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Post modernism (POMO, henthforth) is dead, supposedly. Dinosaurs are dead too, except they are not, from an evolutionary point of view. If you look up to the sky, squint your eyes and peer into the trees in the forest, or contemplate the life of a lamppost in the city, you will see dinosaurs gliding, hopping, pecking, flapping, stooping and swooping their way in the world. You will see that dinosaurs are very much still around and everywhere. That is because birds are dinosaurs, or to be more accurate, birds are descendants of dinosaurs. Similarly, we see POMO’s multiplicity of representations in every field of intellectual discourse. One needs to look no further than POMO’s predecessor, modernism, to verify the tricky proposition of making pre-mature declarations of death. Modernism, and, by proxy, positivism, whose own supposed death was the precursor to the rise of POMO, is still ubiquitous and alive in institutions to this day. Modernism has left its fingerprints all over educational philosophy, and moreover, continues to guide policy and implementation in its image. It’s also interesting to note that postmodernism itself commented on this sort of messy state and status of existence when it invoked ideas of chaos, complexity, irony, uncertainty, unpredictability, out-of-controlness, and general ontic and epistemic multiplicity and plurality. As well, by declaring that it lives only in the moments, POMO escapes any accusatory claims that it has outlived its tenure of a historical period.

Still, there is no denying that POMO has become an exhausted dance partner in intellectual and academic discourse communities. That we would want a new dance partner to re-awaken aliveness and quicken our life's heartbeat is totally understandable. In this regard, reflecting on the longevity and vigor of wisdom traditions may be illuminating. In championing deconstruction of the modernist views and sensibility, such as solidity, linearity, objectivity, and certainty, POMO closely resembles a wisdom tradition, for example, Buddhist philosophical and psychological views. The latter, however, is in no way in danger of receiving certification of death and being phased out. Why, then, is POMO dying of exhaustion, whereas Buddhist philosophy is not? In asking this question, we invoke Michael Peter’s (2008) observation: “In one sense these eschatological narratives of endings (and beginnings), . . . are endemic to Western culture . . .. Reading the signs of exhaustion – an end or completion – the users of this device, following many precedents, lacked the confidence to name ‘the new’ and fell back upon the strategy of naming what it is not.” Perhaps what POMO lacked is a positive framing and offering of *how to live well* the lack of solidity, non-linearity, uncertainty, unpredictability, and the like. In the absence of positive, practice-based offerings, POMO would become a nihilistic viewpoint, and in due course, would exhaust itself out of existence.

Regardless of which new dance partner we choose, or whatever the new tune and the dance steps we may get into, the one thing we must keep in mind is the living planet, Earth, within whose bosom we live and die. That is, regardless of what variety of *isms* we may choose to dance with, we need to ask a crucially discerning question: will *this* philosophy help us and the earth to survive and flourish, together? That’s a supremely educational question.
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