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ABSTRACT

Discussion regarding postmodernism is a complicated and controversial issue, because theorists and intellectuals of this field are heterogeneous and dispersed in their views regarding social, political, cultural, artistic, economic grounds and their go togetherness and linkage seem difficult. The present article is to investigate postmodernism in a library method and by reviewing the literature of postmodernism in order to contribute to introduce this approach better. To do this, some classical scholars of sociology and philosophy who have had fundamental roles in shaping this approach and also contemporaries and more recent figures within this approach who have written regarding this flow, were read. Then their key words and main points of their views were explained as much as possible and at last a conclusion was provided.

INTRODUCTION

One of the key interpretations extracted from Jean - Francois Lyotard's and Jean Baudrillard's works knows postmodernism as questioning modernist epistemology which is based on the obvious distinction between subject and object. Other points presented regarding description of postmodernism and are related to disbelief in meta-narratives (Lyotard) mean that in Targeted Age of Reason one cannot believe in no kind of universal explanation about human behavior. Furthermore, contrary to modernism which considers production as a model, postmodernism takes the end of technology based on reproduction. And additionally, postmodernist view takes modernist requirements serious. For example, if signs and language is the result of differential relations and not intrinsic quality, and if following Foucault, power is not taken to have no intrinsic quality, this point has requirements some of which postmodernism pursues to the end [1].

In addition, postmodernism can be defined in comparison with modernism. All theorists of postmodernism relate their new theories to modernist analyses and criticism to some extent. While Foucault more or less shows modernism in the form of the process of increasing rationalism to anomaly and dominance, Deleuze and Guattari take it as classifying with oppressiveness of will in social structure and repressed characters, which reinforces the band of fleeing. Baudrillard in early writings theorizes modernism as the analysis of object system, a consuming society, media and information, modern arts, contemporary fashion, gender and thought [2].

In addition, postmodern can be known as equivalent to moving toward unorganized capitalism, consumerism, rapid pace and continuous change, emphasis on appearances and Images, mass media, globalization, unpredictability, doubt in reality and the end of social issue [3].

Furthermore, postmodernism refers to cultural and intellectual phenomena. One of these phenomena is withdrawal from "constructionism", a view in the philosophy of science which claims that science is constructed on a true basis of observable realities. Furthermore, postmodernism questions all beliefs of Enlightenment. The second phenomenon which originates from the first one is the collapse of knowledge hierarchy, taste and belief and attention to local affairs instead of globalized ones. If science is a flexible issue, its authority will be withdrawn. "Learn from Las Vegas" (either natives or nature) becomes a slogan. The third phenomenon is replacement of printed books to TV screen, migration from word to image, from discourse to show movement or as lexicographers of visual arts prefer, from word-centeredness to image-centeredness. While postmodernism emphasizes the degeneration of modernity, it is engaged in changes which are considered as social conventions. Or a kind of modern society is going to be constructed whose framework can be understood vaguely now, or a new stage of capitalism is to begin. In both forms, two crucial issues is produced: the new prominence of...
information and communication technology, which facilitates more extension such as globalization, and consumerism which may overshadows the common centrality of production [4].

Since knowing and understanding the idea of postmodernism are not possible without paying attention to its literature; therefore, the present study begins with reviewing classical texts of this domain. Then contemporaries and recent writings are analyzed and presented briefly; at last the diverse thoughts of intellectuals and theorists are summarized. I the present study, it is tried to answer the following question: what are the main characteristics and features of postmodern thoughts and views?

The classics and construction of postmodernism:

Among the classics, Karl Marx who showed that transforming production continuously means that every hard and tight object will be removed totally. Nothing is safe from the corrosive effects of capitalism. Although he welcomed to modernism, he detested its midwife, capitalism. Continuous enhancement of technology efficiency, strong search of domination over markets and the extension of capitalism's clutches all over the world were all military aspects which discriminated between those who took benefits and those who were prisoners and had nothing to lose. A large part of Marx's main project, as he himself were not aware of it, resulted in a more complete genre of modernism. By stating that financial economy had been changed into a "true society", Marx mentioned that instead of face-to-face communication of traditional societies, the world was going to be dominated by military domination of impersonal and objective relations. Considering goods to be idols conceals the true nature of transmission and exploitation of capitalists. In addition, Emil Durkheim, in his work about suicide and labor division and Sigmund Freud in his work about aggressiveness considered torment, worry, frustration, and dejection as the results of modern civilization. In Weber's view, in a world which forces only emphasizes economic criteria, these criteria soon undermine that world; he was afraid that bureaucracy merely accelerates cruelty and inhumanity. Bureaucracy not only prevented people from growing, but also endangered democracy. According to him, "bureaucratic organization, alongside state machine are involved in constructing prisons of the future, in which people may be the farmers of Egyptian government, submissive and helpless; while formal admiration and futurism as a merely technical goodness, which is rational, is transformed into the ultimate value which ex cathedra determines the tendencies of their affairs" [4].

But Nietzsche who undoubtedly is one of the most important features among postmodern intellectuals, is the key point of the contemporary intellect particularly the intellect which takes the anti-humanistic position- and examples of it can be seen in Foucault's works- was conceived in Nietzsche's philosophy. He has been a modern departure point in the intellect of the recent ear, the departure which refuses the necessity of the relatively stable relationship of subject-object [1]. He stated that "nihilism smashes". In his view, "truth is not but the congelation of ancient metaphors". He spent his life to show that the hopes and expectations of Enlightenment are nihilistic. One the most basic concepts in the postmodern discussion is revolving around being or not being the reality or multiplicity of reality. Nihilism is a Nietzschean concept. Nietzsche emphasizes that the so-called rational systems in fact are satisfying systems. Therefore, Nietzsche removes the disguise of the claims of discovering truth and shows that these claims are those things that he calls "will to power". Those who have such claims consider themselves higher than those who these claims are presented to them; therefore, they dominate over them. The motto "Death of God" of Nietzsche means that one can believe in something no longer [4]. God is dead. He is slain by "the faithfulness", by will focused toward truth, which the faithful have always treated like a task and this god guide the faithful to this direction which this faithful people consider him as an error which can be deprived of him. Rightly, it is with this ultimate nihilistic outcome that Nietzsche neglects modernism. Since, the concept of truth enjoys no credibility no longer, and this basis cannot transfer no true moment- because it has no basis of the thought advent- modernity cannot be neglected via critical hearts because this "self" has been the last step within modernism. From this path, it can be revealed that the other way should be searched. This path means that moment which could be considered as postmodern generationin philosophy is drawn [5]. Ethics is a lie and truth is a myth. All remains for us is the Dionysus selection of acceptance of nihilism and living without illusion or claimbut with enthusiasm and happiness. If one follows this issue, nothing will remain from the difference between truth and error; this difference is a mere deception. Beyond our language and its concepts, nothing remains- like God- which justifies this difference. Nietzsche shows difference as part of will to power [4]. Therefore, will to power is the foundation of Nietzsche's anti-idealistic position. He states that will to power refers to the "world" and continues that: this world is the will of power- and not something part of it! And you also are part of this will to power not something part of it". No willing subject is hidden behind power, no classification is between will and more than it, or between being or nothingness, or subject or object- because classification is part of will to power. Will to power is a mass of forces by which identities should be constructed, and no unity behind hidden appearance. Reevaluation of values means construction of values within the play of forces of the will of power. Values always require to be justified; they, as Kant believes, is not present "in itself" [1].

The other important figure is Martin Heidegger. He was involved in the nature of human being's thought more than everything else. He believed that paying attention to identified and addressed historical issues have
shown the route of philosophy, and he tried to encounter the challenges of modern world, which has prisons itself in the dominance considered to limit the attention to the individuals' real lives. He looked at the western thought in the sunset; however, he considered this sunset as an opportunity for reconstruction and not as a terminal [4].

On the other hand, Simmel, who is known as not only one of the main founders of sociology (the only postmodern thinker) among sociologists, covered the world of sociology and the world of cultural analysis, and tried to reflect and think by considering the increasing importance of technology and also by carefully considering the tool which technology, without clarification the objective and investigate its facilities for freeing individuals and also its limitations for individuals' growth.

Along with the basic issues of social development, methods of relations between individuals and a society, the relation of objective culture and subjective one is revealing more and more for Simmel. He presented the term "tragedy of culture" trying to understanding these relations. Tragedy of culture refers to this meaning that life and creation are updating, but this articulation and statement take a formal appearance whose feature is distancing from valuable origin of life on creativity [6]. According to him, this cultural tragedy or crisis refers to the deepening gap between objective culture, which can be seen in technology, and the more and more alienated individual repressed by true search of individuality. He emphasizes the lack of obvious meaning in the modern world of industrial systems. A lack which he relate to the fall of Christianity. In his identification of modernism, Simmel tried to draw a picture of "transient moment" of life with its all mess. Simmel foretold some of the central discussions of postmodernism. He fed a tragic view which for example, marriage becomes a merely tyrannical and lifeless issue or religion cuts his bands with certain beliefs completely and fall to the end of mysticism. According to him, art is a tool to overcome modernist discrepancies, he believes that in the time of crisis and anomie, tendency toward aesthetic is increasing. [4]

New figures of postmodernism:
Jacques Derrida:

Jacques Derrida is the main figure of postmodernism. Postmodernism is a kind of permanent revolution against the authority of not only science and philosophy but also the church and governments. Its linguistic, discursive and political strategies is known of "deconstruction". Derrida was in the same idea with Saussure that the semiotic meaning of signs originates from their differences. However, structuralists wrongly believed that as these different relations are established, meanings will be consolidated. Derrida believes that the meaning of a sign is polyphonic and variable. On the other hand, the basis of Derrida's view is that the world we experience and know is dependent upon fragile and displaced foundations of language and discourse. He explicates the mode of meaning creating and shaping social lives, such as social inequality, by language [7].

However, his favorite to reevaluation of the dependency of intellectual tradition of logic of identity and undermining the bases of this dependency. And by the help of an approach called "deconstruction", started a fundamental research on the nature of the western metaphysical tradition and its basis, i.e. the logic of identity. Whole Derrida's works are delving about the nature of writing in its broadest meaning as difference. Since writing always contains the elements of iconography, ideography and phonology, cannot be identical with itself. Therefore, writing is always impure and consequently is challenging with the concept of identity and at last the concept of origin as a comprehensive issue. Writing in one meaning is purer than phenomenological forms imagined that writing reflects them. Writing like trace, semeon and graph are transformed to the presumption of all forms of the phenomenon [1]. Therefore, if for Lyotard social issue's being atomistic means that each of us are bound to our local language games, to Derrida, tis issue is the issue of "texts"; the cultural life requires the texts we create, encountering other texts which influence our texts via routes never being able to be explained. The task of deconstructionism- a strategy taken from Heidegger by Derrida- is questioning continuously about our texts and those of others and denying stationary or stability of the texts.

Emphasis on uncertainty of language totally undermines the logocentric position of modernism. However, some intellectuals like Rorty claim that Derrida states that modern era has finished, others, on the other hand persist that he is still in the domain of this era. But, there is no doubt that the concept of his deconstructionism has penetrated to the domain of valid works of postmodernism. Derrida's description indicates that the authority itself is falling, while they are clear when-all cultural products- are not only the products of their "authors", these authors cannot impose their specific meaning on them.In this view, people's participation changes to one of the cultural creation routs, in such a way that consumers of texts take them in a new form in suburbs of cities, colonies, nomads and wall to wall houses [4].

In general, philosophical work by Derrida claims that deconstructionism is the common statements both in scientific works and everyday language. Everyday language is not neutral; it contains presumptions and cultural postulates of a complete convention. In such cases, critical revision of the philosophical basis of the convention unexpectedly may result in a new emphasis on and personal creativity of researcher, philosopher-reader [1].

Derrida thought that he had found the hidden logic of western thoughts and called it logocentrism. Western logocentrism is due to effort for accessing a reliable language which can be able to reveal truth, rightness of
ethics and beauty. Derrida points out the binary oppositions in western thought which has a vital role in establishing the order of truth. Binaries like speech/writing, absence/presence, meaning/form, body/soul, nature/culture, positive/negative, transcendental/experimental and cause/effect are continuously repeated and are placed in the heart of western culture. However, words of every of binaries does not present equal values. The first word is prior and the second is peripheral and derivative. For example, priority of speech over writing is a basis hypothesis. They consider that speech is a immediately and clear tool for articulating subjective thinking, but writing by making our mind in involved metaphorical and figural aspects of language darkens our views. Western thinkers, by focusing on hierarchical binaries, are pursuing identifying the order of truth and realities, an order which can play the role of a reliable basis for judgment about truth/falsehood, knowledge/ideology, reality/illusion or true/false. Instead of presenting his system, Derrida opposed the idea of effort for discovering the order of truth. In his writings, he tried to indicate that the claim of authority of thinkers in comparison to precise investigations cannot be defendable. He believed in uncertainty, polyphony and changeability of the meaning of signs. Particularly, he focused his critical significant capabilities toward weakening hierarchical binaries, which were a high status in western culture. The objective of his linguistic and political strategy is undermining, deconstruction and displacement of hierarchy and reducing its domination over linguistic organization of subjectivity and society. Undermining hierarchical binaries gives this opportunity to the signifiers and forms of subjectivity and peripheral or neglected social life to be present publically. Therefore, it seems that post structuralism want to be a kind of public voice for all depressed differences (like women, ethnic minorities, homosexuals) [7].

Jean-Francois Lyotard:

Jean-Francois Lyotard (1924-1998) in his multiple works, discourse, sign, deviation from Marx and Freud and libidinal economy, drew the general principles of postmodernism. He rejected the main aspects of Enlightenment. It has been claimed that demand of truth in modern enlightenment was accompanied with establishment of social hierarchy and depression. Lyotard resorts to the critical postmodern research which is pursuing foundations, undermining hierarchy and speaks from the mouths of people. The term "postmodernism" particularly after publication of Lyotard's book titled as Postmodern Situation, found general application; whose basis distinction between modern knowledge from postmodern one and also results in Lyotard's fame [7].

Postmodern situation was written as a report about knowledge for government of Quebec and investigates the situation of knowledge, science and technology in advanced capitalist societies. It has been judged about this concept that the concept of society as a form of "uniqueness" has lose its validity. The concept of society is valid no longer due to increasing "disbelief" to legitimating metanarratives. And science is a modern science which tries to legitimate its own principles by referring to a metanarratives - i.e. a narrative outside its jurisdiction. Two influential narratives are as follows: one is this assumption that knowledge is produced itself and the other is this assumption that knowledge is produced for public subject which is pursuing freedom and release. However, postmodernism indicates that now this ideals of knowledge have been questioned and additionally, there is no logical reason for resolving the dispute of these ideals [1].

Lyotard discusses that in pre-modern societies, narrative is considered as knowledge, not for this reason that it is correspondent to realities but for this reason that it should have adaptability with social principles which determined who has the right to speak with whom. As far as these social principles were obeyed to the extent that narratives take this social principles obvious and reinforce them, it directly results in social unity. On the other hand, the feature of modernism is considered as attack to narrative knowledge. Narratives (like religion and mythology) are put aside as ignorance, superstition, and as a sign of inferior civilization. Modern human beings replace science which is claimed that it will access to objective truths. Science requires an external resource for legitimating itself; because there is no direct bond between science and social cohesion. Lyotard believed that modern science resorts to narratives to legitimate itself. This is a paradoxical issue because science claims superiority because of ignoring narratives. In both cases, science is dependent on a different narrative with its pre-modern kind. Lyotard takes this kind of narrative as "grand-narrative or metanarrative", because it is compiled tales which give meaning and cohesion to situational or littler tales or acts [7].

Lyotard states that "if we want to ultimate simplifying issues, we can define postmodernism as disbelief and metanarratives”. He directly is involved in Enlightenment in the worldwide advanced technology era. Metanarrative is following this policy of Enlightenment which science legitimates itself as the carrier of freedom. Modern knowledge with great narratives like wealth creation or workers revolution, legitimates itself. According to these narratives, we by knowing ourselves better, we will be free. Lyotard caused the collapse of metanarratives by this claim that we cannot be dependent on such discourses any longer [4].

Therefore, in his view, we cannot be dependent on grand narratives or stories which tend to reveal the main meaning and objective of the world history any longer. Other metanarratives such as the Marxist belief of the arrival of the communism via revolution or Enlightenment liberal narrative of improvement via scientific wisdom are less believable nowadays. Lyotard takes history as a random issue or as a string of random events which more than be towards improvement, they are moving toward nowhere, can have unexpected
Baudrillard feeds the first stage of his work with the help of a semiotic theory about production and object particularly what is related to the concept "use value", which emphasizes the semiotic value of objects. In the second important stage of his work, he even states that the concept of sign as the bearer of meaning and signification is too reducing, in contrast, what Saussure says about play with morphemes, in which words magically are produced by displacing morphemes, is more adaptable with the way language works. At last, Baudrillard proposes something that he knows as the radical implications of outbursting codes in postmodern societies. Undoubtedly, the code refers to computerization, the code facilitates the ignorance of truth and paves the path for the thing Baudrillard knows as "hyperreality" [1].

He discusses that we live in a "metareality". By metareality, he means getting computerized, information technology and media together shape our experience through producing images and models of reality while they take the place of reality itself. How do we know reality? We watch TV and read books and newspapers; these are models we use for accessing the reality. We live in the metareality era. In a world where these models are present and produce or even define reality [2, 3]. In metareality, truth is not marred, but is considered unrelated and insignificant. In metareality all things is radical (not intended to be too many; because it cannot be determined that what is many and what is little and what is enough) [8].

In his view, new electronic media promise a global arrival of pure representations, models, codes and figures as well as media images which have become real or in a better word, any difference between a comprehensive media world has been removed by these media. In fact, one of the victims of this issue can be the society itself or as Baudrillard states "social issue". "In mass media we can have no content because the influence of these media indicates that social issue itself and along it traditional political strategies are illusions [4].

Baudrillard writes about something which is not present, which is perished and is not available any more, something which its foundation and basis are marred. Baudrillard persists that the main feature of our time is absence and invisibility. History has been stopped, indeed if such things have been present; things with which we are living are commonly considered as remains. A change of which Baudrillard speak is not an ordinal one, but is a change which ends all changes. A change which we cannot speak of any longer. The representation intended by Baudrillardremoves the nature of difference between true and false, real and illusionary. We have no tool or way for testing appearance with the criterion of reality, or even we do not know which is which. By dominating and totally flourishing representation, even words which we use "they pretend to have something which they do not have": meaning and referent. Baudrillard's representation undermines the reality and his favorite prefixis too represented. In his world all things are too much and too many. But Bowman in a criticism of him states that personal experiences can be restricted to the TV screen. However, one wonders if the world can be restricted to TV screen. One feels that by respecting Baudrillard, lives after TV and beyond TV as well. For many people, reality is still that which has been so: hard, firm, stable and difficult. They, before surround themselves to quid images, require that they feed from a real bread [8].

Michel Foucault:

Michel Foucault does not consider the profound and ultimate truth; for him only those layers of truth are available which should be removed. He wants to know that how people dominate themselves by producing knowledge. And he knows knowledge as producer of power; therefore, first human beings are subjective creatures and then dominate this very subjective creature. He criticizes the hierarchical nature of knowledge because the highest forms of knowledge have the greatest power. In addition, he is interested in investigation of techniques and technologies originates from knowledge and want to know how different institutions use these
technologies for imposing power on people. He considers history as the continuous turn from one dominant system (based on knowledge) to another one. Although Foucault pays attention to historical examples, his main interest is focused toward the modern world. He in an archeological kind of knowledge about psychiatry want to describe the dialogue cut between rationality and madness. And finally he draws a picture of Weber's iron cage-uniformity nights which "the mad" (the foolish) should spend in iron cage made by rationality. And he considers psychiatry as "monologue of reason about madness". Foucault making difference between the mad and the wise and applying moral supervision on the mad, pays attention to origins of Human Sciences (especially psychology and psychiatry). This issue itself is considered as a more general part of the role of Human Sciences in the moral supervision. He also investigates the genealogy of power. He believes that torturing prisoners replaces its role to the supervision of them by guard principles. Punishment has taken and more rational form (the place of a hangman was occupied by a watch and it does not to do so) and consequently from many perspectives, he has more influence on the prisoner. Although the previous torture could be good for a public show, it considered bad in terms of the "economy of power" because the audience was motivated to have power. The linkage between knowledge and power is obvious regarding torture, but by improving principles, this linkage becomes unclear more and more. The modern system of principles was more principled, efficient, stable and sufficient; in summary, this system has made its influences more and economic expenditure less. This modern system has not made that it behaves more humanistic, but it has been made for "a more influential punishment ... and more profound power in the body of society". However, he has not a negative attitude toward growing a disciplined society, but he considers positive outcomes for it. For example, he states that discipline in the army and industrial companies has a satisfactory function. However, Foucault shows a great and deep fear of spreading discipline, particularly the time when discipline spreads in the network of the government's police and brings the whole society under its supervision and make it the objective I disciplined principles. Foucault's emphasis is on the genealogy of power. In his view, gender is considered "a kind of dense transferring point about power relations". He states that his objective "is to define a regime composed of power-knowledge-pleasure which determines and maintains the mode of debate regarding gender of human being in our world. He believes that in the west "Libido determines and explains everything". Before the 18th century, the society was observing death, but by the arrival of this century, the society withdrew from this emphasis and paid attention to life particularly libido [9].

While Jacques Derrida emphasizes on literary and philosophical issues, Michel Foucault refers to humanities. In Foucault's view, we should consider genealogy. His concern is knowledge, but in his view, knowledge is merged with power and human's body. In genealogy, the origin is traced, but there is no causal relationship between them and no origin for them is searched. According to Nietzsche, human's body can be useful for explaining his behavior, while in Foucault's view, a body is something on which one can work. A body is workable. He recognized these two propositions in the western philosophy. Classical thought which originated from 17th century, no status was considered for humans. However, this modern proposition which is the very feature of 19th century and after it, confirms human being as both object and subject. By being separated of language from representation, the distinguished capabilities of humanities will be born. However, if the production of these capabilities can be traced, their death can be followed in the same way. Foucault reveals what he considers as profound limitations of sociology and psychology and shows that fields such as psychoanalysis is possible to fragmen.t human being. His works is greatly indebted to this idea that not only modern premise is collapsing, but also its theme-human being- is dead. In his works, he emphasizes this pure conclusion from different perspectives [4].

In addition, among distinguished figures of this school, one can name Gilles Deleuze, philosophy professor, Felix Guattari of prominent psychoanalysts, Fredric Jameson, Ehab Hassan, David Harvey, Professor of Geography, Jacques Lacan, French psychoanalyst and Charles Jencks architect, theorist and author in the fields of architecture, art and postmodern literature [10].

Conclusion:

Therefore, when the ugly and terrifying outcomes of modernism result in scandals, Marx's ideas based on tyranny and destruction of capitalism occurs. And normative foundation is removed and dissolution of moral discipline is bold, discipline and unverifiable surveillance secularism, and change in the fate of religion which more formal and contractual relationships become social and communal; and Homeless Minds (Berger), Administered society (Adorno), single-domain human (Marcuse), Reduced the level of technique (Jacques Elul) find eyewitness. And ascribing the mass incineration to "rational civilization" and Bureaucracy (Hannah Arendt and Zygmunt Bauman) and authority and identity's being scattered (Weber), Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism (Daniel Bell) information society and information technology take an urgent form; and when commercialization of research and increase in power and also the twofold role of information technology (Lytord) are felt more seriously; and when reality and meaning's being questioned, and consumerism is criticized because of "deceit" and also because that they promise something which they cannot fulfill (Bauman). The horrible face of industrial systems with the decline in environment brings about the loss in irreplaceable
resources, the destruction of the ozone layer and urbanization and the appearance of aliens. On the other hand, wars, the collapse of the Communism, rigid bureaucracy and instrumental reason and different types of social and cultural engineering, machinery accuracy even in music and art will occur. Therefore, accepted teachings of the western world “particularly beliefs of enlightenment” question the method of social analysis and political action; and the rise of postmodern draws degeneration of modernism; in addition, it undermines old boundaries. Then it is the time when a school called postmodernism, either in meaning or a new situation or either in the meaning of an unfinished project of modernism is proposed and in spite of the presence of frequent discussions and criticism in different part of the world, it grows. In the opinion of some thinkers, this approach can be presented after the positive, interpretive and critical paradigms and the fourth sociological paradigm.

Therefore, postmodernism is a multi-layered concept which “belongs to the domain of social thinking and make us aware of different great social and cultural upheavals which is occurring in many advanced societies in the end of 20th century. The rapid transformation of technology which guarantees the expansion in communication from far distances and the power of computer, a change in the direction of political interests, the outcome of social movements, particularly those movements which are dependent on gender, environment and ethnic and racial issues are all involved in this concept [4].

Postmodernism is a way of thinking which its theme is extracted from the summary of postmodern thoughts Baudrillard, Lyotard, Derrida and Foucault are as follows:

1. The issue of subjectivism and uncertainty related to knowledge
2. The end of the era of making theory and ethical macro-theories regarding the society
3. Lack of access to theory of absolutism and value
4. Failure of Ideas progress and Consequences aloneness of historical fatalisms
5. Opposition to the dominant culture and subcultures solution
6. Being essentially negative and critical
7. It is Critic of assumptions and modern absolutes
8. They pay specific attention to the concept of language and know it as a system of play dependent on sensual mood
9. They criticize modern technology and its orientation towards the environment
10. Technology development at the cost of the destruction of the environment are opposed.
11. devoid of any content of everyday life
12. Social contradictions in postmodern society are dispersed and superficial.
13. Institutions of education, hospitals, mental health clinics, prisons and public media have main contradictory positions.
14. Struggles which are current around gender, ethnicity, class and cultural status are irreducible to each other.
15. The very feature of postmodernism is the process of “fragmentation” which undermines boundaries.
16. The social domination acts not through suppression and force or rational power, but via person by means of deception and mass media images.
17. Contemporary societies are composed of social heterogeneous dynamicity

Postmodernism is in reaction to modernism and different ideologies related to it. Idea and suggestions has freeing from modernism and tyranny and its representation in culture, language, tradition, religion and…. This way of thinking is a fan of freedom of speech is against unnecessary rigidity of modernism and emphasis on reason and aesthetic limitations [12]. Its main principles and characteristics are as follows:

1. ignoring objective truth.
2. Critical treatment with every kind of epistemology
3. Denial of generality and comprehensiveness from any thought, conscience and thought.
4. Pluralism
5. Serious doubts about the past beliefs.
6. invalidity of valid issue
7. denial of reality
8. representation instead of presentation
9. non-meaningfulness
10. skepticism
11. pluralism
12. Argument about meta-narratives or grand narratives
13. Confirmation of otherness and difference
14. View of language as what it means in relation to a social context and it is dependent on
15. Emphasis on style and form rather than substance [10].

Therefore, postmodernism is a pessimistic period opposite to optimistic modernism. While modernism is advocate of Enlightenment, postmodernism is an anti-enlightenment philosophy; and its entire main beliefs question Enlightenment. While it is an important movement in diverse dimensions and it is seriously related to feminism, movement for racial equality, the rights and the peace movement and different types of movement like these. However, it is lacking a central principle and clear cut organization, and complicatedness, discrepancy, obscurity and diverse features are its inseparable features.
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