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Abstract
This article presents a postmodern analysis of the concept of truth, deconstructing reality by firstly tracing the historical development of the concept in different philosophical epochs and then highlighting the role of language, power, and cultural context in shaping our understanding of truth. The postmodernist rejection of absolute truth and emphasis on the relativity of truth is discussed, along with the influence of language on truth and the role of power in defining what is considered to be true. The article also examines the postmodernist critique of science and its emphasis on situating scientific knowledge within a particular cultural and historical context. Unlike previous scholarly works, the paper argues that, the postmodernist analysis of truth challenges traditional notions of objective reality and underscores the importance of context and perspective in shaping our understanding of truth.
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1. Introduction
The concept of truth has been debated by philosophers for centuries, with various perspectives on what constitutes truth (Horwich, 1998). Heraclitus and Parmenides, two prominent figures in ancient Greek philosophy, engaged in a profound debate that laid the foundation for discussions on the nature of truth (Andrei, 2019). Parmenides, known for his monistic philosophy, postulated that, truth is singular and unchanging (Graham, 2017). According to him, the world is a unified and timeless entity, and change is an illusion (Popper & Austin, 2012). Parmenides’ emphasis on the stability of reality starkly contrasted the views of Heraclitus. In contrast, Heraclitus, often referred to as the philosopher of change, argued ardently for a worldview where everything is in a constant state of flux (Brinkmann, 2017; Stamatellos, 2012). For Heraclitus, truth is dynamic, and the only constant is change itself (Hamblet, 2009). His famous statement, “You cannot step into the same river twice,” demonstrates his belief in the perpetual nature of reality (Brinkmann, 2017). This philosophical dichotomy between Parmenides and Heraclitus set the stage for further discussions on the metaphysical nature of the existence of truth.
Moving forward in the timeline of ancient Greek philosophy, Socrates emerged as a pivotal figure. Unlike Parmenides and Heraclitus, Socrates did not leave behind written records of his thoughts (Edmunds, 2006). Instead, his ideas are primarily known through the writings of his disciple Plato (Allen, 2001). Socrates' conception of truth is characterised by his commitment to a process of continuous inquiry and self-examination (Rowe, 2011; Schlosser, 2014; Ransome & Ransome, 2009). While Socrates did not provide a systematic metaphysical theory like some of his contemporaries, his approach to truth was rooted in the Socratic method. Rather than presenting a fixed set of doctrines, Socrates believed in the pursuit of knowledge through dialectical conversations (Meyer, 1980; Edmunds, 2006). He argued that, genuine wisdom arises from recognising one's own ignorance and engaging in an inexorable examination of one's beliefs. Socrates emphasised the importance of questioning assumptions, encouraging critical thinking and engaging in open dialogue with others to search for profound insights about truth (Ransome & Ransome, 2009). His philosophy stems from the idea that the path to truth lies in an ongoing and humble pursuit of understanding rather than in the assertion of dogmatic truths.

Building on Socrates' philosophical groundwork, Plato, his disciple, developed a more comprehensive exploration of truth and reality. In Plato's philosophy, truth is intimately connected to the theory of Forms (Mason, 2014). According to Plato, the physical world (the world of doxa) we perceive is a realm of shadows and imperfect reflections of a higher, non-material realm of eternal and unchanging Forms or Ideas (Brentlinger, 1962; Silverman, 2003). These Forms represent the perfect and unchangeable essences of things such as beauty, justice, or equality (Silverman, 2003). According to Plato, the ultimate truth lies in this transcendent world of Forms, which is more real and permanent than the ever-changing material world we experience. In The Republic, Plato uses the allegory of the cave to illustrate the journey of his philosophy towards the realm of Forms, portraying the process of enlightenment and the realisation of higher truths beyond mere appearances (Lundy, 2013; Nicolae, 2022). In essence, Plato's concept of truth extends beyond the Socratic emphasis on self-examination to encompass a metaphysical realm of eternal, unchanging truths that underlie the shifting phenomena of the observable world (Brentlinger, 1962).

Nevertheless, Aristotle, a contemporary of Plato and a prominent figure in ancient Greek philosophy (Guthrie & Warren, 2012; Edel, 2017), continued the discussion on truth and reality, refining and expanding upon the ideas of his predecessors. In his influential work Metaphysics, Aristotle introduced a distinct perspective on truth, focusing on the idea of correspondence or conformity (Aristotle & Aristotle, 1933; Newman, 2002). Aristotle postulated that, truth is the conformity between one's mental representation and the objective reality external to the mind (Newman, 2002; Edel, 2017). In other words, according to Aristotle, truth arises when our thoughts accurately reflect the state of affairs in the world. This notion, often referred to as the correspondence theory of truth, which has played an essential role in shaping philosophical thought and discussion of truth (Long, 2010).

As a matter of fact, Aristotle's emphasis on the relationship between mental concepts and external reality provided a more systematic and concrete understanding of truth. In contrast to Plato's theory of Forms, which posited a separate realm of unchanging truths, Aristotle grounded truth in the empirical world (Long, 2010; Fenner, 1995). According to him, knowledge and truth are derived from a careful observation of the world around us, and accurate representation of reality is the hallmark of truthful statements. Aristotle's contribution to the philosophy of truth established a foundation for later thinkers and became a cornerstone in the ongoing dialogue about the nature of truth and its connection to the observable world.
Being influenced to a greater extent by Plato and Aristotle, the medieval period saw the intertwining of truth with religious doctrine. This is evident in the works of St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. While St. Augustine in his book *The Confession* sought to explain the relationship between divine truth and human understanding (Falcetano, 2018; Teubner, 2017). Whereas, St. Thomas Aquinas in his book *Summa Theologica* sought to reconcile reason and faith, thus, contributing to the development of the correspondence theory of truth (Aquinas, 2014). However, Aquinas does not view the two (faith and reason) merely as complementary; rather, he suggests that, philosophy serves as the “maid” or helper to theology, encapsulated in his famous phrase “*philosophia ancilla theologia*” (Chroust & Collins, 1941). This perspective introduces a profound dialogue on the interdependence of reason and faith in the pursuit of truth, enriching the ongoing discourse on the nature of knowledge and its relationship to divine understanding (Aquinas, 2014; Falcetano, 2018).

Furthermore, the Renaissance and Enlightenment periods that marked the age of reasoning witnessed the decline of the authority of the Catholic Church leading into the shifts towards empirical observation (Barnett, 2004). The expansion of the natural sciences pioneered by Nicolas Copernicus (1473–1543); Galileo Galilei (1564–1642); Francis Bacon (1561–1626); Johannes Kepler (1571–1630), just to mention a few brought new developments in our understanding of the concept (Wood, 2012). In this regard, Descartes' foundational doubt and his *Cogito Ergo Sum* (I Think, Therefore I am) changed the perspectives of truth from objective to subjective aspects (Moreno, 2011; Cottingham, 2003). On the other hand, Kant’s transcendental idealism introduced a new perspective on truth, asserting that, it is not merely discovered but actively constructed through the interplay of the mind and experience (Allison, 2004). In this framework, Kant aimed to reconcile the viewpoints of rationalists, exemplified by figures like Descartes, Leibniz, and Spinoza, with those of empiricists such as John Locke, Berkeley, and David Hume (Neujahr, 1995). Until then, truth had been traditionally viewed as singular, objective, and independent of the mind.

Further still, the 19th century witnessed a significant shift in philosophical thinking about the concept of truth. Friedrich Nietzsche's nihilistic ideas, which questioned the existence of objective truth, played a crucial role in shaping the intellectual landscape (Spinks, 2003). This laid the foundation for major 20th-century movements such as existentialism, postmodernism, and analytic philosophy, with thinkers like Ludwig Wittgenstein stressing the analysis of language. Nietzsche’s rejection of the idea of an absolute truth had a lasting impact, influencing how philosophers approached questions about reality (Spinks, 2003; Jocic, 2022; Creasy, 2020). The combination of Nietzsche's nihilism and Wittgenstein's focus on language marked a turning point, shaping philosophical discussions in the 20th century (Creasy, 2020). Therefore, the 20th-century movements like existentialism, postmodernism, and analytic philosophy particularly that are exemplified in Wittgenstein's linguistic analysis.

Based on this background, three things need to be clarified for the reader to understand: first, the traditional notions of objective reality, embodying the belief in a singular, external reality independent of individual interpretations; second, the concept of correspondence or conformity, where truth is established by statements aligning with the external world; and third, the association of these traditional views with modernism, emphasising reason, science and technology to uncover objective truths and improve society, forming a historical continuum countered by postmodernism's challenge to the universality of truth grounded in cultural and subjective experiences. Postmodernism challenges the traditional view, arguing that truth is always shaped by cultural, historical, and linguistic factors and that no universal truth exists beyond our individual and social experiences. In this perspective, postmodernists argue that, truth is not a fixed, objective reality but a socially
constructed concept that varies depending on the context in which it is used (Lyotard, 1984). This view challenges traditional notions of objective reality and underlines the importance of context and perspective in shaping our understanding of truth.

2. Methodology

This paper used a combination of analytical and phenomenological methods to investigate evolution of the concept of truth across various philosophical epochs. The analytical aspect involved a thorough examination of primary sources namely, philosophical texts, letters, and treatises engaging qualitative content analysis. The analytical method enabled the researchers to break down the complex ideas into small ones manageable to the context (Neuman, 2007; Jensen & Jankowski, 1991). By so doing, this method enabled the identification of key themes and perspectives of each philosopher and epochs on truth.

Instantaneously, the phenomenological approach added depth by exploring the lived experiences of individuals within each philosophical epoch (Neuman, 2007). This involved a phenomenological analysis of how individuals, especially philosophers perceived and experienced truth in their respective cultural and historical contexts. By examining the subjective dimensions of truth, the phenomenological method enriched the analysis with insights into the personal, contextual, and experiential aspects that shaped philosophical discourse (Bryman & Burgess, 1994; Jensen & Jankowski, 1991). This dual approach guaranteed a comprehensive exploration of intellectual developments and lived experiences to unravel the complex dynamics integral to the evolution of the concept of truth.

3. The Postmodernist View of Truth

Postmodernism, is a philosophical movement that emerged in the late 20th century (Farhangpour & Abdolsalami, 2016). It challenges the longstanding notion of absolute truth held by pre-19th-century philosophers. Departing from traditional views, postmodernists hold a distinctive definition of truth, contending that, it is not an objective reality but a socially constructed concept shaped by cultural, historical and linguistic factors. This perspective takes us back to the ancient age of the sophists, who, like postmodernists, argued for the relativity of truth. The sophists, such as Protagoras, Gorgias, and Antiphon, maintained that truth is not absolute but relative. For instance, Protagoras exemplified this viewpoint with his statement "Man is the measure of all things," illustrating the profound implications of this relativistic standpoint on politics, science, and art (Lee, 2012).

In politics, postmodernism view of truth challenges established power structures and calls for a recognition of diverse voices; Whereas in science, it questions the assumption of objective and neutral knowledge; and in art, it urges a reconsideration of traditional aesthetic standards, emphasising the value of diverse forms of artistic expression (Lee, 2012; Lyotard, 1984). This relativistic perspective has far-reaching implications for contemporary discussions on power, diversity, and equity, offering valuable insights and tools for promoting a more just and equitable society in the today's world (Lee, 2012; Lyotard, 1984).

It is important to note that, one of the major postmodernist principles involve the rejection of comprehensive and all-encompassing explanations attempting to define the world (Lyotard, 1984). Postmodernists, instead, emphasise on local narratives and individual perspectives that reflect the diversity of human experience (Habermas, 1984). This argument aligns with certain modern philosophers. For instance, Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida argue that, dominant narratives often serve as mechanisms of power, shaping and controlling our understanding of truth while perpetuating domination (Foucault, 1977; Derrida, 1978). According to this perspective, those in positions of power control the narrative and define what
is considered true. In this respect, Michel Foucault argues that, power is both repressive and productive, shaping the boundaries of discourse (Foucault, 1977). However, their arguments differ from those of contemporary philosophers such as Jürgen Habermas, who asserted that, all-encompassing narratives can provide a basis for shared understanding and communicative action (Habermas, 1984). This emphasis on local narratives and individual perspectives has significant implications for politics. For example, in Africa, where postcolonial narratives challenge Eurocentric perspectives, indigenous voices are reclaiming their histories and cultures. Movements advocating for decolonisation in education and the arts have gained momentum, seeking to redefine the narrative surrounding Africa's past and present. Such prominent movements like Black Lives Matter and Me Too, are prominent in the contemporary society, rejecting overarching narratives and thus, advocating for social justice (Foucault, 1977; Habermas, 1984; Lyotard, 1984). These movements amplify individual experiences, challenging systemic inequalities and promoting inclusivity and equity.

### 3.1. Language and Truth

Another central theme in postmodernist thought is the role of language in constructing reality and truth (Derrida, 1978). It is argued that, language plays a crucial role in shaping our understanding of truth, with postmodernists contending that, words are not neutral but are infused with cultural and historical meanings (Butler, 1997; Rorty, 1989). For example, the word “freedom” may have different connotations in different cultural contexts, leading to varying interpretations of what constitutes freedom. Making reference to modernists such as Jacques Derrida, a French philosopher, with his “deconstruction,” contends that, language is a system of signs constantly shifting in meaning. This aligns with the argument of contemporary scholars like Judith Butler and Richard Rorty, who emphasise the socially constructed nature of language (Derrida, 1978; Butler, 1997; Rorty, 1989).

The postmodern perspective that emphasise the subjectivity and relativity of truth has far-reaching implications in our contemporary life. For example, in Africa, we witness diverse interpretations of truth in postcolonial narratives challenging Eurocentric perspectives. Postcolonial movements in Africa, like “Rhodes Must Fall,” challenge Eurocentric views (Dlamini, 2016). This phenomenon is similar to what is witnessed in countries like India and China in Asia, as well as Brazil and Mexico in Latin America. In India, interpretations of historical events differ (Chakrabarty, 1992), while China’s complex history and Latin America’s diverse cultural narratives exemplify the relativity of truth (Quijano, 2000; Mignolo, 2000). Moreover, Derrida’s deconstruction concept emphasises that, language is always open to interpretation and that meanings are never fixed or stable (Derrida, 1976). In this view, there is no single correct interpretation of a text or concept but rather a multitude of possible interpretations shaped by the reader’s cultural and historical context. This deconstructive approach has been applied to various disciplines, from literature to philosophy and law. For example, in legal studies, postmodernist scholars have used deconstruction to challenge the idea of legal certainty, arguing that, legal texts are always open to interpretation and that judicial decisions are shaped by various factors, including cultural and political context (Kleinman, 1993). In this regard, the law is not an objective set of rules but a system of power relations constantly shifting and open to contestation.

Similarly, in literary studies, postmodernist scholars have used deconstruction to challenge the idea of the author’s intention, arguing that the meaning of a text is not determined solely by the author’s intent but by a range of cultural and historical factors (Barthes, 1977). In this view, the meaning of a text is not fixed but is constantly shifting and open to interpretation.
In this regard, postmodernism challenges traditional notions of language as a transparent medium that accurately represents reality. Instead, postmodernists argue that language is always infused with cultural and historical meanings and constantly shifts in meaning. This deconstructive approach has far-reaching implications for law, literature, and philosophy. It underscores the need for critical reflection on the role of language in shaping our understanding of truth (Kleinman, 1993; Lyotard, 1984; Derrida, 1976).

Postmodernism’s critique of language as a transparent medium that accurately represents reality has strengths and weaknesses. One of the strengths of this perspective is that it highlights the importance of recognising that language is not a neutral tool for communication but is always shaped by cultural and historical factors (Derrida, 1978; Lyotard, 1984). This implies that different cultures and historical periods may have different meanings and interpretations of the same language, leading to misunderstandings and misinterpretations. Therefore, postmodernism’s emphasis on critical reflection on the role of language in shaping our understanding of truth can help us to avoid such misunderstandings and improve our communication with people from different backgrounds (Rorty, 1989).

However, one of the weaknesses of postmodernism’s approach to language is that it can lead to skepticism about the possibility of objective truth altogether. Here, the critical question is that if language is always infused with cultural and historical meanings and constantly shifts in meaning, how can we ever know what is true? This skepticism can lead to relativism and a rejection of the idea that there are universal moral or ethical standards that apply to all cultures and societies. This has been criticised as a dangerous position that can lead to moral nihilism and a breakdown of social order, a feature of the contemporary postmodern Western society (Barthes, 1977; Kleinman, 1993).

Scholarly analysis support both the strengths and weaknesses of postmodernism’s approach to language. For example, in law, scholars have argued that language is a key tool for interpreting and applying the law, but it is always infused with cultural and historical meanings (Koskenniemi, 2011). This means that legal interpretations and decisions are not always objective but are shaped by the cultural and historical context in which they are made. Similarly, in philosophy, postmodernists have challenged traditional notions of language as a tool for representing reality and have emphasised the importance of recognising the role of language in shaping our understanding of truth (Fish, 1989). This has led to a more nuanced approach to the relationship between language and truth, which acknowledges the issue’s complexity.

As a matter of fact, postmodernism’s critique of language as a transparent medium has led to a greater appreciation of how literature can challenge and subvert dominant cultural narratives (McHale, 2013). However, some critics have argued that postmodernism’s rejection of objective truth can lead to denying literature’s ability to represent reality meaningfully (Sacks, 2018).

3.2. Power and Truth
Another central theme in postmodernist thoughts on truth is that, power relations play a significant role in shaping what is considered true. According to postmodernists, those in positions of power can control the narrative and define what is considered true. This is exemplified in the work of Michel Foucault, who argues that power is repressive and productive. In other words, those in power control what is said and shape what can be said by defining the boundaries of discourse (hooks, 1990; Bricmont, 1998).

Moreover, Foucault’s concept of power knowledge highlights that, knowledge is not neutral but shaped by power relations (Foucault, 1980). In this view, those in power can shape
what is considered true and what is not by controlling the production and dissemination of knowledge. This has significant implications for fields such as science, where scientific knowledge is often used to justify power relations and reinforce social hierarchies. For example, postmodernist scholars have used Foucauldian analysis to challenge the idea of scientific objectivity, posing an argument that, scientific knowledge is not neutral but is shaped by social and political factors (Harding, 1991). In this view, scientific knowledge does not reflect an objective reality but is shaped by power relations and cultural biases.

Similarly, postmodernist scholars have used Foucauldian analysis to challenge the idea of universal human rights, arguing that power relations and cultural biases shape human rights discourse (Bhabha, 1994). In this view, human rights are not a fixed and universal concept but are shaped by cultural and historical factors (Foucault, 1980). In this regard, postmodernist thought challenges the idea that, knowledge is objective and neutral. Instead, postmodernists argue that, knowledge is shaped by power relations and cultural biases, highlighting the need for critical reflection about the role of power in shaping what is considered true (Harding, 1991; Foucault, 1980).

From this discussion, it can be inferred that, the assertion that, knowledge is shaped by power relations and cultural biases, rather than being objective and neutral, is a central tenet of postmodernist thought (Foucault, 1972; Lyotard, 1984). This perspective highlights how dominant groups can use their power to construct and perpetuate certain forms of knowledge while marginalising alternative views (Hooks, 1990).

Among the strengths of this perspective is that, it draws attention to how power relations and cultural biases shape the production and dissemination of knowledge. By highlighting the importance of critical reflection and questioning established forms of knowledge. Thus, postmodernism helps to promote a more democratic and inclusive approach to knowledge creation (Haraway, 1988). However, a weakness of this perspective is that, it can lead to relativism and the rejection of any claims to objective truth. This can be problematic, particularly in fields such as science, where objective truth claims are central to advancing knowledge. The focus on power relations and cultural biases can sometimes overlook the importance of empirical evidence and rational analysis in determining what is true (Sokal & Bricmont, 1998).

Recent scholarship has further explored the relationship between power and knowledge, highlighting how power can shape the categories and concepts used to construct knowledge. For example, feminist epistemology criticised how traditional epistemologies have been male-centered and excluded women's experiences and knowledge (Harding, 1986). Similarly, critical race theory has drawn attention to how race and racism shape knowledge production and dissemination (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001).

This suggests that, critical reflections and questioning of established forms of knowledge are crucial for promoting a more democratic and inclusive approach to knowledge creation. It also underscores the need to recognise and address power imbalances and cultural biases in knowledge production and dissemination, particularly in fields where objective truth claims are central to the advancement of knowledge.

### 3.3. Science and Truth

Postmodernists have been particularly critical of the scientific method, which they argue is based on the assumption of an objective reality that can be discovered through empirical observation. Postmodernists reject this idea, arguing that, scientific knowledge is always situated within a particular cultural and historical context. This view is exemplified in the work of physicist Alan Sokal, who famously submitted a hoax article to the postmodernist journal
Social Text, arguing that, scientific language was being misused in postmodernist discourse (Haraway, 1991; Hodson, 2020). In this context, Sokal emerges as a critic, aiming to highlight what he saw as a detrimental impact of postmodernist discourse on the integrity of scientific and humanistic disciplines.

Sokal’s hoax article used scientific jargon to make nonsensical arguments about the relationship between quantum mechanics and social theory. In this respect, Sokal aimed to expose what he observed as the misuse of scientific language in postmodernist discourse, which he argued was undermining the credibility of both science and the humanities (Haraway, 1991). While Sokal’s hoax was controversial and received criticism from some postmodernist scholars, it eventually highlights the tensions between postmodernism and science. Postmodernist critiques of science have focused on the idea that, scientific knowledge is not objective but is shaped by cultural and historical factors (Hodson, 2020). Postmodernists argue that, scientific methods are not value-neutral but are shaped by social and political interests. This has led to some postmodernists to argue for a more socially engaged approach to science, which takes into account the social and political implications of scientific research (Haraway, 1991; Hodson, 2020).

The postmodernist critique of science has several strengths, including its emphasis on the influence of social and cultural factors on scientific knowledge. Postmodernist thinkers argue that, scientific knowledge is not objective or neutral but reflects the cultural and social context in which it is produced (Hodson, 2020; Haraway, 1991). This critique has highlighted the importance of critical reflection on the role of power and culture in shaping scientific knowledge. This has encouraged a more critical and reflective approach to scientific inquiry, making scientists more aware of their own biases and assumptions. This can help to promote social justice in science education, as Hodson (2020) argues, by encouraging a critical examination of the social and cultural factors that shape scientific knowledge.

Moreover, highlighting on the importance of reflecting on the role of power and culture in shaping scientific knowledge. It suggests that, by making scientists more aware of their own biases and assumptions, postmodernism can encourage a more critical and reflective approach to scientific inquiry. Furthermore, Breen's (2021) work highlights the ways in which feminist and postmodernist critiques have challenged traditional views of scientific knowledge as objective and neutral. In this regard, Breen argues that, these critiques have highlighted the social and political context in which scientific knowledge is produced and have prompted scientists to consider how social and cultural factors shape their work.

Another strength of the postmodernist critique of science is that, it raises critical questions about the nature of science itself. Postmodernist thinkers argue that, the traditional view of science as a purely rational and objective enterprise is misguided and that, science is deeply embedded in cultural and political contexts. This critique has prompted scientists to consider how their work is shaped by social and cultural factors and has led to a greater appreciation for the role of subjectivity and interpretation in scientific inquiry. Moreover, Ashrafi (2021) traces the evolution of postmodernist critiques of science over the past several decades, highlighting the importance of this critique in shaping the field of science.

Furthermore, Gare’s (2021) work explores how postmodernist analyses can help to address the pressing environmental challenges facing our planet, highlighting the practical implications of this critique for addressing real-world problems. It is important to note that, this critique encourages us to be more mindful of the subjectivity and interpretation involved in scientific inquiry and to recognise that, scientific knowledge is not always neutral or free from bias. By acknowledging these limitations, we can work towards a more nuanced and accurate understanding of the truth. Ultimately, the postmodernist critique of science encourages us to
examine our assumptions about scientific knowledge critically and to be more reflective in our pursuit for the truth. Ultimately, the postmodernist critique of science encourages us to critically examine our assumptions about scientific knowledge and be more reflective in our pursuit of truth.

4. Conclusion
The postmodernist analysis of truth has challenged traditional notions of objective reality and emphasised the importance of context and perspective in shaping our understanding of truth. While postmodernism has been criticised for its relativism and rejection of scientific knowledge, it has also contributed to important debates about power relations, language, and cultural context in shaping our knowledge and understanding of truth. Ultimately, the postmodernist critique of truth reminds us that, our understanding knowledge of reality is always situated within a particular cultural and historical context and subject to constant interpretation and reinterpretation.

Therefore, the postmodernist critique of truth has sparked important conversations about reality's complex and dynamic nature. While its rejection of objective truth and scientific knowledge has drawn criticism, its emphasis on context, perspective, and diversity highlights how power dynamics shape our understanding of the world. Ultimately, the postmodernist analysis of truth invites us to approach knowledge with humility and curiosity, recognising that our understanding of reality evolves constantly and is contingent on our cultural and historical context.
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