▪ Global Social Sciences Review (GSSR) ▪ Vol. VII, No. I (Winter 2022) ▪ Pages: 46–58
▪ DOI: 10.31703/gssr.2022(VII-I).06 ▪ URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2022(VII-I).06
▪ L- ISSN: 2520-0348 ▪ p- ISSN: 2520-0348 ▪ e-ISSN: 2616-793X
▪ Citation: Butt, G. S., Khalid, M. N., & Hussain, T. (2022). Theory of Deconstruction: A Study of Scholastic Scope Thereof. *Global Social Sciences Review*, *VII*(I), 46-58. https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2022(VII-I).06

Cite Us

Theory of Deconstruction: A Study of Scholastic Scope Thereof

Ghulam Sarwar Butt * Muhammad Naveed Khalid † Tariq Hussain ‡

Contents:

- Introduction
- Research Methodology
- Discussion
- Deconstruction and Education
- Deconstruction and History
- Deconstruction and Hermeneutics
- Deconstruction and Literature
- References

Abstract: *This research article primarily dealt with the impact of theory of deconstruction in various disciplines; it endeavoured to study the power of pervasion of this notable literary and philosophical theory into other areas of study including the field of education, too. Theory of deconstruction as propounded by Jacques Derrida, famous French abstruse thinker and philosopher of twentieth century, emphasizes the transient nature of the meaning of a text by finding various aporias -- a logical disjunction in a text -- and impasses lying in the text whatever. Such aporias disturb the underlying system of logic of the text under consideration leading to its own negation. Being considered as the main building block of Postmodernism --a style and concept in the arts characterized by distrust of theories and ideologies and by the drawing of attention to conventions -- this aggrandized theory has pervaded a great many fields of knowledge changing their fundamental claims altogether . In this way, this theory has gained much attention in the realm of knowledge. This article, as a matter of fact, studies this very influence of theory of deconstruction in the realm of various disciplines.*

Key Words: Theory, Deconstruction, Derrida, Education, Aporias, Postmodernism, Impact/influence.

Introduction

One of the most influential and powerful theory of Postmodernism is considered to be the theory of deconstruction as enunciated by French abstruse theorist and philosopher Jacques Derrida. This theory insists on the impermanence and unfixity of the meaning of a text – mundane or transcendental. According to Jacques Derrida, there is no permanent signifier of a signified which, in turn, results in the fact that language is just a chain of signifiers. Derridean deconstruction has been in vogue since its inception as a vigorous and powerful theory in the realm of history of philosophy. This theory has been lauded by many academics from various disciplines the world over. Owing to its deep global impact, this theory has influenced almost every field of study including education. Derridean deconstruction has categorically changed our perceived ideas and notions regarding the rules and principles of a number of disciplines; hence, making a headway towards totally new and sui

* Assistant Professor of Islamic Studies, Government Associate College, Pasrur, Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan.
† Resource Person, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
‡ Assistant Professor, Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: ghulamsarwarbutt1977@gmail.com

generis vistas of knowledge and learning. In the field of education, as an instance, theory of deconstruction helps deconstructing the "hierarchical, racist and anti-democratic structures" in schools, colleges, universities and even the whole education system.

Research Methodology

In order to show an influence of theory of deconstruction in various disciplines of knowledge an analytical, comparative and descriptive method of research was used throughout the process of completing this research article. Also, the historical research method was also taken into consideration.

Discussion

In this section we will try to discuss the theory of deconstruction by assessing its scope in various disciplines of life. Perhaps, being the most influential figure of Postmodernism---a Utopian philosophy that wants what lies beyond the present moment (Siebers, 1998), Derrida by his theory of deconstruction has managed to pervade many disciplines like education, hermeneutics, politics, philosophy, theology, literature, feminism to name but a few. Within the framework of postmodern discourse, in fact, deconstruction has come to play an important role (Silverman, 1998). The strategy of deconstruction is to manifest how texts come to disturb their inherent system of logic; it is shown by *fastening on the 'symptomatic' points, the aporias and impasses of meaning, where* texts get into trouble, come unstuck, offer to negate themselves (Eagleton, 1996). Let us observe the theory of deconstruction's scholastic/academic scope in the following lines.

Deconstruction and Education

Postmodernism has challenged every stance taken by modernity in order to put forward the concepts of Totality and one World View and Grand Narratives etc. Among the postmodernists, French philosopher and theorist, Jacques Derrida, is considered to be perhaps the most powerful voice who through his theory of deconstruction endeavoured to demolish all the traditional and patriarchal ideas and notions regarding metaphysics, cultures and meta-narratives. Postmodernism and theory of deconstruction in particular must be seen as a contextual discourse which has challenged particular disciplinary demarcations in such fields as social studies, geography, education, feminism, and many other areas (Trifonas, 2000).

Education is the very discipline which has been much influenced by theory of deconstruction put forwarded by French theorist and philosopher Jacques Derrida. This theory intends to dislodge all the traditional or hierarchical concepts in every walk of life so is the case with education. In this field of knowledge, theory of deconstruction also intends to demolish all sort of traditional ways of learning and schooling; it wants to totally transform our ideas and notions about racial, discriminative and parochial sentiments in the classroom environment of any sort. In other words, Arato (2000) argued it can be said that "deconstruction helps us to deconstruct our thinking about learning, learners and facilitation of learning rooted in our hierarchical and discriminative educational heritage."

Owing to the overwhelming influence of theory of deconstruction, the educationists, the philosophers of education, and educational and curriculum theorists around the world have expressed mounting interest in the seminal works of Jacques Derrida and his theory of deconstruction (Biesta and Kuehne ,2001). However, the major influence of theory of deconstruction on the practice of education originally came from the adoption of deconstruction in English departments. Eagleton (1996) explained Derridean deconstruction helps enlarge the scope of various queries about education and teaching to a level that the parallel of which is impossible to find in the history of education. That is why the theory of deconstruction moves the whole of questions regarding education, regarding teaching, regarding the teaching of philosophy, and regarding philosophical teaching from the surface of methods and techniques to a level that is deeply concerned with the political, the ethical, and , ultimately, with the destination of life, history and humanity. Theory of deconstruction strengthen and deepen

© 2022 The Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

our comprehending of education, too (Arato, 2000). The questions about pedagogy, and also the questions regarding what it means to think, to learn, to teach and to know and more particularly what it means to teach the Other as Other.

Derridean deconstruction intends to deconstruct texts whatsoever by associating them to a particular motive or ideology which , as a matter of fact, provides them life. This is what the Ornstein and Levine (2008) have superbly narrates:

"Derrida developed deconstruction as a method to trace the origin, or the genealogy, and the meaning of texts or canons. (A canon is a work, typically a book, prized as having authoritative knowledge in a given culture.) A text is often a book, but it might also be a dialogue, a movie or a play, or another type of cultural representation. In education, a text is often a curriculum guide, a video, or a book, including a textbook, such as the one you are reading. The purpose of deconstruction is to show that texts, rather than reflecting metaphysical truths or objective knowledge, are historical and cultural constructions that involve political power relationships. For example, you can deconstruct this book or any textbook by answering such questions as: Who are the authors? Why did they write the book? What were their motives? Does the text endorse a particular ideology? Does that ideology support some people, groups, or classes over others?"

In the light of this argument, it can be that no "Great Book" is out of the reach of firm clutches of theory of deconstruction. Thus, whether it be Plato's "The Republic" or Aristotle's "Nicomachean Ethics" are just historical pieces which can be deconstructed to know how they were and are used as rationales for the supremacy of one group over others.

Like Existentialists, Postmodernists including Derrida makes an effort to raise the consciousness of their disciples and proteges but their focus is on social inequalities instead of personal choice and they also disregard the fact that the texts of curriculum contains objective realities. That is why Allan C. Ornstein, Denial U. Levine (2008) has rightly observed:

"Like existentialists, postmodernist teachers work to raise their students' consciousness. While existentialists focus on consciousness about personal choice, postmodernists focus on consciousness about social inequalities by deconstructing traditional assumptions about knowledge, education, schooling, and instruction. They do not regard the school's curriculum as a repository of objective truths and scientific findings to be transmitted to students. It is an arena of conflicting viewpoints – some of which dominate and subordinate others."

Postmodernists like Derrida consider the state institutions including educational ones as the instruments of exploitation of the downtrodden groups of society and help sustain the dominance of the powerful privileged class of the society in the guise of providing free educational facilities to all the strata of society irrespective of the difference of caste, colour or creed; they are of the view that public schools help create a society which is patriarchal and Eurocentric. Thus, deconstruction of the curriculum based on the so-called Western canons is a fundamental objective of Derrida and other postmodernists; they challenge these canons are male-dominated, European-centered, Western, and capitalist culture. They argue that the contributions of underrepresented groups – Africans, Asians, Latinos, and Native Americans; feminists; the economically disadvantaged; and gays and lesbians – should be included in the curriculum (Cooper, 2006).

Derrida does not value the scientific method too as the pragmatists do but rather his theory of deconstruction intends to deconstruct it by regarding this method as a Grand/Meta Narrative devised to empower one particular class in order to sustain its power and prestige upon other underdeveloped classes of society. A teacher should empower himself by becoming professional educators. By doing this, they will be in a better position to empower their pupils in a better way. They need to deconstruct official statements about the school's purpose, curriculum and organization, and the teacher's role and mission. Real empowerment means that as teachers proceed from preservice to practice they take responsibility for

shaping their own futures and for helping students to shape their own lives. Derrida and other postmodernist also wants to deconstruct the test system by asking questions like who mandates the testing, develops the test, interprets the test results, and determines how test scores will be used (Cooper, 2006).

Deconstruction and Hermeneutics

According to Culler (1997) hermeneutics is a branch of knowledge that deals with texts--- legal, religious or philosophical--- and endeavours to find their meanings, seeking to unearth new, finer and preferable interpretations. Hermeneutic paradigms belong to the disciplines of law and religion where people try to interpret an authentic and reliable legal or holy text in order to decide how to act. Derrida (2013) endeavoured to replace the old hermeneutics which dreamed of "deciphering a truth" and "nostalgia for origins" with a way of interpretation that "affirms play and makes an effort to pass beyond man and humanism". One of the remarkable events in the history of Judaism has been caused by a literary movement known as "Deconstruction". The ways of reading texts that we have considered natural and final are only the possible modes of reading that may be regarded interpretation in honesty of intention; however, they are, in fact, culturally bound and particular historical products---- the products of the epoch of Logos, as a consequence Logocentrism (Ward, 2001).

The fundamental job of deconstruction is the reading, in fact, a close reading, of texts, whereas the interpretation of texts is the basic activity of hermeneutics; deconstruction relinquishes the interpretation of texts. The text is writing. The writing necessitates a reading. Writing is the textuality of text. Writing is not something considered to be the opposite of speech. Writing is that original space in which a text is conveyed, dispersed, displayed, limited, contexted and so on…. As Derrida has narrated in the "Plato's Pharmacy", writing is neither a remedy nor a poison; rather it being a "Pharmakan" has the properties of both. Thus, writing is undecidable; it is a play of differences (Textualities, 1994).

However, Derrida, through his deconstruction strategy questions the very way Hiedegger endeavours to make Western Metaphysics tremble and shows that Hiedegger's criticism of the "metaphysics of presence"--- a felicitous phrase coined by Derrida--- is itself cluttered with symbols/signs of presence. Derrida's critique of the concept of presence takes us beyond the Heideggerian hermeneutic of Being into the prohibited areas of 'differance'--- a fundamental instrument of deconstruction of Derrida (Caputo, 1993). This concept of 'differance' is instrumental in postponing/undecidability of the meaning of a text whatsoever. Through this weapon, Derrida attacks the very idea of the permanence of the meaning of a text and diametrically denies such sort of futile notion. It is said that Derrida is a watershed for thoroughgoing and revolutionary hermeneutics. As we know, in hermeneutic field the concepts of metaphysical beings like the Truth, the Origin and the Transcendence are considered to be the essential elements. Derrida denies any stable and single meanings of a text; hence, hermeneutics is liable to be attacked ruthlessly by the deconstruction of Derrida as hermeneutics stresses single and singular meaning of a text.

Gadamer (2004) a famous German Philosopher, in his magnum opus "Truth and Method"--- a book on hermeneutics---accords much significance to tradition. He is of the view that it is an incessant and ceaseless process which is necessary for the communication of the 'goods and wealth' of the past to posterity. He further asserts: "it was necessary to have a truly historical hermeneutics and tradition is one with the present of its being understood". That is why Caputo (1993) opines that defense of a pliant and mobile tradition is a principal trait of Gadamer. On the other hand, Derrida consider it his main responsibility to end and terminate the tradition. So, Derrida undermines Gadamer's stance of giving much importance to tradition. In fact, Derrida does not accord any import to traditions---religious or philosophical--- and deconstruct them pitilessly. Derrida, through his technique of deconstruction, undoes the idea of the 'meaning' and 'truth of Being' and every epoch that insists such notions.

Similarly, Immanuel Kant (2012), famous German philosopher, in his hermeneutics, subordinates religion to morality when he writes:

"Moral laws are destined to make highest possible good in this world and this cannot be attained without the help of God; so, religion must be added to morality."

Thus from this statement, it is obvious that for Kant the 'idea of God' plays the role of "Supplement" to morality. In other words, morality is the protector of religion and the idea of supplement shows that morality lacks something which religion comes to fulfill. So, once this deficiency is fulfilled, morality allows likelihood of divine supplementation but on its own terms. Kevin hart, while discussing various shades of Kant's stance regarding God, writes that Kant is the torchbearer of negative theology based in philosophical considerations (Hart, 2000). However, this intellectual move on the part of Kant remains metaphysical so it is open to deconstruction. That is why; Derrida regards Kantian philosophy an illusion (Rorty, 1982). Because, for Derrida, the very idea that has metaphysical ground is liable to be deconstructed. As a matter of fact, Derrida's deconstruction impugns everything which gushes out of Kantian philosophy (Hart, 2000).

Deconstruction and Philosophy

Philosophy is the special target of the theory of deconstruction---a process of problematising the Logocentric discourse as propounded by Jacques Derrida (Grosz, 1989). Jacques Derrida's unwavering standing as a staunch adversary of Western philosophical traditions, in particular the Western Metaphysics has no parallel in the history of Western philosophy. Kates (2008) has gained carte blanche in this regard. Deconstruction is a sort of reading which draws doubting and gloomy conclusions regarding reality, reason and philosophy.

Derrida is of the view that Western metaphysics is based on Logocentrism--- a system of thought that is based on permanence, authority and stability. And this Logocentrism is further dependent on the concept of binary oppositions (speech/writing, good/bad, inside/outside, etc.) in which first term is given preference to the second one. This is going on from the Greek period. Deconstruction intends to explore the flaws and contradictions that the hierarchical ordering presupposes in the text and other sides of the meanings of the text, particularly those that are hidden or implied. In this way, the binary oppositions are shown as a result of the text rather than something independent of it.

As an instance, in Rousseau's work, culture, while it being an oppressive and corrupt force, comes into existence from a happy and peaceful state of nature in which the Homo sapiens live in idyllic isolation from one another. Thus, to Rousseau, nature foregoes culture. However, when seen through another angle, nature is the outcome of culture. And the idea of nature or natural, at any under consideration moment of history, will change and differ in accordance with the culture of the time. What this reality manifests is not that the dichotomies of nature/culture should be put upside down---that is the culture is factually prior to nature--- but rather that their inter-relationship is not one-sided and unidirectional as Rousseau and others had supposed. Hence, the point of the deconstructive close reading is to restructure and displace the binary oppositions, not just to reverse it.

To Derrida, the most significant and pervading dichotomy is the one that regards 'writing' a derivative of 'speech'. This opposition illustrates that 'speech' is a superior and genuine form of language because in speech the ideas, aims, and notions of the speaker at once "present"; on the other hand, in writing they are far-off, distant and "absent" from the speaker or writer and thus more likely to be misunderstanding. Here, Derrida declares that spoken words work as linguistic signs only to the degree that they can be recurred in various contexts, in the absence of the person who first uttered them. Speech is entitled to language, this is to say, only to the extent that it retains features traditionally allot to writing, such as 'absence', 'difference' (from the originary utterance) and the prospect of misunderstanding. One sign of this reality, according to Derrida, is that the account of speech

in Western philosophical traditions usually depends upon instances and metaphors connected to writing. In fact, such philosophical texts mark out speech as a form of writing, even in cases where it is openly claimed subordinate to speech. The point of deconstructive critique here, however, is not to manifest that the dichotomy of speech/writing should be upturned, nor is it to describe that there is no difference between speech and writing.

Stuat (1998) describes Derrida says that, similarly, linguistic meaning is decided by the 'play' of differences--- a play that is "boundless", "indefinite", and "undefined"--- not by an originary concept or intention existing prior to and outside language. Signs were not such foreseeable entities for Derrida, and there was never an exemplary co-existence of signifier and signified to warrant an un-problematic communication. Some 'slippage' of meaning always happened. Hence, to Derrida, meaning are momentary and transient phenomenon that is no more as it comes about in written or spoken language, rather than something stable, firm and fixed which holds over time for a series of divergent audiences. Derrida is of the view that entire Western philosophy is based on the assumption that the complete meaning of a word is 'present' in the mind of the speaker, such that it can be communicated, without any noteworthy slippage, to the listener. This dogma is what Derrida regards the 'metaphysics of presence'.

According to Stuat (1998) for Derrida, linguistic meaning is not a stable phenomenon: at all times and all places, 'differance' is applicable. The liking for pun and quibble in the deconstructive texts illustrates the very ability of 'differance' to show that language is not stable entity and it also highlights an infinite creative power to make new, unforeseen and un-anticipated meanings.The above stated discussion shows the way Derrida dismantles the received notions regarding the meanings of words. In his works, Derrida tirelessly discusses texts of famous Western Philosophers like Plato, Husserl, Rousseau, Levi-Strauss, Hiedegger, Rousset, etc. and deconstructs their text by finding various aporias and contradictions in it and hence he shakes the very foundations of the edifice of Western metaphysics. In truth, Derrida's venture moves around the likelihood of finding a place which is unconditioned by metaphysics (Hart, 2000). In short, Culler (1981) explained Derrida struggles to purge Philosophy from its impurities through his theory of deconstruction.

Deconstruction and Theology/Religion

Theology deals with the 'revelation' that God has revealed to the mankind on His own Initiative; whereas '*metaphysics*' studies God and His manifestations beginning from our God-given ability to recognize Him simply because He is our Lord and Creator. So, metaphysics is the natural companion of theology (Upton, 2002). Scholars are agreed upon the thesis that Derridean Philosophy provides vigorous resources for taking into question religious questions. Religious thought was not a new interest for middle-aged Derrida, but rather the milieu in which deconstruction first developed.

Jacques Derrida wrote on many scholars and philosophers from a number of disciplines including philosophy, literature and theology to name but a few. So, deconstruction in this sense is disciplinary nomadic. Derrida uses his famous technique, though he is reported to have said that deconstruction is neither a method nor a critique, of deconstruction aims at the close study of the texts of literary and philosophical figures. So far as the Derrida's notions about theology or religion are concerned, they are usually not in the favour of religion. In an early elaboration of "*Of Grammatology*", Derrida stressed a form of writing freed from the restrictions of "*metaphysics and theology*". Similarly, Derrida declared, in one of his interviews, that "*differance* bars any alliance with theology." Derrida, it is narrated, denies the superiority of God under the influence of Nietzsche; that is why, he is often called a *French Nietzschean* (Edward, 2011). Derrida's deconstruction intends to regard God as "undecidable and unpredictable character", too (Sherwood, 2005).

Taylor (1984) explained Deconstruction undoes the very fabric of *Western Theology*. It not only criticizes the binary opposition but also challenges the whole system of notions which are based on theological considerations. After the

deconstructive analysis of the binary oppositions, it becomes almost impossible for them to re-establish themselves in accordance with the previously defined oppositional system. It is noteworthy to emphasize that deconstruction's stratagem to deal with the theological text is not from without; rather it, like a parasite, invades from within. Deconstruction remains simultaneously inside and the outside of the theological network that it challenges. On the one side, deconstruction's queer critique suffuses and overturns the stratified system of theological notions. On the other side, the viability of this parasitic discourse presumes the progressive survival of its host. Owing to this dual nature, deconstructive writing is always self-contradictory, deceitful, and aberrant. Having challenged the accepted and conventional standards, the jargon of deconstruction can have no final or real meaning; rather they remain in transition (Hart, 2005). However, Caputo (2001) writes that the religion has started influencing secular philosophical figures like Derrida, Lyotard and Luce Irigaray are talking about the "prayers and tears of St. Augustine….all in search of God." This shows that religion has also influenced major intellectuals of postmodernism instead of their utter disregard of religion. That is why Caputo remarks: "The flower of religion is one of the blossoms in postmodern florilegium."

Deconstruction and Feminism

By any definition, feminism is a social and political force which wants to change the current power relationships between man and woman. According to Maggie Humm, feminism generates from the idea that in all societies women are of low rank than men. In spite of a comprehensible appeal to the logically well-ordered world of the *Enlightenment*, feminist theory more exactly falls in the ground of postmodern philosophy (Sim, 1998).

Deconstruction can play a powerful role for feminism and other theories that endeavour to make us well- informed of the harsh and authoritarian role ideology can play in our lives (Tyson, 2006). The field of feminism--- the movement that advocates women's rights on the basis of the equality of the sexes--- has also been influenced by Derridean deconstruction. Derrida consults Nietzsche in the critique of the metaphor of femininity. Grosz (1989) described Derrida's act of calling into question the *Logocentrism* has been appreciated by many French feminists in order to make a forceful reading technique for subverting *Western metaphysics* and *Logocentrism* in their generalization. Though theory of deconstruction remained useful for various feminist projects yet Derrida's stance viz-a-viz feminist theory has been ambiguous but ambivalent .

Derrida even became controversial within the feminist societies due to his use of "*Woman*" as a metaphor for the revealing of truth, especially in his reading of Nietzsche. Derrida's readings of "*The Gay Science*", a famous text of Nietzsche, compel to believe that woman is a mimic of truth. In his book "*Spurs: Nietzsche's Style*", Derrida discusses in detail the implications of "*Woman*" as a metaphor of textuality (Grosz, 1989). However, Derrida's challenge to *Logocentrism* through his theory of deconstruction supports the feminists' efforts. His concept of "*differance*" has become a symbol of powerful course inside the feminist theory, quite different from liberal efforts for equality. It is believed that the development of new and independent definitions of woman and femininity finds its roots in the Derridean concept of *"differance*".

Butler (1999) a famous American Philosopher, has an immense influence of Derridean Deconstruction. This is the reason that she, in many of her texts, have taken up deconstructive motifs. In one of her notable book namely "*Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity",* she writes that:

"The violence of the text has identification and the consistency of the class of sex as its target, a demised construct, a construct ready to deaden the body."

Being nothing, the feminine cannot take part any ontology; it is a debased copy of man. This discussion highlights the repercussions of the impacts of Derridean Deconstruction on the thought of Judith Butler. Butler intends to deconstruct all these notions regarding feminine. In

"*Undoing Gender*", she discusses the theme of femininity from various angles and remarks that the idea that the sexual difference is the fundamental difference has come under scathing criticism from many quarters (Butler, 2004). She asserts that gender is a device by means of which concepts of masculine and feminine created and naturalized.

This paragraph manifests in a lucid manner the influence of "*differance*"--- a key aspect of theory of deconstruction--- which attacks the *Logocentrism* and also wants it be alive, too, for its own existence.

Diane Elam, a famous feminist writer, wants to set feminism--- apparently a political project--- and deconstruction---appears to be a philosophical and literally project--- side by side instead of giving priority to one term over the other. Their reconciliation is sine qua non for the their mutual friendship and their walking shoulder to shoulder with each other has been possible because both of them has dislocated themselves from their respective spheres: politics and philosophy. On the other hand, deconstruction upsets of understanding of how theories links with practice by re-examining the enmity of philosophical thought to political action. To be brief, this double displacement nullifies the map of intellectual and social space inherited from the *Enlightenment* (Elam, 1994).

She is of the view that both deconstruction and feminism are revolutionary concepts because they are there to change what it means to comprehend the past; in fact, their encounter impel one to reassess the temporality of feminism's movement. She further writes that in the West the notion of a *Universal Truth/Reality* has been prevalent of which the proponents of deconstruction have been sceptical. Also, this very idea of *Universal Truth* has been the cause of victimization of women. Elam (1994) argued Diane endeavours to illustrate the true nature of the relationship between deconstruction and feminism when she says that the feminism's dependence upon deconstruction is not subjection or lowliness nor is deconstruction's reliance best understood as an affable domestication of an otherwise disorderly and rowdy monster.

Some feminist scholars see theory of deconstruction as something leading to "*negative feminism*". As an instance, Linda Alcoff argues that Derridean deconstruction unveils what is commonly comprehended a binary opposition between such terms a man/woman, good/bad, nature/culture and its challenging the supremacy of the primary term is, in fact, refuting the established system in which these dichotomies have been constituted that is *Logocentrism*. In this backdrop, women become constructed as the total negation of *Logocentrism*. Alcoff here asserts that such situation is not favourable to feminism because it does not help in articulating anything positive and meaningful in the idea of woman rendering it a type of political project without any considerable meaning (Ferguson, 1992).

Deconstruction and History

So far as the concept of history is concerned, Derrida does not recognize any origin for it. For him, any appeal to an absolute origin would be an effort to tame history, tying it to one primary moment in the face of which all the subsequent development would be utterly unnecessary (Baring, 2011). So far as the theory of deconstruction is concerned, it intends to demolish any such origin as is necessary for providing a starting point for history. Like Michel Foucault, Derrida too denies any origin for history. That is why; Hugh J. Silverman (1994) writes:

"The natural upshot of the deconstruction of the origin is a repetition to the extent that origin is neither a beginning nor even a satisfactory start; rather it is only a limit, a margin which is not attained and completely inscribed as such in history."

Derrida offers his own account of history that cannot avoid a definite warfare and diversion, of history which is always departing from the whole of man (Gaston, 2007). He, as is evident by his books namely "*Writing and Difference*" and "*Dissemination*" endeavours to reinterpret the conventional role played by literature and history in philosophy. He redefines history as the history of departure from totality, as an excess which is at the same time both the possibility and the ruin of any

totality. Like other disciplines, deconstruction left tremendous impact on the field of history. Jacques Derrida once remarked about his magnum opus "*Of Grammatology*" that it is out and out a history book. In this celebrated text, Derrida is of the view that speech and nature can never be taken as a-historical quintessence because to regard themselves as natural they must be supplemented by the historical, the traditional and the cultural. Simultaneously, this supplement cannot be regarded a historical determination, too. "*Of Grammatology*" gives rise to such new terms as "*trace*" and "*differance*" in order to put forward a new. That is why Edward Baring (2014) has rightly observed:

"Deconstruction would not have been so hostile to historians if it had, in one way or the other, not addressed the core issues of historical understanding."

Derrida's long engagement with Husserl provided him the opportunity to know Husserl's thought about history, in particular. So far as the Husserlian concept of historicity is concerned, Derrida supports it; even he advocates the philosophy of history as propounded by Husserl. But for Derrida Husserl's approach towards history is more fitful and intermittent. And, also, Derrida is of the view that Husserl's notions about history are, as a matter of fact, the reconsidering history's relationship with philosophy--- the relation of history with his own "*transcendental phenomenology*" more than anything else. Derrida's method of deconstructing history is his continuous rethinking history and historicity; he, in reality, wants to break with the traditional standard of historiography and transmuting the end of history. His notion of anachrony keeps him aloof from the established enlightenment frameworks that consider the historical change with regard to a progressive development. This concept of anachrony invokes fairly forceful effects upon Derrida's own work, too (Kate, 2005).

Deconstruction and Literature

Literature is not beyond the effects of Derridean deconstruction, too. For deconstruction, it is worthwhile to note, language is impermanent, transient, dynamic and unstable, regularly propagating possible meanings. Second, existence has no origin, no stable signification, and no permanent ground. Third, *Homo sapiens* are disorganized battlegrounds for competing ideologies whose only "characters" are the ones we think up and select to believe. The main word here is unstable. So, it is a matter of no surprise that for deconstruction, literature is as unsettled, equivocal and unstable as the language of which it is composed. Thus, meaning is also not stable entity. Meanings are produced by the reader during the process of reading. Any interpretation of a text which looks so obvious is, in fact, based on some ideology or cultural beliefs or values--- with which we so accustomed that we consider them natural. To be brief, we produce meaning and value we 'find' in the text. Both writers and readers are influenced by their cultural contexture; authors in constructing their writings and readers in constructing their readings. Hence, literary as well as critical texts can be deconstructed. Derrida does not intend to reverse the orders of the binary oppositions--- in which first term is privileged and second term is degraded--- but rather demonstrates that the valued term (as an instance in speech/writing dichotomy) speech is not free from the negative properties attributed to writing (Tyson, 2006).

Moreover, the literature written under the influence of postmodernism including the theory of deconstruction nullifies the conventions of truthlikeness, rationality and sanity. In such literature, almost everything and everyone exist in such a cataclysmic state of contortion, instability and abnormality that one becomes unable to know the conditions in the actual world from which they have been derived. Sim (1998) discussed characters of such literature are "structureless beings" Language disorder, *pastiche* (a hotchpotch, jumble), fragmentation, looseness of association, *paranoia* (unjustified mistrust of other people or fear of complete engulfment by someone else's system) are the distinctive features of the literary text written under the impact of deconstruction. Lastly, Derridean deconstruction has also deconstructed

the very understanding of the literary terms. As an instance, for deconstruction, irony is not a theme but a well-ordered negation of understanding.

Deconstruction and Politics

Critchely (1999) argued deconstruction can definitely be used as a robust method of political analysis. As an instance, showing how a particular political regime is founded on a set of undecidable assumptions is a significant step in the undermining of that government's claim to legitimacy and validity. Jacques Derrida's political proclivity was unequivocally towards the left whereas Leo Strauss was politically conservative. That is why; Derrida is reported to have said that the deconstruction of text whatever is fundamentally a political act. Strauss is of the view that in order to understand a text the intention of the author plays a key role; however, Derrida does not pay any heed towards this idea. To him, intention has nothing to do with the process of understanding a text. Strauss stresses the tension between politics and philosophy, Derrida proposes that we should regard all efforts to articulate and so maintain order---rhetorical, scientific or philosophical--- to be basically political. In short, for Derrida, the political contains principally in the execution of power.

Mouffe (2005) discussed it is of much import to know that 'politics' deals with the 'ontic' level whereas the 'political' refers to the 'ontological' one. "Ontic' deals with the abundant practices of traditional politics, while the 'ontological' refers the way through which society is organized. However, some theorists say that 'political' means a space of liberty and public deliberation, whereas others see it as a space of power, animosity and dissension. For Derrida, deconstruction essentially operates from the inside by borrowing all the strategic sources of subversion from the ancient Western metaphysical system/structure.

Deconstruction of Derrida answers this critique of Lavinas without which there is neither hyper-politicisation nor decision. Postmodernism armed with his fatal and deadly weapon that is deconstruction deconstructs all the claims of meta-narratives such as Enlightenment narrative, Marxist narrative and other grand narratives in the field of politics. However, Hebermas rejects this stance of deconstruction. Hebermas says that when postmodern writers including Derrida do not respect the grand narratives, then what ground there be for accepting their own account? If we corroborate this stance of postmodern writers then paradoxically it would be erroneous regarding the status of meta-narratives. It is said that probably 'new modernity' will take birth from postmodern politics.

Deconstruction and Ethics

It is generally supposed that ethics, a branch of philosophy also called moral philosophy or empirical reasoning, is an area of inquiry that assumes the philosophical or metaphysical underpinning which deconstruction deconstructs. That is why famous seconders and disciples of Derrida like Paul de Man, Geoffery Bennington, Harold Bloom, Irene Harvey, Rodolphe Gasche, and Christopher Norris relegates the significance of the relationship of ethics to deconstructive reading (Critchely, 1999). Derridean deconstruction has nothing to do with ethics because all the notions and ideas of ethics are transferred to us from the "*Western Metaphysics",* so these concepts cannot be given a respectable place or be a subject of commendation; rather they are the object of deconstruction and they should be deconstructed. Ethics is out and out a metaphysical concept, so it cannot be admired in the realm of deconstruction. However, deconstruction might furnish fresh and novel ways of thinking regarding some of the issues conventionally posited by ethics. Metaphysical concepts of '*writing*', '*sign*' and '*metaphor*' are considered to be the sources of deconstruction of metaphysics. Similarly, ethics also might provide deconstruction with resources oppressed or left untapped by its metaphysical resolution, and such resources might then be presented as a mightier than that metaphysical determination, in excess of it. In such a situation, deconstruction might be described as ethical and probably as ethics itself.

The pivotal point of Levinas's moral philosophy is the relationship with the *Other*, which, as the *Other* is totally other, mysterious and

unreachable, is a non-relation, too. Levinas, in fact, wants to achieve a relationship beyond relationship. The *Other* is at the same time immediate and unpossessable, too near to avoid but too far to grasp. Thus, Levinas through his concept of ethics presented the idea of the presence of the *Other*. This notion of ethics precedes the traditional metaphysical concept of ethics. Derrida says that Levinas, in this way, tries to correct the Greeks' indifference to the *Other*. So, Levinas calls his concept of the ethics as "the first philosophy" which can liberate us from the clutches of the Western metaphysics. However, in the last part of his famous text "*Violence and Metaphysics*", Derrida also chastises the concept of "*superior empiricism*"---as given by Levinas - whose first and foremost philosophical flaw is that it intends to present itself as a philosophy in any way (Eagleton, 2009).

References

Atkins, D. G. (1983). *Reading Deconstruction: Deconstructive Reading.* Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky.

Arato, F. (2014). Deconstruction of Education. *The Hungarian Educational Research Journal, 4*(2).

Baring, E. (2011). *The Young Derrida and French Philosophy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baring, E. (2014). *Derrida and the Problems of History of Philosophy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biesta, Bert, J. J., & Egea-Kuehne, D. (2001). *Derrida and Education.* New York, London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge, New York.

Caputo, J. D. (1993). *Against ethics: Contributions to a poetics of obligation with constant reference to deconstruction.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Cooper, D. E. (2006). *Postmodernism: A Companion to the Philosophy of Education* Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing.

Culler, J. (1997). *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Derrida, J. (2002). *Who's Afraid of Philosophy: Right to Philosophy.* Trans. Jan Plug. California: Stanford University Press.

Eagleton, T. (2009), *Troubles With Strangers: A Study of Ethics* . NJ: Willy-Blackwell Publications.

Elam, D. (1994). *Feminism and Deconstruction.* London/New York: Routledge.

Ferguson, M. (1992). *Feminism and Postmodernism.* North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Gadamer, H. G. (2004). *Truth and Method*, Trans. Joel Weinsheimer, Donald G. Marshall (2nd ed.). London/New: York Continuum.

Gaston, S. (2007). *Starting with Derrida: Plato, Aristotle and Hegel.* New York: Continuum Publications.

Grosz, E. (1989). *Sexual Subversions.* NSW: Allen and Unwin.

Hamilton, W., Altizer, & Thomson, J. J. (1966). *Radical Theology and the Death of God* Indiana: Bobbs Merrill.

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time.* New York: Harper and Row.

Hart, K. (2000). *The Trespass of the Sign.* New York: Fordham University Press.

Kant, I. (2012). *Critique of the Practical Reason,* Tans. Philip Rudissil (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kates, J. (2008). *Fielding Derrida: Philosophy, Literary Criticism, History, and the Work of Deconstruction.* New York: Fordham University Press.

Ludemann, S. (2014). *Politics of Deconstruction: A New Introduction to Jacques Derrida*, Trans. Erick Butler. California: Stanford University Press, California.

McQuillan, M. (2007). *The Politics of Deconstruction.* London: Pluto Press.

Mouffe, C. (2005). *On the Political.* New York: Routledge.

Nicholson, L. J. (1990). *Feminism/Postmodernism.* London: Routledge, London.

Ornstein, A. C., & Levine, D. U. (2008). *Foundations of Education.* New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Peeters, B. (2013). *Derrida: A Biography. Trans. Andrew Brown.* Cambridge: Cambridge Polity Press.

Rorty, R. (1982). *Consequences of Pragmatism.* Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Scot, J. W. (1988). *Gender and the Politics of History.* Columbia: Columbia University Press.

Sherwood, K. H. (2005). *Derrida and Religion: Other Testaments.* London/New York, Routledge.

Siebers, T. (1998). *The Subject and the Other Subjects*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Silverman, H. J. (1988). *Postmodernism and Continental Philosophy* New York: State University Press.

Sim, S. (1998). *The Routledge Companion to Postmodernism.* London: Routledge.

Taylor, M. C. (1984). *Erring: A Postmodern A/ Theology.* London/Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Trifonas, P. P. (2000). *Revolutionary Pedagogies: Cultural Politics, Education and Discourse of Theory.* New York: Routledge.

Tyson, L. (2006). *Critical Theory Today: A User Friendly Guide.* New York: Routledge.

Upton, C. (2002). *The System of Antichrist: Truth and Falsehood in Postmodernism and the New Age.* New York: Sophia Perennis.

Ward, G. (2001). *The Blackwell Companion to Postmodern Theology.* NJ: Blackwell Publications.