What is postmodernism? Here at last is a long overdue graphic study guide to the maddeningly enigmatic concept used to define our cultural condition in the late twentieth century.

Postmodernism claims that “modernity” which began with ‘the Enlightenment’, industrialism, Darwin and Marx, has collapsed. We now live in an endlessly ‘contemporary culture’ full of contested meanings. The resulting postmodern culture embodies parody, pastiche and cultural cross-over. It is a virtual world of hyperreality containing such strange phenomena as post-Holocaust amnesia, Disneyland, cyberspace, and Fukuyama's proclaimed ‘end of history’.

The author, founding editor of the ‘Introducing...’ series of graphic study guides, takes us on a roller coaster ride through structuralism, deconstruction and semiotics in the company of postmodern icons such as Foucault, Levi-Strauss and Barthes. His brilliant text is superbly illustrated by Chris Garratt.
A "Real" Postmodernism?

If there is a “real” postmodernism, it is recognizable by three urgent items on its agenda.

The first item is the dilemma of reproducibility in the age of mass consumerism. Walter Benjamin’s 1936 prophecy of an elimination of the aura and autonomy of original works of art through mass reproduction has not come true. We have seen it have the opposite effect. Million-dollar prices for originals might be said to be proportional to their availability in mass reproduction which has made them all the more desirable to own.

A consumerist aura now extends to anything with a halo of the relic - Marilyn Monroe’s panties or Al Capone’s Pontiac - or anything with nostalgia value - art deco radios, bracket phones, biscuit tins - because they are the souvenirs of yesteryear’s ancient manufacture.

1930s Wireless/Cassette Player
Our reproduction 1930s wireless in real wood veneer contains the same recent solid state circuitry giving excellent sound quality. It has an illuminated glass dial, MW/FM reception with automatic frequency control and stereo dials for tuning, volume and band selection. An optional extra is a cassette player built into the right-hand side of the wireless. 15 watt plug-attached (240V). Complete with British Standards. 36 x 34 x 35 cm. £4.99

Flapper Lamp
Mirroring the brash style of the Jazz Age, this lamp creates the mood of a bygone era. It is made of brass and glass, with a white shade. 15 watt (240V) plug attached. 14" high including shade, base 8" square. £9.95

Initial Stamp
Decoration your stationery with this initial stamp taken from a unique wooden alphabet. Rubber stamp with wooden handle. £2.95

Peter Rabbit Draught Excluder
Imitate Peter Rabbit's famous hare from Beatrix Potter's stories in the 1930s for a small box of spools of thread. £19.99

Pewter Inkwell
Add an elegant period touch to your desk with this fine pewter, pewter inkwell, a British pawnshop. £39.99

THE MORE VAN GOGH'S "SUNFLOWERS" BECOMES A POSTER CLICHÉ, THE MORE YOU HAVE TO PAY FOR THE ORIGINAL.

This is image consumerism. The reproduced is taking the place of reality or replacing it as hyper-reality. We are living what has already been lived and reproduced with no reality anymore but that of the cannibalized image.
The Simulacrum

It seems that the genealogy of postmodern art can only be dis-connected from the modern in theory. Theory is not in this sense a culmination but a negation, literally, an “end of art.” Let’s look at the extreme postmodernist conclusion advanced by French sociologist Jean Baudrillard, that the representational image-sign goes through 4 successive historic phases...

The simulacrum is arrived at when the distinction between representation and reality - between signs and what they refer to in the real world - breaks down. The representational image-sign goes through 4 successive historic phases...

1. It is the reflection of a basic reality.
2. It masks and perverts a basic reality.
3. It marks the absence of a basic reality.
4. It bears no relation to any reality whatever - it is its own pure simulacrum...

Reality becomes redundant and we have reached hyper-reality in which images breed incestuously with each other without reference to reality or meaning.

How is it possible to arrive at the nullification of reality, even “in theory”? And what is the genealogy of a theory that leads to such a radical conclusion?

He means that the border between art and reality has utterly vanished as both have collapsed into the universal simulacrum.
PART TWO: THE GENEALOGY OF POSTMODERN THEORY

Theory → From the Greek: THÉORIA
To look, to observe, to reflect
Also to be a (theatre) spectator

From the Latin: SPECÈRE
To inspect, to look;

Speculation
Looking — for gain

Postmodern theory is a consequence of this century's obsession with language. The most important 20th century thinkers - Bertrand Russell, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Martin Heidegger and others - shifted their focus of analysis away from ideas in the mind to the language in which thinking is expressed. Philosophers or logicians, linguists or semiologists, they are all language detectives who seem to agree about one thing. To the question, "What permits meaningful thinking?", they reply in different ways, "The structure of language."

LA LANGUE
Language (synchronic)

LA PAROLE
Word of usage (diachronic)

The only way is to separate language as a system (la langue)....

....from its actual manifestations in speech or writing (la parole).

Structuralism

Linguistics before Saussure tended to get bogged down in the search for the historical origins of language which would reveal meaning. Saussure instead viewed the meaning of language as the function of a system. He asked himself: how do you isolate a coherent object of linguistics from a confusing morass of language usages?

* Look for the underlying rules and conventions that enable language to operate.
* Analyze the social and collective dimension of language rather than individual speech.
* Study grammar rather than usage, rules rather than expressions, models rather than data.
* Find the infrastructure of language common to all speakers on an unconscious level. This is the "deep structure" which need not refer to historical evolution. Structuralism examines the synchronic (existing now) rather than the diachronic (existing and changing over time).
Meanings and Signs

In Saussure’s view, the entire set of linguistic meanings (whether past, present or future) is effectively generated from a very small set of possible sounds or phonemes. A phoneme is the smallest unit in the sound system that can indicate contrasts in meaning. The word cat has 3 phonemes: /k/, /æ/, /t/, which differ minimally from mat, cot, cap, etc., each generating other meanings that combined grammatically and syntactically can produce extended speech or discourse, the code of language used to express personal thought.

A distinction is made between significant units, -words, or monemes—each one endowed with one “value”...

...and distinctive units - sounds, or phonemes - part of the form but with no direct “value”.

The relation between Sr and Sd must be arbitrary.

Non! What is arbitrary is the relation between the signifier and the thing which is signified.

You won’t find the connection in the ‘meaning’ of the concept (as a stand-in for a thing) but in its use in social practice.

The problem is - does the signified refer to the image or concept “ox” or to the ox itself as thing? The association of sound and what it represents is the outcome of collective learning (use in social practice, or what Wittgenstein calls “language games”) - and this is signification. Meaning is therefore the product of a system of representation which is itself meaningless.

Signification

Saussure proposed that within the language system, the signifier (e.g. the word or acoustic image, ox) is that which carries meaning, and the signified (the concept, ox) is that to which it refers.

Signifier and signified together \( \frac{Sr}{Sd} \) make up a SIGN.

Signification is the process which binds together signifier and signified to produce the sign. A sign must be understood as a relation which has no meaning outside the system of signification.

The choice of sound is not imposed on us by meaning itself (the animal ox does not determine the sound ox - the sound is different in different languages: ox - English, bue - Italian).

Note the extreme economy of human language: with only 21 distinctive units American Spanish can produce 100,000 significant units.
The Binary Model

Saussure bequeathed a decisive binary model to postmodern theory. Language is a sign system that functions by an operational code of binary oppositions. We have seen one binary opposition: Sr/Sd. Another crucial binary opposition is syntagm/paradigm, which operates as follows.

**syntagmatic series** (also called contiguity or combination) - the linear relationships between linguistic elements in a sentence

**paradigmatic series** (also called selection or substitution) - the relationship between elements within a sentence and other elements which are syntactically interchangeable

SYNTAGMATIC (COMBINATION)

He shut the door

---

PARADIGMATIC (SUBSTITUTION)

He shut door

She closed window

They opened etc.

---

Figures of Speech: Metaphor and Metonymy

This apparently simple binary contrast of substitution and combination generates higher degrees of complexity and might be said to account for the imaginative or symbolic use of language - in other words, the possibility of meaningful fictions.

For instance: paradigmatic substitution involves a perception of similarity which can generate METAPHOR - "a tower of strength", "a glaring error" - descriptions that are not literally true.

Syntagmatic combination involves a perception of contiguity which can generate METONYM (naming an attribute or adjunct of the thing instead of the thing itself - "crown" for royalty, "turf" for horse-racing) or SYNECDOCHE (naming the part for the whole - "keels" for ships).
Roman Jakobson (1895-1982), a Russian-born linguist, applied Saussure's binary model to aphasia, a severe speech disorder caused by brain damage. Jakobson identified two distinct kinds of aphasic disturbance.

In traditional literary criticism, metaphor and metonymy had always been thought of as related figures of speech. They are not related but opposed. The consequence of this is extended discourses in which either the metaphoric or metonymic order predominates...

Aphasics who suffer from (paradigmatic) substitution deficiency will resort to metonymic expressions.

Those deficient in (syntagmatic) combination are confined to using similarity or metaphor.

What does this tell us? There are two opposed forms of mental activity underlying the use of metaphor and metonymy.
Semiology

Saussure and Jakobson’s binary order has applications that extend into other “discourses” besides the text, and this is the domain of semiology (from the Greek semeion, a mark, sign, trace or omen).

Saussure opened the way to analyzing culture itself as a system of signs by proposing that structural linguistics was part of semiology, a general science of signs which studies the various systems of cultural conventions which enable human actions to signify meaning and hence become signs. Linguistics is a model of semiology because the arbitrary and conventional nature of language is especially clear.

Saussure’s idea of semiology is this: the meaning of any action or object may seem natural, but is always founded on shared conventions (a system). Semiology avoids the usual mistake of assuming that signs which appear natural to their users must have “intrinsic” or “essential” meaning that requires no further explanation.

example: a restaurant menu

paradigmatic plane
a set of foodstuffs with affinities or differences from which “dishes” are chosen (metaphoric selection or substitution) in view of certain “meaning”: types of hors d’oeuvres, entrees, roasts or sweets. The sets of foodstuffs are the signifiers.

syntagmatic plane
real (metonymic or contiguous) sequence of dishes chosen during the meal. The signified is the referent or cultural “value” - a meal.

Semiology can be applied to decoding fashion, advertising, myth, architecture and so on.
Structural Anthropology

Claude Lévi-Strauss (b. 1908), following Saussure and the Slavic linguists Roman Jakobson and N.S. Trubetzkoy, developed **structural anthropology** in the late 1950s which systematized a semiology of culture.

At this time in the 1950s, the binary code had been applied in **cybernetics** and the rapid development of **digital computers**. Digitalism operates on the binary or base-number 2 system, rather than our usual decimal base 10 system and has a notation 1 and 0 (10 = 2, 1001 = 9, 11001 = 25, etc.). Computer information-processing operates on an "on" switch (a magnetized dot = 1) and "off" switch (absence of a magnetized dot = 0).

Language is the system that permits thinking. Thinking is the "system-output" that occurs in the interaction between human subjects (situated within culture) and the environment (nature) which is the object of thinking.

**binarism**

```
  nature---------------->culture
         (non-human)       (human)
```

Thinking can therefore occur because language allows us (1) to form **social relationships** and (2) to categorize our environment as represented by symbols.

Among many primitive peoples it is the custom for each tribe or family to adopt some object from Nature as their special symbol, or totem. This totem may be an animal or plant, or a carving in wood or stone, and is supposed to be helpful to the tribe it represents. Tribes which have an animal totem will never kill that special animal, while those that have adopted a plant as their symbol abstain from eating others of the same species. Poles surmounted by grotesque carvings are often set near the encampments of North American Indians as totems, while among the aborigines of Australia totemism is almost universal.

This technological binarism - the digitalized aspect of Information Theory - influenced Lévi-Strauss towards a mechanical theory of communication. How does it work?
Totems are categories that specify (divide up) what’s “out there” as symbols for thinking, in other words, binary classifications.

What can or cannot be eaten (and why).
Who can or cannot be married (and why).

Thinking in this sense is literally (re)producing society.

How is the binarism human/non-human reflected in totemism?

Tribal societies apply substitutions (metaphors) and combinations (metonyms) to “think” about non-human nature. Animals and vegetables aren’t simply things to eat but are read as codes that link nature to human society by way of the “higher” (non-human) gods. This is a code-chain that runs two ways.

The human mind functions in model binary sets - noise/silence, raw/cooked, naked/clothed, light/darkness, sacred/profane and so on.

Minds working logically (that is culturally) unconsciously duplicate nature. An example. Why have we chosen the colours green, yellow and red for our traffic-light sign system?
Because it is a “fact of nature” that our colour code signals for Go - Caution - Stop mimick the same structure found in the spectrum.

Green is a short wavelength, red is long and yellow lies midway.

The brain searches for a representation of the binary opposition (go) +/- (stop), and finds green and red and also the intermediate colour term (/) caution, yellow.
Brief Critique of Structuralism

The positive benefits of structuralist analysis are undeniable. But so are its negative shortcomings.

1. Dematerialization and formalism

Saussure’s language system eliminates material origins; it also de-psychologizes, since it need not posit an “unconscious” motivation even on a biological level.

Although Saussure speaks of “deep structures”, these have nothing to do with the unconscious in a Freudian sense. Structuralist analysis is an abstract “surface” reading as opposed to a Marxian or Freudian “deep” reading which thinks in terms of symptoms - origins, causes and cures.

In contrast, structuralism is value-free of such “medical” ambitions.

Similarly, although Jakobson does not deny the material (neurological) origin and reality of aphasia, his analysis tends to de-materialize and formalize it.

Structuralism opens out a formal area of inquiry - a non-dimensional space of abstraction - which might seem to resemble philosophy (“thinking about thinking”) and its exclusive reliance on the rules of reasoning to arrive at a general picture of the world.

Structuralism goes much further in the direction of hyper-rationalism. It claims that “meaning” is a product of signification, a process maintained by timeless and universal structures forming a stable and self-contained system based on binary oppositions. The elements of the system, or signifiers, carry meaning only in relation to each other; their relationship to the signified - whether concepts or things or actions - is arbitrary, based purely on convention.

2. Formalizing the human

“I think therefore I am.” What happens to this famous Cartesian proof of self-identity in the structuralist view?

The “I” or unitary human subject - the very cornerstone of Western logic and philosophy - dissolves into a signifying language-user. The “I” is a language fiction, signified by use, not meaning, and generated in much the same way as metaphor or metonymy.

Structuralism is unhelpful in explaining what motivates the language-using subject, i.e., the individual.

The logic of the system entirely surpasses and evades the subject’s reasons for using language. Saying, “to communicate his personal thought”, is not good enough. How did “personal thought” get into the system, anyhow?

3. Non-historical

Structuralism is non-historical, or more accurately, a-historical. Its analysis is valid (in principle) no matter what is historically present. This is consistent with its discarding of historical origins and motivations.

These features of structuralism’s rigorous abstract intellectual mark it as a typically modernist project - and yet as an instant flip-over into postmodern theory. As we noted before, “modern must inevitably become postmodern”.

We can witness this happening by seeing what actually happened to structuralism in its own heyday in the 1960s.
Poststructuralism

We can see the beginnings of a po mo attitude in the mid-60s with the overlap of structuralism and the "post"-structuralist second thoughts of Roland Barthes (1915-80).

...we must now face the possibility of inverting Saussure's declaration: linguistics is not a part of the general science of signs, even a privileged part, it is semiology which is part of linguistics...

Barthes is saying that semiological analysis collapses back into language - a forerunner of Baudrillard's more radical notion of "art totally penetrating reality", of the border between art and reality vanishing as the two collapse into the universal simulacrum. A collapse into total semblance.

Barthes in the mid-60s doesn't go quite so far - but almost. He notes that semiology itself can be added to Jakobson's classification of metaphoric types, along with lyrical songs, Chaplin's films and Surrealism. Barthes explicitly states...

"The metalanguage in which the semiologist conducts his analysis is metaphorical..."

Barthes is (partly) responding to a higher degree of reflexivity, a typically postmodern penance paid for modernist intellectual arrogance.

Reflexivity doesn't mean simply to "reflect on" (which usually comes later, or too late) but is an immediate critical consciousness of what one is doing, thinking or writing. However, since it is impossible to do anything innocently in our age of lost innocence, reflexivity can easily slide into ironic self-consciousness, cynicism and politically correct hypocrisy.
The Death of the Author

Barthes was an early and elegant exponent of semiotics who recognized that anything in culture can be decoded - not just literature but fashion, wrestling, strip tease, steak and chips, love, photography, and even Japan Incorporated.

In 1967, Barthes caused a sensation by proclaiming "the death of the author". He meant that readers create their own meanings, regardless of the author's intentions: the texts they use to do so are thus ever-shifting, unstable and open to question. This applies equally to the scientific or structuralist author who cannot stand outside such interpretation.

Writing: Degree Zero

Unstable interpretations are inevitable because writing tends to a "zero degree" of sense. What does Barthes mean?

You can read a text for pleasure and sense... but you're finally left with a sense of enigma, a final sense which the text doesn't express or refuses to surrender - a sort of unyielding thoughtfulness. It is like the thoughtfulness of a face which tempts one to ask... "What are you thinking?"

...or just a cold and lonely, lovely work of art?

I'm thinking it's about time you got me another drink.

This is the zero degree of writing - a closure, a retreat and a suspension of meaning.
...Poststructuralist Blues...

No Exit from Language

How far have we got with resolving the Big 3 problems—representation, reproduction and legitimation?

Far enough to be disillusioned with meta-languages to resolve them.

A metalanguage is a technical language, such as structuralism, devised to describe the properties of ordinary language. Wittgenstein had already come up against the limits of logic as a metalanguage in the 1920s.

You can't stand outside language to understand it.

A privileged or "meta"-linguistic position is a mirage created by language itself. Structuralism, semiology and other forms of metalinguistics which promised liberation from the enigma of meaning, only lead back to language, a no exit, and the consequent dangers of a relativist or even nihilistic view of human reason itself. Deconstruction, an offshoot of poststructuralism, has often been accused of "relativizing everything". What is deconstruction?

Deconstruction

One of the most influential postmoderns, the philosopher Jacques Derrida (b.1930) has waged a one-man "deconstructionist" war against the entire Western tradition of rationalist thought. In particular, Derrida has targeted Western philosophy's central assumption of Reason which he sees as dominated by a "metaphysics of presence".

What's wrong with reason? And what's it got to do with presence?

Reason has been shaped by a dishonest pursuit of certainty which I have diagnosed as logocentrism—the guarantee of "the word made flesh."

In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God... and the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us...

The Sleep of Reason

The history of philosophy from Plato, its founding father, and Aristotle, Kant, Hegel, right up to Wittgenstein and Heidegger, has been a constant logocentric quest. Logocentrism derives from the Greek logos, "the word by which the inward thought is expressed" or "reason itself".
J'ACCUSE!

Logocentrism desires a perfectly rational language that perfectly represents the real world. Such a language of reason would absolutely guarantee that the presence of the world - the essence of everything in the world - would be transparently (re)present(ed) to an observing subject who could speak of it with complete certainty. Words would literally be the Truth of things - the "Word made flesh", as St. John puts it.

**Pure communion with the world** - that is the seduction of logocentric Reason.

Against the essentialist notion of certainty of meaning, Derrida mobilizes the central insight of structuralism - that meaning is not inherent in signs, nor in what they refer to, but results purely from the relationships between them. He draws out the radical "post-structuralist" implications of this point - that structures of meaning (without which nothing exists for us) include and implicate any observers of them. To observe is to interact, so the "scientific" detachment of structuralists or of any other rationalist position is untenable.

**THERE IS NOTHING OUTSIDE THE TEXT.**

- He means 'text' in the semiological sense of extended discourses, i.e. all practices of interpretation which include, but are not limited to, language.

Derrida is outraged by the totalitarian arrogance implicit in the claims of Reason. His anger does not seem so eccentric when we recall the shameful history of atrocities committed by rationalist Western cultures - the systematic "rationality" of mass extermination in the Nazi era, the scientific rationalism of the A-bomb and the Hiroshima Holocaust....

Structuralism's insight to this extent was correct. It was incorrect to suppose that anything reasoned is ever universal, timeless and stable. Any meaning or identity (including our own) is provisional and relative, because it is never exhaustive, it can always be traced further back to a prior network of differences, and further back again...almost to infinity or the "zero degree" of sense. This is deconstruction - to peel away like an onion the layers of constructed meanings.
"Différence"

Deconstruction is a strategy for revealing the underlayers of meanings "in" a text that were suppressed or assumed in order for it to take its actual form - in particular the assumptions of "presence" (the hidden representations of guaranteed certainty).

Texts are never simply unitary but include resources that run counter to their assertions and/or their authors' intentions.

Meaning includes identity (what it is) and difference (what it isn't) and it is therefore continuously being "deferred". Derrida invented a word for this process, combining difference and deferral - différance.

Derrida has tried to extract a positive benefit from the disillusioning failure of a structuralist metalanguage by upholding its subversive merits. In so doing, he has left himself open to accusations of relativism and irrationalism.

---

The Accuser Accused...

YOU SAY NOTHING IS REAL

YOU SAY EVERYTHING IS OF EQUAL VALUE.

BECAUSE EVERYTHING IS ONLY A CULTURAL, LINGUISTIC OR HISTORICAL CONSTRUCT.

NOTHING IS ANY LESS REAL FOR BEING CULTURAL, LINGUISTIC OR HISTORICAL, ESPECIALLY IF THERE IS NO UNIVERSAL OR TIMELESS REALITY TO WHICH IT CAN BE COMPARED.

- ANYTHING ELSE?

YOU SAY THERE ARE AN INFINITE NUMBER OF MEANINGS.

YOU SAY THERE IS NEVER JUST ONE.

NO - ONLY THAT THE QUESTION MUST REMAIN OPEN.
The Structures of Power/Knowledge

The historian Michel Foucault (1926-84) is the postmodern theorist most directly concerned with the problems of power and legitimation. He tackles power from the unusual angle of knowledge as systems of thought which become controlling, that is, socially legitimated and institutional. Foucault initially called his investigations of knowledge an "archaeology" of epistememes (from the Greek epistemai, "to understand, to know for certain, to believe", which gives us epistemology, the verification theory of knowledge concerned with distinguishing genuine from spurious knowledge).

Foucault’s episteme is a system of possible discourse which "somehow" comes to dominate each historical era. He concentrates on the "somehow" by which an episteme dictates what counts as knowledge and truth and what doesn’t.

Foucault completely upsets our conventional expectations of history as something linear - a chronology of inevitable facts that tell a story which makes sense. Instead, he uncovers the underlayers of what is kept suppressed and unconscious in and throughout history - the codes and assumptions of order, the structures of exclusion that legitimate the epistemes, by which societies achieve their identities.

By the mid-70s, Foucault moved away from "archaeology" towards the "genealogy" of what he now called "power/knowledge" and he focused more on the "microphysics" of how power moulds everyone and not only its victims) involved in its exercise. He showed how power and knowledge fundamentally depend on each other, so that the extension of one is simultaneously the extension of the other. In so doing, the reason of rationalism requires - even creates - social categories of the mad, criminal and deviant against which to define itself. It is thus sexist, racist and imperialist in practice.
Art and Power/Knowledge

Literature and art are closely linked to knowledge in Foucault’s view of history, not situated within the episteme but rather articulating its limits. Art is meta-epistemic: it is about the episteme as a whole, an allegory of the deep arrangements that make knowledge possible. An example. Suppose Foucault were looking at Picasso’s Demoiselles d’Avignon; what would his archaeology make of the “deformed” nude prostitutes on show? There are structural disparities to consider.

1. Picasso’s own male narcissism is put at risk. (a) by the threat of syphilis contagion from the prostitutes (degeneration and death) and (b) by the strange virile asymmetry of their bodies (formal aesthetic and gender transgressions).

2. The African mask-like faces (right) signal and reinforce this “strange virility”, a sense of disordered Otherness echoed by the demoiselles’ masculine arms, legs and torsos.

This strikingly articulated asymmetry is proclaiming something about a social category of exclusion. What is it?

Eugenics: measuring the excluded inferior

Fear of racial degeneration in Western societies marked the early 1900s, a danger posed by the epidemic consequences of syphilis, but especially by the threat of criminal sub-types. Eugenics, a pseudo-science of “racial improvement” based on Darwin’s idea of natural selection, drew on the new sciences of neurology, psychiatry and anthropology to distinguish the fit from the unfit. Anthropometrics (an applied branch of physical anthropology) measured the shapes of countless heads, noses, ears and limbs to classify the ideally proportioned (healthy/superior) human types and the degenerate sub-types. In the sub-types belonged the savage (non-European) races, the insane, criminals and prostitutes, all classifiable by asymmetrical features.

included (FIT) humans

excluded (UNFIT) sub-humans

prostitutes reveal asymmetrical facial anomalies and masculine body traits.

I visited the Hopital St. Lazare in Paris to observe the prostitutes interned there.
Some possible conclusions

-Racist eugenics is an essential component of modernity’s episteme - its system of dominant knowledge - which leads to Nazism’s Final Solution by mass extermination of “unfit types”.
-Picasso’s painting is meta-epistemic: it disturbingly allegorizes the whole episteme by including what it excludes.
-It is “about” the problem of representation in modernity - how knowledge of the Self and Other is constituted, reproduced and legitimated.

Modern art is not a confirmation of modernity but an articulation of its limits.

Theory does not express, translate or serve to apply practice: it IS practice. But it is local and regional...not totalizing...it is not to awaken consciousness that we struggle but to SAPPOWER...it is an activity conducted alongside those who struggle for power and not their illumination from a safe distance.

Avantgarde modern art which supposedly begins with Picasso’s Demoiselles d’Avignon can be seen as originating in protest and reaction against the unlimited totalizing project of modern rationalism.

What is Power?

Power cannot only be coercive. It also has to be productive and enabling.

Power would be a fragile thing if its only function were to repress.

Foucault criticized the Marxist-Freudian liberation model of sexuality as a natural instinct repressed by authoritarian familial and social institutions.

It is not simply a matter of discovering the “truth” about our repressed desires by embracing a model of liberation. The problem is - how do people become subject to a particular kind of sexual experience?

How is an “experience” articulated in a system of rules and constraints so that we can recognize ourselves as subjects of a sexuality which opens into optional fields of knowledge?

Foucault is saying that power isn’t what some possess and others don’t, but a tactical and resourceful narrative. Power is in the texture of our lives - we live it rather than have it.
The Fiction of the Self

French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan (1901-81) led a "back to Freud" movement after being himself expelled from the orthodox International Psychoanalytical Association. Lacan's notoriously obscure writing is modelled on the arcane style of the French Symbolist poet Stéphane Mallarmé (1842-98) and also harks back to wilful Surrealist provocation (some of his early work in the 1930s appeared in the Surrealist journal Minotaure).

THE UNCONSCIOUS IS STRUCTURED AS A LANGUAGE.

Whereas Freud keeps faith with a materialist biology of mind, Lacan applies Saussure's linguistics to explain how the mind comes to be structured and inserted in a social order.

Lacan replaces Freud's classic trinity of the psyche - Id, Ego and Superego - with structures of the Imaginary, the Symbolic and the Real which represent the stages of human psychic maturation.

This is Lacan's most famous pronouncement: What does it mean? How can the unconscious, which is instinctual and, by definition, unknowable to the subject, be structured as a language?

THE UNCONSCIOUS FUNCTIONS BY SIGNS, METAPHORS, SYMBOLS, AND IN THIS SENSE IT IS "LIKE" A LANGUAGE.

But Lacan's point is that the unconscious only comes to exist after language is acquired.
The Imaginary or "Mirror Phase"

Between 6 to 18 months, the infant makes its first starting discovery of itself in the mirror as an image which appears total and coherent.

A sense of self arrives externally, from a reflection, or from the imaginary. Identity comes from mis-recognition, a false persuasion of Self, which remains with us as an ideal ego for the rest of our lives. The mirror supplies the first Signified and the infant itself acts as the Signifier.

Lacan is saying that we are all imprisoned not in reality but in a hall-of-mirrors world of signifiers

$S^R$ (THE SIGNIFIER) CHILD $S^I$ (THE SIGNIFIED) IMAGE $S$ (SELF) $S^C$ (THE SIGN)

It is through language that the child enters the social world - the symbolic order - as an "I"... 

...but with a crucial difference for the male and female subjects.
The Symbolic Order

The Symbolic order refers to the system of pre-existing social structures into which the child is born, such as kinship, rituals, gender roles and indeed language itself. Identity assumed at the Imaginary phase is finally constructed by the Symbolic order, the realm of the Father who prohibits the mother-child "incest" relationship. Language belongs to the Father, that is, to the patriarchal order of the phallus.

The male child resolves his Oedipal "murderous" conflict with the Father by identifying with Phallic Power. He can do this because he possesses a "signifier" - his penis - which in the Signified realm represents the Phallus or Sexual Power. The position of power in language is the Phallus which imposes the Symbolic order.

"I feel like killing him!"

"And women?"

"They are excluded - forever outcast as "the others" - without language because they cannot escape from the Imaginary into the Symbolic order, as males can."

Patriarchy silences women.
Not entirely silenced...

Paradoxically, Lacan's extreme marginalization of women has given a boost to postmodern feminist theory.

**How do you explain that?**

**It's got to do with the status of meaning in Saussurean linguistics.**

Remember, structuralism says that meaning is not an independent representation of the real world grasped by an already constituted subject, but part of a system that produces meanings, the world and the possibility of a subject.

If identity is a construction and not an absolute fixed reality, then this opens up immense scope for feminist thinking. The entire historical process by which identity has been represented as a self-evident certainty is thrown into question. Derrida's attack on logocentric certainty, Foucault's unveiling of historical exclusion and Lacan's own idea of the self as fiction can be seen as weapons useful to postmodern feminism.

No Place in History

Let's look at two examples of postmodern feminism, beginning with Luce Irigaray (b. Belgium, 1932).

Women have been assigned no place in history. Just look at the way women have been represented...

They appear as exterior representations either of *something else* - monuments of Justice, Liberty, Peace..., or as objects of men's desire.
Woman is represented by a form of metonymic differentiation that reproduces her oppression by excluding her from history.

WOMEN HAVE BEEN PUT IN THE SCHIZOID POSITION OF BEING SIMULTANEOUSLY IN HISTORY AND NOT IN HISTORY - "WRITTEN OUT" OF HISTORY BY MALE THEORY.

THAT LEAVES ONLY TWO POSSIBILITIES...

EITHER - there is no feminine sexuality except as men imagine it
OR - feminine sexuality is a schizoid duality
(a) subordinate to the needs and desires of men
(b) autonomous and explorabed only within a radically separatist women's movement

Male theories of sexuality - Freud's or Lacan's - literally cannot think of women except as negatively imaginary, incomplete, an empty signifier (the vacant womb).

Women are the sex which isn't one.

As a result of these views, the psychoanalyst Irigaray was expelled from the Lacanian psychoanalytical school in 1974.
Julia Kristeva (b. Bulgaria, 1941), a pioneer semiotician and psychoanalyst, agrees with Irigaray in refuting the Freudian and Lacanian accounts of identity which place the feminine outside the process of self-constitution. Meaning is not a once-and-for-all break from the Unconscious which occurs when the signifying subject enters the Symbolic order. Although it can never be “spoken”, the Unconscious is the biological preliminary to meaning, its uterus, which always remains present as a force that can disrupt signification.

Kristeva places the semiotic in the Unconscious pre-Oedipal stage as that which both withholds and permits meaning which can destabilize the dominant repressive discourse of the Symbolic order.

Kristeva goes to an extreme in rejecting the category itself of “woman”. She refuses to believe in an “essential” woman, a fixed gender, and tries to project a Subject beyond the categories of gender. She is impatient with liberal emancipatory feminism, asserting that the main egalitarian demands of the past have been largely met.

Kristeva has been much criticized by “egalitarian” feminists for soft-pedalling the real misery which sexual difference still causes for women, and therefore neutralizing women’s real experience. She is seen as in danger of sending women back to “loving maternity”.

The very dichotomy man/woman as an opposition between two rival entities may be understood as belonging to metaphysics. What can “identity” – even “sexual identity” – mean in a new theoretical and scientific space where the very notion of identity is challenged?
What is Postmodern Feminism?

Feminism's position in so-called postmodernity highlights the artificially constructed debate between "modernism" and "postmodernism". This debate has served to divide liberal (modernist) feminism from radical (postmodern) feminism. Liberal feminism is deep-rooted in modernity. It is a rationalist project of emancipation, originally inspired by the ideals of revolutionary Enlightenment in America and France, and classically formulated by Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women* in 1792.

Militant feminism since Wollstonecraft's day came to recognize a dilemma that is still unresolved.

EITHER - coexist with men on the liberal route to egalitarianism
OR - come out against men on a radical separatist route

The second route has been defined by women's communality, radical lesbianism and Andrea Dworkin's extreme formulation of men as all essentially rapists. But both routes are inherently modernist and do not constitute an opposition between modern-versus-postmodern. Postmodernism comes in only with a deconstructionist notion of a Subject beyond the fixed categories of gender. A third term is introduced. As Kristeva says...

Wollstonecraft imagined that the rights of men, enshrined in the American Declaration of Independence, could be extended to women without causing large-scale disruptions to the existing social institutions.

WOMAN AS SUCH DOES NOT EXIST. SHE IS IN THE PROCESS OF BECOMING.

Such an idea becomes possible if a certain model of historical progress is rejected, as we'll next see...