

## IS POST-MODERNISM A TRAMP FOR THE DEVELOPMENT?

*Zafer CİRHİNLİOĞLU<sup>1</sup>*

### ABSTRACT

*It is widely accepted that, in our day, the world is divided into two different parts; developed and undeveloped. Undeveloped countries were left simply with one choice; that is, development or modernisation. In this period, Western civilisation points to a number of basic values/concept, namely, capitalism, individualism, secularism, human rights, consumption, and more importantly than the others, rationality. However, intellectuals in the West is apparently convinced that it is just time to shift the direction of these discussions and to maintain and consolidate relative vested privileges and superiority of the West, which were gained on the basis of principles of rationality and particularly the positivist methodology. This article reviews the post-modern discourse from the perspective of undeveloped countries. It is concluded that post-modernisation services for the exploitation of the labour market and material resources of undeveloped world.*

**Key Words:** *Development, post-modernisation.*

### ÖZET

#### Post-modernizm Gelişmek İçin Bir Adım mıdır?

*Günümüzde dünyanın ikiye bölündüğü yaygın kabul görmektedir; gelişmiş ve gelişmemiş, ülkeler. Gelişmemiş ülkeler sadece bir seçenekle karşı karşıyadırlar artık; gelişmek ya da modernleşmek. Bu dönemde, Batı uygarlığı bazı temel değerlere/kavramlara işaret etmektedir; kapitalizm, bireysellik, laiklik, insan hakları, tüketim ve bunlardan önemlisi, rasyonalite. Fakat, Batıdaki aydınlar, Batının, rasyonalite ve özellikle pozitif metodolojinin ilkelerine dayanarak kazandığı, göreceli imtiyazları ve üstünlük-*

---

<sup>1</sup> Doç. Dr.; Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, Sivas.

leri korumak ve sađlamlařtırmak iin bu tartıřmaların ynn deđiřtirmenin zamanı geldiđine inanmaktadırlar. Bu makale, post-modern sylemi, azgeleřiřmiř lkeler aısından deđerlendirmektedir. Sonu olarak, post-modernizmin, azgeleřiřmiř lkelerin maddi kaynaklarını ve emek piyasasını smr-meye hizmet ettiđi kabul edilecektir.

**Anahtar Szckler:** Geleřiřme, kalkınma, post-modernizm.

## INTRODUCTION

Since the end of the Second World War, almost all undeveloped countries have been trying to modernise their economy, society, policy and culture. However, in our time, while the rich countries seek the way to become more and more richer and powerful, the poor ones are struggling with many kinds of difficulties in many different areas of the life. The world is no longer as the world in the past. There is no doubt that the world is now divided into two different parts; *developed* and *undeveloped*. In other words, we live, in this century, within a *divided, industrialised, developed* and therefore *alienated* world. Especially with the emergence of USA within international political arena as a super power, undeveloped countries were left with only one choice; that was *development* or in general as taken as its equivalent, *modernisation*. For a long time, *modernisation* was perceived as a matter of *life and death* in poor countries. The advice of the modernised countries has been very simple and immediate; *modernise* or *join* to the other countries that were disappeared throughout the long history of the world. Additionally, from the perspective of the intellectual people in modernised countries, *modernisation* has also been unique and has been seen as a magical instrument by which all the problems of the poor countries in Africa, Asia and South America might be solved. Surprisingly, this concept has also been gained a wide acceptance among the intelligentsia of the poor countries. However, until 1960's and 70's, there was no rival view to the *modernisation*. By the time, the concept of the *modernisation* was replaced with the concept of the *Americanisation* of the world. By willingly or unwillingly, USA has been taken by all countries as an ideal type in many respects. USA is not only a super power but intend to be *the big brother of the world*. She is now also a symbol of Western culture and civilisation. Europe, too, as a whole, seems to be in trace of USA. Under the pioneering role of USA, the western civilisation seems to have achieved of setting up its hegemony all over the world. This might be also called *Eurocentric modernity* (DIRLIK; 2002). "If modernity called forth a universal history that would be all-inclusive, the pretension to universality could be sustained only by rendering spatial into temporal difference. Having historicized time, modernity's histories proceeded to suppress or marginalize temporalities that did not accord with the teleologies of modernity, conceived thought

programmes of economic (capitalism), political (nation-state) and cultural (science) development, for which the history of modern Europe provided the ultimate frame of reference. Those who joined or were compelled into history were placed in history according to their proximity to the ideal of progress that informed those teleologies.....The globalisation of modernity issues not in the victory of Eurocentric modernity but its historicization” (DIRLIK, 2002:3-4).

In short, Western civilisation signifies a couple of basic values/ concept, *modernisation, development, capitalism, individualism, secularism, human rights, consumption*, and more importantly than the others, *rationality*. As a matter of fact, as Weber (1968, 1989) noted, *rationality* is the origin of the western kind of development and this way of reasoning is a product of *Protestantism*. *Rationalism* has given a certain and acceptable way to the modernisation and the economical development of all western countries. As known well, this process is began with the industrial revolution in England in last century. Within the following century, however, the discussion over the *modernisation of the others* seems to have lost its meaning for many reasons. It is now the time to change the direction of the discussion and to maintain and consolidate relative vested privileges and superiority of the West, which were previously gained on the basis of principles of *rationality* and particularly *positivist* methodology. Mainly for this purpose, a different discourse from *modernisation* has been already introduced into international scientific discussion and named *post-modernisation*<sup>1</sup>. Until now, this model of thought is both boosted and criticised by many theoreticians in many ways and for various reasons.

This article reviews the *post-modern* discourse from the perspective of undeveloped countries<sup>2</sup>. For this, it reveals the political background of

---

<sup>1</sup> From some other perspectives, this process might also be called globalization “which over the last decades has replaced modernization as a paradigm of change and a social imaginary. The discourse of globalization claims to break with the earlier modernization discourse in important ways, most notably in abandoning a Eurocentric teleology of change.....to deal with problems that transcend nations and regions, which all suggest that institutional arrangements informed by a Eurocentric modernization process are no longer sufficient to grasp and to deal with the world’s problems”(DIRLIK, 1999:301-302) As seen, whether this process is called globalization or post-modernism, it represent a theoretical or practical rupture from Eurocentric modernist promises. However, globalization as mostly considered as political and cultural process is excluded from this work to be more systematic.

<sup>2</sup> See also, Sylvester (1999), in which she pointed out that post-colonial studies and developmental studies had much in common. However, post modern discourse presented different aspects of modernization which were overlooked

these theories and argues that, despite the fact that *post-modernism* is originally a western model of making art and social sciences, it is deliberately planned and exported to the intellectual arena of undeveloped world. In addition, although the article gives no importance to the *hidden hand theories*, it asserts that the implicit or explicit aim of *post-modernisation* theories is not a coincidental one. Similar to the *modernisation theory*, as might be remembered well from the works of *dependency* literature which asserted that they were a simple instrument helping for the growth of international capitalism, *post-modernisation* services in favour of capitalist exploitation of the labour market and material resources of undeveloped world.

### **The Rationality of the Post-Modernism**

There is no common definition of the *post-modern* condition (KELLNER, 1990; CALLINICOS, 1990; ROSE, 1991). This might be much clearer in the following words of a critic of post-modern who holds the view that there are some vital confusion in post modern discourse and asked in a teasing manner: “what is it exactly and do we give three cheers for it, or one cheer, or do we deplore it? From the point of view of a democratic educationalist, there may seem to be a number of positives, the dereification of elitist cultural forms, the construction of bureaucracy, the opening of space for *new voices* etc., but on the other hand, all this may be undermined by its *dark side* –the relativism, the nihilism, the chaotic tendencies possibly leading to fragmentation and social breakdown and at the level of self, extreme self-centredness and the centring of the unitary self. Clearly, the hope is that the former will prevail, but we cannot be certain of anything” (QUICKE, 1999:1) Despite the fact that we cannot be certain of anything in present period of history, postmodernism symbolises a new period proceeded by *modernisation*. For this, before everything else, the principles outlined by *post-modernism* are radically dissimilar to those of the *modernism*. These might be well summarised by these statements by Lemert (2002:387-88) quoting from Allen; “post-modern signs firstly increasing importance of culture, secondly, destabilisation and dereification of culture, thirdly, increasing significance of the self, and finally, decreasing viability of the individual subject”. The principles of *post-modernism* emerged out at first in the area of arts<sup>3</sup>, especially in architecture. By the time passes, they were also embraced by all areas of human sciences. *Post-modernist*

---

by both of them. For this, he seems to be in search of finding a convergence point of all them.

<sup>3</sup> For this discussion and detailed accounts of arts in postmodernism, see especially, Williams (2001).

theoreticians in social sciences are in favour of it for many reasons; some of the theoreticians believed that in post-modern period the structure of the class in modernised countries is now shifted to a new one that can not be explained on the base of classical class theories (LASH and URRY, 1987). In the same line, Bell (1973) pointed out that the structure of the labour was also changed. The new market relation is introduced into capitalist system and the new rule of the new period can be defined by the *images* rather than commodities (BAUDRILLARD, 1975). In other words, *post-modernism* is a transition period from the *old* to the *new* one. While *modernism* represents *purposiveness, mind, determinism, uniformity, balance, positivism, monism, novelties*, post-modernism, by contrast, represents *unpurposiveness, coincidency, irrationality, indeterminism, separatism, plurality, anti-methodology, traditionalism* etc. (HASSAN, 1980; JAMESON, 1984; BURGIN, 1986; FEKETE, 1988; see also, Roberts, 2000). Post-modernism refuses the old and present some concepts/principles in contrast with the modern concepts/principles as new ones. For most post-modernist theoreticians, all concept/principles of the modern period have to be changed. However, what has to be changed varies according to the theoreticians; for some, it is *the old cannons of modern system* (HASSAN, 1980), or it is *the culture of capital* (JAMESON, 1984), or *modernist values that volarise the art* (BURGIN, 1986), or, for some other, *modern distinction between value and fact* (FEKETE, 1988). Lyotard (1984), who is known as the founder of the *post-modernism*, maintained that the concept of *post-modern* could be used for all theories that capsulate the past, the present and the future. These sort of theories tried to develop a *meta-discourse*. These could be named shortly *grand-narratives*. The works of Hegel, for examples, could be defined by this way since his main topics such as *the dialectics of Geist* or *the emergence of the mind* that were all on the level of *meta-discourse* were all in this way. Lyotard (1984) criticises the Marxist school on the same base since it asserts that it explains all history of all countries without making a distinction among countries. He is also critical of most of all philosophy and art; “modernists in art, philosophy and science all assume the existence of an objective, unitary, rational universe, even when they expose its unconscious, invisible, abstractor artificially constructed character. In contrast, postmodernists presuppose no familiar rules by which the presentation of reality may be judged. In architecture, music, and the graphic arts, for example, they reject all formalism and aim to communicate the genius or whim of the creator. To be post modernist is therefore to renounce the *illusion* of wholeness, which has brought only terror and domination” (LYOTARD, 1984:82). According to Lyotard, in sociological area, a typical example of this line is Parson's works. Getting his inspiration from the Bell's view on *information age* defining a new period in human history, Lyotard (1984:3) believed that "all societies went through a *post-*

*industrial* period while all cultures were faced up with a period of *post-modern*. Therefore, the status of the knowledge within society has already been changed". He reduced all scientific knowledge that was developed throughout *modernisation* period to a simple discourse. Scientific knowledge is now open to any critique just as art and other discourses. Because of this, *post-modernism* points to deconstruction of all theories came about in the period of modernisation (DERRIDA, 1987; ROSE, 1991). In short, Lyotard (1984) defines the *post-modern* as a radical cut from the tradition and dominant culture and aesthetics. *Post-modern* expresses the reality not only on the base of universal values but of the local values. Similarly, Baudrillard (1975), also argues that *post-modernism* is important on the context of investigation of the meanings around us. According to him, economical systems are no longer economical systems; they are now only systems of *signs* and *images*. Individuals are directed to a particular commodity via many ways even if he/she does not need it at all. Media decides over what is to be consumed rather than consumers. The distinction between what is real and what is unreal disappears under these market conditions. The words such as *reality*, *progress* lost their meaning and it became impossible to focus on society as a research area. Therefore, he refuses of any possibility of making social sciences and believes that meaningful research can be done only in terms of interdisciplinary manner. On the same line, Feyerabend (1975) refused all methodologies, especially *positivism*, believing that *modern* methodological approaches have destroyed human mind and kills all opportunities of emergence of alternative views. The fact that positivism overlooked the long history of human being by accepting only one single method, undermined the creative ability of human being. Yet, for example, human being had been cured illness for ages and knew a lot about human body before the emergence of the modern medicine. Giving an excessive and unnecessary importance to the *rationalism of modernisation*, modernism put the human mind to a prison. Therefore, for Feyerabend, modernism must be left and human mind must be liberated from all chains that surround it. Under this model, a return to the tradition and varieties of rationality of the past is seemed to be acceptable as a main principle of *post-modern* discourse. In short, it seems that within the *post-modern* discourse, a relative location to the human mind has been given.

An attempt to re-evaluate methodological challenge of postmodernism towards modernism has recently made by Roberts (2000), suggesting that some critics of postmodernism is misunderstood. They would be useful in creating social theory, since "the post-modern move in sociology creates the possibilities of going beyond the epistemological stalemate between positivism and social constructionism that plagued sociology over two decades" (2002:13).

*Post-modernism* is also understood as a re-definition and transformation of *modernist values* (JENCKS, 1986), and a certain position of the concept of *post* and *modern* (FULLER, 1988). For some, *post-modern* society is simply *post-capitalist* society (DAHRENDORF, 1959). It may also be a society in where the revolution of professional managerial class is observed (EHRENREICH and EHRENREICH, 1977). Post-modern society sometimes means *post-industrial society* (ETZIONI, 1968; BELL 1973, 1976), or *late-modernist* society, or *late-capitalist* (JAMESON, 1984), or a society in where the principles of the modernisation are introduced on a rapid and exaggerated manner (CROOK and et all, 1992); *post-modernism* might be a status of the mind or spirit (FEATHERSTONE, 1988). Whatever it means, what is real about all efforts to define is the fact that all societies are changing from a certain situation to another one (WATERS, 1994; GIDDENS, 1984). *Post-modernism* asserts that the period of *modernisation* is terminated and a new one has already been launched.

Extreme interpretation is therefore valid and also popular. One of best known author in this line is Foucault, who is French philosopher. He mainly criticised the structure of power, knowledge and discourse. “His empirical analysis of historical and archival materials has been taken up with enthusiasm within sub-disciplinary groupings in sociology, notably health and illness, sociologies of gender and the body, social welfare and organisational sociology. In these fields, Foucauldian approaches have been applied to offer a critique of many features of modernity and the modern subject” (FOX; 1998:417). As Foucault puts it, “modernity is an ethos or critical attitude which one adopts toward the world -permanent critique of our historical era”(1984:42). He asserts that “modernity is often spoken of as an epoch, or at least as a set of features characteristic of an epoch; situated on a calendar, it would be preceded by a more or less naive or archaic premodernity, and followed by an enigmatic and troubling 'postmodernity'” (1984:39).

Like Feyerebend, Foucault seems to be in favour of refusing modernist principles and substitute them for new ones, criticising all languages and discourses created in the period of modernisation. They all made the agents passive and submissive in their relation to society. In this example, again, individuals must be freed from all their chains created by the power relation of modernity. “Although Foucault’s analysis is found so weak that it little contributed to the social theory” (FOX, 1998: 416, 436), he clearly encouraged post modernist movement in many respect. What Foucault had in his mind was the idea that modernism was never redemption for individual enlightenment. In contrast, it reinforced passive position of the individuals within society.

Hierarchical order among cultures that was made by *modernisation* or *enlightenment* on the base of developmental scales has lost its meaning within the *post-modern* discourses. According to *post-modernism* each culture has *its own rationality*, therefore, there is no *rational* principle that might be universally valid and could be exported to the other countries. There is no longer any developed country that could be a *model* for the others. Radically, the main interest area of the *development* is refused by *post-modernism* and therefore, all variations between cultures no longer exist.

### **Post-modern Development**

What are the implications or the consequences of such a view for the development process of the underdeveloped world? What does the *post-modernism* present or represent for the undeveloped countries? And especially, is it a tramp in the front of development? As known, in a certain period of history, *modernisation* was perceived as a compulsory period for all countries including undeveloped ones. However, it is a fact that undeveloped societies have much lower income than any developed country has and they are apparently dependent on Western economies. In this case, without completing *modernisation* process, why does a *hidden hand* want to drag them to a new period called *post-modernism* that can not be even defined clearly by intellectual living within developed countries? Can it be taken only as a coincidental event that, just at moment when poor countries have had a good opportunity to evaluate in details the values and principles of *modernisation* advised towards the end of 20th century, a world wide discussion over *post-modernist* principles was introduced into international intellectual arena?

A quite satisfactory response to the questions came from Habermas (1985, 1987) who is a well-known German theoretician. According to him, the founders of *modernisation* or *enlightenment* wished to create an *objective science, universal ethic<sup>4</sup> and law*. These efforts were in fact totally well

---

<sup>4</sup> “The morality that modernist ethics is seen as being directed to eliminating is action that is informed by the participant's experience: action that is sensitive to the welfare of others and to the cultural traditions that give form and value to the intersubjective realities of any given event..... From a postmodern perspective, modernist ethics is thus seen as seeking to eliminate morality itself, replacing it with rule-governed behavior. The following of ethical rules is just that: rule-following. Rule-following is not respecting the interests of others; it is not sensitive to the traditions that determine and give human value to any event..... From a postmodern perspective, modernist ethics is seen as being driven by the

designed and accurate ones and helped well to organise every day life according to rational principles. Following his Enlightenment predecessors, Habermas has argued that “modernity can be understood not only as a historical epoch, but also as a normative project embodying definite goals of rationalization, democratization, and emancipation..... The project of modernity....intended to release the cognitive potentials of each of these domains- science, universal morality and law, - from their esoteric forms. The Enlightenment philosophers wanted to utilize this accumulation of specialized culture for the enrichment of everyday life -- that is to say, for the rational organization of everyday life" (HABERMAS, 1987:344-46) Thus, Habermas maintains that, while modernity can be understood in empirical terms as a sociological process of modernization involving industrialization, bureaucratization, secularization and urbanization -- it can also be conceived in normative terms as an unfinished project of emancipation. As he puts it: "...the project of modernity has not yet been fulfilled” (HABERMAS, 1989). “Because Habermas is committed to modernity as an "unfinished project" of emancipation, he must reject the postmodern claim that modernity is either historically surpassed or morally discredited. In particular, he must refute the postmodern "reversal" of the modern project's normative claims, where postmodernists argue that its emancipatory promises, emanating from the Enlightenment, yield coercive outcomes. He does this by providing two criticisms of the postmodern critique of modernity --its homogeneous concept of Enlightenment reason and the performative contradiction it encounters once it rejects reason as a source of evaluation” (TATE, 1999:79-80). To put it another way, Habermas (1989) defends modernity as an "unfinished project" by defending its Enlightenment legacy. “Habermas draws a normative distinction between different types of modernization within modernity, based on an internal differentiation within the Enlightenment legacy of reason, which allows him to resist those indictments of modernity that reverse the normative credentials of its Enlightenment legacy by identifying reason as a whole with modernity's repressive outcomes”(1999:81). Habermas, the "unfinished project" of modernity is to extend the claims of the *lifeworld* to hold the systemic processes of state and economy democratically accountable. Thus, according to this model of thought, the targets of *modernisation* have never lost their meaningfulness. This might be observed in political arena. For example, “in recent years, there has been growing public dissatisfaction with democratic institutions. This unease is evidenced by such phenomena as the rise of popular protest and social movements.....Criticising crisis of liberal

---

fear that morality will degenerate into brutish animalism in the absence of ethical rules” (BAGNALL, 1988:313-14).

democracy, he believed that liberal democratic regimes are far from sufficient or complete..... He made a compelling argument for the need to deepen or extend democracy....His vision of deliberative democracy relies on reasoned consensual decisions. His argument foreground concerns about legitimacy and (universal) justice..... rationality and universalism”<sup>5</sup> (KAPOOR, 2002:459-61). Put it in other words, he recommended to both developed and undeveloped world to deepen their democracy in the light of principles of modernity and enlightenment. For him, even Western societies have not fully completed the modernisation process. It can be said that they are just in the middle of it. For this, *post-modernism* means, in some sense, a sacrifice of *modernist* politics. Habermas sees, for example, Lyotard as an anarchic who can see what is trivial but not what is really important. In short, Habermas believes in the functionalities of the *modernist* principles and insists on transferring all these principles into practical life. In order to achieve this aim, he proposes to create *a common communication ground* for all. In other words, a consensus among all people is necessary. Habermas' view on *post-modernisation* has some important clues for undeveloped countries.

Like Habermas, Jameson (1984) is not pleased with the *post-modernist* interpretations of the life. “With the expansion of the capitalism all over the world, the culture, leaving its local roots, is transformed to a world culture. Under this world culture, all individual and institutional activities have gone under a model in which their limits have not been defined clearly” (JAMESON, 1984:57). He also maintains that *post-modernism* symbolises a number of *uncertainties*. Human mind is far away for being itself. Capitalist system has created its own conditions; for example, *post-modernist* culture has no deep understanding of life because, under this culture, everything is a simple imitation of the classical art works. *Post-modernist* production only aims to the consumption of the commodities. *Post-modern* culture is immediate and historical. *Post-modernism* knows nothing about the time. Time is a concern of individuals. *Post-modernism* sees the nature as a computer network rather than a balanced ecological system. In short, for Jameson, *post-modernism* is a sort

---

<sup>5</sup> On contrary to this view, postmodernist understanding of democracy “reveals a provocative and compelling interpretation of its meaning that testifies to its uncertain and indeterminate character. ....Lyotard and Lefort advocates alternative forms of democratic practice and suggests the need for additional research on instances of marginal democratic action often neglected in research on democratization..... Lyotard advocates a presentation of the unrepresentable, a sustained attention to difference and heterogeneity.... Lyotard rejects the modernist pretensions of Habermas' model of universal pragmatics” (MCKINLAY, 1998:481-485).

of capitalist expansion (late capitalism) and its compulsory cultural consequence. Expanded capitalism has created a new understanding of the world with the models of *post-modernism*. This assessment of *post-modernism* by Jameson has been shared by many other Marxists. For example, inspired from Gramsci's theory, Wood (1986), asserts that with *post-modernism*, what is social is virtually shifted to what is ideological. Therefore, for *post-modern* discourse, there is no class differentiation within any society in classical terms. In similar way, Harvey, too, (1989), asserts that *post-modernism* is an expansion of *Fordist* period and called it *post-Fordist* period. Within this model, both *modernisation* and *post-modernism* are the expected historical consequences of capitalist development. A group of theoreticians (CROOKS, PAKULSKI, WATERS, 1992) in similar line have also hold the view that *post-modernism* is a side effect of *modernism* whose principles are applied intensively in western societies for years. According to him, especially, the principle of *rationality* of the *modernisation* is used in so excessive way that all cultural wholeness lost their meaning and every thing are divided into pieces. Excessive differentialism and individualism is resulted in a weakness and the tradition disappeared by time.

Naturally, the transformation that *post-modernism* seems to advise, has rather different consequences for undeveloped countries than Western ones. In general, it is possible to say that by turning the modernisation process up to down, *post-modernism* wishes to shift the direction of the development. Despite this, as Habermas argues, especially undeveloped countries, which follow the principles of the *modernisation* that were advised long time ago, failed to have created a welfare society and therefore are not modernised yet. In a sense, this *de facto* case indicates that in contrast with the hopes of the theoreticians in Western countries, *modernisation* did not help well to the development of the underdeveloped countries. In our time, undeveloped side of the world have begun to ask seriously the reasons for this failure in the process of the modernisation. Just on this point, West-centred science made it clear that they would leave the *modernist* principles and put new principles, that are called *post-modern*. The intellectuals in both developed and undeveloped countries have now new subject to discuss over. Without questioning *modernisation* and its consequences satisfactorily, all people and intellectuals found themselves in a *post-modern* world. It seems that the modernisation which was a political instrument of politicians in one time in history is replaced by the post-modern discourse which is itself another political instrument.

Western countries would maintain their political/economical power and capital accumulation which they obtained on the base of modernisation/rationalisation of the society, by imposing *irrationalisation* to

the undeveloped countries in this period of human history. After two big World War, there is no real danger for developed World other than the widespread demand of undeveloped countries to share fairly the resources of the world and no exploitation of the poor ones. The people of the undeveloped countries seem to be much more alert and conscious as far as this point is concerned. Despite the fact that the content of the *post-modernism* is rather different than that of the *modernism*, the main aim of these two world view is fairly the same. *Post-modernism* seems to enwide the road that was opened by the *modernism*.

This view is also shared by Bologh and Mell (1994:36-38) who asserted that “by showing that all identity are false and untenable, postmodernism makes positive solidarity impossible. The only source of solidarity is negative an oppositional or subversive stance.....The metatheory of postmodernism tends to undermine struggles for development. By advocating a kind of nominalism, it undermines opposition to the nominalism of political economy monetarism.... It also tends to undermine attempts at rational debate regarding social organisation for development because it conceives such attempts as colonising. It reduces social organisation to the play of power/desire with no alternatives than exposing power....”.

In order to brake up with *post-modernist* strategies, the intellectuals of undeveloped world must be much more alert and spend much more effort and time on creating their own model of the development and their own way-out. It must not be forgotten that the process of the development is related to the external as well as internal dynamics.

### **Conclusion**

*Post-modernism* offers a little for the development process of the undeveloped countries. It is in fact introduced into international discussion for shifting the direction of the changes of the undeveloped societies. It aims at maintaining the interest of the West that were gained through the phase of the *modernisation*. While the intellectuals of the undeveloped countries, have began to discuss over the reasons why their societies were not developed in spite of all advises that were given by the politicians of the developed countries, the scientific atmosphere is changed; scientists in developed countries declared that they are about to leave the principles of the modernisation. However, it is clear that all undeveloped countries need to apply the principles such as *rationality*, universal science etc. It seems that all undeveloped countries will only develop on the base of their own natural resources and intellectual power, not the discourses imposed by the West.

## REFERENCES

- BAGNALL, Richard G. 1998), "Moral Education in a Postmodern World: Continuing professional education", *Journal of Moral Education*, Vol. 27 Issue 3, p. 313-32.
- BAUDRILLARD, Jean. (1975), *The Mirror of Production*, St. Louise.
- BELL, D. (1973), *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*, Basic, London.
- BELL, D. (1976), *Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*, New York.
- BOLOGH, Roslyn Wallach; MELL, Leonard. (1994) "Modernism, Postmodernism, and The New World (Dis)order: A Dialectical Analysis and Alternative", *Critical Sociology*, 1994, Vol. 20 Issue 2, p81, 40p.
- BURGIN, Victor. (1986), *The End of Art Theory: Criticism and Post-modernity*, London.
- CALLINICOS, Alex. (1990), *Against Postmodernism: A Marxist Critique*, New York.
- CROOK, S., J. PAKULSKI, M. WATERS. (1992), *Postmodernisation*, Sage, London.
- DAHRENDORF, Ralf. (1959), *Class and Class Conflict In Industrial Society*, Stanfodr University Press.
- DERRIDA, Jacque. (1987), *The Truth in Painthing*, London.
- DIRLIK, Arif, (1999). "Formations of Globality and Radical Politics", *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies*, Vol: 21. No: 4, pp. 301-338
- DIRLIK, Arif. (2002), "Modernity as History: post-revolutionary China, Globalisation and the Question of Modernity", *Social History*, Vol: 27, No:1.
- EHRENREICH, B. and J. EHRENREICH. (1977), *The Professional Manegiral Class*, *Radical America*, 11(2), p.7-31.
- ETZIONI, Amatai. (1968), *Active Society*, Free Press, London.
- FEATHERSTONE, M., (1988), "In pursuit of the Postmodern": An Introduction", *Theory,, Culture and Society*, Special Issue On Postmodenism, ed. M.Featherstone, Vol.5, nos, 2-3. p.195-215.
- FEKETE, John. (1988), (ed.), *Life after Post-modernism*, London.
- FEYERABEND, Paul. K. (1975), *Against Method*, London.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. (1984). "What is Enlightenment?" in Paul Rabinow, (ed)., *The Foucault Reader*, New York: Pantheon Books.
- GIDDENS, A. (1984), *The Constitution of Society*, Oxford.

- HABERMAS, Jurgen. (1985), "A Philosophico-Political Profile", *New Left Review*, 151, p.75-105.
- HABERMAS, Jurgen. (1987), *A Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, Oxford and Cambridge.
- HABERMAS, Jurgen. (1989) "Modernity: An Incomplete Project," in Hal Foster, (ed.), *Postmodern Culture*, London: Pluto Press.
- HARVEY, D. (1989), *The Condition of Post-modern*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- HASSAN, Ihab. (1980), "The Question of Post-modernizm", in, Harry R. Garvin (ed.), *Romanticism, Modernism, Post-modernism*, Bucknell Review, London, p.117-26.
- JAMESON, Frederic. (1984), "Post-modernism and the Cultural Logic of Capitalism", *New Left Review*, 146: 53-93.
- KAPOOR, Iian, (2002), "Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism? The Relevance of the Habermas-Mouffe for Third World Politics", *Alternatives*, 27, 459-487.
- KELLNER, D. (1990), "The Post-modern Turn; Positions, Problems, and Prospects, iç, G.Ritzer (ed.), *Frontiers of Social Theoy: The New Styntheses*, Colombia University Press, New York, 255-286.
- LASH, S. and J. URRY. (1987), *The End of Organized Capitalism*, Polity, Cambridge.
- LEMERT, Charles.(2000), "Commentary On Allan And Turner. Sailing In Postmodern Winds: Formal Methods In Uncertain Worlds", *Sociological Perspectives*, Fall2000, Vol. 43 Issue 3, p. 387, 12p
- LYOTARD, Jean-François. (1984), *The Post-Modern Condition*, University of Minneapolis Press.
- MCKINLAY, Patrick F.(1998), "Postmodernism and democracy: Learning from Lyotard and Lefort", *Journal of Politics*, May, Vol. 60 Issue 2, p. 481, 22p
- NÍC J., Fox. (1998), "Foucault, Foucauldians and Sociology", *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol: 49, No: 3, 415-434.
- QUICKE, John. (1999), "The Postmodern Turn: problems and possibilities", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol.20, No: 2.
- ROBERTS, Michael. (2000) "Rethinking the Post-modern Perspectives: Excavating the Kantian System to Rebuild Social Theory", *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol: 41, 681-698.
- ROSE, M. (1991), *The Post-Modern and the Post-Industrial*, Cambridge University Press.

- SYLVESTER, Christine. (1999), "Development studies and postcolonial studies: disparate tales of the 'Third World'", *Third World Quarterly*, Vol: 20, No. 4, pp. 703-721.
- TATE, John W. (1999). "Posting Modernity to the Past?", *Telos*, Issue 115, p. 79-95.
- WATERS, Malcom. (1994), *Modern Sociological Theory*, Sage, London.
- WEBER, Max. (1968), *Economy and Society*, New York, Bedminster Press.
- WEBER, Max. (1989), *Selections in Transition*, W.G.Runciman (ed)., Cambridge University Press.
- WILLIAMS, Alastair (2001), "Adorno and the Semantics of Modernism", *Perspectives of New Music*, Summer1999, Vol. 37 Issue 2, p. 29, 22p.
- WOODE, M., (1986), *The Retreat from Class: The New "True", Socialism*, London, Verso.