

Lapis Lazuli

An International Literary Journal

ISSN 2249-4529

www.pintersociety.com

GENERAL SECTION

VOL: 9, No.: 1, SPRING 2019

UGC APPROVED (Sr. No.41623)

BLIND PEER REVIEWED

About Us: <http://pintersociety.com/about/>

Editorial Board: <http://pintersociety.com/editorial-board/>

Submission Guidelines: <http://pintersociety.com/submission-guidelines/>

Call for Papers: <http://pintersociety.com/call-for-papers/>

All Open Access articles published by LLILJ are available online, with free access, under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial License as listed on

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Individual users are allowed non-commercial re-use, sharing and reproduction of the content in any medium, with proper citation of the original publication in LLILJ. For commercial re-use or republication permission, please contact

lapislazulijournal@gmail.com

The Scientific Grand Narrative in Select Contemporary American Science Fictions: A Utopian Dystopia

Anish Bhattacharyya

Abstract:

The contemporary developed societies exhibit a postmodern tendency in its questioning of traditional grand narratives guiding the human society. However, parallelly the scientific language acts as the guiding light for these societies towards an uncharted terrain. In the era of globalisation, every society is already super-saturated with socio-cultural heterogeneity. Some thinkers like Fukuyama consider this to be the pinnacle of human progress. However, others like Derrida provide a contrary opinion. I would like to argue that everything is tied together by the simple and fragile thread of technological and material progress.

This paper shall thus study if the scientific language replaces every other grand narrative to become a master narrative, and the aftermath of such an event. It will look into what may happen to the society when the grand narrative of material progress collapses. The paper shall aim to locate the nature of knowledge being pursued by the contemporary American society and it shall argue if it leads the society towards a utopian or dystopian future, or perhaps something altogether different beyond the binary.

Keywords:

grand narrative, scientific language, utopia, dystopia, contemporary American society, science fiction, postmodernism, anti-utopia.

The word 'science' originates from the Latin word, 'scientia' meaning 'knowledge'. Science refers to the knowledge about the natural world. It claims to have access to a certain truth about the universe. Thomas Kuhn in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* argues that the chronology of scientific evolution is marked by several "paradigm shifts" (Sim 66). It is not a "linear accumulation of knowledge" (Sim 66) and several social factors affect the development of a particular field in science. Factors like industrial demands, social ideologies and politics play important roles in shaping the direction of scientific progress. Science thus resembles a cultural artefact just like fashion, politics, literature, etc. Hence, the idea that science is a discipline which has its own terms and conditions, calling for a certain type of thinking while rejecting other methodologies is not beyond scepticism. It is a feature of a grand narrative and science then is guilty of harbouring a logocentric¹ approach. Before delving further into the topic, let us understand the rise of the scientific language as a spirit of rational enquiry into the pursuit of knowledge.

Emergence of the Scientific 'Language' in the Contemporary Society:

The enlightenment perception of knowledge treated 'knowledge' as absolute, indifferent of mankind and his society. The quest to know therefore became man's attempt to know the ways of the creator. It was simply assumed that the pursuit of knowledge served as bridges to connect the blind spots of religious perception of the universe. The enlightenment saw human reason as the tool to have access to this truth. The truth however, was coloured by a religion. It questioned religion at points, but did not reject its relevance altogether.

The enlightenment perception of knowledge gave way to modernism and the latter believed that true knowledge can only be understood if it is removed from the grasp of tradition and history. Modernism therefore marks the beginning of secularization of knowledge. Modernity placed on the artist this task of unearthing the hidden knowledge (which exists irrespective of the human beings and his history). Thus, modernist art became a repertoire of human knowledge stripped from the influences of history, tradition, religion and culture. It aimed to create new mythologies which can justify modern existence. Joyce perhaps equips Stephen Dedalus with this task when the latter observes his surroundings – "Ineluctable modality of the visible: at least that if no more, thought through my eyes" (Joyce 45). The thinking through the eyes is important for the modernist author for it is the only path to separate his culturally maligned brain from interpreting the visible. There is a conscious effort in Stephen's part to know about the visible world independent of the human filters limiting experience. Truth is then seen as existing outside and independent of the mind. Thus, the modernist artist attempts to trace the pattern of this reality. A modernist novel like *Ulysses* therefore plays with several techniques to study this nature of the underlying reality.

But a postmodernist novel realises that there is no reality existing outside the mind so as to speak. Thus, postmodernists believe that there is no truth in anything created by the human mind - so no account of human condition is right. Postmodernism rejects this idea of an essential pre-existing story. It states that man creates his own story irrespective of the world. There can be no world's own story, but only records of varied, conflicting human stories. They do not negate knowledge; they simply reject the possibility that human beings have to do anything related to knowledge. The human self is constructed by the society, history, culture, gender, race and class, etc. Human knowledge thus depends on several aspects and is resultantly a collection of fragments. It is not something unified or singular. Philosophy which deals with questions of knowledge, existence and other metaphysical concepts is rendered meaningless from this perspective. It is no more than human records of experiences and interpretations. It can never be regarded as a record of 'knowledge' which exists beyond human perceptions.

The popularity of science stems from this crisis. It substituted the culturally and historically coloured human perspectives by an ahistorical and non-cultural discipline. Science becomes the new tool to unearth knowledge in the 'purest' form. Knowledge is no longer limited to religious guidelines as science does not adhere to it. But it must be noted then that science ensures the demise of religion but not god, for religion is only one tool to know god and so is science. Thus, the idea of god in a scientific world is highly complex. The idea of God therefore becomes open to interpretations, and movies like *Bruce Almighty*² plays with this idea. The god in the movie is imagined to resemble an African American, who wears a white suit and clearly announces that he has no control over the human free will. Thus, the modern god synthesises the idea of human individualism as the will of the divine.

The reason behind this shift is the realisation, that human knowledge is interpreted through the languages which are coloured heavily by human cultures. So there had been a need to come up with a language to interpret the realities of the universe which is free from the human perceptions and subjectivity. The modernist writer views this rise of the scientific language as something to be feared, yet filled with opportunities. Mark S. Morrisson notes in *Modernism, Science and Technology* – “In England and the United States, experiences of loss and vulnerability in a rapidly changing world were balanced by palpable excitement about a future in which the imagination’s wildest flights of fancy might be realizable—for good or perhaps for ill” (2). He goes on to quote W. B. Yeats’ poem *The Second Coming* to highlight the dilemma of this situation (1). The “rough beast” moving towards Bethlehem expresses the modern predicament of religion in the age of science. Machines are the new messiah of the contemporary world.

In the contemporary times, science is taken to become that one tool replacing other discourses like religion, philosophy and et al. to pursue the search of truth. This is perhaps because, “science offers an account that describes the world not from the point of view of one particular species of intelligent life” (Luntley 16). The human subjective vision of truth is rendered corrupted and excess. The scientific method emphasizes the necessity of the objective vision of truth. Now a question which arises at this point, which is, why is the objective truth necessary? Without objective truth, man is left with subjective judgements which are always competing against one another. There can be no fundamental scale to measure the validity of one subjective framework against another. The society is pushed towards anarchy (Luntley 27). Science promises a way out of this probable anarchy. But, what does the language of science mean? By, the language of science, I am referring to what other thinkers like Luntley calls the language of the physical universe. However, I would also speak on how this initial inclination towards the language of the physical world makes way for a language which stresses the application of the scientific tongue in everyday commonplace reality.

The language of science is objective and indifferent towards the human feelings. If it is believed to lead one towards absolute knowledge of the universe, then one’s vision of creation suddenly turns indifferent and filled with existential crisis. The world created life and thus came man. Now what man does with his life is not a concern of the universe – it is man’s. The truth which the cosmos shares is indiscernible by man and his language cannot capture it. Despair results from the indifference of the universe, however there is a way to avoid despair. God is not indifferent, if he is there. Man is responsible for himself, as God is for the cosmos. Philosophy and criticism thus witness Derrida’s rant that there is no outside text, or Nietzsche’s declaration of the death of god, or perhaps Barthes’ assertion that the author is dead, et al. Hence it is hardly surprising to see works of art expressing doubt towards a source of meaning beyond itself. The art of postmodern society therefore often encourages ‘play’ rather than a ‘purpose’ within the narrative.

Is the Language of Science free of the Human?

A question then arises, is the language of science free of scepticism aimed towards every source of truth? Is the purposeful image of the scientific language right or just a façade? If no human language can do justice to the ‘world’s own story’, then how can science enjoy that privilege? Science is also a human language, although claimed to be free from human prejudices and cultural influences, yet it is something created by man. Science attempts to transcend every prejudice, socio-cultural barriers while trying to

uncover the secrets of the universe. But the modernists are wrong according to the postmodernists, because according to them every language is coloured by human cultural barriers, hence science can be no exception. A language with “context-independent” meaning is not possible. There can be “no pure language of thought” (Luntley 17).

Postmodern scepticism of knowledge therefore destabilizes the idea of truth. By the term ‘truth’ the postmodernists refer to the conception of knowledge which exists independent of the human beings. They believe that realisation of such knowledge is not possible because human mind cannot think without language. Therefore, even if knowledge exists, it is not graspable by man. It leads to the perception of the scientific vision as restricting, and the human mind cannot really have the glimpse of reality through it. The language of science exorcizes the human subjective estimation of reality. It makes one wonder, does reality even include the subjective experience? This is perhaps the most obvious flaw of the scientific worldview in my opinion. It is meant for the programs of machines and not the subjective mind of man. It perhaps can explain the immense popularity of magic real fiction in the contemporary times. Writers specialising on the magic realistic genre like Haruki Murakami³ thus goes at length to emphasize the subjective aspects of the mind and he places his characters far away from the conundrums of Tokyo. This brings us to the next question, if the scientific method is flawed and restrictive what causes its popularity and influence?

“[I]n defence of the scientific view of the world is the observation that science has enjoyed an enormous success so far. The success is a success in explanation, prediction and control.” (Luntley 45-46). No matter how much man realizes that the scientific method is just another tool towards interpreting knowledge, it can be flawed and even prove disastrous, yet man cannot overlook its ability to give him a position of power. This quality advocates the perception that perhaps the scientific method can usher an era or progress through knowledge. However, whenever power is associated with knowledge, it leads to anxiety, fear of the unknown, as knowledge remains answerable and limited to those with power.

With the distrust of grand narratives in the postmodern society, the latter is left without foundations of truth guiding judgement. Man, without any external standard to support his decisions suddenly finds himself at a loss. All the responsibility falls upon himself. Perhaps, such a feeling of loss is bandaged by science. It gives man a language which is apparently free from the cultural inhibitions, determined to mine more knowledge. It grants him power over others and the rest of the universe, and he becomes a demigod in a world where god is not looking.

But, as touched upon this issue earlier, the language of science restricts the mind of man. It is mechanical, bereft of any subjective qualities, striving towards gathering only objective knowledge. The reality which science attempts to capture is mechanical and causal. Now the question arises does the human mind limit itself to these patterns? For instance, the setting sun and its dying light is not just a phenomenon of refraction and reflection. The light reminds man of something more by causing a chain reaction within the mind. If the language of science identifies reality at all, then it perhaps identifies a picture of reality which is reactive and interactive. However, man works upon the world and the world acts upon him. If the scientific worldview fails to understand man completely, and if man restricts himself to a strictly scientific outlook, then is he not betraying his nature?

Thus, the scientific method fails to recognise the mind as an important factor which may affect reality. By reality, I am not referring to the fact that perhaps if one wills, one can alter the motions of the planetary bodies. Instead, I am referring to the realities which are man-made. For instance, when the river does not irrigate a nearby tract of field then the group of farmers create a channel to divert the river water to benefit agriculture. Enlightenment and modernity hailed anything as 'real' only if it transcended the human subjectivity. Reality was thought to exist in isolation, which is supposed to be constant, irrespective of the human mediations. It is postmodernism which claims that every reality is interpreted through language and no language is without the cultural and human influences. Thus, the only reality which is left to man is the man-made reality. Postmodernism therefore questions the authoritarian stance of the scientific language as an authentic form of enquiry to knowledge. Thus, even the scientific pursuit of knowledge and the assumption of its objective nature is indeed flawed and must not be taken at face value. It completely alienates the human from the fabric of reality, even though man is an integral part of such a reality. Despite the shortcomings of the scientific perception of the real, the scientific method has a more legitimate claim of understanding the real as compared to the scepticism offered by postmodernism. This is because the scientific claim is "tested rigorously against experience in repeatable experimentations" (Luntley 128).

The By-products of the Scientific Language: Power, Capital, Utopia and Dystopia

Anxiety forms the backdrop of the contemporary society. Apparently, everyone is lacking something which the society has to offer. To fulfil this lack and to end this anxiety, people participate into the endless pursuit of commodities. Technology becomes a tool which is used by capitalists to manufacture new commodities. The state of anxiousness favours the desire for substitutes, to reach a certain degree of normalcy. There is an inherent desire to conform to the contemporary standards. But this leads us to even more pertinent questions - what are the contemporary standards? Who creates these standards? Thus, technology becomes a weapon in the hands of the powerful to generate more capital. Knowledge for the sake of knowledge becomes illusory.

Therefore, the contemporary society is guided by grand narratives of cultural and material standards which remain invisible to the naked eye. If there is conformance, then there must accompany a degree of non-conformance. Thus, the issues of surveillance become supremely urgent under these circumstances for those in power. Surveillance and scandals associated with it forms the backdrop of the contemporary developed societies and America is at its centre.

Recently, the social media platform, Facebook which is accessed by a large portion of the global population faced a severe charge. It was accused of selling user data to private corporations for profit. Compared to just the last decade, this development is unprecedented. Previously people accessed the social media platforms from the personal computer, however, this is the era, (or perhaps decade) of the smartphones. Most of the 'apps' used by the people demand access to Facebook or google accounts for identification. Hence it is terrifying to imagine whether anyone's personal data is safe at all. This fear is not immaterial and the greatest example is the 'icloud' hack of personal photos and videos of Hollywood celebrities. It is one of the most infamous data breaches of the recent time. Surely, the American society has moved a long way from FBI and CIA monitoring citizens to hackers keeping tabs on everyone's digital footprints.

The regulation of citizens is not limited to their activities, but even their genetic constitution has become an area of interest for the powerful. Experiments in the field of genetic modification is being carried out by scientists to create more efficient beings. A complete survey of this field is not the goal of this research, but the aim is to have an understanding of the society we are living in. It is important to note that the immensely popular franchise like the 'Jurassic Park' which had begun much earlier is no longer entirely fiction. Scientific projects are being carried on to revive the 'mammoth' from its extinction. Similarly, the passenger pigeon is being attempted to bring back from the dead. Pigs are being experimented upon to see if it is possible to harvest human organs from them. Thus, on one hand there is an inherent utopian potential in the pursuit of scientific knowledge in this field, but on the other, there is a fear of what might happen if man tampers with nature with an abrupt understanding of it. This concern also forms the basis for the dystopian imagination.

In the recent times there had been an explosion of films and novels dealing with this concern that human knowledge of the universe, is still not adequate to master it. Movies like 'The Core' (2003), 'The Day after Tomorrow' (2004), '2012' (2009), 'Pompeii' (2014), 'San Andreas' (2015), etc. all express the powerlessness of man when confronted to the wrath of nature. No matter how technologically advanced he is, he cannot control nature.

There is another category of films which deals with not natural disasters caused by ecological imbalance, but it focuses on manmade disasters. For instance, the movie *The Island* (2005) is set in the near future which shows the cloning of people and later harvesting the clones for organ replacement surgical procedures. The clones are not considered to be human beings with a mind of their own, instead they are considered to be nothing more than organ banks. This leads us to another liminal zone between the utopia and dystopia, that is the anti-utopia. "Anti-utopia—a utopia that the author intended a contemporaneous reader to view as a criticism of utopianism" (Claeys and Sargent 2). It is under this category that the *Divergent* trilogy lies.

Scepticism of the Scientific Grand Narratives in the *Divergent Trilogy* and *Hunger Games Trilogy*:

The traditional definition of science as a subject aiming to study the "natural world based on facts learned through experiments and observation" (Merriam Webster Dictionary) demands revision in the contemporary times. In a world motivated by technology, science is a device for churning out more profit. It is a device to carry forward the capitalistic ideals of profit making. Its aim is not just an isolated study of nature for the sake of obtaining knowledge. Instead, the focus is on emphasizing the efficiency and bettering the quality of material life. This is the continuation of the Enlightenment project which upheld a similar ideal. This leads to the birth of a global culture which favours consumerism and seeks happiness in choosing objects from an array of choices. Science offers utopian possibilities through its large marketplace and in uplifting the quality of life. A consumer develops this belief that comfort and happiness are similar qualities.

The differences of cultures are repressed and overlooked when the whole population is categorized into two major groups – the consumers and the non-consumers. This capitalistic democracy where the chief aim of the non-consumers is to become the consumers is not the end of history as thinkers like Francis Fukuyama⁴ suggests (4).

The occasional violence occurring in the name of religion and ethnicity proves this thought. Violence symbolizes the return of the repressed differences between human beings herded as consumers in a global marketplace.

The apparent Utopia of the consumers stands on the edge and is in a position to turn dystopic, if ever the market model fails. When money is taken out of the equation the differences which are intentionally ignored shall rise to prominence. This becomes even more viable when science and capitalism teach the civilization that the goal for happiness lies in material indulgence. People question the urge of belonging to each other in times of need. Thus, when a crisis arises, everyone remains busy in ensuring the survival of his own little world shaped by his financial condition.

This bleak vision is present in several contemporary literature, especially fiction and films. For instance, Veronica Roth's *The Divergent Trilogy* and Suzanne Collins's *The Hunger Games Trilogy* reveal a similar perspective. Both of them depict futuristic dystopias, Panem and Chicago respectively. Technological advancements at the cost of everything else leads the earth towards natural and manmade disasters. The economy collapses and the grand narrative of technological progress comes to a halt. The societies get split into fragments (Capitol and Districts, genetically pure and damaged) and are plunged into the chaos of war. The Utopian promise leads towards destruction and ends with the rise of totalitarian powers.

The Capitol dwellers are the consumers in Panem and the District dwellers are the slave like labourers, the non-consumers. Similarly, Roth's Chicago and the place called the 'fringe' contain the genetically damaged individuals while the rest of USA is governed by the genetically pure people. These binaries stem from the metanarratives which are by-products of our contemporary times.

The totalitarian rulers remain unchallenged primarily because they rule over oppressed people who hardly have any resource to oppose the rulers. They are not united under one banner, under one great cause. It takes the discovery of a counter narrative which can challenge the one propagated by the authoritarian regime. In Roth's narrative, the Bureau constructs a grand narrative of genetic defect to divide the population into pure and damaged individuals. It erases the memories of a large pool of 'genetically damaged' citizens and places them in Chicago, guarded by large walls from all sides. The oppressed characters finally realize that violence cannot be blamed on the genetically damaged, as several historical records show how great wars had been fought even before the genetic divide came into existence. It was perhaps in the Bureau's interest to keep the narrative alive so that it may continue receiving the grants from the government to carry the experiment for generations.

In Collins's narrative, technology is unavailable to the District dwellers and it is controlled by the Capitol. They use it to monitor the District dwellers and to construct devastating sacrificial altars like the Hunger Games arena. In Panem, technology has lost its life enriching narrative and is equated with power. District 13, the weapons manufacturing unit of the nation only managed to challenge the Capitol due to its access to nuclear weapons and superior technological resources.

Any form of artistic expression is prohibited in both the narratives and is strictly monitored by the state. The powerful subdues the powerless and it is the latter which makes use of art as a form of resistance. Katniss Everdeen's decision to dissolve the narrative of inter-District differences and give a proper burial to a fallen tribute challenges the narrative of the state. She sings a song on the camera in front of the

corpse of Rue to let Panem realize that the Districts are not blinded by hatred for one another even when they are fighting amongst themselves for survival. In the final part of the trilogy she sings the song, “hanging tree” (Collins, *Mockingjay* 77) to let the listeners realize the futility of living like slaves. She advocates how death is better than serving President Snow’s whims.

In the *Divergent Trilogy*, where the society is divided into factions, solely concerned with one duty, the abnegation faction is endowed with the task of selfless service to the society. It considers art to be an act of indulgence. Tobias’s effort to preserve a blue crystalline sculpture represented his rebellion against the oppressive rules of the faction system. He rejects the idea that individual desires can be mechanically castrated to benefit the larger society. Tobias and Tris’s decision to tattoo their bodies are not simply a desire for aesthetics, instead it celebrates art and individual desires.

Katniss, Tris and Tobias all go on to challenge the rulers of their mechanical societies which posed a threat to egalitarian values in the society. Their defiance of the status quo is in line with Lyotard’s scepticism of scientific knowledge. Lyotard argues that any scientific proposition depends on the interrelationship between the “sender, addressee and the referent” (23). The sender proclaims a truth and attempts to prove it. The addressee either agrees or refutes it, however if he agrees then he aligns himself with the sender’s stance on the truth. The referent is not entirely knowable to the society, it is known only through the argument of the sender approved by the addressee. The possibility that the referent may harbour parallel and contradictory truths is hardly entertained. Science furthermore claims that non-scientific, or narrative knowledge cannot judge it and the former develops institutions for its study. It develops a separate ‘language game’ for its pursuit.

Science develops when members of the institution challenge or accept and gradually modify the scientific discourse. Lyotard says that accumulation of scientific knowledge therefore concerns “memory” and it is an ongoing “project” (26). Thus, it is therefore not much different from non-scientific, or narrative knowledge (both concerns the influence of memory through the ages).

The scientist’s condescension of narrative knowledge and rejecting the latter as “savage, primitive, underdeveloped, backward, alienated, composed of opinions, customs, authority, prejudice, ignorance, ideology” (27) is not accurate. Narratives are then not just “fables, myths, legends, fit only for women and children” (27) because science is essentially similar to the narrative knowledge.

Another problem which occurs in the imagined societies fuelled by the grand narrative of science aided progress is the suppression of individual sexual desires. In Roth’s Chicago, homosexuality is discouraged as it does not contribute to the mixing of genomes. The society is utilitarian in the execution of its proposed model of existence. It discards the anomalies into factionless or executes them in case they are ‘divergents’, not genetically programmed to belong to just one faction for the rest of their lives. They perceive the divergents as threats to their societal structure. While Collins does not portray any homosexual characters, yet through the character of Finnick Odair she reveals how the Capitol exploited the tributes and forced them into prostitution for earning political gains. This exploitation and suppression of libidinal energies remind the readers of Lyotard’s ideas on Marxism. Lyotard claims that Marxism suppresses sexual desires and anything which did not fall under its proposed model of bourgeois and proletariat, hence libidinal energies exposes the position of Marxism as a grand narrative. A similar thing happens here, especially in the case of the *Divergent Trilogy*.

The grand narrative of societal progress based on scientific advances thus resembles the myopic vision of Marxism.

Lyotard therefore is sceptical of scientific rationality justifying a utilitarian stance for operating the 'societal experiment' in an unchallenged manner. He advocates the necessity of postmodern science. Science shall not be a closed discipline beyond the questions from other methodologies, instead, it must search for paradoxes within itself. This idea is highly relevant in the contemporary times as science and capitalism together define the very fabric of our times. If these paradoxes are not there, the imagined utopian future turns dystopic.

Conclusion:

Several American popular fictions depict a post-apocalyptic dystopian society in the future in the contemporary times. This emerging pattern is not an event in isolation, instead it is the reflection of postmodernity. In other words, the consciousness of living in a postmodern society, which is the society of the spectacle. Commodities act as seductions and promise fulfilment. People often turning away from the problems around them. On one hand, there is the utopian understanding that we are living at a time, when difficult tasks can be completed in an instant. And on the other, we are living at a time when totalitarian forces lurk beyond visibility, always attempting to cease control. Can one consider technology and the scientific language as neutral agencies which must be pursued for the sake of the advancement of knowledge? In the imaginations of the popular authors they transform into the weapons of those in power which are exerted to ensure their stay in power. Hence, they must be questioned without blind submission.

Endnotes:

Logocentrism – a term coined by Ludwig Klages in the 1920s. It expresses the idea that language and words represent an external reality. Derrida in *Of Grammatology* states that the 'presence' can never really be achieved, because it is always deferred. Hence logocentrism is an illusory notion.

Bruce Almighty – a film directed by Tom Shadyac in 2003. Jim Carrey plays the role of Bruce Nolan who happens to acquire the powers of God for a week. Morgan Freeman plays the role of God.

Haruki Murakami – Contemporary Japanese author who writes popular fiction in a predominantly magic real setting. He refuses to call himself postmodern, yet his writing exhibits several postmodernist techniques. His Japanese novels are translated in almost 40 languages worldwide.

Francis Fukuyama – His proposed theory on the end of history in the democratic society is being alluded to here.

WORKS CITED

- Claeys, Gregory, and Lyman Tower Sargent, editors. *The Utopia Reader*. New York U P, 1999.
- Collins, Suzanne. *The Hunger Games*. Scholastic Press, 2008.
- . *Catching Fire*. Scholastic Press, 2009.
- . *Mockingjay*. Scholastic Press, 2010.
- Fukuyama, Francis. "The End of History?." *The National Interest*. Harper Perennial, 1989.
- Grant, Ian Hamilton. "Postmodernism and Science and Technology." *The Routledge Companion to Postmodernism*. Ed. Stuart Sim. Routledge, 2001.
- Joyce, James. *Ulysses: With an Introduction by Declan Kiberd*. Penguin Books, 2000.
- Luntley, Michael. *Reason, Truth and Self: The Postmodern Reconditioned*. Routledge, 1995.
- Lyotard, Jean-Francois. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. U of Minnesota P, 1984.
- Morrisson, Mark S. *Modernism, Science and Technology*. Bloomsbury, 2017.
- Roth, Veronica. *Divergent*. Harper Collins, 2011.
- . *Insurgent*. Harper Collins, 2012.
- . *Allegiant*. Katherine Tegen Books, 2013.
- Sim, Stuart. "Postmodernism and Philosophy." *The Routledge Companion to Postmodernism*. Ed. Stuart Sim. Routledge, 2001.

BIO-NOTE

Anish Bhattacharyya is presently working as an Assistant Professor in English at Adamas University, Kolkata. He is pursuing his Ph.D. in English at Visva Bharati University, Shantiniketan.

E-mail: anishbhattacharyya@gmail.com