectic, resulting from the existing world outlook and multi-structural character.

In Conclusion

Today, a changing cultural context is observed. The new discourse assumes the coexistence of "the past" and "the present," and "the traditional" and "the modern," that has something directly in common with the sociocultural grounds of noted societies.

The movement from the modern to postmodern shows an updating of public consciousness. Thus, the establishment of conditions for an occurrence of the postmodernist paradigm in non-Western societies, including the Turkish one, testifies to updating the stereotypes of attitudes to them. This, in our opinion, is

important because at the heart of postmodernism lay the ideas of dialogue and pluralism.

In the given context, the social processes and public thought, in our opinion, should be analysed within the limits of stories of each society. So, a necessity for the application of the interdisciplinary approach, in which the ideas from sociology, history, political science, and social gnoseology, are crossed, faced, and supplemented for each other, is felt (*Mejdistsiplinarnost v naukakh i filosofii* 2010, 201).

The philosophical analysis of notions and concepts revealing the cultural content of sociocultural experience and studying the forms of their reflection in public consciousness is important for the characteristics of modern processes.

An investigation of the development of public consciousness is important for forecasting the alternative perspectives of each society's development.

The features distinguishing it from others are inherent in each country.

As for the "traditionalism-modernism" dichotomy, neither the reckless apologetics of the past nor modernisation especially can reckon on a guiding role in a public idea of non-Western societies, including synthesised ones. So, the ideological struggle of various currents is increasingly developed on the grounds of synthesis, and is carried on about this or another combination of traditions and modern elements.

Synthesis, implying the selective usage of those elements of traditional thinking, which can be combined with a modern perception of the world and modernised values, and urgent for the preservation of the cultural characteristics of moral-ethical values in particular, can be a possible way for development.

The combination of a strong autochthonal culture with a sufficiently modernised one can become a good cultural precondition for the "East-West" synthesis. However, it depends on the cultural experience of the considered country; that is to say, it is possible in the case of the availability of similar cultural preconditions. In this case, this formula may be applied to non-Western societies, the sociocultural grounding of which is a coexistence of the East and the West.

References

Demirci, F. (2000). Modernite Sorunsalında Postmodernite. In *Düşünen Siyaset Birikimler I*, Düşünce Dergisi, Sayı 15, Aralık (pp. 83–108). Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Mejdistsiplinarnost v naukakh i filosofii. (2010). Otv. Redaktor I. T.Kasavin. M.: IFRAN.

Topçuoğlu, A., & ve Y. Aktay. (1999). 'Yeni Zamanlar'a ilişkin Tasavvurlar ve Postmodenizm. In *Postmodernizm ve İslam, Küreselleşme ve Oryantalizm* (pp. 10–13). Ankara: Vadi Yayınları.

Türkone, M. (2006). *Türk Modernleşmesi.* Ankara: Lotus.

Chapter 15
Multiculturalism in the Postmodernist Discourse

Abstract Today, multiculturalism is characterised as an ideology, a policy, and also a discourse that leads to an extension of the multiculturalism agenda, and is becoming actual. At the same time, multiculturalism, being a discourse type itself, can be considered in several discourses. One of them is the postmodernist discourse. One of the most widespread statements is that multiculturalism displays a cultural situation of the postmodern. The postmodern epoch expands the content of multiculturalism. The postmodernist discourse expanding the messages of the concept brings multiculturalism up to date, emphasising more than ever the necessity of dialogue with a communicative component, and multiculturalism as a form (and/or a necessary condition) of coexistence in the modern polycultural world. Multiculturalism has something in common with the philosophical bases of the postmodern. Hence, connecting multiculturalism with the postmodern corresponds to a pluralistic vision of the postmodern, which as a whole characterises its mentality and, it is possible to say, is conformable in its value aims.

Keywords Multiculturalism · Discourse · Postmodern · Pluralism · Dialogue · Plural modernities · Polycultural world

Today, multiculturalism is characterised as an ideology, a policy, and also a discourse that leads to an extension of the multiculturalism agenda, and is becoming actual. At the same time, multiculturalism, being a discourse type itself, can be considered in several discourses. One of them is the postmodernist discourse.

Multiculturalism, as the world outlook position, assumes tolerance to the cultural difference that is also an expression of the especial (Мамонова 2007).

Multiculturalism is brought up to date with globalisation's strengthening.

The ideological and political contexts of multiculturalism include both positive and negative relations to multiculturalism as a phenomenon.

The negative attitude to multiculturalism is connected with its former understanding as a melting pot consisting of an ethnocultural basis as dominant and the various immigrant groups. Since the mid-1960s the politics of the "melting pot" has given way to the ideology of multiculturalism. "Representatives of the ethnic

groups do not look as others if only they correspond to the general mood and values of the country" (Ibid.). That is, on the basis of certain basic social grounds, the ethnocultural differences are cemented without being beyond a context (the given vision can be observed in Naisbitt's work "Megatrends" through the example of American society) (Ibid.).

The above-mentioned relation is also expressed in characterising a multiculturalist as not an obvious racist when "the multiculturalist's respect for the peculiarity of *Another* is the very form of the assertion of own superiority" (Jijek 2005, 110).

The mosaic nature of norms and values, and the coexistence of various cultural fragments in one culture, have something in common with the multiculturalism of the postmodern. The multiculturalism of the postmodern assumes not only polyethnicity, but also a variety of the vital styles (Мамonova 2007).

The culture of the postmodern, in which plurality is legitimised as the substantive origin, assumes the absence of borderlines between the subject and object that leads to infinite determinations (Ibid.).

Multiculturalism as a culture model carries the local traits showing the historical features of culture development that generated it (Ibid.). In this measurement, the parallel between the variety of values in the mosaic structure of the postmodern and the sociocultural ground of non-Western societies can be drawn. The postmodern situation is characterised by a deviation from cultural homogeneity. This break is carried out against an estrangement from traditional conceptual oppositions of the modern. It is considered that normal innovations of modernity have been exhausted (according to Lyotard). The given tendency as a whole is observed in the world, including in non-Western countries. Here, it is necessary to stipulate that, on the whole, cultural homogeneity is impossible; however, there is a universal reference point to the level of which others attempt to attain.

The component of the postmodern program is seen in the multiculturalism project, assuming the creation of a global community with a set of cultures, which have the right to existence and should cause respect. An original interpretation of the given view has laid down the basis of the singularities theory, which has become the basis of multiculturalism (Posadskiy 2008).

The multiculturalism characteristic of a cultural condition of the postmodern acts as a link to its philosophical program, its cultural pluralism expressed in its rhizomatic nature (Rzayeva 2012, 554, 556).

One of the most widespread statements is that multiculturalism displays a cultural situation of the postmodern. First of all, the argumentation is a refusal to reduce to a common denominator so characteristic of the modern, and also that multiculturalism as a culture model assumes, first of all, the removal of the centric development vector, and the dehierarchisation and legitimation of cultural difference's forms. As a whole, it is possible to say that multiculturalism is conformable in valuing the guidelines of the postmodern (Мамonova 2007).

The uniqueness of the present multicultural situation is seen in how it represents a situation of talking in which the new perspectives of worldview, attitude to the world, and its comprehension are formed (Ibid.).

All this brings up to date, "anti-essentialist and poststructuralist programs of researching the culture, emphasizing plurality and ambivalence of social positioning of the individual in the postindustrial world" (Solovyeva 2011, 6).

At the same time, the problematical character caused by the presence of a set of cultures in one society, each of which represents a symbolical system codified in institutes of the society (Malakhov 2010), which can cause a cultural situation crisis.

In the given condition there can be a multicultural person, combining in themselves various "fluid" post-cultural identities and characterised by the following properties: syncretism, value relativism, hybridism, cross breeding, and ambivalence (Posadskiy 2008).

Multiculturalism is closely connected with the paradigm bases' research of the conceptualisation of the stranger. The dialogue, as a special type of interaction, includes the figure of the "Stranger."

The postmodern removes the differentiation between "title culture" and "alternative cultures."

The lack of a "dominating culture" (and when the concept of "culture" is not attached to the concept of "ethnos") is put forward as a characteristic feature of a culturally pluralistic ("multicultural") society. The freedom in choosing "own" cultural samples (Malakhov 2010) has something in common with the pluralism of the postmodern.

In the present context, the matter is not only of categories of "ethnicity," "subculture," and "developed in theoretical traditions of social constructivism and poststructuralism" on which the polarisation "I (we, own)/Other" is based (Solovyeva 2011, 6); i.e., the term "Other" in the modern multicultural world has substantially lost the connotation of the category of "ethnicity."

"A cultural variety is not only and not so much the ethnic variety" (Malakhov 2010). In particular, in postmodernist narratology the ethnocultural discourse extends at the expense of the inclusion of the right to the alternative vital worlds, and the binary opposition "Own-Strange" grows the new senses.

The postmodernist form of multiculturalism discourse expresses the rhetoric *difference,* which has taken the place of the rhetoric Identity (Malakhov 1997). Derrida and Deleuze noted the primary value of the first.

The directive at the domination of mainstream culture is removed by the postmodernist premise of the acceptance of ambivalence as a natural state of affairs and the existence of distinctions as a natural reality; that is, tolerance of the approach (Kravchenko 2002, 305).

The constant accentuation of the fact of difference in the postmodern (Sim 2006, 6) excludes "the use of one classification net for forms of culture" (Мамонова 2007).

This is connected with the rhizomatic nature of postmodern culture representing "both multitude and unity of the organized determinacy in which plurality is similar to the substantive origin" (Ibid.), and multiculturalism is a world outlook position with its "aim at social tolerance in a pluralistic society."

The context of multiculturalism transforms "the alien" into simply "another" (Nizamova 2009), and assumes respect for the mental bounds of social inhabitancy of each cultural unit (Posadskiy 2008).

One of the basic postulates of the postmodernist paradigm is legitimation. The presumption of the basic plurality of the world picture, expressed in legitimation when the collage understood in an extremely wide range of values of this term becomes a symbol of postmodern culture (Mojeyko 2001, 415), characterises the pluralism of postmodernism—"anything goes" (Grant 2006, 17).

The consonance of multiculturalism to the postmodern's philosophical foundations is expressed in the subject (divide) put at the forefront, for which the problems of identity and the choice of value preferences become decisive. The postmodern epoch expands the content of multiculturalism by reducing it, "not only to an ethnic variety, but also a variety of vital styles, orientations and cultural tendencies" (Мамонова 2007).

Multiculturalism and identity can be considered in a context of a correlation of the global and the local. Identity can then express self-identity as natural while multiculturalism is a variety. At the same time, both can express "a policy of maintenance of these origins" (Fedotova et al. 2008, 409).

The conflict of multiculturalism and identity is a conflict of the categories of the global and the local, or more precisely, people conceiving by these categories (Ibid.).

This view assumes the presence of the mental bounds of a society in which the interaction of social forms different from one another, but connected with the value bases of the society, is carried out (Posadskiy 2008).

Multiculturalism as Plural Modernities

In the modern polycultural space, multiculturalism is especially brought up to date.

What is meant under "modern culture" nowadays is a modern form taken by the cultural structure of some society or country consisting of original cultures and preserved. In modern cultures, this structure (subdivided into numerous cultures) has contributed to a generation of such notions as "cultural mosaic" or "multiculturalism"; in particular, these notions became topical under the influence of the "postmodern society."

The concept of "multiculturalism," in its meaning of the coexistence of diversities, is used to describe a cultural structure consisting of multiple cultures. Multiculturalism as a cultural model is in harmony with the aesthetic and philosophical foundations of postmodernity; having legitimised multiplicity as a substantive principle, the culture of postmodernity identified multiculturalism as a vision in which the tolerance of cultural diversity is also an expression of singularity.

Among a number of multiculturalism concepts, when it is used for the description of a modern cultural situation in the world as a whole, the multicultural social constructions in certain societies, and policy, there is one more measurement as a set of modernities in the non-Western world. As one of signs of postmodernity it is always presented, however it is brought up to date under the influence of the last one.

Historical diversities have brought about religious diversities.

Today's multiculturalist condition means dialogue, and multiculturalism is regarded as a new philosophy of interaction (Pokrovskaya 2011).

The ideas "dialogism" from Martin Buber to Mikhail Bakhtin, and the conception of "difference" by Emmanuel Lévinas created on a basis of "dialogue philosophy," can be premises of the given vision.

In a new cultural context, the polyphony of ethnic, national cultures and subcultures owing to the various natures of an origin, various ways of functioning, and various organisations is legitimatised. The policy of cultural pluralism is seen in the encouragement of a "dialogue" between ethnolinguistic and ethnoconfessional groups, and also in a formation of the general communication space, which is inherently super-ethnic (Мамонова 2007).

Herein, the "understanding of other cultural positions and, probably, opposition as a real, uncompleted problem, as 'another's truth' and, hence, exactly the same perception of own, blood truth as opened, suspended one" is brought to the forefront (Ibid.).

The achievement of the communicative culture of a pluralistic society is seen in overcoming the bounds of the normative nature by means of dialogue, and forming the value consensuses (Posadskiy 2008).

In Conclusion

Hence, connecting multiculturalism with the postmodern corresponds to a pluralistic vision of the postmodern, which as a whole characterises its mentality and, it is possible to say, is conformable in its value aims.

The nontrivial sense of the concept ("multiculturalism") is caused by its multilevel nature, urgency, and the discursive analysis.

Multiculturalism as a set of modernities is complicated by the combination (coexistence) of two paradigms of culture—the traditional and modernist ones, analytically contrasted according to the key ontological, anthropological, and gnoseological parameters (Morina 2011, 15–19).

The postmodernist discourse, expanding the messages of the concept, brings multiculturalism up to date, more than ever emphasising the necessity of dialogue according to a communicative component, and multiculturalism as a form (and/or a necessary condition) of coexistence in the modern polycultural world.

References

Fedotova, V. G., Kolpakov, V. A., & Fedotova, N. N. (2008). *Globalniy kapitalizm: tri velikiye transformatsii*. M.: Kulturnaya revolutsiya.

Grant, I. H. (2006). Postmodernizm ve Politika. In S. Sim (Ed.), *Postmodern Düşüncenin Eleştirel Sözlüğü* (Trans. M. Erkan & A. Utku), 1. bs., 17–30. Ankara: ebabil Yayıncılık.

Jijek, S. (2005). *Interpassivnost. Jelaniye: vlecheniye. Multikulturalizm*. SPb.: Aleteyya.

Kravchenko, S. A. (2002). Tema 19: Postmodernistskiye teorii. In *Sotsologiya: paradigmi cherez prizmu sotsilogicheskogo voobrajeniya*, 302–313. M.: Ekzamen. http://window.edu.ru/resource/257/42257/files/t19.pdf.

Malakhov, V. S. (1997). Kulturniy pluralizm versus мultikulturalizm. *Nezavisimaya gazeta* (NG-Stsenarii), 14.06.97. V sbornike "Skromnoye obayaniye rasizma." IGPI.RU. http://www.igpi.ru/info/people/friends/malakhov/articles/1132597922.html.

Malakhov, V. (2010). Zachem Rossii multikulturalizm? *Gosudarstvo i antropotok*. http://antropotok.archipelag.ru. http://www.antropotok.archipelag.ru/text/a062.htm. Accessed May 14, 2010.

Mамonova, V. A. (2007). Multikulturalizm: raznoobraziye i mnojestvo. *CREDO NEW teoreticheskiy jurnal*. http://credonew.ru/content/view/606/32/ Accessed May 16, 2009.

Mojeyko, V. A. (2001). Legitimatsiya. In A. Gritsanov & M. Mojeyko (Eds.), *Postmodernizm. Ensiklopediya*, 415, Mn.: Interpresservis; Knijniy Dom. http://www.gumer.info/bogoslov_Buks/Philos/PostModern/_40.php.

Morina, L. (2011). Konseptualizatsiya chujogo v aspekte problemi multikulturalizma. *International Journal of Cultural Research* www.culturalresearch.ru, *1*(2): 15–19. http://www.culturalresearch.ru/files/open_issues/01_2011/IJCR_01(2)_2011_Morina.pdf.

Nizamova, L. R. (2009). "Multikulturalizm". *Ekonomika Sotsilogiya Menedjment.* http://www.ecsocman.edu.ru/db/msg/127521.html. Accessed July 3, 2009.

Pokrovskaya, N. (2011). Globalizatsiya i kulturniy pluralizm. In *Rossiyskaya pressa v polikulturnom obshestve: tolerantnost i multikulturalizm как orientiri professionalnogo povedeniya (materiali issledovaniy nauchno-prakticheskoy konferentsii)*. http://www.tolerance.ru/biblio/dzyalosh-1/multi/1_pokrovskay.html. Accessed April 26, 2011.

Posadskiy, A. (2008). Pluralisticheskoye obshestvo v usloviyakh neokonservativnoy volni. http://pda.cskp.ru/clauses/5/c/3627/. Accessed September 17, 2008.

Rzayeva, R. O. (2012). K voprosu o dialogichnosti postmoderna. In *"Dialog kultur v usloviyakh globalizatsii" Materiali Bakinskogo Foruma, posvyashennogo pamyati Geydara Aliyeva*, 554–559. M.: "Kanon+" ROOI "Reabilitatsiya".

Sim, S. (Ed.). (2006). Postmodernizm ve Felsefe. In *Postmodern Düşüncenin Eleştirel Sözlüğü* (Trans. M. Erkan & A. Utku), 1. bs., 3–15. Ankara: ebabil Yayıncılık.

Solovyeva, A. (2011). "Etnicheskaya subkultura": конseptualizatsiya etnichnosti v kontekste kulturnikh razlichiy. *International Journal of Cultural Research*, *1*(2): 6–14. http://www.culturalresearch.ru/files/open_issues/01_2011/IJCR_01(2)_2011_Solovieva.pdf.

Index Names

Index Words

A

Aesthetic, 6, 13, 14, 46, 80
Alternative contemporaneity, 62
Alternative cultures, 79
Alternative modern, 62
Alternative modernisms, 62–65
Alternative modernity, 1
Another, 1, 2, 25, 26, 38, 42, 45, 64, 78, 80
Anthropological, 9, 81
Anti-modernism, 31
Anti-postmodernists, 37
Asia, 56, 58
Asian society, 56
Authenticity, 65
Azerbaijan, 52, 74, 75

C

Classical modernization, 55, 57, 58
Communications, 20, 21, 32
Community, 11, 69
Consciousness, 17–22, 27, 42, 50, 74
Contemporaneity, 2, 11, 17–19, 25–27, 55, 62,
    63, 66
Crisis, 50, 79
    of identity, 50
    of modernism, 50
    of traditionalism, 50
    of values, 50
Criticism, 35–37
Cultural codes, 1, 2, 64
Cultural crisis, 50
Cultural hegemony, 11, 19
Cultural identities, 12
Cultural pluralism, 12, 21, 58, 78, 81
Cultural policy, 57
Cultural polyphony, 32

Cultural relativity, 64
Cultural variety, 12, 13, 18, 44, 79
Cultural wars, 12
Culture, 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14, 33, 37, 44, 52,
    56–58, 65, 66, 68, 73, 75, 78, 81

D

Decentralization, 12
Deconstruction, 21, 35, 61, 67, 68, 70
Deconstructivism, 33
Dehierarchization, 78
Desacralization, 68
Destruction, 26, 65
Dialogism, 32, 81
Dialogue, 8, 21, 29, 32, 41, 44, 46, 61, 79, 81
    of cultures, 57
    philosophy, 81
Discourse, 3, 9, 29, 65, 75, 77
Discursive analysis, 61, 67, 81
Dominating culture, 15, 79
Dynamism, 27, 69

E

East, 51, 52, 63, 74, 75
Eastern societies, 51, 63
East – West, 51, 76
Eclecticism, 14, 35, 64, 70
Elite, 14, 43
Enlightenment, 6, 25, 30, 31, 43, 63
Episteme, 9, 14, 68
Epistemology, 20, 69
Ethnicity, 79
Ethnic variety, 79, 80
Ethnocultural identity, 14
Ethos, 17, 22, 33
Euro-Asia, 56