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Abstract
This paper traces the historical discourse of Western Civilization from the period of Modernity to Postmodernity. Major political, social, moral, and scientific shifts occurred in the Western Civilization during Modernity because of the maturation of underpinning utilitarian and materialistic ethics. Postmodernity is a critique on the ideologies of modernity. The identifiable difference between the two lies in the nature of discourse. The discourse of modernity rests on the transcendent criteria such as ‘progress’ and ‘reason’. Postmodern discourse, on the other hand, analyzes social life in terms of paradox and indeterminacy and rejects all metanarratives and overarching guiding principles, religion, science, objectivity, rationality and the notion of truth. Yet the two are closely related and complement each other by sharing a deep commitment and affinity to empiricism, concrete forms and reductionism.

Introduction
The roots of Western civilization’s philosophic thought lie in the Grecian schools but its religious self formed and matured in the churches of the Roman Empire. The earlier Christianity abhorred worldly pleasures (including business and philosophy) and was centered around the notions of austerity (Gibbon, E. (n.d.). and monasticism (Watson, P. (2005). This simple and austere religiosity was however corrupted in the Middle Ages by saint worship, imagery, religious fiction and the doctrine of ‘Original Sin’. The later doctrine became a central theme in western Christianity and “painted a harsh and terrible picture of an implacable God” (Armstrong, K. (1993). The elevation of church to the status of a super-state, advent of the inquisitions and, the idea of “papal infallibility” (Smith, H. (2002). were however challenged during the period of Renaissance of thought and culture between 1350 and 1600 AD (Magee, B. (2001). The external contacts with Arabian Civilization, rise of rationalism, empiricism and science continued transforming the western civilizations’ discourse throughout the late-Enlightenment period in the 18th and 19th centuries. This paper traces the historical discourse1 of Western Civilization from the following period of late 19th and 20th centuries (Modernity) to the present times of Postmodernity.

Modernity
The 19th century has been described as the post-Enlightenment or Modern or as Age of Progress ( Baird & Kaufmann. (1997). In terms of sociology ‘modernity’ refers to the social-political and scientific-philosophical reality of western societies from roughly the mid 18th century onwards (Stockl, K. (2006). The scientific discoveries of the earlier two centuries led to numerous technological advances in Europe and America resulting in Industrial Revolution. The mass production and distribution started changing the demographics and in England in 1800 only 21% of the population lived in cities while by 1890 this figure had jumped to 62%. Some significant consequences of the Industrial Revolution include: transformation of industry by the proliferation of inventions and machines,
the passage of economy from regulated guilds and home industry to a regime of capital investment and free enterprise, the industrialization of agricultural sector, the ascent of Britain as the major colonial power, vast improvements in man’s ability to destroy or kill, generation of democracy by raising the business class to predominant wealth and political supremacy, mechanistic theories in biology (Durant, W. & Durant, A. (1967) – an attempt to explain all the processes of life as mechanical operations, weakening of religious beliefs and, breaking down of the moral codes (Crippen, T. (1988)).

As the 19th century came to a close the Roman Catholic Church was desperate and at war with the modern world. In 1907 Pope Pius X condemned modernism as the “synthesis of all heresies” (Lyng, G.S. & Kurtz, R.L. (1985). Post-1840s era is considered as the time when transition from Enlightenment to Industrial Revolution took place and the utilitarian ethics nurtured in the previous period started reaching the society at large and Christian ethics were pushed back as means to reach the desirable social ends. The post-industrial emergence of liberalism and liberal sate in the West needed the notion of nationalism to develop so that the citizens could feel a sense of duty to serve their nations (Oliver, M. (1997). Adam Smith had already provided the economic rational for nationalism by presenting the notion of absolute advantage by postulating that a nation “exports an item if it is the world’s low-cost producer” (Porter, M. E. (1990). The nationalistic spirit brought with it imperialism in the 19th century because an essential part of it was to look upon other nations as either inferior or enemies.

The socio-economic and socio-political culture produced by the Industrial Revolution had however its critics. Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Frederick Nietzsche (1844-1900) presented a strong critique and reaction against it. Marx is recognized as “one of the principal moulders of modern thought” (Crotty, M. (1998). By synthesizing philosophy, history and economics, he laid the foundations for the critical inquiry and focused on real-life people, society as it is experienced, and not on mere abstractions. In contrast to the traditional German philosophy which descends from heaven to earth, Marx’s philosophy ascended from earth to heaven (Marx, K. (1961). He agreed with Hegel (1770-1831) that contours of societal forms and regimes also represent stages in human self-understanding. He also retained his notion of “dialectic” (Palmer, D. (1994). which in the context of society came to be encapsulated in the term “class struggle, stemming from inherent tendencies in the capitalist mode of production” (McLennan, G. (1989)). Marx perceived a basic conflict in capitalistic society between capital and labor and between bourgeoisie and proletariat. Production was central to his thesis and he saw liberation from the capitalistic class struggle through relations of productions and argued that human beings were dependant on the material conditions of their production. For him “power depends on control of the means of production” (Portes, A. (2006). His notion of class struggle is not however limited to work and includes the totality of the worker’s existence. Economic alienation is at the heart of his core ideas and it is the “alien and hostile natural world” (Marx, K. (1963). along with alien and hostile men that stand over against the workers.

For Nietzsche (1844-1900) strength is the ultimate virtue and weakness the only fault. Good, for him is, what survives and wins, bad is what yields and fails. Morality then lies not in kindness but strength and the ultimate objective of human efforts should be the elevation of, not all, but only strong individuals. He rejects the “vain aspirations” (McLennan, G. (1989), of philosophers to capture truth and reality through the agency of metaphors. He considers democracy as drift and exaltation of the ordinary over those who are excellent because of their superior ‘blood’, breeding and power. He deplores feminism along with Christianity and democracy and declares that “man is for woman a means and (woman for a man is) a dangerous toy” (Durant, W. (2006). He criticized the cultural conditions of his time which he attributed to the prevalence of democracy, Christian values and above all the English who corrupted the world through democratic ideas. His self-centered philosophizing in statements like “shop-keepers, Christians, cows, women, Englishmen, and other democrats belong together” (Durant, W.2006, p. 562) were later on praised by Adolf Hitler in Mein Kampf (Oliver, M. (1997). But his work has grown throughout the 20th century especially in France and America.

Charles Darwin (1809-1882) and Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), the main exponents of biology and psychology during modernity, lived in times when Europe witnessed major political, social and moral shifts. When Darwin was at Cambridge the English Parliament had passed bills allowing Dissenters and Catholics to hold public office for the first time in centuries. A vast liberal tide was gathering to break down the ancient walls of privilege. This tide of change was accompanied by critical questions relating the Creator with the recently developed and developing science. The scientists started pondering over questions like; “Could God’s goodness be deduced from the perfect adaptation of animals” (Desmond, A. & Moore, J. (1991). Natural theology was in crisis and many expected a new life science to arise like a phoenix from its ashes.
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Those were the times of division of labor, mass production, Hobbes’ *bellum omnium contra omnes* (war of all against all) and Laissez Faire. All of that fitted with Darwin’s theory of evolution and that sort of “flaming science” (Desmond, A. & Moore, J. (1991). was favored by general public trying to overthrow the undemocratic state (Watson, P. (2005).

Recent biochemical evidence has not substantiated Darwin’s view of evolution and it is said that his ideas can perhaps explain living entities at a morphological or gross level but his assumption that inside of the organisms would be simpler has not been the case. Contemporary biologists assert that, “...for Darwinian theory of evolution to be true, it has to account for the molecular structure of life...... (research equipped with sophisticated technology) shows that it does not” (Behe, M.J. (1996). Lynn Margulies, a distinguished Professor of Biology at University of Massachusetts challenges the molecular biologists to “name a single, unambiguous example of the formation of a new species by the accumulation of mutations” (Mann, C. (1991). To date her challenge is unmet. There is hardly any support for evolution from the paleontologists and to them evolution ‘never seem to happen’ and the ‘Cambrian explosion’ or the ‘biological big bang’, estimated to be about only 10 millions years ago, has further reduced the time required for complex organisms like humans to have evolved from simpler forms of life, like protozoa (Ho, M.W. & Saunders, P.T. (1979), McDonald, J.F. (1983), Miklos, G.L.G. (1993), Orr, H.A. & Coyne, J.A. (1992), Endler, J.A. & McLe llan, T. (1988). A century and a half has passed since Darwin published his book *Origin of Species* and, yet many questions regarding the origin of life and the formation of complex molecules from inorganic sources are still unanswered (Majerus, M.; Amos, W.; & Hurst, G. (1996).

Sigmund Freud thought that the idea of religion thrives on our innate helplessness against the apparently invincible forces of nature and equates this with our childhood defenselessness in front of the ‘powerful’ parents. He sums up religion as the “son-father relationship (where) God is the exalted father, and the longing for the father is the root of the need for religion” (Freud, S. (1955). For Freud this mental infantilism induces the mass-delusion of religion, which however “succeeds in saving many people from individual neurosis” (Freud, S. (1955). Parent-child relationship is the central theme in his analysis of human ego which, with the passage of time, learns to repress and inhibit sexual impulses with the result that “the illusion” (Freud, S. (1955). of spiritual love over and above the sexual feelings is produced.

In recent times Freudian psychoanalysis has come under criticism. He is termed as “nowhere near as original a mind as he is generally given credit for” and that he was a scientist only in “quotation marks, who fudged and faked his data and deceived both himself and others” (Watson, P.2005). Unconscious, according to Watson, was not discovered by Freud. Similarly many of the credits given to him like the discovery of psychological concepts such as Id, Ego, childhood sexuality, the Oedipus complex, repression, regression, transference, and, the libido were not original to Freud. These concepts were already floated by philosophers and scientists like Schopenhauer, Von Hartmann and Nietzsche and many others had already come up with similar notions. The entire concept of psychoanalysis is considered not working as a treatment and Freud is alleged to have “affected the general public’s conceptions about the field of psychology and has contributed to many misunderstanding” (Stanovich, K.E.2007).).

In the field of philosophy Bertrand Russell (1872-1970) and Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951) developed analytical philosophy. This reduced philosophy to the much less speculative realm of objective logical inquiry (Oliver, M. (1997). Russell inherited and carried forward the English positivist tradition and thought that world’s woes were largely due to mysticism and metaphysics. He therefore abandoned Christianity as much of it could not be phrased into mathematics (Durant, W.2006). His search for ‘purity’ from metaphysics and mysticism was seen thriving in the ‘Vienna Circle’ formed by a group of philosophers, scientists and mathematicians during the 1920s and 30s with the sole aim of purging science and philosophy from “meaningless metaphysics” (Moore, B.N. & Bruder, K. (2001). “Philosophers reduced the scope of their inquiries so much that Wittgenstein, the most noted philosopher of this century, said, ‘The sole remaining task for philosophy is the analysis of language.’ What a comedown from the great tradition of philosophy from Aristotle to Kant” (Hawking, S. (1996), Williamson, T. (2007).

Russell expounded on the possibility of existence of God and rejected the ‘first-cause’, ‘natural-law’, ‘design’ and ‘moral’ arguments. He held the church responsible for retarding progress and development and attributed the success of the idea of religion to fear and terror of the unknown (Russell, B. (1957). The foundations of analytical philosophy were laid earlier by Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806-1873).
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According to Mill, utilitarian ethics were traceable to Socrates who asserted it against the popular morality of sophists (Moore & Bruder. (2001), Presby, M.G., Struhl, J.K. & Olsen, E.R. (2000). This view holds that man is basically a creature of feeling and sensibility and is pleasure seeking and pain avoiding animal and an act is good or right if it produces a surplus of pleasure over pain. An act would be wrong or bad if it produces more pain than pleasure. This view places more importance on the consequences, rather than the nature, of any act for determining whether it (that acts) is moral or not. In nutshell utilitarianism applies scientific and empirical principles to the fields of politics, moral philosophy, economics and, theory of sovereignty (Suda, J.P. (1967). In Max Weber’s (1864-1920) view the only inescapable fact is the “rule of man over man” and any construction of a world free from this fact, must be considered to be utopian. In America the utilitarian tradition was carried forward by the pragmatists William James (1842-1910) and John Dewey (1859-1952) (Oliver, M. (1997).

The major cultural outcome of Western democratic model is ‘pluralism’, the main features of which can be summarized as a society composed of competing interest groups, a conception of the state as a political organ responsive to the needs of these diverse groups within society, a democratic culture which sets a minimum and realistic measure for the values of political participation and trust and, an empiricist and multi-factorial methodology of social science (McLennan, G.1989). The discussion till this point reveals major social, political, moral and scientific shifts, which manifested in the forms of positivistic sociology, liberal democracy, utilitarian ethics, Darwinism, psychoanalysis and analytical philosophy based on logical positivism, during the Modernity period of the Western Civilization.

Postmodernity

Contrary to the popular belief that postmodernism is predominantly a North American phenomenon its traditions are much better developed in France and the United Kingdom (Stephens, C.U. & Guignard, R.M. (2000). It constitutes a reaction and critique to the ideas of Western modernity. Oliver (Oliver, M. (1997). has commented that “postmodernism is a state of mind, it is an attitude. The term was first used in the 1960s to describe the dawning of a new era which Jean Francois Lyotard described as characterized by the gradual decline of the old ideologies and belief system of the modern world”.

The identifiable difference between modernism and postmodernism is the difference in the nature of ‘discourse’ (information, knowledge, communication). The discourse of modernism rests on transcendent yet anthropocentric criteria such as ‘progress’ and ‘reason’. In contrast postmodern discourse analyzes social life in terms of paradox and indeterminacy. It rejects the human agent as the center of rational control and understanding (Cooper, R. & Burrell, G. (1988). and dismisses “all science as empty formalism” (Doody, R.S. (1991). but trusts local scientific practices at the expense of any attempt of their global interpretation (Rouse, J. (1991). Postmodernism, according to Rosenau, questions many a themes of the modernist project. It “questions causality, determinism, egalitarianism, humanism, liberal democracy, necessity, objectivity, rationality, responsibility, and truth” (Rosenau, P.M. (1992). Nonetheless it retains the modernist commitment to empiricism and deeply adheres to a concrete form through ‘le quotidien’, daily life analysis or everyday life focus which forms an alternative to theory (Rosenau, P.M. (1992).

For postmodern philosophers ‘cultural studies’ or studies of identity are the mainstay of culture and the question of identity pervade humanity. Media icons are the key components of postmodern culture and many contemporary philosophers are just as comfortable writing about Madonna as they are about politics or classics or ethics. Postmodern philosophers, like Michel Foucault (1926-1984) argue that knowledge and power are inseparable and the quest for finding out the ‘truth’ is underpinned by our own perceptions and beliefs about truth rather than what the truth actually is under a set of circumstances. He uses Bentham’s Panoptican to construct his notion of ‘panoptic gaze’ which the society and culture imposes on the individuals. Jean Baudrillard’s (1929-) philosophy of ‘hyperreality’ – where physical reality meets the virtual (Tiffen, J. & Terashima, N. (eds.) (2001) - is a reflection of the blur of images presented through the mass communication media and locates the contemporary culture as virtual or unreal. He thinks that America is so engulfed in the imagery of its mass media that the lines between reality and fiction and fantasy are blurred and uses the example of 1993 Gulf War which according to him never actually happened except in the news rooms of the popular media. He terms this fusion of reality and fiction as “simulacral” (Baudrillard, J. (1994). of the postmodern society. The philosophy of Jacques Derrida (1930-) is replete with idiosyncratic terminology and jargon which creates interpretive uncertainty among the commentators (Oliver, M. (1997). Derrida criticizes the Western civilization for its quest for a ‘center’ established around modernist ideas of rationality and objectivity.
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He attributes many problems of language and representation to the Western modernist tradition of controlling the relationship between “speech and writing” (Derrida, J. (1997). For him deconstruction of language assumes the role of both a philosophy as well as a practice (Caputo, J.D. (eds.) (1997). The postmodern social thought demands the abandonment of traditional methodologies and social imagery and views society as embodied from language games (Murphy, J.W. (1988)).

Simone De Beauvoir (1908-1986) gave a new approach to the philosophical and political issues about women and concentrated on women as the ‘other’ of man and held the cultural norms and institutions, like marriage and family, responsible for their suppression. She describes the isolation of women in Victorian England where “Jane Austin hid herself in order to write” and “scientists proclaimed that woman was a subspecies destined only for reproduction” (De Bouvoir, S. (1952). She also labels marriage as ‘obscene’ because it blurs a woman’s individuality and freedom and cites Fascist Italy during modernity where women were put “in double bondage: to public authorities and to her husband” (De Bouvoir, S. (1952). For her perfect fidelity is incompatible with the authentic existence of women as it deprives them of risk and adventure in life (Oliver, M. (1997). She, however, did not believe in attacking men for the emancipation of women but looked at women’s liberty through developing their own individuality. Hannah Arendt (1906-1975) was not a feminist philosopher in the sense of Beauvoir but focused on the lack of political and cultural exposure of the masses in industrialized world and the resulting lack of plurality according to her makes the masses more inclined to accept irrational political doctrines, such as, nationalism (p. 166) “and war” (Arendt, H. (1990). In that sense she was inspired by Nietzsche who foresaw that liberal democracy would eventually produce a dangerous sameness in the form of ‘men without chest’ (Fukuyama, F. (2006). whose concerns and preferences would be limited to their immediate material needs and who would be full of desires and reason but lacking in thymos or wisdom.

Postmodernism is also linked to the ‘death of the subject’ or to the ‘end of the individual’. The postmodern culture emphasizes and encourages hedonism, self-indulgence, and an obsession with ‘personal’ image or style, as opposed to an ‘old-fashioned’ (modern) reliance on character or vocation. Some of the contemporary postmodernists – Jean Baudrillard, for instance – “see the postmodern subject as an empty shell that is incapable of exercising any kind of critical judgement” and define postmodernism as “the cultural logic of late capitalism” (Ashley, D. & Orenstein, D.M. (2005). Globalization has resulted from the technology revolution of the late 20th century when the hyperreality of the postmodern Western media started spreading the utilitarian and materialistic values, lifestyle and culture across the world. The postmodern world is viewed as shaped by the forces of commoditization, consumer capitalism, and the generalized secularization of the world. This worldview accepts the contemporary world as a space of shrinking religiosity (and greater scientism), less play (and increasingly regimented leisure), and inhibited spontaneity at every level. This view is based on a premature requiem for the death of religion and the victory of science but the evidence seems to suggest otherwise and religion is not only not dead but that it may be more consequential than ever in todays interconnected global politics. The inner paradox of hedonism and the hedonistic consumption requires its bodily disciplines and these disciplines encourage repetition and discourage inventiveness by their nature (Appadurai, A. (2008)).

Many view globalization as a form of neo-colonialism by the West and noted contemporary linguistic philosopher Noam Chomsky, in a series of interviews with Barsamian, notes the current Western (especially American) colonialism, in the following way:

“Much of the world is overwhelmingly opposed to the (Iraq) war because they see that this is not just about an attack on Iraq. Many people correctly perceive it exactly the way it’s intended, as a firm statement that you had better watch out, you could be next. ....This (Iraq war) has nothing in particular to do with access to the oil for import into the United States. It’s about control of the oil.... For the last twenty five to thirty years, the U.S. has been blocking any (peace in the Middle East) such settlement....The current government (of George Bush) has claimed rights that go beyond any precedents, including even the right to arrest citizens, hold them in detention without access to their family or lawyers, and do so indefinitely, without charges” (Barsamian, D. (2005)).

Edward O. Wilson, dubbed as the ‘new Darwin’ of postmodern age, argues that reductionism would bring about, what he terms as the ‘consilience’ of knowledge: “The central idea of the consilience world view is that all tangible phenomena, from the birth of stars to the working of social institutions, are based on material processes that are ultimately reducible, however long and tortuous the sequences, to the laws of physics” (Wilson, O.E. (1998)).
On ethics, Wilson takes religion out of the equation and his major arguments in favor of the empiricists include: religions spread by force and wars, like the biological evolution the religions have evolved socially, religion offers a hope of an afterworld, religion is an illusion because it has no objective evidence, the source of ethical precepts is not divine but innate rules of mental development, ethical and religious beliefs are created from the bottom up from people to their culture and no top down from God or other nonmaterial source to the people by way of culture, resistance to empiricism is due to a purely emotional short-coming of the mode of reasoning it promotes, empiricism is bloodless while people need more than reason (Wilson, O.E. (1998).

For some other thinkers this faith in empiricism has, however, come at a heavy price:

“Somewhere along the line, the Western intellectual tradition took a wrong turn…….Many important thinkers have concluded that the West never should have abandoned certain teachings about reality which it shared with the East. They have turned to the Oriental traditions in hope of finding resources which may help revive what has been lost and correct the deep psychic and spiritual imbalances of our civilization……In putting complete faith in reason, the West forgot that imagination opens up the soul to certain possibilities of perceiving and understanding not available to the rational mind” (Chittick, W.C. (2000).

Encouraged by the lack of quest for truth in postmodern times some thinkers have assumed that all major questions have been settled and nothing is left to resolve. Francis Fukuyama is one such thinker whose central thesis in his idea of ‘end of history’ is based on Hegelian and Marxian assumptions that once the mankind achieves a society which resolves and satisfies its deepest and the most basic questions, its further evolution would cease. They both therefore envisioned an ‘end of history’, for Hegel it was in the formation of a liberal state while for Marx it lied in a communist society. For Fukuyama the ‘end of history’ lies in the attainment of liberal democracy after which no further questions remain to be answered and his observation that ‘world’s most developed countries are also its most successful democracies’ (Fukuyama, F. (2006), encourages him to equate democracy with development and success. This end-of-history stance coincides with skeptical postmodern’ perspective as both reject metanarratives in history, the materialism of the right and Marxism of the left, economics, policy making or projection of future based on past (Rosenau, P.M. (1992).

In postmodernity the rationalistic and transcendent ideas of modernity are replaced by the blur and hyperreality of media and technology. On the surface modernity and postmodernity seem poles apart because the former accepts the central authority of a human subject, metanarratives, overarching principles and the notion of truth while the later rejects them, yet they share a common thread. That common thread is a deep commitment to empiricism and reductionism. Based on this observation postmodernism is not expected to bring about major changes in the utilitarian and materialistic ethics underpinning the Western Civilization.

**Concluding Remarks**

The identifiable difference between Western Modernity and Postmodernity lies in the nature of their discourse.

The discourse of Modernity rests on the transcendent criteria of ‘progress’ and ‘reason’. In a way Modernity was not only the outcome of major shifts in social, political, moral and scientific ideas due to scientific and industrial progress but also as a revolt against the ‘church atrocities’ of medieval period. The whole discourse of Reformation and Enlightenment culminated in nationalism, imperialism, positivistic sociology, liberal democracy, ethics of utility and materialism, Darwinism, psychoanalysis, capitalism and, logical positivism based analytical philosophy. The paper however also highlights the failure of major ideas of Modernity. The inability of Freudian psychoanalysis to be regarded as a valid and reliable science, the failure of Darwin’s theory of evolution to withstand microscopic and biochemical scrutiny, the culmination of nationalism and imperialism in the shape of two World Wars, are some examples of the failure of the most basic ideas of Modernity.

The discourse of Postmodernity is underpinned by analysis of social life in terms of paradox and rejection of all metanarratives and overarching principles including religion, science, rationality and the notion of truth. It trusts local scientific and empirical practices without attempting to explain or believe in their universal interpretations. The two however complement each other by sharing a deep commitment and affinity to empiricism, concrete forms and reductionism. The Postmodern discourse is based on the ethics which are very similar to the ethics of Modernity: utilitarianism, materialism and empiricism. Postmodernism seems to have fallen in its own trap. By rejecting all metanarratives and overarching theories, it has embraced the grand metanarratives and overarching principle of rejection and denial.
End Notes

1. Historical discourse from this papers’ perspective includes the development and maturation of major philosophical, scientific, political, and ethical ideas during the late 19th and 20th centuries in the Western Civilization.

2. Watson, P. (2005). p. 976-990. Watson describes in detail about one of Freud’s female patients’, Anna O and how he changed her story and brought in the element of sexuality from the period between 1890 and 1920. He also alleges that Freud’s clinical approach and his findings have never been successfully repeated else where and hence fall short of being called a science.

3. Controversies of postmodernism start with how one writes the word – ‘postmodern’ or ‘post-modern’ – the absence of hyphen implying a certain sympathy whereas the hyphen indicating a critical posture towards it (Rosenau, 1992, p. 18).

4. Also close to the views of Zygmunt Bauman who describes postmodernism as, “attention drawn in all directions at once so that it cannot stop on anything for long and nothing gets a really close look” (Bauman, 1992, p. vii).

5. Hyperreality is defined as the “technological capability to intermix virtual reality (VR) with physical reality (PR) and artificial intelligence (AI) with human intelligence (HI) in a way that appears seamless and allows interaction” (Tiffen & Terashima, 2001, p. 4) and the “generation by models of a real without origin or reality” (Baudrillard, 1994, p. 1).

6. Wilson constructs a debate between the empiricists and the transcend lists on the issue of ethics and makes the empiricists win this debate.

7. Fukuyama however advances the meta-narrative of liberal democracy and therefore clashes with a purely postmodern mind.
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