



Post-Structuralism in Korean Drama “Two Weeks”

Vol. IV, No. I (Winter 2019) | Page: 351 – 358 | DOI: 10.31703/grr.2019(IV-I).38

p- ISSN: 2616-955X | e-ISSN: 2663-7030 | ISSN-L: 2616-955X

Zahir Jang Khattak*

Hira Ali[†]

Shehrzad Ameena Khattak[‡]

Abstract *This research aims at the explication of Korean drama “Two Weeks” by applying poststructuralism. The structuralists contend to have characters as patterns, which can be incurred as apt as universal identities. The poststructuralist mode of analysis, deconstruction, dismantles it as unstable, and its meanings as not self-sufficient. The focus is on discrete analysis than on a judgemental critique, confers a valuable amount of subject deconstruction, especially the protagonist Jang Tae San that has receded to the dismantling of binary oppositions by playing a hero of what structure amounts to a criminal record. Derrida’s deconstruction accedes to those limits that are a pivot to render signification in the chain of signifiers. “Two Weeks” is a signifier of the nature that is conducive to exploring this post-structuralist identity. The study deduces that the incumbent visuals extend not merely to commerce upshot, but it is a deconstruction of the text itself.*

Key Words: Post-Structuralism, Deconstruction, Unstable Meanings, Two Weeks, Jacques Derrida.

Introduction

It is a story of character “Jang-Tae San in exclusion, and this exclusion is obtrusive to who hunt him down as criminal (i.e. to punish him), indifference to those who hunt him for thrusting him in abject adjunct to where he is associated (i.e. to put him in the position of criminal). The impertinence of his situation is amplified by a third-tier: a woman he had a child with. She hunts him down, to save the life of her child who he bitterly fretted about to be aborted in the past. The researcher will observe if Jang-Tae San is actually a criminal or villain through a post-structuralist lens, which is rendered easy by the centrality of character in direction and plot. The researcher notes that the drama is construed through a post-structuralist approach.

Structuralism profusely identifies the arena of the arbitrary mandate of the signifier with the signified. But they fall short of one step, complemented by post-structuralism. The displacement that carries on to no end in particular thus revels in characteristic terms the ultimate nature of continuing research. The need for meta-language, in other words, can be imbibed by the probable evocation and research. To proceed in Butler’s terms poststructuralism is the rejection of “the claims of totality and universality and the presumption of binary structural oppositions that implicitly operate to quell the insistent ambiguity and openness of linguistic and cultural signification” (Butler, 1990, p.40). “Two Weeks” is the concentration of the effect that a criminal as a humanly figure with humanly heart and hopes. This research follows a detailed analysis and a refutation of the signifier “hero” necessarily meaning to be not an “incumbent villain/incumbent criminal” as signified. In structuralism, there is a “disappearance of the subject”, as he is spawned by, and absorbed back into, the general structure (Palmer, 1997, pp. 4). As for Derrida, Jang Tae-san “follows the play of the limit at the apparently more immediate and truthful core of language” (William, 2005, p. 3). His deconstruction can be endorsed in Berkeley’s words that “in a text, contradictions, reversals, and ambiguities can create gaps”. Berkeley argued famously that it is meaningless to speak about anything beyond what is perceived.

The decoding through visual, of text does not imply to make visual the center, rather a component at play; as Derrida’s lecture on “Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of Human Sciences” (1993) inspires to be. The objective of this research is the reception of deception of archetype when the deconstruction follows it to deconstruct it.

Literature Review

“In its less dramatic versions,” writes Palmer, “structuralism is just a method of studying language, society, and the works of

* Professor, Department of English, Qurtaba University, Peshawar, KP, Pakistan.

[†]Lecturer, Department of English, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan.

[‡]PhD Scholar, Department of English, Qurtaba University, Peshawar, KP, Pakistan. Email: shehrzadkhattak@yahoo.com

artists and novelists. But in its most exuberant form, it is a philosophy, an overall worldview that provides an account of reality and knowledge." Poststructuralism is a loosely knit intellectual movement, comprised mainly of ex-structuralists, who either became dissatisfied with the theory or felt they could improve it. (Palmer, 1997). The precept that warrants anything but an apprehension in particular to analytic philosophers. The ideational predicament assumes itself in the post-structuralist study following the analytical philosophers as Belsey recounts, "Post-structuralism is making a virtue of epistemological impotence, forever forsaking the ambitions of reaching the stars." (Belsey, 2002, p. 6) The post-structuralists denounce ontology as an end in itself and comes affront to the distinction of epistemology to ontology. At one pole, theory refers to a neo-Kantian style of structuralist analysis. Here it is understood via the model of an a priori language or grammar and is oriented to the formation of theoretical human sciences — structural linguistics, semiotics, anthropology, political economy, psychology — understood as sciences of possible experience (Foucault, 1971). But on the other pole, one may confer "You who read me, are You sure of understanding my language" (Borges, 1962, pp. 57-8)?. So, post-structuralism is a point of departure from the formative structure that upholds themselves as the nominal categories to identity. Identity cannot be a rapport of patterns. By any other pattern, one forsaken for the other, as the hermeneutics of reader or the interpreter comes forth with the backdrop of his own identity. Thus he may justifiably see a structure too but of different orientation. This diffuses the structuralism, and the transition follows into post-structuralism. Post-structuralism maintains that structures are not universal. This brings forth the predicament, "If language cannot be explained by the discovery of a universal structure, how is the post-structuralism to proceed in making sense of language? One answer is to return to signs as concrete and material entities and to describe the relationships between these" (Radford, 2004). The meanings are not thrust upon by structures, but by the non-structures very likewise that disseminate them. In the words of Harcourt: "In contrast to other forms of critical theory, poststructuralism focuses on the social distribution of power associated with the construction of knowledge, what has come to be known as the "power/knowledge" critique" (Harcourt, 2007).

Post-structuralism probes and divest us out of the generalities that one has been anticipating, and critically analyses with insight into how far structures are inadequate to account for meanings. Deleuze and Guattari explicate Structuralism and Post-structuralism as games of Chess and Go respectively. "Go is war without battle lines, with neither confrontation nor retreat, without battles even: pure strategy, whereas Chess is semiology" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 353. In 1966 lecture "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences", Jacques Derrida conferred the play of signs, and essentially the "decentering". Instead of deflection from an identified center, Derrida described this "event" as a kind of "play." "It is not surrounded, but traversed by its limit, marked in its inside by the multiple furrows of its margin" (D: 25). It is to be noted that "the limit is not defined in opposition to the core; it is a positive thing in its own right" (William, 2005, pp. 2). Poststructuralists trace the effects of a limit defined as difference. Here, "difference" is not understood in the structuralist sense of the difference between identifiable things, but in the sense of open variations (these are sometimes called processes of differentiation, at other times, pure differences) (William, 2005, pp. 3). "From a Poststructuralist perspective, identity is:

- Contextually situated in a past-present-future time frame
- Fluid, dynamic, shifting and variant;
- Multiple, multi-dimensional, diverse and accordingly negotiated due to having contradictory and conflicting selves, among which we make a choice" (Kouhpaenejad, Gholaminejad, 2014).

Poststructuralism's identity is to recede from demarcations of identities as a blur. The dramatists and drama-art are very much concerned with actions' understanding and the difference amongst them of course. "We understand action because the motor representation of that action is activated in our brain." (Rizzolatti, Fogassi, & Gallese, 2001, p. 661). The facets of neuro-behavioral sciences demystify, and in our study, the legacy of deconstruction can collocate with it and in cinematography, therefore, we see the motor representation of the action in the form of activated motor-neurons that are rendered by visuals.

Critical Analysis

Poststructuralism refutes the unconscious structures as the generalities to account for all particularities. For Jacques Derrida posits that meanings are unstable. It can be noted that the structures of meanings are not universal, and do not reflect ontological truths about humans or society. Poststructuralists "focus on those gaps and ambiguities in the system of meaning and find meaning there" (Bernard, 2007). In the drama "Two Weeks" there is a displacement in the protagonist's identity from backdrop criminal to shift of identity that is deconstructed. A metamorphosis in even the *self* that has converged in the anti-hero has actualized him as a hero. The stage of *actualization* in Maslow's hierarchy of needs is hereby recalled, "Human needs arrange themselves in hierarchies of pre-potency" (Maslow, 1943, p. 370). It is these and their hierarchy that causes aporia. As in the instance:

Jang Tae San: "I... was trash. Born as trash, I lived as trash.... Just once in life, I would like to live as a human being." (Ep 3)

Reinscribing with oneself a new life is wishfulness that partakes to undo oneself. The dystopia is the asset of an anti-hero. It makes of him impunitive or abrasive. An anti-hero in Shafer and Raney's findings indicate the antihero enjoyment that differs from traditional hero (2012, p.1028), the schema produced the appeal that is not well contained within bounds of Affective Disposition Theory, a theory that falls short of explaining this phenomenon. But the man without veneration, albeit with intact sensibility, is the restructuring of both categories, hero versus anti-hero.

This leaves us with the innuendo of needs not only of the "hero" figure (the traditional one, who always raised the audacity of universal goodness) but also of the "villain"/ "self". This dissociation with the general-good is a signifier in the structuralist terms for the bad. But since he is foregrounded as the central figure of the story we do get to see the good of him. This leaves one enmeshed in the efficacy of "foregrounding" playing an ample role in associating with the one as good or bad label. This is what reiterates arbitrariness and the vulnerability of the efficacy itself by meaning alone. For meaning is to bash or too assertive maybe, that we need something in beyond to know it is bashful or does it justifiably empowers assertiveness. These are themselves the elements that prefigure a tragedy. So, this deciphers that tragedy happens not only through character but also through meanings.

The story begins in the middle when the protagonist Jang Tae-San is living a meaningless life at a pawn shop. Confronting his old gang members they are surprised at his making money through night clubs.

Character a: "He is insulting all the gangs in the country."

Character b: "Why aren't you guys not doing anything about him then? He's insulting all of us."

Character c: "Because he went to jail twice instead of President Moon."

These three fellows observed Jang Tae-san in the manner as if they held the moral standing to denounce Jang Tae San. That is the presence of emotion not in opposition to the necessary absence of it, but possibly in opposition to another altogether different emotion with no characteristic association, like in the instance above "insult/pity. Likewise, the "goodness" is attached to the "gang", but "bad or insulting" with the "nightclub". This is characteristically vitriol but polemic to its own acclamation of having the reverence in being gang and debilitating in clubbing.

Ko Man Seok: "Bro, I am curious. What is your identity? Are you a gangster or good-for-nothing bastard?"

Jang Tae San: "They say I am both." (Ep 1)

The identity is fluid. He has deconstructed his own identity. But he has not deconstructed enough to be out of the box. If he had been out of the box, then in episode 10 one wouldn't have found him helpless about himself and blaming himself the way he had made of himself.

"Did you sell your body last night?" (Ep 1)

Tae San inquired by pawn shop's member, seems a person bereft of morality and conduct. The centrality of this character as the protagonist seems unlike the traditional characterization. This gives an indication of the post-structuralist mode of drama and the identities deconstructed. As can be followed by Tae San's remarks to In Hye in flashback instance:

"The child and you, I said you're both a burden." (Ep 1)

Deconstruction relegates through the ambivalence of text inherently in opposition to itself, on the other hand in drama, the visual itself is the deconstruction of the text, which makes it exactly the name it's known by, i.e. drama. So, margins do control the structure as a whole and diffuse the meaning into it. Victims and culprits may share common structures like both are "hideous", "have gestures of inaction or exaggerated action", "posits great threat", "exclude certain forces of nature", but exactly "fear nature". But the point is, Jang Tae-San sure becomes a culprit but he is refuting the structure when the viewer or audience resumes seeing his nemesis. The verisimilitude of a better character than him is Senator Jo. She is a well-respected lady. The assortment of one privileged over the other. Senator Jo's wallet got stolen and the women react:

"Her wallet was stolen and it has only 3000 won in it". (Ep 1)

The character is turned into a monument when people gossip about her. The onlookers within the drama ensue similar results. The prerogative that articulates discretion and therefore the viewers within the drama (which is the imperative knowledge), constructs dogmatism. The onlookers contrive to proliferate liminal main cast into paradoxes. "Paradoxes, as they occur in Derrida's thought, do not close down or stall argumentation, but rather open it as a form of intertextuality" (DeRoo, 2008, p.5).

A hospital is a place where people lay sick and bed-ridden. But the first scene of the hospital with the children running and playing soccer is not the image signified. The certainty of the patient and the agent makes two differences. The prior is alive if the latter realizes. It is, therefore, the mundane that is arrived at, with the loss of it. To privilege life over death is itself an onset of death.

[M]y here-now is absolutely untranslatable and . . . the world in which I speak is absolutely heterogeneous. It has nothing in common with that of anyone, here. What I feel within me, what I live within me, the way in which words come to my mind, all of that is absolutely incommensurable. With the multiplicity of those who receive it, understand it each more or less in their own way and each from a here infinitely different from my here, there is no common space; this distance between his here and mine is infinite. . . . Between two "here," there is properly infinite irreducibility, an infinite heterogeneity (Derrida, 1998, p. 247).

Behind the signification of Senator Jo's prestigious outlook is the matter of solace and the will to goodness specifically chartered for her son. To that end, all means justify, like the Machiavellian policy. President Moon and Senator Jo disclose in their talk that they had it planned. It was a tactic to gain eminence in the public eye. The two plots get twisted unto each at the very development of the plot since episode 1.

Tae San: "You think I am just going to show up now and say she's my daughter? I am not going to do that. I would never to do that." (Ep 1)

The disowning father is the figure and his animosity that posits his character, and it is construed with the vivacity of his inaction to redeem any positive quality and not because it is inherently bad. Just like as elucidated by Derrida that the foundation of the authority of law is *external* to justice (Glendinning, 2016, p. 5) before even the cues had any explicit sign of its presence, the relation between two basic characters have already derived that line of law and justice. Replies, In Hye:

In Hye: "Yes you wouldn't do that.

And you can't do that." (Ep 1)

The reception of disowned father is the figure actualized and the evocation at other's end. That other is In Hye. The meanings above disseminate a Korean father that isn't attesting a patriarchal father. Yet had he been in a different context, the cue had been rephrased as 'Is he a father?' Albeit, left in situ, In Hye had made sure, he isn't a father. The fixity of boundaries of identity is precariously at aporia, for another feasible interaction at a different juncture evoked:

Soo Jin: "Daddy!" (Ep 1)

The role of an 8-year-old daughter is the subversion of Tae San's identity, a daughter that he had never met before. That's what can be seen through the transition from textual to visual, which the viewer can tacitly visualize i.e., Tae San's positive vibe.

The news ticker of a fugitive murderer, Jang Tae San brings a logocentric innuendo. This is logocentrism, that domineers in the speculative and criminal investigation agency, the police. Before the police, it was the viewers who already had the knowledge of protagonist Tae San's *suo moto* cognizance. So, he isn't an anti-hero. But he has the *form* of an anti-hero. The murder scene at Mi Sook's home, Yeongdeungpo-gu, is where police discover Tae San.

Jin Il Do: "Victim had been in jail before twice."

The assistant detective reports to his senior and is spanked at the head by another senior for slip of tongue in "victim" for "culprit". As if two times being in jail is self-evident of crime. As if the nefarious act is stigmatizing and holds sway in being expectant of unchanging fixation, and the growth has slackened on some rigid score. That's how the world has known stigma as. "Stigmatization probably has a dramatic bearing on the distribution of life chances in such areas as earnings, housing, criminal involvement, health, and life itself" (Link, & Phelan, 2001, p. 363). The discrimination against Jang Tae San has the inexorable fate that

The visual modalities configure to create complex identities and complex narratives. The incongruity of exposition to expository depiction holds sway and regard a gestalt to be the monopoly of signification. It's monopoly true, in that it is a monopoly of individual, and nothing recognizes more individual than Derrida's deconstruction.

. Tae San's lives a life of carelessness. But it is very much the life of inhibition.

Jin Il Do: "This bastard is a total trash. Gambling places, night clubs, part-time jobs as a host and recently he was stalking Oh Mi Sook..." (Ep 2)

The effacement is thus the tenable congruence to be received at the end of actor Jin Il Do, an underhand knowledge of him (Jang Tae San) is all that the *other* (Jin Il Do) knows of the *self* (Tae San). Yet "according to Derrida, the only "relation" that is possible between self and other is one of interruption, that is, in effect, a nonrelation. And this is the only "relation" that is defensible" (Legrand, 2011, p.286).

In Hye: "Take care of yourself until the surgery date." (Ep 2)

It is not compassion that formulates this phrase, but an exigency as *order by request* or *request by order*.

"You should have something called thinking." (Ep 2)

Why, well the action, is it extermination of sentiment? Man/ woman and head/heart, rational/emotional binaries held is another *modus operandi* of apathetic explication. It is apathetic to look at things in a strategic way. And it is the stratagem inherited from generations, the outlook. Not only do the *modus* of societies change over time, but the individual is a composition of variations that no one individual is like the other, let alone have rational/emotional, man/woman bisections. How are strength and relations correlational? It is not where one is born determiner of what one becomes, but who they become where one is born. The newborn is not the one relying on the strength of grown-ups, the grown-ups' strength depends on the newborn. Just as the commitment of parents is more vigorous than youngsters.

Im Seung Woo: "This is a scandal homicide case, and that guy intentionally killed... They just make trouble while acting upon their emotions and desires. Two previous convictions.... I told you that a people's personalities are determined when they're born." (Ep 2)

"An apparent, plain, or downright murder" (Bouvier, 1856), aberemurder, a "willful murder" is Im Seung Woo detective's implication when he says homicide. A trier of fact is mitigated owing to intuition- "malice-aforethought"? Malice-aforethought completes the condition of homicide.

Jang Tae San: "It's not me. It's not me!" (Ep 2).

That's all he screams about when the result of the fingerprint came out. The forensic is aberrant therefore, or the crime is exorable. "Without successful identifications and accurate comparisons, any pursuit of justice by law enforcement officials is severely limited" (Fisher, 2014, p.4). The limits configure the knowledge too. Moon Il Sook covered all up this time and without even a warning. If Jang Tae San opens his mouth and assert his alibi (hospital), there are chances Moon Il Sook will be a threat to Soon Jin, his daughter, and In Hye. So, choice and chance are not binary oppositions here, but rather in a chain of signification one signifying the other. One sign defers to another.

In Hye: (seeing her daughter drawing) "Why is he crying? An adult, too."

Soo Jin: "He has a story."

In Hye: "What is it?"

Soo Jin: "A story is when you can't say it."

Mom said that." (Ep 2)

"Cognition is essentially construed as an activity carried out by an embodied and embedded agent" (Schilbach et al, 2013, p.395). This is an embodiment and embedded to recede the cognition that itself is a disclosure of agents (lying not at the core of knowledge but on the periphery of knowledge). Silence would have then essentially meant 'no story'. But Soo Jin's instrumental thought, the agencies at work in the mental precursors illustrate here a story in association with silence. The structuralist notion would have the narratives as precursors of larger archetype, the universal. The peripheries for it are expedient.

Soo Jin: Like ajhussi, a good person, right? (Ep 2)

The audacity to have an association with the right or rightness or the good, have the discursive recollection of struggling for the right thing. However, "from the critical perspective of a higher-order observer, the literary theory might lose its apparent distance from the object of study, as well as analytical and descriptive purity. Seen from the outside, it turns to be a discursive practice intertwined with literature" (Juvan, 2000, p. 2-3).

Tae San was picked as "scapegoat". Even in the jail cell when a prisoner who had just arrived, had tried to choke Tae San to death in his sleep. Tae San on struggling free began punching him in defense. The coming back of inspectors, they believed Tae San as the defector bashing him... "Why don't you put a show for us?" The refutation in discursivity exists and evince the tussle with reality by behaving precariously injuring at its most the haves-not. The reality is therefore construed But Derrida's theory is not a mere theory, but a philosophy. So, it's more justified to regard it as a philosophy and apply it as a philosophy. As a philosophy, it elucidates the inherent opposition in the interchangeable notions that are conceived by structuralism in fixity.

Doctor: "...that's why she'll be going into aseptic room."

Im Seung Woo: "What if in the process something happens to donor?" (Ep 2)

The volition is almost like a petition here, that has circumscribed itself into a denotation with connotation.

The researcher follows another instance,

Park Jae Kyong: "He was Moon Il Sook's dog. He did everything he's told." (Ep 3)

To tally with data that detective Park Jae Kyong had on Jang Tae San, she linked the pieces together into an identity that her intuition developed. The simulation that works from the center (i.e., that dispense) is the one deflected if the periphery is realized. Here the center can refer to sign of detective/justice and periphery as fugitive/framed.

Jang Tae San: "I didn't do it to run away. I did it so I won't die. I have to be there for your surgery." (Ep 3)

Is it that the periphery holds the stakes, and the center the meaning? If so, it is a destabilized contention that runs within the text itself. "Your" isn't actually "your" as referring to In Hye, nor "death" pertaining to conviction by execution. But not signifying the execution doesn't displace from un-fear of detectives or the police. It is within this signification being led on by another signified: the real criminals.

Moon Il Sook: "So he is trying to find the inside information so he can clear his name?" (Ep 4)

This notion by Moon Il Sook is inferred before even Tae San had any thoughts of doing so. Thereby, the signification cannot be always leading somewhere, but it can follow what has never even been chosen. So, it encapsulates into the incumbent position, whereby any awry data can make information and consequently a meaning.

"I am scared of human blood more than anything in this world." (Ep 4)

"Scared" is a word that has negative polarity, while the phrase "...of human blood" reverses the polarity. This is what we converge through sentiment classification, and this appends to deconstruction. "In sentiment classification, a sentence which contains positive (or negative) polarity words does not necessarily have the same polarity as a whole, and we need to consider interactions between words instead of handling words independently" (Nakagawa, 2010, p. 786). The polarity also shows the

pragmatism that eclectically leads to dogmatism. Pragmatism is the language's way of being secular and paradoxically, is the face-value of dogmatism. As in the instance below:

Park Jae Kyong: "Moon II Sook is a kind of person that never forgives a betrayal. That kind of bastard... saved Jang Tae San." (Ep 5)

Albeit, it is this kind of speculation that leads to demystification, a trial-and-error in dogma and not secularism that believes they are liberal and sensu lato humanistic. Female prosecutor Park Jae Kyong speculates about the case when the intransigence of *corpus delicti* of Tae San's murdering Mi Sook for Moon II Sook and being put to jail in his place while being helped in escape by a small explosion in the forest doesn't piece together. His escape recounts a betrayal to Moon II Sook.

Tae San: "Why do I keep on living just being wronged?" (Ep 5)

Soo Jin: "It's because they think you look like a fool." (Ep 5)

"Being wronged" is by signification not wholly in concordance with being "fool" for a fool implies "wronging more than wronged because of his *unwisely act*. This lack of sense (unwisely actions) is perpetrated by Tae San, but being *wronged* develops a different meaning of insensibility perpetrated *unto* him. With this kind of perpetration, how will the detectives chase him even when they change their manner of looking from "behavior" to "heart". Does it decipher that the whole chase has been flawed because they are chasing wisely a *fool*?

"There's no use looking at his behaviors. You have to look at his heart." (Ep 7)

If Tae San is a fool, as learned by Soo Jin who is his daughter albeit conscience and reason for his life; why would a person have lived because of a fool?

Han Chi Gook: "I am Han Chi Gook, that lived thanks to you." (Ep 7)

Is he a fool because he isn't a murderer? Provided that, you live in a circle who are murderers if you won't murder you will be a fool. The prestige is independent of what this world (of murderers) is in comparison to the world of livers/ one who observes life.

Jang Tae San: "I never wronged you in any way. What's the reason this time?" (Ep 7)

Moon II Sook: "You think all three times were my fault? They were your fault." (Ep 7)

If the blame-game and confrontation here were real, they wouldn't have groped for a reason. Albeit to grope for reason is different from to have a reason, and one deconstructs the other... in a way that *to have reason* is merely to have the *collective sense* of how the faults work and to *grobe for reason* is to empower the individual sense of fault. So, no one is really not faulty, nor in possession of no reason. It is the collective sense which is exactly that makes "I" and "You".

Moon II Suk: "You got scared of me because your heart is weak. You didn't run away from my threats because you aren't brave enough. You made a choice, you good for nothing brat." (Ep 7)

If you have to vandalize a person, you may take charge of the ad-infinitum discourse of theirs, but by all, in all, you refute them with their own co-existence. This is the inherent instability of asepsis, if one may call it, that is to say, asepsis doesn't exist if it were the metaphoric denotation of life. Fundamentally, Derrida's "aporia" can be recalled here. The binary opposites of weak/brave, bad/good do not exist so much as blue and green, even green is made of blue if one appends the art configuration. Moon II Suk is a palpable, kaleidoscopic figure that has just deconstructed by his presence next to Tae San, not so much as he is bad and Tae San as good, but by the retribution of identification as the repository of so much in need of the other, with nothing as privileged as the other de-privileged.

Structuralism poses definite boundaries between characters that fall under some scale of the head prototypes, of one being wronged and one who wrongs. If the one exhibits wrongs, is he a wrongdoer of the same degree if one gathers evidence against him? How characters are framed and form displaced identities being exhibiting between good and evil discrimination. The drama and connotes the protagonist as wrong, and villain the one who wrongs.

Deconstruction is therefore not ostracism (by destabilizing meanings), but a realization to see things out of the so-called incumbent centrality. Like senator Jo Seo Hee responds to Jang Tae San as,

Senator Jo: "You probably know how precious life is by now." (Ep 14)

It (this statement) consorts and is the gusto that has her approach (life is precious) to the meaning (of life) with the motive (ends justify the means) she has exposed here if we keep the context of her addressing this Jang Tae San (the fugitive). The Machiavellian policy that she has (the characterization of which had made of her a villain), when this policy wasn't well-requited she pried into pills to self-death.

Park Jae Kyong: "What will happen to your son if you die. By wanting to be an angel to your son you made countless others shed tears." (Ep 16)

So, even Machiavellian policy is not exclusive, but an intermission in the schema of thoughts shed at the instance when centrality could not hold and defer to a signifier of suicide. A blog gathers, "The movies definitely help from certain perspectives" (Boss, 2017). So, movies and the like as dramas can be a good medium of deconstruction. Media literacy is open to exploration.

Conclusion

It is incommensurable that the drive or behavior or action makes one the exemplification of common archetype, being even deflection, is structuralism- an outmoded approach. One learns from the Korean drama "Two Weeks" the de-centrality that can be foregrounded by the anti-hero inception of character through the visual modulations that are choreographed, and the thematic schema of hero that is the metamorphosis of not only Jang Tae San (protagonist) but also partake in the exigency of what a man he is. What a man he is, deconstructs the philosophy of man, behavior, justice, and subversion in the reality that is construed. The nemesis brought by Tae San's discerning and his discerning to reach resilience has a mortifying muse for the viewer, a deconstruction. The implications of deconstruction by applying Derrida's philosophy has made one re-read not the only text of literature as is in vogue but also the drama with their visual cues that deconstructs more than the viewers or readers anticipated. It reorients to see the unprivileged aspect, while the text of drama is repleting the privileged aspect. This overt deconstruction followed by social, behavioral, neurological, and technical constructs is deconstructed. Derrida's deconstruction meanwhile we found in the process of this explication, is not the subversion of every speech or act or conception, but the demystification of the process that happens to converge point to point. In short, deconstruction is a way of realization.

References

- Belsey, C. (2002). *Poststructuralism: A very short introduction*. Oxford: OUP Oxford.
- Bouvier, J. (1856). A Law Dictionary, Adapted to the Constitution and Laws of the United States: aberemurder. (n.d.). Retrieved January 19 2017 from <http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/aberemurder>
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- DeRoo, N., (2008) "Review of "Jacques Derrida: Opening Lines", " Essays in Philosophy: Vol. 9: Iss. 1, Article 7.
- Derrida, J., (1992). Force of law: The 'mystical foundations of authority'. In *Deconstruction and the possibility of justice*, ed. Drucilla Cornell, Michel Rosenfeld, and David Carlson. London: Routledge.
- Derrida, J., (1993). Structure, sign, and play in the discourse of the human sciences. *A postmodern reader*. New York: State University of New York Press. p. 223-242.
- Derrida, J.,(1998). "Fidélité à plus d'un," 13 Cahiers Intersignes 221, 247.
- Fisher, E., (2014). *Deconstructing the CSI effect: Forensic Science and the Media* (Thesis). University of Pennsylvania.
- Foucault, M. (1971). *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York, 303–87.
- Glendinning, S., (2016). Derrida and the Philosophy of Law and Justice. *Law and Critique*. University of London.
- Goodrich, et al. (eds.). (2008). *Derrida and Legal Philosophy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Harcourt, B. E., (2007) *An Answer to the Question: What is Poststructuralism?* University of Chicago Law School
- Juvan, M., (2000). "On Literariness: From Post-structuralism to Systems Theory". *Comparative Literature and Culture*. 2(2). p. 1-12.
- Kouhpaenejad, M. H., & Gholaminejad, R., (2014). Identity and Language Learning from Poststructuralist Perspective. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(1), pp. 199-204.
- Legrand, P., (2011). Jacques in the Book (On Apophasis). *Law & Literature*, Vol. 23, Issue 2, pp. 282-294.
- Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. C., (2001). Conceptualizing Stigma. *Annual Reviews*. Department of Sociology, Columbia University, New York. 27:363–85.
- McTaggart, J., & McTaggart, E. (1896). *Studies in the Hegelian dialectic*. Cambridge, MA: University Press.
- Nakagawa, T., Inui, K., Kurohashi, S., (2010). Dependency Tree-based Sentiment Classification Using CRFs With Hidden Variables. *Human Language Technologies: The 2010 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the ACL*. Los Angeles, California. p. 786–794.
- Palmer, D., (1997). *Structuralism and Poststructuralism for Beginners*. v3.1. Danbury: For Beginners LLC.
- Radford, G. P., Radford, M. L., (2004) Structuralism, Post-Structuralism, and the Library: de Saussure and Foucault. *Journal of Documentation* Vol. 61 No. 1, 2005 pp. 60-78
- Rizzolatti, G., Camarda, R., Fogassi, L., Gentilucci, M., Luppino, G., & Matelli, M. (1988). Functional organization of inferior area 6 in the macaque monkey: II. Area F5 and the control of distal movements. *Experimental Brain Research*, 71, 491–507.
- Schilbach et al, (2013). Toward a Second-Person Neuroscience. *Journal of Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. Cambridge University Press. 36: 4. p. 393-462.
- Shafer, D. M., Raney, A. A., (2015). Exploring How We Enjoy Anti-Hero Narratives. *Journal of Communication*, (62). p. 1028-1046.
- What Black People Think of Blackface In Korea | ASIAN BOSS : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N6xTOBKADzU>. (2017, Jan 24).
- Williams, J., (2005). Introduction: What is Poststructuralism? *Understanding Poststructuralism* (pp. 1-24). Malta: Gutenberg Press.