The Role of Modernist Literature in Constructing a Hedonist Society

Dr. Youcef ATTIA
Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi University, Tebessa, (Algeria)
youcefattia01@univ-tebessa.dz

Abdelaziz MENCI
Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi University - Tebessa (Algeria)
abdelaziz.menci@univ-tebessa.dz

Résumé

Cette étude examine la validité de l'hypothèse de transcendance/mort ou de modernité dans la littérature, en particulier. Elle s'interroge sur la possibilité de considérer notre époque actuelle comme une exagération de la philosophie des Lumières ou comme une rupture et une discontinuité. Dans quelle mesure peut-on considérer que la libération de la conscience humaine de toute tutelle transcendante marque un départ officiel de la conception littéraire selon laquelle la réalité n'est qu'une perception humaine et relative ? Une telle idée suppose une prise de conscience de la modernité à l'égard de la tutelle du monde symbolique/culturel, ainsi que de celle du monde littéraire.

Pour résoudre ces questions, l'étude examine la capacité de l'univers de la littérature moderniste à construire et à façonner la réalité/conscience humaine, ainsi qu'à reconstruire la société contemporaine, dominée par l'individualisme hédoniste et consumériste. Ainsi, l'objectif de cette recherche est de démontrer que la littérature constitue un capital culturel périlleux, qui pourrait être le facteur le plus déterminant dans la formation de la conscience populaire et la structuration de la vie sociale contemporaine.

Mots-clés : industrie de la conscience, individualisme, hypermodernité, littérature moderniste, société hédoniste

Abstract

This study examines the validity of the hypothesis of transcending/death or modernity in literature, specifically. The study investigates whether we can regard our current era as an exaggeration of the enlightenment's philosophy, or as a break and rupture. To what extent can we regard human consciousness's freedom from all transcendental guardianships as an official departure of the literature's understanding that reality is merely human and relative perception? Such an idea necessitates an assumption of modernism's awareness regarding the guardianship of the symbolic/cultural world, as well as the guardianship of the literary world.

Finding solutions to such issues, the study will look at the ability of modernist literature's universe to construct and shape human reality/consciousness, as well as to reconstruct the contemporary society, which is dominated by hedonist and consumerist individualism. Thus, the purpose of this study is to demonstrate that literature is a perilous cultural capital that may be the most important factor for shaping popular awareness and structuring contemporary social life.

Keywords: consciousness industry, individualism, hyper-modernity, hedonist society, Modernist literature.

Introduction:

It may be obvious that the modern world is marked by an increase in the most liberal cultural tendencies that consider no background as a basis; particularly during the rise of digital mind power, which revealed a limitless uncontrolled world. The concept of postmodernity was once thought to be a background of the digital world, and the most valid reference to overpass modernism and its great narratives, specifically for its cultural and social regularity. However, once we realize that modernism is a constant liberation and rebellion, we are plunged into uncertainty, prompting us to reinterpret the transparency of the concept of background and the concept of going beyond modernism. Our world is defined by the dominance of the symbolic/virtual world, as well as the growth of individualism as well as relativism, which were, if we review it, present in enlightenment thought and in the romantic creed itself, even if the end manifesto promoted indistinctly by occidental cultures appears to refer to invalidate modernism' assumptions, this research will debate the validity of such assumptions, and it will also envisage justifying that the modernist project is linked to the enlightenment thought, This will justify modernism's continuity to the point of inflation to be considered ultra-modernism or an exaggerated one, this may be a negation of the idea of rupture, an amplification of the Enlightenments' Thought which set assumptions alluding that the world is cognitive formulations and human constructions. As a result, the first subtitle will be "the assumption of exaggerated modernism and amplifying the enlightenments' thought" in order to answer central questions such as:

- How did the individualistic space get reformulated?
- To what extent did the philosophy of the Enlightenment and the romanticist creed figure the self-contained individual Manifesto?
-Is modernism a step beyond modernism, or is it a different kind of modernism?

This study begins with the hypothesis that enlightenment philosophy enabled people to recognize that the human world is nothing more than human constructions, interpretations, and perceptions, and that absolute truth does not exist. As a result, new concepts such as individualism, relativism, and the need to be free of any paradoxical guardianship were established. Since Romanticism to Literary Modernity, it appears that unidimensional concepts and interpretations that tempt to be completely efficient have been criticized. Probably, within the context of modernism, it was noticed that human world is perceptions and readings translated by world of symbols and signs that are free and practice their guardianship; thus, the liberating process from paradoxical guardianship was replaced by liberation from unilateralism of symbolic world and its regularity. Studies have shown how modernist literature was liberated from the traditional literary society and individualistic dogmatic guardianships, and how art debated regular cultural authority. For this purpose, the research examines the preceding issues through the second subtitle "the freedom of modernist literature from unidimensional cultural reality" to propose answers to the following questions:

- If the essence of literary modernity is rebellion and going beyond, what is the identity of reality it aspires to go beyond?
- What are the most important assumptions of modernist literature that must be liberated from the shackles of unidimensional cultural conventions and treaties?
- How did the romanticism ideology receive the views of the Enlightenment, and what does the assumption of self-contained man mean?
-To what extent does literary modernism respect the essence of romanticism?

-What is the relationship between a traditional puritan protestant social culture and modernist, artistic, literal, and critical tendencies?
- What are the most important notional views adopted by modernist literary awareness as a way to invalidate traditional views and purify concepts of shaping a false awareness referring to unidimensional reality?

Before moving on to the third subtitle, we should clarify that the methodology requires a specific order. As a result, after highlighting interpretations explaining why modernist literature was liberated from unidimensional modernist reality guardianship, the research begins discussing hypotheses of liberating modernist literature from the unidimensional individualism concept, which may appear to be an apparently beneficial chronological evolution linked to successive historical periods in accordance with a firmly objective regular succession. However, this is not the case; it is a methodological requirement that calls for a specific order for clarification, because modernist literature aspires to be free of both cultural reality guardianship and unidimensional individualism at the same time, but each involves the other: to be free of unidimensional reality guardianship must require being free of unidimensional individualism.

The research alluded to the problematic of post-structuralism proposals and their relationship with modernist literature to justify the hypothesis of freedom of modernist literature from unidimensional individualism; it attempted to justify that post-structuralism proposals cannot be interpreted as a break with or rejection of modernist literature; they are theories that find their recovery in being interested in modernist literature. The research then proved how the destruction and refutation of the dominant cultural world authority involves the refutation of unidimensional individualism and dogmatism, and how modernism authors criticized domesticated individualism and tried to free it from the power of dogmatism via the modernist author's rebellion against himself and refusal of his static and constant centrism. As a result, the hypotheses of: the author's death, the text's openness, and modernist literature going beyond dogmatic individualism are discussed. therefore, the third subtitle should be "the liberation of modernist literature from unidimensional individualism" for the purpose to answer central questions such as: - What is the relationship between poststructuralism and modernist literature?
- From a poststructuralist perspective, how did modernist literature theorize the concept of individualism?
- What are the key hypotheses underlying modernist literature's liberation from unidimensional individualism?
- How can poststructuralist intertextuality be seen as an extension of structuralist intertextuality theory?
- What is the connection between the hypotheses of textual openness and intertextuality with modernist literature, as well as freedom from guardianships of objectivity, absolute truth, freedom from totalitarian guardianship, and unilaterality of the symbolic world?

The study examines both hypotheses of depleting the idea of going beyond, as well as the one of loss of the modernity revolution's artistic distinction, especially following 1968, when assumptions of modernist literature were recognized at the social life level, resulting in an amplification of individualistic logic and a generalization of the idea of the right to be free and in recognizing freedom at the individual level in all other domains, thus, Thus, the distance between the arts and the daily system was removed, while new social and artistic legitimacy such as free expression, sanctifying pleasures, indifferentism, and nihilism emerged.

The research then discusses the emergence of the digital world, how it relates to hedonist individualism and mass culture, the way arts became an expression of the most heinous tendencies, and how imperialism invested in the digital world and looked for to possess the world of signs in order to manipulate desires and to create psychological needs that cannot be satisfied solely through capitalist market products and dominating economic societies. The fourth subtitle will be "hedonist individualism" in order to address a central question such as:

- How did modernist literature lose its critical guardianship and the role of rejecting and refuting?
- What are the social life consequences of generalizing the model of artistic and literary modernism?
-Can hedonist individualism be viewed as a by-product of modernism and an exaggeration of freedom from any regularity?
- How can the relationship between hedonist individualism, the symbolic/digital world, and consumerist capitalism be explained?

1) The hypothesis of exaggerated modernity and the amplification of the enlightenment's thought:

Jean-François Lyotard appeared to believe that modernism had come to an end, and that this end contributed to the emergence of the Postmodernism Manifesto (Lyotard, 1984, p. 15). However, one However, one of the Frankfurt School's leaders, Jurgen Habermas, argues that "modernity is an incomplete project (Habermas, 1981, p. 966) . Gilles Lipovetsky, a French sociologist, held the same view, rejecting the idea of modernism's death and rejecting the concept of postmodernism, which is viewed as a severe rupture with modernism (Lipovetski, 2012, pp. 51-52). As a result, we find Gilles Lipovetsky replacing the concept of postmodernism with others such as: second individualism, second modernity, ultra-modernism (a modernity that exaggerates modernization, amplification, and increasing consumption, resulting in an exaggerated liberation from norms and criteria).

Immanuel Kant, in Foucault's terms, had inaugurated the modernism era (Foucault, 1966, p. 192)because, after scrutinizing the theoretical mind, recognizing knowledge relativism and assuming that mind shapes the world according to its transcendental arguments and laws (the world as phenomenon) Kant deduced that this mind is not subject to any transcendental background, and that man should be guided by his own mind's findings as he must depend on himself to realize cognitive accumulations that will enable the establishing and the construction of a rational human world. In other words, "the mind, thanks to its principles and conditions, became the lawmaker and the commander of the nature which is now subsidiary to mind, before Kant it was the nature who assumed the role of lawmaker and commander of mind" (Rafia, 1991, p. 41). Since that time, there have been voices calling for the deconstruction of all imposed guardianships on human mind, and as a result, the human mind has evolved into the lawmaker, commander, and source. This free and protective mind was used for two purposes: one is the individual (correct) and the other is the public (general). As long as the human common principle is the Kantian mind, it will be seen as a law linked to the public interest that compels individuals to submit in order to comply with the public interest. Thus, the effectiveness of such a mind at the social institutional level (families) and at the political institutional level (the state). Generally speaking, the term 'kantian mind' is associated with a certain level of consistency, rationality, involvement and accountability. The idea of enlightenment refers to an objective development, and while Kant did not advocate the liberation of the individual, he did advocate a general enlightenment and the generalization of the use of the mind. The precise concept was the human subject in general. The preceding discussion may have alerted us to the fact that modernism had two major trends: individual subjectivity and general subjectivity. Individual subjectivity, according to Kantian rationalism, must be harnessed to serve a greater cause. The

Kantian mind appears to be critical and creative, but it must always consider the transition from individualism to collectivism by freely exchanging points of view and establishing an interaction in order to setup a legislative authority that will make, criticize, and amend laws in order to formulate laws and impose the state's sovereignty and the general interest, which individuals are obliged to respect but have the right to criticize freely. As a result, it is a critical, creative, and inclusive mind. Even at the moral level, general human values must be regarded as registered laws in all man's moral conscience. As consequently, the enlightenment/modernist mind was dominated by a discipline tendency that makes individuals serve the collective interest even though what is collective emerges from what is individual. Individuality, on the other hand, must always be collaborative (dialogic) and adapted to realize general interest (KANT, 1992).

Kant's enlightenment text can generally be understood as an activation of the public mind, a dialogic process that aims to produce a holistic view through cooperation, criticism, group efficiency, inquiry, and public debates. On the other hand, a citizen's commitment to his responsibilities and the law is correlated with his private mind. People must never resort to personal rebellion when there is a deficiency. They must first, after performing their legal responsibilities, debate their points of view with the public in order to reach a public consensus that can be used to develop and improve laws. Citizen must never rebel against the state because it is an incarnation of general will, or against any institution; he must first express his commitment, then discuss his views with the public who deems to be the legislator of such laws, because the state is a democratic result of public will. The individual is thus obligated to be respectful of the public will; whenever he discovers a lack of any flaw, he should not rebel alone; instead, he should initiate a debate with the public in order to improve the public will; and there must always be a consideration of the public will space that develops through freedom of criticizing. The private mind is thus obligated to respect the laws adopted by the state as a result of public will, but the mind is free and has the right to debate the public will. As a result, there must be a consistent commitment to the public will in terms of what its ongoing critical movement produces.

The Kantian man became the judge on himself (individualistic tendency), he also exists for himself without being devoted to serve anything else, even if it is transcendental thing that surpasses humanity, this can be summarized into one hypothesis: man is for himself and only for himself, it is almost the same romanticist ideology that emphasized the deconstruction of all transcendental guardianship on man and confirmed anthropocentrism. According to Karl Philip Moritz, one of the earliest romanticism revolution spokespersons at the end of the 18th century, democracy replaces hierarchy and equality replaces submission; and any creature can and must be a subject of pleasure. In response to the question, "Can man become a subject of pleasure?" Moritz responds by praising man: "Man should know how to re-examine the fact that he exists in this world for himself; he must be aware that everything in the interior of every thinking being exists in this world for a private whole, just as every private exists for the whole." We should never consider the private man only as a constrained being, but also as a noble being with intrinsic value. Man's thought is complete in and of itself (Todorov, 1986, p. 19). Tzvetan Todorov then deduces: "this is how the new hedonist society was launched" (Todorov, 1986, p. 19). As Kant rejected knowledge of things as they are in favor of the assumption of phenomena created by mind, knowledge will remain relative; thus, art renounces representing the essential in favour of representing impressions and perceptions; there are no things per se; it is the vision that generates the thing by renewing it. This ideology's relativism and Freudian principles are closer to us in this context" (Todorov, 1986, p. 31).

When we consider our digital era (the ultramodernity era), we will see that it does not call for rebellion or revolution (as Kant suggested), and that it is an era of globalized debates and knowledge, and that what is happening is a reconstruction and reformulation of the world in light of the over-globalization perspective. Individualism is the most influential because it has the legitimacy of collective support and interaction. Instead of conflict and exclusion, technological communication has activated dialogue and relativism relations, and the world is becoming more tolerant and accepting of contradictions as a result. As a result, we believe that what occurred after the 1960s was an incarnation and expansion of Kantian enlightenment thought.

Gilles Lipovetski discusses cinema, and he may believe that postmodernism, viewed as a going beyond and transgressing of modernist ambition, conceals a certain fallacy; he sees the matter as an amplification or exaggeration of modernity or an exaggerated one; however, "this modernist moment is a priori behind us, we should reveal that cinema, like the globalization society, has since entered a new modernism circle, a second modernism that we call ultra-modernism. Since the 1980s, the issue of the new modernism structure has been successfully imposed through the problematic of postmodernism, as was the case with the issue of cinema, which is in some ways our concern in this regard. Several theorists predicted the end of modernism as a depletion of great future utopia, of revolution's objectives, and the pioneers. However, the issue is whether the new concept (postmodern) is effectively set to understand the contemporaneous historical period and cinema because it is spreading during this period. We do not believe this completely, because everything points to the end of a new era of modernism by the end of the 1970s. But, rather than any type of modernism going beyond, this going beyond refers to another modernism, an ultra-modernism or a preferential one" (Lipovetski, 2012, pp. 51-52).

2) Freeing modernist literature from unidimensional cultural guardianship:

Perhaps modernism is essentially a rebellion and a going beyond; it is related to rebel against itself rather than to deconstruction of traditions; its fundamental concept is continuous deconstruction. Literary modernism is thus a rebellious culture, sanctifying liberalism and independence. We are not required to explain further; all we need to do is bringing back Rousseau and the romanticist revolution against aristocratic cultural traditions, and Baudelaire and inspiring the idea of rebellion that glorified revolutionary experiences, individual freedom, and the need to go beyond Bourgeois' traditions, moral contracts, and puritan protestant disciplinarity. As a result, "even if the bourgeoisie achieved a revolution in the field of production and exchanges, the cultural system in which it developed remained authoritative and disciplinary, or precisely puritan if we focus on the United States of America. "These ascetic protestant morals will be criticized by creative artists in the early twentieth century" (Lpovetski, 1999, p. 56).

However, we should note that, during the modernist period, artistic culture in general, and literary culture in particular, appeared to be adopting the Kantian creed, which holds that the mind does not reflect the external world as it is, and thus artistic modernism maintains a certain specificity of avoiding the trap of recognizing the existence of a given transcendental full reality that refers to an external objective metaphysic truth, "Reality is no longer considered a thing, but a process; reality is no longer a confirmed thing that exists in the exterior and that the narrator must describe; it is now a process of conflict with awareness... a collection of personal acts... a psychological performance... Something is constantly changing (becoming)" (Matz, 2004, p. 71).

Reality is simply phenomena, concepts, and interpretations created by the human mind; it is not a datum isolated from perception, nor is it a prior existing authoritative datum; rather, reality is a narration constructed and developed by mind/the human perception according to varied personal

specificity; thus, truth is relative and subjective, and reality consists of varied and multiple personal explanations and compositions; it is never a unidimensional composition, , "recent narratives confirmed continuously the personal perspective as an opposition to the traditional perfect and neutral narrative mode which suggests to be absolutely true, recent narratives focused their interest on limited incomplete and stochastic unexpected point of views in most cases" (Matz, 2004, p. 122). Pioneers of modernist culture (the culture aspiring to liberate the mind from its limitations) have repeatedly declared for a long time their refusal to live in peace with the dominance of unilateral interpretation of established concepts (considered as unique confident concepts) that define reality; this type of concepts is rejected, refuted, and denounced. In this regard, we should recall Herbert Marcus's words: "whether ritualized or not, art contains the rationality of negation. In its advanced positions, it is the Great Refusal-the protest against that which is. The modes in which man and things are made to appear, to sing and sound and speak, are modes of refuting, breaking, and recreating their factual existence. But these modes of negation pay tribute to the antagonistic society to which they are linked. Separated from the sphere of labour where society reproduces itself and its misery, the world of art which they create remains, with all its truth, a privilege and an illusion. In this form it continues, in spite of all democratization and popularization, through the nineteenth and into the twentieth century. The «high culture» in which this alienation is celebrated has its own rites and its own style. The salon, the concert, opera and theatre are designed to create and invoke another dimension of reality. Their attendance requires festive-like preparation; they cut off and transcend everyday experience" (Marcuse, 2007, pp. 66-67).

As a result, we can clearly see that the most important mission of modernist literature is to refute unilateral perceptions of reality and reject them; through this mission, modernist literature realizes new realistic hypotheses that are distinguished by their scepticism, relativism, and individualism It also aspires to be different by demonstrating a greater interest in the necessity of dissolving all conceptual authoritative contracts that have imposed a reified image of man, as they have attempted to convince him about the validity, efficiency, and veracity of a reality that is indeed a delusional promise of salvation, especially when industrial revolutions have inaugurated universes of atrocities and harnessed even children.

Because sophisticated art is a transcendental aristocratic tendency that refers to class inequality and struggles to ensure the continuity of feudal domination, artistic modernity has always avoided harnessing art to realize pragmatic purposes that go beyond individualistic privacy and that reproduces the unilateral traditional concept of reality. Thus, artistic modernism aspires to deconstruct all reification modes; art should maintain the distance of criticism, as well as the privilege of protesting the authority of dogmatic interpretations of reality; it should thus transcend totalitarianism and rigorous definitions, alluding to other dimensions of reality at all times. “As a result, it is always preferable to limit oneself to partial truths because the conviction that truth in real life is always partial. Consequently, the perfect holistic and panoramic narrative view gave way to a personal limited and focalised view toward limited truths in life, so we can say that the focalized perspective replaced the previous objective one” (Matz, 2004, p. 122).

In order to convey individualistic ambitions and deconstruct disciplinarian and the totalitarian hierarchic traditional moral rationalism at the level of bourgeois conception of the world, the protesting tone began to rise at the beginning of the 20th century. The voice of Avant-guard writers and artists also rose to express their adoption of hypotheses of rediscovering reality and redeem its formulations and concepts; it was a continuous effort to set up a democracy at the artistic level, and it is "this democracy that will legitimate all topics” (Lpovetski, 1999, p. 59). Perhaps all we need to do to make our case stronger is to recall James Augustine Aloysius Joyce's statement about Ulysse (I want to enter everything in this novel)". We discover a story about trivial, unimportant things; other things are commonplace, compiled concepts with no clear hierarchy or exclusions that are equally important as the main event. We observe a certain disregard for the events' hierarchical structure and an integration of all subject areas. The artistic approach is being added to the inventive interpretation of modern equality (Lpovetski, 1999, p. 33). It's evident that the goal of the arts is to challenge established cultural norms, particularly those that were generally practiced as a restraint against the liberating vision of modernism, which held that each person is self-sufficient, derives his identity from inside himself, and is the source of culture and relative existential truth. As a result, culture must reflect his goals, and society must uphold his rights and honor his privacy. Because of this, any cultural endeavor must originate from the essence of the human being, who is an end in and of himself. It cannot be transcendental speech that uses the individual as a tool to serve systems that may benefit one class while marginalizing others. “Foucault's research on subjugation and discourse may reveal more about the ways in which dominant subjugation forms—which aim to achieve control and discipline—are impacted by discourse” (Macdonell, 2001, p. 176).

For a considerable amount of time, modernist writers have insisted on surpassing the limitations of traditional literary society, which obstruct any liberating projects and present an

isotopic picture of life and cultural aspirations. By calling art to be concerned in itself and in its new readings, they claimed to ensure the independence of the artistic world, rather than being interested in a virtual reality that was established by literary society habits as the only legitimate interpretation of human reality and its supposedly salvation.

The modernist narrative thus aimed to "keep author personal ideas, and his individual convictions far from the content of the novel. Consequently, the modernist art was a confirmation of creative property and a promising of the individualist centrism; the artist had been struggling to free himself from individualism. Madox Ford suggested in this regard writers to not make writing an exhibition of your state" (Matz, 2004, p. 110). Additionally, there was a strong desire to free subjugated people from the grip of false awareness and creedal restrictions so that they could return to their true creeds, innate abilities, or cultural heritage (Macdonell, 2001, p. 99). As a result, modernist literature attempted to use imagination to create a more realistic artistic universe, even though realism is perceived as an unending, diverse, non-static relative individualism. Because of this, the concept of artist specificity was not linked to the social organization's hierarchy of external world topics that suppresses liberation, but rather to the world of consciousness of modernist artists; artistic freedom allows artists to challenge one-dimensional reality and create an artistic universe that transcends fragile social contracts, allowing them to give, for example, a certain beauty to the ugly and a certain aesthetic to the frivolous. "There is no better quote that sums up this idea than the one ascribed to Rimbaud during his Parisian years: painting must be liberated from the antiquated practice of photocopying in order to become a stand-alone, sublime art form, instead of simply replicating elements that elicit strong feelings, painting must employ lines, colours, marks, and borders that are effectively drawn from the outside world but are refined and simplified—a kind of genuine magic" (Mekkawi, 2021, p. 126).

Style has become a source of concern. An attempt was made to avoid the limitations of any personal affection or just simple personal affection by generalizing the experience. This led to the rejection of romantic expressionist theory, the biographical tendency, and the worship of the personality, as well as the rejection of the inspiration hypothesis. It additionally contributed to the condemnation of the reification of the arts and the tendency to turn them into commodities in the Bourgeoisie market. Generally speaking, the artistic community, which values the absolute, is a vehicle for the persistent desire to break free from the rigid, hierarchical, and traditional conceptions of the world. The intriguing statement, "I found beauty after I had fount non-existence" (Mekkawi, 2021, p. 176) may have been included in the correspondence between Stéphane Mallarmé and his friend. Nihilism is an acceptance of the absolute that allows only words in a rebellious awareness to realize it and restore the world's freshness and fascination that were harmed by antiquated linguistic, stylistic, and notional concepts. It goes beyond traditional explanations and interpretations for their limitedness, tightness, and authoritarian guardianship. The subjects of art should come from within; reality does not create art. This is the reason why modernist art, by constructing its own world and establishing its views in accordance with the logic of art itself, abolished unidimensional cultural reality.

Modernists' concepts of abstraction and eluding reality guardianship may be related to Kant's idea (phenomenon) of reformulating the world through the laws and quotations of the mind. It is remarkably similar to modernists' reformulation of art's reality, which they define as the creative force of awareness and imagination bringing an idea of creation. In general, modernist

art aimed to become independent; it was characterized by its denial of reality and the construction of a free cultural structure that transcends the limitations of conventional literary and artistic experience as well as its prevailing culture. Writers of creative works were consciously determined to create such work.

Art may be trying to validate its uniqueness and freedom by challenging conventional notions of reality in order to draw attention to itself. It is therefore always acceptable to criticize, enhance, and deconstruct such judgments and cultures because enlightenment philosophy had established relativism, the absence of absolute truth, and the fact that the world of culture, laws, and instructions are merely relative interpretations made primarily by human mind and are neither truth nor static transcendental background. The philosophical debate is now focused on escaping human interpretations that pretend to be neutral, valid, and objective while simultaneously practicing authoritarian constraints and dominance through a cultural class that seeks to gain privileges at the expense of other classes. Previously, the philosophical struggle had been primarily about escaping the guardianships of anything contradictory to the human mind. This is the reason why new French narrative, especially the pioneering novelists of the awareness trend, had shown that nothing should be respected and that there is only freedom and the deconstruction of authority. For instance, according to Joyce, characters have no control over their actions; they are impulsive and do not reach higher revolutionary tones.

Talking about the man of modernist art, we would describe him as a new man who establishes his own legitimacy, who overthrows all deities and transcendental ideals, who wants to be in charge of legislation and who pursues equality in all spheres of life. The freedom culture, which undermines the sanctifying of a particular reality and the elitism of a defined culture, is centred. Not to be exhaustive, but it might be enough to show the idea of freedom by dethroning the classical majesties and reverences (which place art in the service of the contracts of traditional artistic society) and taking the Fountain[1] the realm of artistic legitimacy. Art always draws attention to itself by challenging traditional, one-dimensional concepts about reality and the idea that art can be used to achieve a goal that upholds traditional viewpoints. By elevating its internal coherence and systemic structure, art finds its purpose in itself. This is not a banalization of art, but rather a protest against dominant culture, a confirmation of art's autonomy and freedom from traditional conceptual contracts, and a confirmation of the subjectivity of teleology. This may point to a modified romanticist ideology because, despite moving beyond the notion of sanctifying individual emotion, romanticist theory of creation

[1] ***Fountain*** is a readymade sculpture by Marcel Duchamp in 1917, consisting of a porcelain urinal signed "R. Mutt". In April 1917, an ordinary piece of plumbing chosen by Duchamp was submitted for an exhibition of the Society of Independent Artists, the inaugural exhibition by the Society to be staged at the Grand Central Palace in New York. When explaining the purpose of his readymade sculpture, Duchamp stated they are "everyday objects raised to the dignity of a work of art by the artist's act of choice." In Duchamp's presentation, the urinal's orientation was altered from its usual positioning. *Fountain* was not rejected by the committee, since Society rules stated that all works would be accepted from artists who paid the fee, but the work was never placed in the show area. Following that removal, *Fountain* was photographed at Alfred Stieglitz's studio, and the photo published in the Dada journal *The Blind Man*. The original has been lost. The work is regarded by art historians and theorists of the avant-garde as a major landmark in 20th-century art. Sixteen replicas were commissioned from Duchamp in the 1950s and 1960s and made to his approval. Some have suggested that the original work was by the female artist Elsa von Freytag-Loringhoven who had submitted it to Duchamp as a friend, but art historians maintain that Duchamp was solely responsible for *Fountain*'s presentation.
Source:(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fountain_(Duchamp)).

nevertheless exalts another individualism that is characterized by a conscious will and an ability to challenge the authority of personal emotions. While the theory of creation rejects the idea that art should serve personal emotions, the expressionist theory (romanticism) does, and both reject being subservient to reality and traditions in the pursuit of freedom. Because of this, we regard expressionism as romanticist theory in the context of this study, and we also consider the theory of creation as a continuation and modification of romanticism. It's important to remember that both of these ideas are related to Kant's conception of beauty, which supports a tendency toward liberalism.

4. freeing Modernist writing from the one-dimensional individualism

First, it's important to remember that post-structuralism is a theory that is rediscovered through studying modernist literature, not a departure from or rejection of it. As such, post-structuralism can be viewed as one of modernism's tenets. For example, according to Andreas Heisen, post-structuralism was originally a debate about modernism because it is one of modernism's theories. By referencing literary modernism (Proust, Patay, Mallarmé, Artaud, Geney, Joyce, Beket) in post-structuralist works and even in French feminism works by Julia Kristeva and Helene Sixous, this relationship can be clearly shown. Heisen claimed that the opponents of those feminist writers were not modernism, but rather realism and popular culture in general (Broeker, 1995, pp. 34-35). According to Peter Brooker, "this tendency was what made French post-structuralism a criticism and a renovation of the theory's principles, not a rejection of French modernism," in this particular context. Additionally, it has allowed American deconstructionists to keep reading modernism using innovative techniques, like Dieman's works, to highlight internal subjective deconstructionist elements in that literature (Broeker, 1995, p. 39). Modernist literature may have been established and given greater opportunities to spread and transcend its contexts thanks to the interests of post-structuralism. Post-structuralists called for the liberation of text from its own pragmatic contexts, referring generally to printed literature that suggests the author's absence and a gap between writer and recipient who discovers himself alone and forced to deal with the text's puzzles and interpretations. They also stated that "since printed literature is the prevailing communication mean, knowledge remains complicated and abstract, but this unconfirmed interpretation of ambiguous signs or the literature based on such assumptions will flourish" (Kernan, 2000, p. 152).

As a result, it is imperative that we clarify that it is entirely legitimate to use post-structuralist tendencies to explain how modernist literature was freed from one-dimensional individualism. This is because post-structuralism primarily elevates modernist literature and draws its conclusions from its works. For this reason, we see that critical post-structuralism finds the concretization of its theories in modernist literature. For example, Kristeva's work on intertextuality primarily focuses on writing at the end of the 20th century, whereas Barthes attempts to show how intertextual writing manifests itself in modernist movements and ground-breaking movements of the 20th century (Kernan, 2000, p. 75).

It may be the case that challenging the dominant cultural world authority entails challenging one-dimensional dogmatic individualism, which has been domesticated with transcendental awareness contents and subjugated by the cultural system, to the point where it mistakenly assumes that such awareness originates from its own convictions and that it is the

ultimate metaphysic truth, the validity of which should be acknowledged, even though it is in fact a false awareness and merely a culture created by a class. As a result, modernist writers concentrated on challenging domesticated individualism and sought to liberate it from rigid constraints.

A modernist artist is a free-thinking, dynamic person who, like Martin Heidegger's Dasein, constantly ejects itself out of itself. He rebels even against himself, rejecting its static and stable centrism According to Kristeva and other Tel Quell group members' modernist authors call for the dissolution of perfect Ego within a significant practice represented via semantic and intertextual forces. A realistic woman author like Gaskell may lament her multiple egos, modernist authors according to Tel Quel theory advocate and glorify the diversification of speaker's points as imposed by writing. This idea may attend in modernist and Avant-Guard writing the neglection of the unique ego concept in itself and the concept of consistent author's identity. Intertextuality and transfer become the source of importance, glorify and manipulate the dissolution or the neglection of single speaker. That is a game that reach to be in most principal texts to a step called pleasure by Kristeva and Barthes" (Allen, 2000, p. 56) This also describes an individualism with a conscious will that strives for freedom and goes beyond dogmatic, one-sided individualism.

However, structuralists and post-structuralists claim that since the Russian formalists and the precursors of new criticism, the author has been excluded from the field of criticism and refuted to the point of declaring its symbolic death. This exclusion does entail a demand for the world of art to remain independent and to exist in its own right. The authority, importance, and lack of pretended transparency of the artistic system must all be re-evaluated by the author. This strengthens the presumptions of artistic autonomy, privacy, and transcendentality as well as their role in challenging traditional, unilateral, authoritarian conceptions of reality. On the other hand, it alludes to an individualism with a conscious will which aspires to achieve freedom and transcend one-dimensional, authoritarian discipline. In particular, this individualism strives to be devoid of any subjectivity that exaggerates dogmatism. The statements made by Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Paul Valery, Joyce, Virgina, and Woolf may validate their deliberate choice to establish their creative realms in the context of conscious modernist viewpoints that recognize the need to remain independent of any one-dimensional context.

To validate the existence of individualism with a deliberate desire to achieve independence within the literary world, we will attempt to alleviate the excess of the author's delusions by examining how avant-garde criticism asserts that its authors were deliberately chosen to be modernist writers. In response to Barthes Author's Death theory, Graham Allen stated that "Such theoretical statements as the above appear to give all agency to language viewed intertextually. Yet at the very moment that Barthes makes that move he is citing Mallarmé as an authorial point not of origin but at least of conscious determination. Mallarmé's writing, for Barthes, evinces a choice within that author to become a modern scriptor. Likewise, as we have noted, Barthes recognizes that not every modern author chooses to become a scriptor" (Allen, 2000, p. 75).

Even though post-structuralist theories rebelled against authoritarian ideologies, centrism, and any other form of authoritative elitism that pretended to be the truth, they also created a new kind of elitism. For example, Barthes declared that no writer could be a modernist

one. Even structuralism in the critical studies field, which had excluded the writer, began choosing a Beaudelaire's text. As a result, any criticism that aims to dismantle elitism soon produces a substitute elitist paradigm.

Though it may be structuralist before becoming post-structuralist, the idea of the author's death actually comes before both of them. Barthes relied too heavily on Mallarmé's citations. We must note in this regard that the author's death in the context of reading Balzac by Barthes (1968) did not mean the author's total denial; Tel Quel pioneers, particularly Barthes and Kristeva, returned to celebrate critically the mutations of the Ego and the satisfactions of the desires. Graham Allen may clarify that in these words: “The subject is ‘lost’ in the text in the manner in which, as I have discussed, the subject in writing is never identical to the subject itself. The linguistic subject is always split, determined (posited, constructed, structured) by the signifying system within which it speaks. In this sense Kristeva’s work places a psychological dimension onto Bakhtin’s analysis of double-voiced discourse, dialogism, heteroglossia and hybridity. However, as has been implied, the pre-symbolic subject, the subject of drives rather than of thetic language, constantly announces itself in poetic language by breaking apart, or restructuring, the signifying systems within which it speaks and writes. It is at this point that a theory of intertextuality is rearticulated in Kristeva’s work (Allen, 2000, p. 52). The writers appear to have a certain resolve and willpower that allow them to oppose the sign's system authority, which exercises a patriarchal guardianship over what is fundamentally collective.

As for Thomas Stearn Eliot, who declared in his essay Tradition and Individual Talent (Buchbinder, 2005, p. 37) that the formalists, after the step of interest in techniques and ruses of artistic formulation, had noticed the necessity to consider the history of such ruses, the criticism debate was not restricted to the text's openness to post-structuralism. When we recognize that literary work is a combination of its ruses as Chklovsky defined it, “ ignoring the description of literary ruses implies necessarily the historical evolution," Eikhenbaum himself stated that working on particular topics forced us to discuss functions, which led us to revise our idea about ruse, particularly when certain ruses may have been used previously in different periods of the literature's history to produce different impacts. By itself, this theory demanded that we turn to history (Buchbinder, 2005, p. 107).

Gerard Genette's book Seuil clearly confirms the idea of openness (Genette, 1982, p. 25) that goes beyond structuralist creed itself by re-examining quotes from the text's author, proving that structuralism was not always about calling for the text's closure. A certain important thing attracts us in this context: the fact that legislating the openness is kept limited in literary society scope, and did not include other social awareness types. The autonomy of the literary world must be affirmed so “to fully avoid history and reality, the purpose of art is to be intertextually connected with cc connected with other works and to avoid history and reality” (Buchbinder, 2005, p. 102)

The theory of post-structuralist intertextuality was enforcing the text's complete transparency, negating any background or reference, and acknowledging the difficulty of deriving the highest meaning. In the same way that the writers were lost, so was the reader. While post-structuralist Tel Quel theories argued to confirm the text's openness to all cultural and social symbols and texts, structuralism had discussed the text's closure through the literary text's openness to what is literary only. “viewing a text as an ideologeme characterizes the

semantics methods that consider society and history as texts while analysing a text as a textual interference" (Kristeva, 1991, p. 22).

Certain terms have been commented upon by Marc Angenot, who believes that "one of the challenges of intertextuality is to know the degree of extension we should give to intertextuality field itself, should we focus only on the boundaries of literary study or should we take into account all social discourses and go beyond what is literary? Or was this, even at the theoretical Kristeva's main goal?" (Angenot, 2013). This is the reason we have come to the conclusion that, in the words of Jacques Derrida, "there is nothing out of texts" and that, instead, the human world is a symbolic one that is subject to the guardianship of texts that create it and give it its concepts, as Derrida claimed.

Our understanding of existence may have reverted to something akin to the Kantian hypothesis regarding the phenomenon of existence for us and the existence itself, the veracity of which we can never determine. The same phenomenon is translated when we shift from the transcendental Kantian subject to the transcendental symbolic system, which takes on the roles of guardianship, transcendence, and world-making. Saussure said that "our perception of reality and our interaction with it are given to us and shaped by the structure of language we speak" (Buchbinder, 2005, p. 53).

Going beyond strict structuralist presumptions, in particular those concerning the stability of the relationship between signifier and signified, it becomes evident that world signs with symbolic meanings constantly refer to themselves. Language can only serve as a diversion; it cannot serve as a precise, rigorous collective conceptual definition. Derrida contended that "language is inevitably metaphorical" (Sarup, 2003, p. 69) because even our everyday language is metaphorical, pointing to the metaphorical instinct Nietzsche had alluded to. Consequently, the world, or what we refer to as reality, is nothing more than an infinite number of readings of the world and an endless number of interpretations of signs; there is no neutral symbolic reality or unchanging static truth. The world is ultimately made up of dialogic assumptions and signs that only allude to nihilism and scepticism; "the sign constitutes an absent presence, i.e., instead of presenting the object we use the sign, however the meaning of sign is always deferred" (Sarup, 2003, p. 65).

Therefore, it is clear that modernist literature went beyond dogmatic individualism, or the idea of the self-contained individual, to create a paradigm of dialogic and human interference that is ultimately the man. As evidence that modernist literature had transcended the world theories of self-contained literature, this resulted in the development of post-structuralist intertextuality theories, "text is the fabric of quotations resulting from thousand sources of culture" (Barthes, 1989, p. 53). Modernist literature thus embraced the theory that all discourses, literary and non-literary, interfere with the world of culture, leading to the eventual nonexistence of literature itself as it again loses its autonomy and its uniqueness as an elitist and distinguished structuralism. Criticism is now viewed as a ring of dialogic encounters and a crossroads of infinite discourses, rather than as being concerned with the architecture or structure of literature. We understand this as an implicit return to the goal of legislating a Kantian dialogic individualism that transcends the concept of absolute truth and pure subjectivity. In fact, relativism validates dialogic theory rather than contradicting it. According to Jacques Marie Émile Lacan, intertextuality refers to the "impossibility to live out of infinite text, even it is a text of Proust, of a daily newspaper or a TV channel one, the book makes the

meaning, and the meaning makes life" (Angenot, 2013, p. 91). This suggests that we are immersed in language and live in relative concepts of the symbolic world (Sarup, 2003, pp. 18-19). It is possible to view the symbolic world as transparent and neutral, which allows us to recognize the world in a particular way. This may be related to Kant's theory of the duality of phenomena/thing itself.

Therefore, didn't the revolution of 1968 serve as both an affirmation and an example of modernist art? Wasn't it an effort to broaden the definition of individualism that is different, has a conscious will, and constantly strives to achieve freedom and transcend one-dimensional disciplinarian authority? and post-modernity itself, was it not a total acceptance of the right to rebel, a generalization of the creative paradigm in day-to-day existence, and the ultimate liberation from the protestant bourgeois disciplinarian culture?

4. Hedonist individualism:

The Avant-garde lost its privilege, particularly after the 1968 revolution, when the theories that had previously only been applicable to the worlds of art and literature were acknowledged and legitimized at the level of social life. As a result, the idea of going beyond was exhausted, and the artistic revolution lost its brilliance and its sparkle, giving rise to what Hassan Ihab called the literature of silence and what Linda Hutcheon dubbed the narcissist literature. There was a specific vacuum. It appeared that writing could only surpass modernism' literature by either remaining silent or critically revising itself. "Because the 1960s knew the final manifestation of the assault that targeted utilitarian and puritan values, as the final cultural rebellion movement, but it was a mass movement this time," criticism itself continued on its path to celebrate what was originally modernist. The 1960s saw the emergence of a post-modernist culture, but it lacked real bravery or inventiveness; instead, it was content to democratize hedonistic logic and establish trends that favoured more base rather than noble tendencies" (Lpovetski, 1999, p. 110).

Initially, we can draw the conclusion that the concept dubbed "post-modernity" is a generalization of the artistic modernism paradigm rather than a break with it. "It is a significant advancement for the logic of independence and individualism. Although in theory unrestricted, this right was socially limited in the fields of science, business, and politics; as a result, it developed an interest in customs and daily life: Living freely and selecting one's way of living throughout life constituted the most significant social and cultural events of our time, these actions were considered both a legitimate right and an aspiration" (Lpovetski, 1999, p. 10).
The bourgeoisie had only liberated economy and politics; however, once personal freedom began to be recognized in other domains, "it was a daily life revolution that starts to take form, after the artistic revolution of the early 1900s and the political and economic revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries. Because modern man could easily adapt to new developments and change his way of living, he became an activist" (Lpovetski, 1999, p. 111). The individual had developed into a friendly, multilingual, and accepting person who could deal with contradictions and disinterested in general rules.

"So, rather than being seen as a break with modernity, the "post-modernism" era defines itself via the generalization and the prolongation of one modernity's component trends: the personifying process trend, and via the limitation of the second trend represented in disciplinarian process" (Lpovetski, 1999, p. 118). In other words, what appeared to be the era

of going beyond modernism is actually the coronation and the exaggerated expansion of modernism itself.

The man who emerged from modernism in literature and art in general, the man who was driven to rebel, to surpass, to achieve freedom, and to establish himself as a legislator and a reference, the man who aspires to realize total dialogism, the man who gained the recognition that he sought, this man will view this pretended dialogic perfection as a curse in and of itself after experiencing a certain transcendentality and aspiring to play the role of challenging the unidimensional cultural reality and that of surpassing the hegemony of isotopic conceptual images, "Now this essential gap between the arts and the order of the day, kept open in the artistic alienation, is progressively closed by the advancing technological society. And with its closing, the Great Refusal is in turn refused; the «other dimension» is absorbed into the prevailing state of affairs. The works of alienation are themselves incorporated into this society and circulate as part and parcel of the equipment which adorns and psychoanalyzes the prevailing state of affairs. Thus, they become commercials-they sell, comfort, or excite" (Marcuse, 2007, p. 67).

The individualism and relativism creeds generated new social legitimacy such as freedom of expression, sanctifying hedonism, glorifying difference, personal freedom, personal behaviour freedom, pursuing desires, exaggerating in enrooting nihilism, amplifying subjective centrism, and hedonist individualism. Thus, we observe in artistic modernism trends that were recognized in the post-modernism era a distorted justification for practicing banality, abjection, and deformation. Perhaps technological advancements served as the necessary stimulant for the establishment of a regulated digital society characterized by a virtual democracy that grants individualist logic the highest levels of freedom and hedonism. This virtual democracy grants popular culture the advantage over all elitist culture, where anyone can, for example, be a writer, poet, or artist, and any subject can be art. This could lead to a consuming public that is, to put it simply, mediocre, narcissistic, and indifferent. "It seems that Marcuse understood the threat that such a technological society posed to the individualist man. The supposedly dialogue does, in fact, only highlight the hegemony of the unilateral paradigm of an entity or an authority that controls how people express their desires and creates a culture that integrates people's choices and colours for different life modes. All of that is accomplished by means of a deceptive and misleading advertisement that seeks to introduce the identification/magic paradigm, which uses seduction to impose its products and discredit those of others" (Bara, 2013, p. 193).

Possibly man had been driven into extreme nihilism and an easily manipulable hedonist individualism due to mediocrity, which was essentially the result of exaggerated individualist freedom. Imperialism took advantage of individualism to produce cultural interpretations and symbols that seemed to support its goals. Nonetheless, there is an industry and a production of individualist views that exaggerate hedonism and self-autonomy through cultural capital, all implicitly aimed at creating psychological needs that can only be met by imperialist market goods. Since what we understand about the world is what we strive to realize in daily life, reality is governed by the concepts authority of those who monopolize the industry of interpretation and explanation of the world of signs. As a result, knowledge itself is transformed into cultural capital. Understanding itself also became manufactured and oriented.

In his book "Bleu Writing an Introduction to Interactive Literature», Omar Zerfaoui discusses the dominance of images and the virtual world, which now conceals its roots and has

an advantage over real reality. As a result, the digital language that broke with reality is now the place where virtual universes are created in order to recreate the world. This could have something to do with the fact that the digital mind created a virtual world that is essentially marked by the hegemony of pictures, which has erased and replaced actual reality. It is also marked by a digital language, which broke with reality and became the dwelling of existence, allowing signs to dominate the world of signs to the point where the virtual world became a reference (Zerfawi, 2013, p. 107).

To be somewhat optimistic, though, it appears that the modernist individualist disciplinary did not lose its conscious resolve; we observe that the focus on the hegemony of virtual and symbolic worlds is still active and striving to achieve a certain balance, as well as a degree of rational disciplinarity and a restraint on the extremes of individualist culture which exaggerate their agitated hedonism and banal freedom. Recently, there have been movements opposing homosexuality. For instance, a group of people who adopted colours to promote homosexuality slogans was thrown out. There is a certain return to moral norms consideration. On the other hand, it appears that the globalized and digital worlds allude to a certain positivity by emphasizing the immense harm caused by individualism and nihilism, which exaggerate their banal freedom and agitated hedonism. In order to achieve a certain democratic disciplinarity and legitimate hegemony, modernity thus seems to be repeating its cycle. Nietzsche, who was regarded as a superb nihilist, hated democracy because it conferred a banal legitimacy. He was so aspiring to a certain hierarchy. “According to Nietzsche, humanity will raise itself to the superman when it will have rejected the current hierarchy of values and, above all, Christian and democratic ideals. Bourgeois society, at least in words, respects democratic principles. Nietzsche for his part, as we have seen, separates morals into the morality of masters and the morality of slaves. His mouth foams at the word democracy.” He is full of hatred for the democracy infatuated with egalitarianism that strives to transform man into a contemptible herd animal” (Trotsky, s.d.).

Conclusion:

This study may come to support the hypothesis that enlightenment philosophy made it possible to recognize that the world we live in is made up of only human interpretations, constructions, and perceptions, and that there is no such thing as an absolute truth. As a result, relativism and individualism have emerged, as has the need to be independent to any paradoxes. It appears that unidimensional conceptions and interpretations that seem to be wholly effective have been criticized from romanticism to literary modernism. It was noted, possibly even within the modernist framework, that the world of humans is perceptions and readings translated by a world of independent symbols and signs that exercise their guardianship. As a result, freedom from all paradoxes gave way to freedom from the deception of a single symbolic world and its academic discipline. The study showed how modernist literature was liberated from the traditional literary society's guardianship, as well as from the dogmatic individualism one, by debating disciplinarian cultural authority and aspiring to be free of unidimensional cultural reality.

To some extent, it appeared that romanticism's ideology was inspired by Enlightenment views, as it adopted self-contained man hypotheses. Artistic ideology began elevating the humanist tendency centrism and continued to aspire to achieve freedom from the guardianship of traditional literary society. The research also demonstrated the level of involvement of

literary modernism in the core of romanticist ideology by clarifying the essence of the relationship between disciplinarian protestant puritan social culture and critical literary artistic modernist tendencies that were aware of the guardianship of a reality that is indeed mere conceptual contracts which gave the illusion of being confident backgrounds imposing the necessity to be respected. As a result, the research examined the most important conceptual views adopted by modernist literary consciousness, as represented by the rejection of traditional views and the rejection of concepts used to create false consciousness referring to unidimensional reality.

As a result, the research concluded that modernism, as a continuous rebellion, became a modernism exaggerating in modernism; because it aspired to be free from traditional contracts' guardianship, as well as the illusion of unidimensional reality and dogmatic individualism's guardianship. Thus, relativism is established, and general disciplinarity hypotheses are deconstructed, resulting in cultural capitalism that exploits modernist individualist liberal dimension itself to domesticate the individual according to hedonist individualism.

Possibly the occidental thought did not aspire to silence or belittle individualism, nor to end its guardianship, but rather to free it; Kant considered human perception to be responsible for shaping concepts about the world; we can see differences between Descartes and Kant in that the first believes that man can discover the truth, while the second believes that he can construct it. In both cases, there is a certain deconstruction of paradox guardianships on man, as well as a certain scientific ambition to realize objectivity and to shape the world according to a general paradigm, as well as a certain faith in the conscious mind, whether mathematical or experimental.

The Manifesto of Modernism may be related in general to the belief in the conscious human presence represented by science with all its rigorous methodologies pretensions, the previous belief was manifested in several revolutions, the most relevant to invoke at the political level being the French revolution, and the most pertinent at the economic level being the industrial revolution. These conquests rekindled the occidental will to theorize the world, and gradually, the occidental man pretended to be superior and declared the need for his own legitimate guardianship.

The French David Emile Durkheim insisted on the necessity of respecting the collective mind, then the structuralists confirmed the hypothesis of the existence of a collective subconsciousness which constitutes a basis of objective sense, and that the origin of what is social and cultural exists at the level of what is subconsciously individual, perhaps what happened here was also a confirmation of scientific claims about total objectivity. The man, whether through his social consciousness or his collective subconsciousness, remains at the center; what was ultimately neutralized were the personal meanings related to each man individually, and what was established is the hypothesis of producing and shaping a general theory that develops from the general human mind, a theory that is supposed to be relevant for all. As a result, modernism confirmed its rational and disciplinarian ambitions, particularly on the social level. Despite the fact that the modernist hypotheses that arose from the Enlightenment and romanticist trends' matrix aspired to deconstruct the same disciplinarian postulates, we may conclude that modernism has two synchronic and interrelated trends: one individualist and the other rational.

Modernist art may have been an important revolution that produced what is now known as ultra-modernism, which was marked by an agitated hedonist individualism that was adopted by mass culture and translated into everyday life. Perhaps the revolution in daily life itself will produce art that converges with its hedonism and consuming individualism; in this case, art may have lost its critical role as a result of losing its autonomy and turning into a tool of daily life.

Perhaps the artistic world was more ambitious to incarnate modernism in its trends that celebrate individualism and relativism, but art was not the alone ambitious believing in the necessity of continuing the consciousness liberating project from all illusionary guardianship. Sigmund Freud seemed to want to deconstruct the general conscious human mind, but through his words about subconsciousness, he implicitly confirmed the hypothesis of the possibility of liberating mind from the subconsciousness authority and considering the subconsciousness itself an extension of the mind. Even Karl Marx discussed the conflicts between classes and economic determinism, but he did so in a way that did not negate human decision-making. Rather, he was attempting to support the theory that freedom and liberation can only be achieved by understanding the false consciousness that hegemony is based on and how to overcome it. Roland Barthes also conveys, in his discussion of the author's death hypothesis, the importance of taking linguistic authority into consideration. This warning may cause the author to make a conscious decision. While Michel Foucault appeared to be an opponent of humanism, he was actually working toward an implicit goal of releasing the human mind from certain fallacies by showing that it was a victim of authoritative discourses and class conflicts, and that knowledge is a product of the discourses of the dominant class and the outcome of excluding other discourses; it is neither sacred nor neutral. Even though Derrida rejected the notions of centrism and the metaphysics of presence in his deconstructionism and advocated for the difference, he continued to grant guardianship to those who embrace deconstructionism itself. Generally speaking, we observe that modernist thought continued to be realized in the endeavour to liberate human consciousness and restore its centrism up until the point at which this project was realized at the level of social life, where an exaggeration of freedom, individualism, and disregarding all forms of disciplinarian guardianship occurred.

Bibliography

Allen, G. (2000). *intertextuality.* (Routledge, Ed.) London& New York: Tailor & Francis group.

Angenot, M. (2013). *intertextuality: concept and perspective.* (M. K. elbikaai, Trans.) Beirut: Djadawil for publishing, translation and distributing.

Bara, A. (2013). The discourse of trnanscendalism: and the epistemological mutations in contemporary critical theory: deconstructing the conceptual code. *Literature ans Social Sciences Revue, 17*, 185-203. Retrieved June 11, 2023, from https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/4/10/1/12532

Barthes, R. (1989). *The rustle of Language.* (R. Haward, Trans.) California : university of California Press.

Broeker, P. (1995). *modernism and postmodernism.* (A. Allub, Trans.) Abu Dhabi: Cultural complex press.

Buchbinder, D. (2005). *Contemporary literary theory and the reading of poetry.* (A. Abdulkarim, Trans.) Cairo: general egyptian book institution.

Foucault, M. (1966). *Les mots et les choses : une archéologie des sciences humaines.* Edition Gallimard.

Genette, G. (1982). *Palimpsestes:la littérature au second degré.* Seuil.
Habermas, J. (1981, October). La modernité, un projet inachevé. *Critique*, 950-967.
KANT, I. (1992). *An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment.* (T. Humphrey, Trans.) Hackett Publishing.
Kernan, A. (2000). *the death of literature.* (B. H. Dib, Trans.) Cairo: high council of culture.
Kristeva, J. (1991). *Semiotiké.* (F. Ezzahi, Trans.) Casa Blanca: Tobkal Editing.
Lipovetski, G. S. (2012). *L'écran du monde: du cinema au smartphone.* (R. SAdeq, Trans.) Cairo: Center, Translation National.
Lpovetski, G. (1999). *L'ère du vide essais sur l'individualisme contemporain.* Gallimard.
Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *the postmodern condition : a report on knowledge.* (G. B. Massumi, Trans.) Manchester University Press.
Macdonell, D. (2001). *An introduction to discourse theories.* (A. Ismail, Trans.) Cairo: Academic Bookshop.
Marcuse, H. (2007). *One-dimensional Man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society.* London & New York: Routledge.
Matz, J. (2004). *the modern novel: a short introduction.* Blackwell Publishing.
Mekkawi, A. (2021). *contemporary poetry revolution: from Beaudelaire to current era.* Cairo, Egypt: Hindawi foundation.
Rafia, M. S. (1991). *Phenomenology according to Husserl: critical study of contemprary philosophical renewal* . Bagdad, Iraq: Cultural Issues Office.
Sarup, M. (2003). *An Introductory Guide to Post-Structuralism and Postmodernism.* (E. edition, Ed., & K. Boughrara, Trans.) Constantine: Laboratory of translation, literature and linguistics of Mentouri Univeristy.
Todorov, T. (1986). *Criticism of Criticism.* (G. C. Office, Ed., & S. Swedane, Trans.) Bagdad, Iraq.
Trotsky, L. (n.d.). *On the Philosophy of the Superman*, html. Retrieved June 12, 2023, from marxist.org: https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1900/12/nietzsche.htm
Zerfawi, O. (2013). *Bleu writing: an introduction to interactive literature.* Chariqa: Culture and Media office.