# Playing upon knowledge through language games: Lyotard's '*The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*'

Ali Ammar[1] | Mooneer Yousaf [2] | Kashif Ahmad[3] | Syed Attia Bibi*[4]

1. Department of English, Govt. Gordon College Rawalpindi, Pakistan.
2. Secondary Education Department (SED), Punjab, Pakistan.
3. Department of English, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan, Pakistan.
4. Department of English, Bacha Khan University, Charsadda, Pakistan.

*Corresponding Author Email: syedattia.eng@bkuc.edu.pk

**Abstract:**

Lyotard's seminal work The Postmodern Condition has been considered one of the most influential works of postmodernism. It has inspired thinkers and scholars in its criticism and report of the knowledge and its suggestiveness of paralogies. Many scholars even today draw on his definition of postmodernism as the incredulity of metanarratives. The text has been selected to be closely read and understood from the Foucauldian viewpoint of the creation of regimes of truth which we have argued that the text is involved in the same practice of creating its hegemonic place by making certain assumptions and assertions over nature, status, and forms of knowledge. We have also contended that Lyotard's interests are involved in writing this text, particularly in the propagation of the concept of paralogies and rejection of grand narratives. The text has also been viewed from Van Dijk's perspective that certain scholars who are given value by the elite to be part of the scholarly elite control academic discourses which are specifically disseminated and propagated to influence humanity. This is how the postmodern condition has been generated, produced, disseminated, legitimized, and propagated worldwide.

**How to Cite:** Ammar, A., Yousuf, M., Ahmad, K., & Bibi, S. A. (2022). Playing upon knowledge through language games: Lyotard's '*The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*'. *Journal of Humanities, Social and Management Sciences (JHSMS), 3*(2), 62-75. https://doi.org/10.47264/idea.jhsms/3.2.4

**Publisher's Note:** IDEA Publishers (IDEA Journals Group) stands neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in the published maps and institutional affiliations.

_____

## 1.    Introduction

As Foucault says that each society has its own "regime of truth", the types of discourses that are accepted to be true, the "mechanism and instances" that differentiate between the "true and false", the ways these are accepted, the "techniques and procedures" which give these value, and the "status" of the intelligentsia whose words are accorded to be true (Foucault, in Rabinow, 1991, p. 73), It is contended here that, in defining, generating, disseminating, and using knowledge, there are also regimes of truths which are beyond geographical boundaries and have set on and influenced the discourse of various disciplines including the critical theory as well to serve certain vested interests. Knowledge and power have been synonymously used by Foucault since the objectives of knowledge and power are similar i.e., establishing control (Foucault, 1977, p. 188). The relationship between power and knowledge is extremely closer for through knowing, control is established and maintained, and through control, knowing becomes possible. The idea has been furthered by Van Dijk who argues that the actors who wield power in society "not only communicative action, but indirectly also the minds of recipients" (1995, p. 21). The discourses have such influential power that the minds as well as the actions of the people are controlled by those who produce these discourses. The scholars, who are given value, control academic discourse" through various means including the "lessons, textbooks, courses and scholarly publications" (Van Dijk 1995, p. 20).

It is not just the production of discourse responsible for the control, but the dissemination of the discourse is also an important factor. Truths are, thus, developed and established on scientific and logical grounds geared with political and economic gains and are constantly fed to the consumers with deliberate mediations within it so that the demand and supply chain of the "political economy of truth" is maintained. Media and education system are also significant tools serving the purpose of this control and influence through discourse (Foucault, in Rabinow, 1995, p. 73). Having said that, the truth does not remain an objective neutral reality of liberal humanists rather a social construct that could be played upon and modified through any coercive intellectual means by the scholars that are given control, status and value through the discourses as well denoting the societal control of new knowledge (Stehr 2004; 2003, p. 4). Knowledge and truths are more matters of "management" rather than neutral and aesthetic dedication to the thirst for true knowledge (Fuller, 2001, p. 24). The beginnings of the "politics of knowledge" can be traced to 1950s or post-nuclear explosion event (Weart 1988, p. 34), the times which also roughly mark the beginning of postmodernism in literary theory (Huyssen 1986, p. 188).

It is argued in this paper that the concept of the politics of knowledge is not just confined to the new knowledge of sciences and social sciences (Rodrigues, 2002) rather in the field of knowledge, the echoes of the governance of knowledge resound very high even in the works of the scholars who exercise control over discourses (Said, 1993, p. 306). In doing so, they seem to impose their own ideological agenda by inducing specific ideologies to replace the old ones. Being in a position of control and higher scholarly status and having access to mechanism and procedures of discourse dissemination, their discourse also functions as new knowledge and can be studied under the broader viewpoint of politics of knowledge. Jean Francois Lyotard is also one of those popular writers who produced and disseminated specific discourses and tried to define knowledge giving out truths of its own kind and have constructed specific ideologies. A lot has been debated, discussed, analysed, evaluated, and argued on the concepts of Lyotard from various perspectives like comparing modernism and postmodernism,

_____

Habermas and Lyotard, study of his concepts of performativity and meta-narratives and so on (Nuyen 2004; Smith 2001; Steurman 2012; Usher 2006).

However, conducting a close analysis of his text, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (1984), in the theoretical underpinnings of Foucault's concepts of knowledge, power and truth (Foucault, in Rabinow 1995, p. 51-76) is an appropriate gap to argue that the discourses of knowledge and power are the part of politics of knowledge. There seem to be deliberate attempts to reason out certain truths, withheld to be true in the past, through the rejection of peculiar ideologies and the propagation of certain other ideologies. This process of rejection and propagation can be found in the discourses produced by Lyotard, Therefore, one of his very popular work *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* written in 1979 originally in French and translated in 1984 in English by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi has been selected. There is also an important question of *what next?* aligned within the periphery of this paper to suggest certain concepts which could define or re-define or re-instate knowledge and its pursuits.

## 2.    Literature review and theoretical framework

Lyotard's *A Report on Knowledge* (1984) is a seminal and ground breaking work which has been used as reference book by many researchers like Vanhoozer (2003) in the study of theology from postmodern perspective; Peters (2003) in re-evaluating Lyotard for the field of education; Clark (1995) in using it as theoretical perspective for the study of contemporary short fiction; Kellinikos (1997) in studying the relationship among science, knowledge and society; and list of such works goes on. Roberts' (2013) comments on Lyotard's work are undoubtedly acknowledged by majority of the scholars that "It is not hard to see why the book has been so influential. *The Postmodern Condition* provides a highly prophetic account of sweeping changes in key areas of economic, social, and educational life" (p. 27). Yet, there have also been scholarly works in criticizing Lyotard's views like that of Haber's (1994) to present his "politics of difference" (p. 02) by pointing out not just the "useful" but also the "harmful" in him (p. 03). Haber's primary concern, however, is the rejection of Lyotard, Rotary and Foucault's attempts of "universalizing the difference" (p. 05) on the grounds that if universality of totality is rejected by these scholars so must the universality of difference be also contended on the same thesis of logic and concepts. Hence, both are necessary for each other, and subject-in-community is the real politics of difference, which is lacking in the postmodern thinker and propagators.

Berube's (2007) comments on Lyotard's works that his ideas are indispensable for the contemporary reader and that following him would make us accept the irrefutable differences among the humans, ideas and their cultures and that not following him will keep us lurking in the fantasy of mediating and sorting out the essential differences between the reason and non-reason through "double-dose" of reason, are just one of the tributes to Lyotard which place him among the must-readable writers of contemporary era. While some scholars consider his works indispensable for the understanding of contemporary state of knowledge and its production, yet there are others who accept the importance of his works and yet are suggestive of changes to his certain ideas. Presner's (2010) work on digital humanities could be taken up as an example here who suggests that universities in the twenty first century are the ideal places of digital humanities who could legitimise the knowledge using contemporary technologically advanced features of technology. The potential is there in the universities, but all these have to

do is to capitalize and utilize that potential in creation, legitimization and dissemination of knowledge. Whereas Lyotard (1984) who contended and questioned this traditional role of the universities that knowledge could only be legitimized through paralogy or little narratives respecting the differences (p. 66).

Commissioned to write a report on how knowledge is being acquired and dealt with in the world, Lyotard (1984) came up with this book of *A Postmodern Condition: A Report on knowledge* which became one of his most quoted and popular books in the world. Malpas (2003) argues that a report is based on the concrete evidence and is followed by conclusions based on the extensive evidence (p. 17), therefore, this book must be better understood as a report. However, in the study of the report, the reliability and the self of the writer cannot be missed at all completely (Hunt, 2006). Lyotard was a Marxist in the beginning and was disillusioned by the practices of Marxism in Algeria and came back to Paris and kept on reworking on the ideas of Marxism which could be "more radical for contemporary politics" (Maplas, 2003, p. 05). Either he was a neo-marxist or Marxist in his own way, but one thing stands out to be clear that he was not at all in favour of capitalism. Within the book under discussion, there are clear references and voices against capitalism particularly the most powerful one of using knowledge as commodity by the capitalists for their own gains all over the world. As Lyotard (1984) states, "Knowledge is and will be produced in order to be sold, it is and will be consumed in order to be valorized in a new product" (p. 04). Many pro-Lyotardian thinkers, later, regarded him as prophetic in his sayings as whatever Lyotard said in 70s came to be true in the next decades as the elite corporations sold specific forms of knowledge to the world by making these as valuable new products. For the powerful and the selected elites, the spin over the criterion of the legitimization has never been any unsettled phenomenon.

However, a distinction between knowledge and information needs to be clearly made here for a better understanding of the report. Information is the gathering of data in an organized form (Saint-Onge, 2002), while Knowledge is a "creditable true belief" generated from experiences and intellectual abilities (Greco, 2007, p. 57). The purpose of knowledge is "to flag good information and good sources of information for use in practical reasoning (p. 60) and to arrive at the "true and justified belief" (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). Lyotard seems to use these two words synonymously which is negation of the characteristics of either of the one. This synonymous use of the word is evident in the foreword by Jameson of this book in the very first sentence as "knowledge or information" (p. vii). Lyotard points out that "Knowledge in the form of an informational commodity indispensable to productive power is already, and will continue to be, a major—perhaps *the* major—stake in the worldwide competition for power" (p. 5). This is the acceptance of the current condition of mixing up of knowledge and information. In the rest of the sections of the book wherever the word knowledge is used, in most of the cases, it is associated with the flow of information in the computerized world and its political control and use by the powerful.

The placement of altogether two different concepts and their alternate use in the report may be either because of the reason that the writer is not aware of the differences which is very unlikely since the writer has admitted that he is a "philosopher" (p. xxv); or the writer does not want to engage into the distinction between the knowledge and information which also does not seem to be the case for the writer seems to be very well aware of the difference between the two as the above lines taken from his book suggest; or the writer is intentionally mixing up these two

concepts. This idea of intentionality may be deliberated upon and the natural question that might arise here is, of course, what that intention may be. The intention suggested here is that of expanding the postmodern regime of truth. It is to develop a postmodern condition, a kind of metanarrative of its kind that would look at the world from a specific anti-capitalistic, anti-modernistic, and anti-metanarrative perspective. This in a way serves and has served the very end of capitalism by making its task easier to approach the world and ascertain its control through corporations, both political and economic, by managing hegemonic practices through information. By the management of hegemonic practices, it is meant here all the steps that are taken by a corporate culture including generation, production, dissemination, and withholding of information for its implicit interests.

## 3.      Research methodology

The research method selected for this article is close reading. Close reading is selected as the most suitable data analysis technique for literary texts. In the popular texts by I. A. Richards' *Practical Criticism* written in 1930 and *Seven Types of Ambiguity* by Richards's student William Empson in 1930, a method of understanding and evaluating literary writings was postulated with the name of close reading. It is an act of reading closely and diligently as was suggested by William Cave in 1673. Richards (1930/2008, p. 203) also asserts that all respectable poetry invites close reading. With the passage of time there have been different changes in the concept of practice of close reading. Although it is grounded in the theory of new criticism which did not take author reality into consideration while evaluating the text, but later on the intention and aim of the author was also made part of this research analysis method. Coleman and Pimentel (2012, p. 05) suggest that close reading involves the careful examination of the complex texts in depth and references from the original text to support the responses. However, Wiggins (2013) states in his blog on "What close reading actually means?" that "the goal is to understand what the author is doing and accomplishing, and what it means; the goal is not to respond personally to what the author is doing". Close reading operates on the premise that literature, as artifice, will be more fully understood and appreciated to the extent that the nature and interrelations of its parts are perceived, and that that understanding will take the form of insight into the theme of the work in question. The standards in conducting close reading of the selected text, as Fisher and Frey (2014, p. 52) posit, include the study of key ideas and details, craft and structure, integration of knowledge and ideas, and the comprehension of complex literary and informal texts independently and proficiently. In this research work, close reading has been conducted of the prison writings of the selected poets keeping in view the author and his life.

## 4.      Results, analysis, and discussion

The book begins by the arguing that with the change in how knowledge is acquired in the world, the "nature of knowledge cannot survive within this context of general transformation" (p. 04).  That general transformation is that "the miniaturization and commercialization of machines is already changing the way in which learning is acquired, classified, made available and exploited" (p. 04). The tools that help in research and dissemination of knowledge have changed. Knowledge is the hypothetical thesis of the book which has been attempted to be validated by Lyotard by quoting more than 200 references and evidence in the book. It is like machines taking control of credible true beliefs of humans and defining them through the language games. The narrative of recorded history that the production of paper and the

_____

invention of printing machines disseminated knowledge to maximum number of people in the world stands untrue if hypothesis of Lyotard is taken up as valid and verified. Did the printing machines, since their invention, start defining the nature of knowledge? The answer of course will be an enlightened no. Arguably, the machines have given far greater access to the information as well as the knowledge to the people but it, by any means, does not change the nature of knowledge unless we hold this one-sided perspective to be true that we are in a postmodern condition. But here the reference to the metanarrative of history is given to define the limitation of Lyotard's hypothesis. But, for this hypothesis to be held to be true, there are certain other concepts which need to be challenged otherwise those concepts would root out this hypothesis.

One such concept is the "incredulity toward metanarratives" (p. xxiv). The book overall is a journey based on arguments starting from the doubt and rejection of metanarratives to the suggestion of "paralogy" as an end to define the rules of legitimization of knowledge. "This credulity in turn is due to the progress in science; but that progress in turn presupposes it" (p. xxiv). Was there no time in history that the incredulity towards grand narrative was going on? What were the Greeks or Romans or Arabs or classical European philosophers questioning when they stood against the grand narratives of their times? Lyotard further argues that it is to the "obsolescence of the metanarrative apparatus" (p. xxiv), the apparatus that consists of great hero, great goal, great quest, and great dangers is losing its function. World literature has this apparatus to the full and with the interest of the large number of people in it. Powerful and great heroes in the media industry of film genre Game of thrones, Harry Potter and Ertugrul for their worldwide popularity and influence, and Avengers are just few examples, characters facing all the above greats in the discipline of literature Okonkwo, Estha, Olanna, Shams Tabraiz, Changez, Everdeen, Anderson and so on; while philosophers like Rorty, Bloch, Synders, Scruton, Iqbal, al-Faruqi, Rahman, Hassan, Nussbaum, Zizek, West, Gu Su, and so on delving into the great metanarratives of the philosophy with metaphysical and physical questions of the whatness, whyness, and howness of the Being are all there still sprouting.

The study of each case would elaborate and explain how each hero/character of any discipline of knowledge is making reference to a grand narrative and expanding the discussion from that grand narrative onwards, some asserting and reasserting while the others rejecting. In the grand narrative of history, philosophy and literatures around the world, all these practices have been going on. Their contemporary popularity and references still suggest that there is no case of "incredulity" unless when one is bent upon suggesting and propagating it. As a philosopher, any appealing course of thought can be logically proceeded in positive. Then there may arise the very question of defining metanarrative or grand narrative. Narrative has always been regarded as "the quintessential form of customary knowledge" (p. 19), which "determines in a single stroke what one must say in order to be heard, what one must listen to in order to speak, and what role one must play ... to be the object of a narrative" (p. 21). As Maplas (2003) puts it that the grand narrative is "used to organise knowledge, categorise its usefulness for humanity and direct it towards a goal" (p. 30). Are the above examples not organizing knowledge and categorizing it for the usefulness of humanity and directing it towards a goal? Yes, these are doing all these things. The goals are set the way Lyotard set a goal and directed all these efforts and evidence to substantiate the relevance of paralogy.

The goal that "let us wage war on totality; let us be witnesses to the unpresentable, let us activate the different and save the honour of the name" (Lyotard, 1984, p. 82) is set to be against

totality and living respectfully with the differences. The issue with the grand narrative is its being a totality for Lyotard. Yet, each narrative remains in its totality in each point of time until it is expanded and developed by the forthcoming scholar. After the development by the scholar, that narrative would in a state of totality until further modified by the thinker. Another dimension of being incredulous with the metanarrative is its being universal for Lyotard because he opposes the "universal consensus" as suggested by Habermas (p. 60). "The grand narrative has lost its credibility, regardless of what mode of unification is uses, regardless of whether it is a speculative narrative or a narrative of emancipation" (p. 37). Universal consensus is an attempt at unification which seems improbable and impossible to Lyotard. Yet, there are certain elements in the individual and social composition of human beings that are universal and based on these elements, the responses could also be universal or even the very act of questioning on or about the universe is a universal phenomenon appealing for majority of the population in the world. The thirst for justice, the element of fear, hope, depression, of being related to any grand narrative for reclusion, solace, or refuge, for finding meanings in life etc. are all universal elements present in man on this planet. Therefore, there are new ways of looking at things sprouting again and again. But these endeavours are never without reference to the grand narrative(s). The word reference here does not just mean giving a passing allusion to some idea or experience rather it is like standing upon those shores of metanarratives and looking further, deeper, and more profound. Yet, all this is being doubted upon because the war needs to be waged against metanarratives by Lyotard.

Then there are two types of discourses i.e., discourse of the scientific knowledge and narrative knowledge argued upon by Lyotard (1984, p. 11). "Scientific knowledge does not represent the totality of knowledge; it has always existed in addition to, and in competition and conflict with, another kind of knowledge, which I will call narratives in the interest of simplicity" (p. 07). Lyotard sees a decline in both the narratives due to two major reasons i.e., World War II, "which has shifted emphasis from the ends of action to this means" and liberal capitalism (p. 38). So, it seems that Lyotard's attention on computerization and its impact on the change in the very nature of knowledge is a greater focus on the means i.e., advancement in technology than the ends i.e., knowledge. The means seem to justify the ends rather than ends justifying the means for Lyotard. The very reasons which are being considered for downfall of narratives are part of the grand narratives of history, economics, politics etc. hence it is to be accepted here that grand narratives have a reality of their own and the next stage is that of dealing with these metanarratives. Lyotard tried to deal in his own way in the report but at the same time he has not been incredulous towards all the grand narratives. For example, he takes up the concept of "Language Games" from Wittgenstein, a renowned Austrian philosopher associated with the metanarrative of logical positivism and later with behaviourism and pragmatism during the age of modernism; this very concept has its roots in metanarratives of specific disciplines of knowledge. Lyotard is not "incredulous" about this concept of language games, rather, he takes it up and uses it to arrive at his concept of paralogy. But he is incredulous towards many other concepts chiefly the one of grand narratives. But this condition is in no way generalizable to the very nature of knowledge. It could be a temporary passing over phase, an attitude which has also been greatly superseded by the contemporary concepts of metamodernism, digimodernism, performatism, hypermodernism and so on (Eshelman, 2008).

> Language games are the part and parcel of human existence for Lyotard (1984),
> A *self* does not amount to much, but no self is an island … [E]ven before he is
> born, if only by virtue of the name he is given, the human child is already

positioned as the referent of a story recounted by those around him, in relation to which he will inevitably chart his course (p. 15).

There is a devaluation of the role of *self* in a man's life for Lyotard. Whereas, the very definition of knowledge entails the involvement of experiences, whose internalization takes place within the *self* and this *self*-amounts to a lot in the acquisition of knowledge. Furthermore, Lyotard suggests that man would "chart his course" based on the narrative that is there around him. This view can be related to two different narratives in the field of language and psychology. As each narrative is presupposed to be based on discourse that consists of language games having its own particular set of rules (p. 10), then language seems to shape the self of man, a view prevalent in the metanarrative of linguistics as discussed by Boroditsky (2011) that language shapes thoughts which are translated into actions. Or this influence of the narrative around the man could be associated with another metanarrative in psychology society is shaping human mind (Brothers, 2001). Both narratives are not *petit* but are the part of metanarratives in different disciplines of knowledge followed, discussed, and extended upon by many thinkers and scholars in the world. The difference between the grand and the petit narratives needs to be further elaborated here for more clarity. The examples of grand narratives as given by Lyotard are, "… some grand narratives, such as the dialectics of Spirit, the hermeneutics of meaning, the emancipation of the rational and working subject, or the creation of wealth" (p. xxiii).

Metanarratives that set the rules of narration and language games are speculative and emancipatory grand narratives as their central types. The speculative grand narrative is based on Hegalian concept that human life (Spirit) moves forward with the progress in knowledge. Thus, knowledge decides the truths and untruths in the world. The second grand narrative of emancipation takes knowledge that sets man free in the world. Knowledge is not the end rather means to the end of liberty of man. However, the disillusionment from grand narratives of Lyotard comes forward when he argues that both the grand narratives have failed in either granting truth or freedom to mankind. The problems of the world have not been resolved in any case and this is the reason that there is a doubt on the grand narratives (p. 37). This is the actual credulity from which Lyotard seems to suffer. It is form this point that Lyotard takes a departure and argues that the postmodern condition of knowledge is driven to achieve the aims of profitability and performativity (p. 41). Capitalism has taken control of everything related to the generation, production, research, and dissemination of knowledge whose aim is only the profit. But we would like to touch upon a point that we have previously made in the paper that the concepts of knowledge and information have been synonymously used by Lyotard. What capitalism has done is to establish the control over information. The control over knowledge whose aim is to disseminate true and just beliefs to the people based on the learnings and experiences has not been there completely by the hands of capitalism.

The dissemination of true knowledge has also become limited, but it has not been completely wiped out. It can be better understood through the analogy of a cruel king who rules a country for a certain period and does not allow any resistance to come forth in public and puts all his energies and resources to crush the voices of resistance based on truth and justice. But there are/have been and will always be voices of resistance. The numbers of voices may be very few or even less than few or may also be very high in different times. But the voices are and will be there always until the king dies or is killed and voices grow out to be stronger. The nature and status of voice stays same with the same goals of truth and freedom. This is how the

moment of capitalism and postmodernism has served the world. The grip on technology by the powerful has no doubt been strong and specific information could easily be withheld or disseminated as per the will of the elites, but still there are voices of resistance. To give just one example of voices of resistance in 20th century against imperialism like Edward Said, Noam Chomsky, and Iqbal Ahmed, who, belonging to grand narrative of emancipation have been successful in voicing their ideas out loud in the world. There may also have been many voices that could have been silenced by the capitalists, elites and the ruling intelligentsia with their specific profit-making interests.

Truth and justice that were the basis of speculative and emancipatory grand narratives in modernism are not any more appealing to mankind because these have failed as Lyotard points out. Well, these have failed many times before also in the history, which is also a grand narrative if grand narrative is to be defined as having a specific common goal for serving humanity in any way. Was there no death by hemlock of a philosopher among the Greeks, or was there no imprisonment of a scientist among the Europeans, or was there no burning of the libraries and the intellectuals among the Eastern, Africans, Asians? Had we called it the failure of truth and justice and opted for paralogy or anything other than grand narratives for common good of people, would there have been this much progress of humanity? It is in human nature to keep on striving for good in the world no matter what numbers or power or capacity they are in. since the call for the death of the metanarratives, there are still voices of resistance claiming that vaporizing of grand narratives would end all that man has achieved in this world and things would go back to cave age starting everything anew. Postmodernism, is, thus, dehumanizing of humans, perhaps more than capitalism could do. This condition has permeated in the very fabric of every discipline of knowledge and hence dangerous for development and progress for common good of man, more than covid-19 where survivors ratio is very high.

The postmodern condition is thus not just a report, but it has also made certain assertions based on which Lyotard has tried to justify the rationality of "little narratives". While saying that the knowledge "is and will be produced in order to be sold" (p. 04) is to stamp on the depressiveness on human condition that it is never going to find solutions to its problems. Yet this depressiveness has been enjoyed in the past few decades and is being challenged by the thinkers who are involved in announcing the death of postmodernism.

By announcing the dismemberment and fragmentation of grand narratives, human existence and knowledge are reduced to "language games". The purpose of these language games is to allow the differences based on paralogy which could be literally defined as bad or false logic (Malpas, 2003, p. 30). It is through paralogy that Lyotard wants to come to an "idea and practice of justice that is not linked to that of consensus" (p. 66). This is the very idea through which Lyotard tries to outline a "politics that would respect both the desire for justice and the desire for the unknown" (p. 67). But the problem here is that Lyotard sees paralogy as an end in itself not the means. Like the end of knowledge is freedom, justice, true belief, or the common good of the mankind, in Lyotard's politics it is paralogy that would keep on generating new statements legitimized through common rule or metaprescriptions. The end is then again not consensus (p. 65) but paralogy, the dialogue of a new language game which could also break away the capitalist traditions. It is more like getting connected with the idea of Sophists in one way of creating such rhetoric that the purpose is to win over the other. Hence, there would remain nothing else but the play with the words or language games. The better the command

over playing these games, the better and more successful the player will be. But what end does this kind of politics seem to serve?

If the goal of capitalism to control knowledge and maximize profit through working in various dimensions of knowledge, the universities, and institutions all over the world need to develop dialogues (paralogies) and new statements and gather the ruling intelligentsia to keep the differences rolling with respect for the differend and differences of each other. This is what is happening. Symposiums, dialogues, commissions, knowledge production and dissemination agencies, laboratories, research, validating and authenticating bodies, regulatory bodies, and so on are all involved all over the world to keep offering paralogies at regular intervals with maximization of profits for the ruling capitalist elites who own majority of the universities in the world. The paralogy is never going to stop at just breaking away the traditions of capitalism, which it serves. More so, it is to break away the traditions of grand narratives for the common good of mankind. In a postmodern condition of control over knowledge, the commissioning, generation, production, and dissemination of Lyotard's book and the expansion of its influence worldwide is suggestive that Lyotard's proposition and propagation of paralogy and incredulity of metanarratives is serving the end of limitizing and legitimizing the goal and spirit of knowledge to language games for capitalists. Postmodern condition, a regime of truth, is created to keep the dice rolling and profit-making industry of information and technology may keep on maximizing itself. Whereas the voices of sages, philosophers, and seekers of true knowledge have always been loud and clear against such industriousness and performativity of knowledge and information. The paralogy that allows every individual to offer his new statements of difference with the assurance that these would be respected thus becomes and end that blurs the difference between the benefit of mankind and the profit of the capitalists. This blurring of the visions has always been contended in the grand narratives of speculation as well as emancipation or in any other type.

## 5.    Conclusion

This brings us to raise certain questions on the very nature of the postmodern condition. These very questions in fact stem out from the reading of *The Postmodern Condition*. When a self is made up of the language games, the set of rules in which he is born, what is the relevance of human choices in this regard? Is it not aligning with the philosophical debate of the fate and choice, a type of centuries old grand narrative of speculation? What is reliable? Or nothing is reliable in this world for man? What is the point in negating what is inside man, the essential core of human existence that drives him other than the language games in which he is born? What purpose(s) are going to be achieved through language games whose "goal is no longer truth" (p. 46)? If truth is not the goal, then anything being put forth by language games will be untruth, because are things not understood by their opposites in this world? In this way, does the survival of little narratives not depend on the existence of grand narratives? What matters the most, knowledge in itself or how the knowledge is being used? If knowledge does not aim at solving the problems of humans, will the problems of mankind and get solved on its own? Will there be no more new problems for which new knowledge will be required? Or should mankind be left with their self-legitimized little narratives if one such narrative be of the annihilation of this planet? How could the difference between the grand narratives and little narratives be made? Who would legitimate this difference? The idea and practice of justice involves more than one individual and a common criterion on which things could be judged. The judgment and justice are required when there is a conflict and without a magna carta or a

grand narrative to differentiate between the right and the wrong, how can justice be served? if there is constant fragmentation to the core, justice can never be delivered in any form. To be left with the diverse range of language games (p. 61) is to have nothing to rely on for language games keep on changing. Like the reliance on language games is temporary, so is the postmodern condition which has started to be waning in the current times as is obvious in the writings of the contemporary thinkers (Eshelman, 2008). When Lyotard argues that "the moment knowledge ceases to be an end in itself—its realization of The Idea or the emancipation of men—its transmission is no longer the exclusive responsibility of scholars and students" (p. 50), what then remains the responsibility of the scholars and students?

**Declaration of conflict of interest**

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest(s) with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

**ORCID iD**

1. Ali Ammar https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6599-8583

2. Mooneer Yousaf https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6552-2382

3. Syed Attia Bibi https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0218-0485

## References

Baudrillard, J. (1994). *The illusion of the end.* trans. Chris Turner. Polity.

Bérubé, M. (2007). *Rhetorical occasions: essays on humans and the humanities*. University of North Carolina. https://uncpress.org/book/9780807877388/rhetorical-occasions/

Boroditsky, L. (2011). How language shapes thought. *Scientific American*, *304*(2), 62-65. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26002395

Brothers, L. (2001). *Friday's footprint: how society shapes the human mind*. Oxford University.

Browning, G. (2000). *Lyotard and the end of grand narratives.* University of Wales.

Carroll, D. (1987). *Paraestlietics: Foucault, Lyotard, Derrida.* Methuen.

Cave, W. (1676). *Primitive Christianity: Or, The Religion of the Ancient Christians in the First Ages of the Gospel. In Three Parts*. J.G.

Clark, M. M. (1995). Contemporary short fiction and the postmodern condition. *Studies in Short Fiction*, *32*(2), 147-160. https://www.proquest.com/docview/1297937454

Coleman, D., & Pimentel, S. (2012). Revised publishers' criteria for the common core state standards in English language arts and literacy, grades 3–12. Common Core Standards Initiative. https://www.corestandards.org/assets/Publishers_Criteria_for_3-12.pdf

Eagleton, T. (1990). *The ideology of the aesthetic.* Blackwell.

_____ (1996) *The illusions of postmodernism.* Blackwell.

Empson, W. (1930/1973). Seven types of ambiguity (2nd ed.). Penguin.

Eshelman, R. (2008). Performatism or the end of postmodernism. Aurora. *Davies Group*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237837509_Performatism_or_the_End_of_Postmodernism_Aurora_Davies_Group_2008

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2014). *Checking for understanding: formative assessment techniques for your classroom.* ASCD. Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2014). *Checking for understanding: Formative assessment techniques for your classroom.* ASCD

Fuller, S. (2001). *Knowledge management foundations*. Butterworth-Heinemann.

Foucault, M. (1975/1977). *Surveiller et punir*, Paris: Gallimard. Translated as *Discipline and Punish*, Alan Sheridan (trans.). Pantheon, 1977. https://monoskop.org/images/4/43/Foucault_Michel_Discipline_and_Punish_The_Birth_of_the_Prison_1977_1995.pdf

Foucault, M. (1991). *Discipline and punish: the birth of a prison*. Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1998). *The history of sexuality: the will to knowledge*. Penguin.

Gaventa, J. (2003). *Power after Lukes: a review of the literature*. Institute of Development Studies. http://www.powercube.net/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/power_after_lukes.pdf

Greco, J. (2007). The nature of ability and the purpose of knowledge. *Philosophical Issues*, Vol. 17, The Metaphysics of Epistemology, 57-69. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1533-6077.2007.00122.x

Haber, H. F. (1994). *Beyond postmodern politics: Lyotard, Rorty, Foucault*. Psychology.

Habermas, J. (1987). *The philosophical discourse of modernity: twelve lectures.* Trans. Frederick Lawrence: Polity.

Hayward, C. R. (1998). De-Facing Power. *Polity*. 31(1). https://assets.cambridge.org/97805217/80797/sample/9780521780797ws.pdf

Hegel, G. W. F. (1969) *Science of Logic.* trans. A. V. Miller, George Allen & Unwin.

_____

Hilary J. (1997). Critical discourse analysis as a research tool. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 18(3), 329-342. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0159630970180302

Hutcheon, L. (1988). *A poetics of postmodernism.* Routledge.

_____ (1989). *The politics of postmodernism.* Routledge.

Hutchings, K. (1996). *Kant, critique and politics.* Routledge.

Hunt, C., & Sampson, F. (2006). *Writing: self and reflexivity*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Huyssen, A. (1986). *After the great divide: modernism, mass culture, postmodernism*. Indiana University.

Jameson. F. (1981). *The political unconscious: narrative as a socially symbolic act.* Routledge.

Jenkins, K. (1999). *Why history? ethics and postmodernity.* Routledge.

Kallinikos, J. (1997). Science, knowledge and society: the postmodern condition revisited. *Organization*, *4*(1), 114-129. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/135050849741008?journalCode=org.

Kant, I. (1929). *Critique of pure reason.* trans. Norman Kemp Smith. Macmillan.

Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The post-modern condition: a report on knowledge.* Trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. University of Minnesota.

_____ (1989). *The Lyotard reader.* Andrew Benjamin (ed.). Blackwell.

Malpas, S. (2003). *Jean-Rancois Lyotard*. Routledge.

Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: how Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University.

Nuyen, A. T. (2004). Lyotard's postmodern ethics and information technology. *Ethics and Information Technology*, *6*(3), 185. https://www.proquest.com/openview/82d406fa7038a90933e61e943f4dd671/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=25743

Peters, M. (1995). Education and the postmodern condition: revisiting Jean-Francois Lyotard. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *29*(3), 387-400. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-9752.1995.tb00367.x

Presner, T. (2010, June 8). Digital Humanities 2.0: a report on knowledge. Zotero. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=d96803c5657b3f849d3e2600a4a3efbd686d0780

Rabinow, P. (editor) (1991). *The Foucault reader: an introduction to Foucault's thought.* Penguin.

Readings, B. (1991). *Introducing Lyotard: art and politics.* Routledge.

Richards, I. A. (1930/2008). Practical criticism V 4. Routledge.

Roberts, P. (2013). Academic dystopia: knowledge, performativity, and tertiary education. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, *35*(1), 27-43. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10714413.2013.753757?journalCode=gred20

Rodrigues, M. J. (Ed.). (2002). *The new knowledge economy in Europe: a strategy for international competitiveness and social cohesion*. Edward Elgar.

Said, E. (1993). The politics of knowledge. *Race, identity, and representation in education*, 306. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40962977

Said, E. W. (1991). The politics of knowledge. *Raritan: A Quarterly Review*, 11(1), 17- 31. http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/aasc/classweb/spring07/aas105/PoliticsKnowledge_1.pdf

_____

Saint-Onge, H. (2002, May). Linking knowledge to strategy. In *Strategic Planning for KM Conference, Toronto* (pp. 28-29). https://www.arcom.ac.uk/-docs/proceedings/ar2001-577-586_Robinson_et_al.pdf

Sim, S. (1996). *Jean-François Lyotard*. Prentice Hall. https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780190221911/obo-9780190221911-0041.xml

Smith, J. K. (2001). A little story about Metanarratives: Lyotard, religion, and postmodernism revisited. *Faith and Philosophy*, *18*(3), 353-368. https://www.pdcnet.org/scholarpdf/show?id=faithphil_2001_0018_0003_0353_0368&pdfname=faithphil_2001_0018_0003_0353_0368.pdf&file_type=pdf

Stehr, N. (2004). The social role of knowledge. In Genov, Nikolai (ed.), *Advances in Sociological Knowledge*. International Social Science Council, 84–113.

Stehr, N. (2003). The social and political control of knowledge in modern societies. *International Social Science Journal*, 55, 643 - 655.

Steuerman, E. (2012). Habermas vs Lyotard: modernity vs postmodernity? In *Judging Lyotard*. Routledge. 111-130. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780203007013-5/habermas-vs-lyotard-emilia-steuerman

Usher, R. (2006). Lyotard's performance. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *25*(4), 279-288. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11217-006-9009-z

Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese discourse*, *1*(1), 17-28. https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/55871296/Aims_of_Critical_Discourse_Analysis-libre.pdf?1519306203=&response-content-disposition=inline%3B

Vanhoozer, K. J. (2003). Theology and the condition of postmodernity. *The Cambridge companion to postmodern theology*. Cambridge University. https://philpapers.org/rec/VANTCC-14

Weart, S. R. (1988). Nuclear fear: a history of images Harvard University.

Wiggins, G. (2013, May 17). On close reading, Part 2. Granted, and . . . (blog). http://grantwiggins.wordpress.com/2013/05/17/on-close-reading-part-2/

Williams, J. (1998). *Lyotard: towards a postmodern philosophy.* Polity.