A CRITICAL APPROACH TO CULTURE AND SOCIETY DEFINITIONS

Zafer GUNDUZ

Research Assistant, PhD. Student, Philosophy Department, Cumhuriyet University, Sivas, Turkey
zafergunduz62@hotmail.com.tr

Abstract

The point that is stressed by definitions of culture, which rely on its authenticity and considerations that it entails individuality (diversity), is its diversity. Being diverse and acknowledgement of authenticity of the diversity, involves forwardness in itself. Though the acknowledgement of diversity and the impression of integrity formed by the acknowledgement seem to pose a coherence, yet it bears a negative aspect internally. Despite so-called acknowledgement of diversity, coherence and integrity formation seem to be more important. Since coherence of the integrity is based on measures of the seeking subject, forwardness aims to preserve things that are available or to simply fill the gaps. Hence complexity and diversity bear a negative meaning for available things. Because of centered approach which basically is putting familiar things into a closer circle while putting others aside. It brings concretization to the culture. To the extent of concretization endeavor, it leads us to study culture as belonging to a society (the privatization aim here even breaks down culture to a subculture level). Concretization of culture itself might seem as understanding and acknowledgement of culture, however, the aim for making a definition involves detaching the existent from existence forms and from the environment that it exists in. This article is to discuss, with philosophical terms, how different cultures embrace sincerity in exposing themselves while interacting with other cultures given our definitions of culture and the

seeking for multiculturalism. Thanks to developments in transportation and means of technology, different cultures and societies meet and interact easily. Though we have a heritage of drawing borders, these borders hardly preserve their existence. The issues under discussion have evolved from the endeavor to build a common identity-culture-society to acknowledgement of diversity and difference.

Keywords

Culture, Individuality, Multiculturalism, Centered Approach, Others

1. Introduction

Along with the developments in technology, increasing communication means have revealed to us the information of other cultures and lives beyond the borders –which already became symbolic- we live in. Our boundaries affect our everyday life, depending on whether good or bad the developments are outside the local borders we live in. The news and social media are conveying the developments in the different regions of the world every day. Increasing population, decreasing resources, destruction of natural resources, wars, struggles of refugees to survive are on the way to becoming a problem of our everyday life. The fact that we do not face directly with some of these problems, means that we come to ignore the existence of these problems. Unfortunately, we are not able to avoid the psychological impact of problems that we are physically far from being in. The opportunities provided by the developing technologies and the widespread use of social media and the internet enable us to realize the existence of separate lives apart from the country, culture and religion we live in (Soykan, 2015, 322). For this reason, discussing the possibilities of living together and providing the most probable conditions for it seem like the greatest issue of our time.

In general, the conditions and possibility of living together are only given by the existence of some prior acknowledgments. The formation of a "self" as an individual requires the presence of these pre-acceptances. To become a "self" requires forming a boundary and defining the self and the other against itself (Agamben, 2013, 3-4). To form this boundary, one must accept the existence of the environment, society, beliefs, cultures in which the individual lives together. With these assumptions, the individual can now differentiate things as those for herself/himself and those not for herself/himself. Although psychological and conceptual explanations are given for acceptance of the self, the fact that it is for practice provides that it forms itself and its boundaries, giving meaning to its notions for an integrity

and concreteness only within a practice[1]. In short, the self can only be provided meaning by directing itself to what is practiced.

The existence of the individual as a being with others and the emergence of the possibility of self-formation in this order requires the existence of the 'other'. From this point of view, the individual as the existing one always derives her/his own boundaries from being directed towards the others (Jenks, 2007, 90). Being directed to the other is the line where being together and being distinct become clearer. "The self" has to be in a diversity (the other, culture, faith, society). Obligation is necessary for her/him to form her/his boundary. This and being together in a limited sense that not only the other. As we point out to her/him being with the same species as herself/himself, it includes everything outside of it.

2. Culture and "Self"

The aim of this study, rather than making a distinction of "self" and "not self" based on the notion of "self", is to make a logical inquiry for living together grounded on a culture oriented and centrality approach which we would really like to discuss by prioritizing the subject first in forming the boundaries regarding the "self" (Russell, 1975, 29-30). For this reason, it is necessary to emphasize the coexistence where the individual distinguishes herself/himself from the 'other'. Coexistence and the 'other' also have a context that expresses the diversity (being different) of others. While diversity is everything around the "self", in particular it has a design for the "self" which directs it to the others of its same genre. In other words, all intentions expressed by the words like 'diversity', 'other', and 'different' put all particular things together under the same genre with the "self" (Welsch, 2013, 513-532).

While the awareness, which belongs to the self and is limited by a specific field, receives criticisms like the "self" forgets its own existence and that it is in a world together with other existents, this forgetfulness now stands there as a concrete reality. The individual is making an order of importance for the existent and in the effort to preserve its existence order. She/he ranks importance of existents for the sake of closeness to and usefulness[2] for

---

[1] Etimologically, creating boundaries, existing among things is one of the possibilities of objects as in the sense of being in the world. Being in the self, however, is beyond existing among things for the subject. She/he, as intervening subject who retains its authenticity at the same time, is not there as a simple existent with other things. She/he is there as part of a demonstration. Unlike with the things, it is aimed at the practice, and with its the intervening trait. Levinas, **Sonsuza Tanıklık**, p62.

[2] Chris Jenks, quoting Harris in his work 'Subculture', positively associates living together and being a society with proximity, mutual support and solidarity. However, in its further chapters he recognizes that living together and being a society also bear a negative connotation by differentiating between social classes and other differences. Jenks, **Altkültür**, p29-38.

herself/himself, separatetly from the classifications like being a unique existent in its own genre, between beings and inanimate things, being a rare existent or being a unique genre. This seems to be more of a benefit to herself/himself. There seems to be an approach towards blessing itself and a display that it is special (Jenks, 2007, 65). The effort to separate itself from the 'other' and other existents is reflected in its practice of living together in the course of its entire life. Every expression she/he makes associated with the 'other' refers to the things/beings that she/he has to live together considering importance and usefulness, similarity, and identity around her/his centrality and within limits of tolerance.

To attain "self-consciousness", since it hosts the 'other' in itself, all our actions and interpretations fall within "being together". While "being together" and "self and the other" do not pose any problem, we need to understand why difficulties arise associated with living together and getting to know the 'other'. Making hasty conclusions asserting that these problems arise due to inequalities like opportunity gap, education, and wealth leads us to a superficial analysis rather than the real cause of the problem.

Definitions that ground on human being's being born into a culture-society are debated a lot.[3] What is a man, what is the culture, the possibilities of being together, etc., are deeply controversial topics that can be started quickly (Eagleton, 2011, p9-43. Mejuyev, 1987, p21-22. River 1998, p122-123. Uygur, 2013, p18. Karsli, 2016, p38-58). One of the reasons for such discussions is that the concerns of creating an initial point or an analytical foundation are shifting to a point where the existent is ignored. The existent lives through an oblivion (of herself/himself) with producing an inception and an effort to understand such as first cause. Part of the oblivion is the possibility of being together with the self and the nearest 'other'. First of all, forgetting the life cycle that we exist together and are a part of (where we are positioned as the nearest) produces the different and the not different. Making the distinction as closest and farthest to herself/himself and making this distinction not in a sense of coexistence but in an assumption of inception (where the self is positioned in the very center) have caused us to overlook the fact that we are in a mutual coexistence in this world. Since our effort for creation / acceptance of an inception has a strong basis within our history of existence, the hypotheses for definition of inception have both direct and indirect certainty in itself for the existent (Açıkgenç 2008 28-29). The certainty is the search for persuasion in

---

[3] As a sociological theory, talking about the existence of human being in a society includes harmony and inception endeavors in itself. There is also an endeavor to classify societies as to their religion, language, race, region and socioeconomic traits. In this way, definitions of popular culture and being cultivated are made. Berger, **Kültür Eleştirisi**, p141-143.

others. One of the means of this persuasion effort is the culture. Cultural definitions also have implications for teaching and for the 'other' to be in harmony by ignoring its differences and drives it to long for being the desired 'other'. Hence, addressing any approach like pluralism, other culture or multiculturalism is sacrificed unilaterally. When we talk about cultural pluralism or differences; what we do is bringing to the foreground the points that belong to the 'other' and differentiate us from it. The expressions we have made for the different have the opposite meaning as they have an intention to bring out similar aspects with the self in essence. Because she/he is the other than the self. As far as the the 'other' is concerned, it gets further away from the self. This diversion brings pollution for the self. Since the pollution and the incompleteness are features of it, the responsibility of keeping belongings of the self clean feels its weight more. The "self" cares that the different one needs to move away from herself/himself so that its belongings are not not contaminated. Increasing similarities between the 'other' and the self will increase pollution. Since this is a compromise, proximity between the self and the other will produce the idea that the self will begin to lose its attributes as being authentic and clean (Douglas, 2007). She/he will start losing her/his qualities and start questioning why she/he is so similar to what is standing far from itself. This is a sign of contamination. However, the presumption that the pollution is caused by creation of ambiguity and by the endeavor for creating abundancy is just derived from readings throughout the history (Mejuyev, 1987, 21-38). Historicity is filled with, or interpreted as, the struggle to get rid of the complexities of living together with the other. To recover from complexity and uncertainty is tried to be facilitated through the redundancy of expressions of certainty. Likewise, since the desire for certainty includes getting rid of ill-defined or contaminated things and uncertainty, the other is unable to recognize it from the very beginning as it is a victim of this desire[4]. The other needs to to learn about this certainty. Since learning includes approaching to the certainty (desire for satisfaction) the reliable evidence encounters with a state of recovery from misconception. The possibility of taking action, with this credible evidence will facilitate the approach towards action. Since she/he acts with the intention of being at the center of these definite presumtions, her/his feeling suspicion that these definite presumtions of herself/himself being blurred in a form of "what

---

[4] The Turkish edition of Newton's Mathematical Principles for Philosophy of Nature translated by Aziz Yardımlı, clearly distinguishes the nature of the definite (rational) and the indefinite (irrational) in the foreword as follows: "The universe is rational and can only be understood by an equally rational mindset. The world is also equally irrational for an irrational mindset. Scientific knowledge is knowledge of science or reality, or it is absolute knowledge should you wish to put it in another way- the knowledge of noncelestial, but simply unchanging, unchangeable; it is the knowledge of existent and the existent is the rational. Or the irrational is the non-existent, simply an imagination designed by fantasies of someone." Newton, 1998, p8.

if" quest is due to her/his proximity with her/his same genre, belief, culture, nation and family. In circumstances where she/he maintains proximity, she/he classifies herself/himself as a center, and classifies others with criteria such as importance, usefulness, and maintains "what if" quest as to such classification. As she/he moves out of this classification, she/he will assume adjectives such as different, lacking, dirty, primitive and evil. For this reason, as the criteria of being different increase, she/he will get further away from laying the importance on being together.[5]

As the proximity deepens, the orientation towards the other and coexistence will again be an orientation towards the self and understanding of it. It is not just a psychological struggle to identify the the self. On the contrary, the self does not feel just psychologically central; she/he is within this effort in a physical/experiential way. In the experience-oriented direction, the effort to go to the desired result is the most significant plan. It is not only the results of the following experiments, but also the judgments drawn from them guide our experience of learning. Because a behavior that should bear importance and usefulness direct our actions (as required by our understanding of being central). Of course, there is nothing wrong with us to act like this. An established proposition is like a tool for a certain use. "I'm totally sure" does not mean that every single person is sure. It means that we are part of a community that science and education bring together (Wittgenstein, 2009, 49). The saying is actually an acceptance's content. It is the satisfaction of a certain community and the acceptance of its closeness to the desired outcome (Wittgenstein, 2009, 49). For this reason, the following inference can be made easily: a certain community derives its togetherness from its potential for proximity within. The potential of the the self and the society for being together is maintained as a result of self's orientation towards the other with a sense of proximity[6]. For the self, to be within a society with the other is a desired situation. In this respect, togetherness is not coincidental, it contains causality. Along with togetherness, the proposal itself that will be produced alongside provides its certainty over this closeness'

---

[5] For Chicago school, as urban organism becomes increasingly complex, it produces a centralized decentralization idea which makes it difficult for centralization to be determined. This approach, which is an ecological model / representation, emphasizes that the domino effect is not ignored while addressing social problems. Chris J., **Altkültür**, s94.

[6] In Language, Truthfulness and Logic, Ayer says that our knowledge is based on certainty, and that consequently the acceptance of logical things, which are definite in their existence, is a tradition. The precision statement for an existence will always be false. Because the proposition is a synthetic structure. For this reason, no synthetic statement is logically touched. Traditionally, generating an initial proposal and introducing a property related to it require defining tautology that is, creating an analytic proposition. But putting a syntactic proposition on this one, which is an acceptance, leads us to a ridiculous result. For this reason, its functional and understanding direction must be foregrounded from the certainty of the suggestion. This is to talk about the proclamations of things and things. Proximity means proposition; is strongly verifiable. Ayer, A.J. (1984). **Dil, Doğruluk ve Mantık**, trans. by Vehbi Hacıkadiroglu, Istanbul: Metis Publications, p152.

measurement. Therefore, plurality is not a unit that is formed at all. On the contrary plurality is formed by units, each one is different from the other (Zellini, 2011, 55). The plurality mentioned here is the togetherness of the self and the other. The togetherness here is about coming together of different things within proximity. Within a mutual importance classification and usefulness, this integrity here derives its existence from the existence of this potential. This possibility is continuous to the extent and validity of the proposals that it presents. The awareness of this continuity is rationalization. This is no longer just a continuity for the self, but a rationalization for the self who is with the other. Although there are reasons / needs (security, food) within the tendency to centralize and the individual tends to be with others through these reasons / needs, the self is at the core of this tendency and certainty.

It is necessary to establish protection and harmony of this environment since the need for living together, which is maintained through proximity, has its diversity and the other in itself. This environment, which occurs in a direction, carries various propositions based on the action, which are not so evident since they have to bear requirements of direction in advance. The orientation that holds the society together, and propositions that maintain self-disclosure against ambiguity and practice all belong to the culture. Because culture produces conditions for the self to express itself and the other within proximity and for the integrity to hold within the soceety which comes through practice. For this reason, culture must contain in itself the possibility of belonging for the self. The self on the other hand, is in an orientation towards the other and is together with the other to the extent of proximity. Culture therefore, like the self, must be in an endeavor for maintaining proximity and centralization. When we say culture of something, we emphasize its features that are different from others. Here there is a manifest of harmony with the other in a sense of proximity. The different one needs to be clarified in order to clarify its own existence. Culture plays an important role in this clarification. For the self, thanks to this, the other will always be different. The culture, thanks to its mentioned role here and since it has an endeavor to reveal the differences and move the differences away from itself, manifests its functional (practical, useful) side more rather than its substantive and integrative sides.[7]

The fact that the culture is oriented towards practice, hence it requires a continual formation within it (Jenks, 2007, 16). This existence, in itself, includes a possibility for existence belonging to the self, and phenomenons it has and does not have. What she/he has is

---

[7] By quoting from Wright Mills in his work *Subculture*, Jenks states that, "stability" and "order" efforts have become obscured by "humanitarian ideals". However, such concepts always produce a pathological case as a socially "healthy" structure, an invocation of will. Chris Jenks, **Altkültür**, s100.

determined by what she/he does not have. Since things she/he does not have will produce fear that will reveal her/his deprivation, she/he will try to either remove them or establish authority over them. This is purely an existence at all senses. Existence, at any single time, occurs between composition of the limited (peras) and unlimited (aperion). The limit is what determines the logical order of each object, at any moment drawing them out of pure causality as much as possible, giving form and character to them, making them exist tangibly. On the other hand, besides the limit, there could have been no history or any progress, unless there was no anti-born principle which prevented an object from being fixed on the edges of its existence which established it with the limit principle (Zellini, 2011, 9-10).

3. Belonging and Ignoring Others

Culture's effort to be oriented towards the limit and the belongings of the other, which could be expressed as belogings that it does not have, and its endeavor for being unlimited (its desire to be authoritarian) reveal its concern for action (practice). This concern will keep formation and movement constant. Because this effort involves a completeness and the impossibility of achieving the unlimited, motion will keep the culture alive and dynamic as a constant attribute. Culture exists, before anything else, by being belonging to the self. This has gained vitality in the extent of communication between the self and the other[8]. Considering our quest for understanding the culture, what is missed is the fact that she has acquired this harmony by belonging to the self, even if definitions say that she pursues to preserve the existence of being together. The concern of the self also exists in the culture. Togetherness is nothing more than a simple manifestation of a concern. It is a concern towards certainty, in the effort for centralization and over the self and the other. Future orientation and harmony pursuit of this effort, which we can also express as a practical concern, leads it to communicate with other cultures. The quest to understand other cultures and the desire for harmony, lead it to understand the reasons behind and rightness of its own existence, question the necessity for being different, and finally defend the righness and possibilitie of being being such different. As such, it is necessary and sovereign. She either dominates the limits she lives in or she has to do so. Culture is culture as far as it is directed towards the other. It is different in the way it belongs to the self. Belonging to lifestyle of the self renders her dynamic and practical. Yet the concern for producing basic expressions

---

[8] In the definitions of civilized cultures, the culture is emphasized for its function as a tool. This emphasis can also be interpreted in the form of a cultural concern. Culture is a form of humanization of the nature, and similarly, human beings are a product of culture. Nermi Uygur, **Kültür Kuramı**, p18-19.

(propositions) with the quest for certainty, and the endeavor for coherence and harmony disengages it from the possibility of being self (belonging to something). To the extent of universalization, she puts herself in a privileged position above others, trying to define them. This is an incidence of centralization. To the extent of centralization, it will lose its trait of belonging to the self. Making it autonomous and authentic by ignoring that it belongs to the self is rendering living together as a problem.

Our effort to understand culture leads us first to the understanding that it belongs to something and that it must be read through this belonging. For this reason, the relationship between the self and the other is tried to be expressed first as priority regarding for harmony, centralism and authoritarian side (Levinas, 2011, 89). But this ontic priority will cause us, though we are trying to avoid, to get away from the possibilities of being together and ignore dynamic side of the culture. Studying culture alone within a relationship of belongingnesss would not be enough for us to understand the culture and this would even be a wrong and flawed study too. Its authenticity is tried to be surrounded by belongingness (Mejuyev, 1987, 56-57). Its belongingness to the self produces an artificiality. But it has gained an authentic potential by being equally pragmatic, having continuity and movement as its attributes, and concern for practice (Bauman, 2011, 63). However, the emphasis has been put on the localization through all the readings to date. This effort has turned to other through centralization and tried to get rid of it in its endeavor to solve the problems that it has produced to the extent of potentials of being together (Moles, 2012, 125).

The concern about cultural practice also contains usefulness and development during its reading. Because her future orientation and search for harmony are tried to be read through the self, and similarly the same definitions of fear, security, interest, economy and politics lay on the basis of readings about the self, it contains usefulness and development in itself (Bauman, 2011, 11-12). Benefits and development are at the main points of the requirements that drive society to harmony regarding being together and culture. In this case, approaching the other will naturally not accept it as it is, and it will cause the problem of representation by expressing herself (UNESCO Report, 1982, 5-21).

The acceptance of the existence of diversity and the necessity of living with differences have begun to be discussed and the definitions about the culture like as it is an artificial phenomenon attributed to the subject and is tried to be restricted are losing ground to some extent. Although it seems to be a detriment to this discourse and determination effort, it has not prevented it from continuing its centralization in accordance with the new conditions.

Cultural diversity is again in harmony. Regarding speech and representation, it continues to maintain the existence of national culture, religious culture, integrity and fundamental truths. Such continuity seems to get stretched as the other insists in its desire for representing itself. But stretching is not voluntary, and it has a conscious negative orientation too (Gramsci, 2003, 261). The basic expressions of truth and coherence, which it grounds itself on and which are at the same time dominated by it, are now not just a stand-alone acceptance and an absolute stagnation, but a moving measure to the extent of the stretch. This moving dimension of representation imposes itself to the other as to the extent the other longs to represent itself. This imposition does not take its existence from a visible necessity. On the contrary, it is grounded on a negative influence (Badiou, 2015, 47-48).

This imposition on the other offers us a unique potential to emphasize the authenticity of the culture. Because culture, acquiring its possibilities of existence through the possibilities that belong to the self, takes an authentic effort to be directed to practice. Now the culture does not place the self in the center, but start to place itself right there (Uygur, 2013, 19). This reveals her authenticity. She neglects her own basic propositions and certainty, her belongingness to the self, and imposes her sense of belonging on the self[9]. It becomes a phenomenon on its own as a represented. It tries to be an authority for itself as a phenomenon on its own (Russell, 1975, 93). As such, there is truth, flaw and orientation in itself. The practical orientation of the culture needs a protective structure to protect its current situation. This will take us to the self. The self has therefore been part of the culture which emerged through its own actions and through its orientation towards the other, and has strived to exist under culture's determinations.

The cycle between the self and culture has shaped itself to comply with the necessity of living with the emergence of differences (the necessity of living together). Difference (I use it in the sense of individuality) has diversity in it. Today, almost all of the existing states or societies are heterogeneous in terms of ethnicities, religions, social groups, politics, and lifestyles they host, and these different sub-groups even host differences withing each. Multiculturalism is a definition given to the coexistence of different people in this respect[10].

---

[9] Levinas emphasizes the ambiguity of being neutral in his dialogue with Andre Dalmas. He tells him that he tries to avoid from ambiguity, stating that those who exist the system do negation and affirmation. That is why people who are in a range say that they take refuge in the ambiguity of the neutral and try to gain vitality with concern. In the system (actual world, physical world, and real world) such despair which belongs to the individual seeks possibilities to for relief. Levinas, E. (2011). **Maurice Blanchot Üzerine**, p69. I think that one of the means of this quest is the virtual world.

[10] Critics of culture believe that culture plays an important role in social and political development as well as in the development of individual identity. We can divide culture in two ways, by its individual and collective

The practical and dynamic aspect of this difference should not be overlooked. Contents of culture change constantly depending on time and place. Talking about a culture for this reason requires taking into consideration the change it has undergone so far. Considering that the possibilities and awareness for change are increasing today, it is necessary to think and discuss our approach to culture and multiculturalism[11] (Monod, 1997, 18).

4. Authentic Structure

The regularity and adaptation endeavor that belongs to the culture is perceived as getting the other more close to this direction. The other should express herself/himself in this culture, which is an ontological priority. In terms of representation the other has to go into a formation where it loses its differences. It's because culture claims integrity in itself. It possesses its own existence and rightness as it's in the center. It is through this rightness that it is authoritarian. The other is just a single part of this whole. Impressions like the other, as just a part of the whole, alone forms the whole would simply mean that our reading, as we mentioned at the beginning of the article, is in a wrong way. Because, given the belongingness to the self, as a product of an orientation and a practical concern, the culture has acquired an authentic structure. With its authentic structure, its integrity goes beyond the belongingness to the self (national culture, religious culture, etc.). In order to protect its integrity, it is necessary to protect its authentic possibilities. Any single whole (culture as a whole) would always be broken down into smaller pieces by dividing it into halves, and even the smallest parts of the division were actually present in the whole before the division process begins. Their presence (parts) must be in the whole and obvious; because they cannot escape from it and when the division process inevitably reaches them, they will be in a limited form of belongingness which is implicitly necessitating it (Zellini, 2011, 31-32). In this way, culture will preserve its authenticity towards practice. Each and every single different one has to exhibit itself for representation sake, but not through the possibility of being different, on the contrary, by the desire for belonging to a whole and being a part of it. Through the ages, actuality and limits have provided the necessary proposals for theories of knowledge (such as

---

orientations. The individual culture that leads the individual to the acquisition of a personal identity and to become a self (appearance, intelligence, personality, etc.), and the social culture, with collective orientations, which is oriented towards the society (sexual, economic, racial, ethnic, religious, etc.) that the individual belongs to. Multiculturalism manifests itself by expressing these distinctions. Arthur A.B., **Kültür Eleştirisi**, p. 144-45.

[11] Saying "I know it" necessitates the determination of the possibilities that make it happen. Once it has been decided what is the decisive factor for that proposition, it now reveals something meaningful. But this meaning is oriented towards use/practice. However, it is used within the context of space and time of the moment – the usage is limited with the potential of that context. Wittgenstein, **Kesinlik Üstüne + Kültür ve Değer**, p. 11-14.

social theories, and even this can be extended to physical sciences), and the indispensable criteria for conceptual abstraction and classification (Zellini, 2011 33).

This authentic structure, which makes the self to prioritize itself against the other, allows culture to preserve its integrity. Because classical literacy and historical approach have always been in an attempt to reflect itself with a desire to produce centralization, protection and righteous propositions (Bauman, 2015 50). The question of multiculturalism, culture, and the possibility of living together cannot be enough to produce a solution from the point of ignoring the fact that integrity will move with the effort to protect itself (Lukacs, 1978, 154-157. Cushing, 2006, 264-272). Protecting itself involves the reproduction and transmission of itself. The reason for the complication is our age itself. It is argued that one of the methods for the culture to preserve its own authenticity is its belongingness to a particular society. Thus, society will find itself surrounded by the represented culture. The individual will be protected from the different by this means. Culture will now guarantee its own existence. As determined and in a form of instrumentality, culture assumes an authoritarian possibility. Utility will no longer be mentioned for the individual but the culture. It has been the source of a possibility for belongingness (UNESCO, 1982, 5-21). This important task of the culture is often emphasized in terms of time. Because it is not needed anymore protecting the potential of creating the basis for living together. Living together, which is now forgotten, the other's authenticity, and togetherness of different were all compromised for harmonization, development, and orientation for the future. The most important responsibility and tool of this effort is presented as belonging to the culture. Vague expressions like national culture (effort to classify the culture) have a utility to propagate modernity[12]. This is a historical change and development discourse (Tomlinson, 1999: 138-139). Note that these expressions are related to the dimension of cultural representation. It is indisputable that there is an effort of practice by the culture in favor of the self. Here the self, based on readings of culture, lives in a structure where its acts are more of the culture of sovereign. However, it is ignored that culture is in an

---

[12] Considering the debate about modernity and nation, protection of national integrity and orientation towards national resources (not only natural resources but also beliefs, ethnic structure, socioeconomic structure, culture, etc.) have continued to be debated in non-Western societies. Though there are reasons for this, like psychological and spiritual needs, there still can be something useful in the west (so-called modern societies). This is eventually a situation of coexistence. But as a reality, science and technology inevitably impose itself on these cultures. Protecting its own existence against this imposition can cause serious problems in a society. For the modernity and the products of modern societies, coexistence provides a comfortable opportunity to produce its own existence. Cushing, **Fizikte Felsefi Kavramlar 2**, p286-287.

endeavor for maintaining its own autonomy since the authenticity culture is ignored too[13]. Such criticism is becoming more frequent with the ability of technology to reach beyond the national borders and allow the different to express themselves. What is addressed here is that culture has an effort to protect itself. Culture is in a state of authoritarianism that is constantly practicing because it is trying to take away what is different from itself and to get the self into its limits. Bauman says that he would certainly not tolerate the mixture of culture (Bauman, 2015, 6). In the same book, where he also talks about Bourdieu, he says that the culture is a construct for the creation and preservation of social class differences and social hierarchies (Bauman, 2015, 6). In this new age, it has to be faded, quantitatively, the effort for being closed, protecting own existence and the cultural ground for existence. The technology has just accelerated the experience of change, which has already been exercised slowly on everyday life by the media. This in itself contains a vague quantitative increase, not a sequential increase. Recently, especially the growing interest in social media has brought up the reality that culture is a tool for the self. In this kind of environment, self-expression of the self and her/his approach to the different is not based on proximity and protection need, but rather on decreasing these to extinction level. It is not mentioned much about a monolithic culture, a culture that has an authentic possibility, a culture that protects and cares harmony. The self does not have such an aim in mind for practice. For this reason, representation does not form a single unity. Given by the physical possibilities of coexistence, the distinctions such as deprived, bad, not good, etc. can not exist in these environments fully. In the social/virtual environment, the attribute of being a cultural belonging for the self cannot fully make a sense in terms of representation. For this reason, there is no condition that lead to discrimination based on differences put in the center as criteria. Because in the virtual environment the other is the self herself/himself. In a physical environment, cultural assumptions can surround and limit the self, however, virtiual environment removes this possibility from culture.

Again, aware of this weakness of cultural proposals, it tries to bring forward the transformation of culture, conservation and future[14]. If we look closely, the most important challenge of our times comes out to be technology and virtual environment. It is even more

---

[13] The other, who is the reason to culture's creation, is dominated by the culture itself. Though national unity is maintained and national culture is created by the culture, culture also destroys them back. Terry E., **Kültür Yorumları**, p177.

[14] Being protective, as a result will move the existence into a discourse of certainty. Because the protection is determination of the limit. This means that it is not weak. It makes its own certainty by trying to convince the other. Wittgenstein, **Kesinlik Üstüne + Kültür ve Değer**, p37-38.

effective to intervene in the authoritarian side of the real world from the virtual world, where there is a degree of solidarity and togetherness. Through the virtual environment, the existent has started to be evaluated with an approach using statements like "what if", "could be different", and "could be changed" without really considering the real conditions led to what happened (Bauman, 2015, 83). The distinction between the physical world and the virtual world does not, of course, make one feel so certain. Because the self, first of all, is a part of the world and she/he is also involved in the culture as being in the world. There are cultural influences in all of the thoughts that she/he has acquired. In this way, the change of a nested whole does not show itself as easy and short. For the self, the presence of this representation does not make itself felt in every environment where she/he expresses herself/himself. However, the self, who belongs to the place where she/he lives in, is able to get rid of the sense of living in a space. In this manner she/he gains the possibility for getting out of the borders of the physical space and the culture she/he lives in. She/he gets the opportunity to enter into the depths of her/his own existence and conditions of existence that she/he has forgotten and threw into the back of her/his consciousness due to the facts like culture. Representation is further differentiated in the virtual environment than in the physical world. We can also make a conclusion that it has the possibility of creating the conditions of being free. In a flowing culture, she/he can recognize that the space and the certain propositions of her/his acquired culture are different in virtual world.

5. Virtual Environment can be Solution

The arguments such as "can be different" or "must be different" used for the culture, where the self is in with all its senses affected by are used mainly in discussions. The authoritarization of culture and her/his authentication are also the reasons for this. This approach, which belongs to the individual, has opened the way for authoritarianization of the culture and preservation of the harmony for the future. What is overlooked is, because of authoritarianization and authentication of culture, the fact that it is something acquired by learning, and that it exists in life with an acceptance in the form of belief. The recognition that she/he is achieved through an experience of learning and acceptance leads us to the fact that its certainty, righteousness, and its centralization attitude are wrong[15]. It is from the fact that the individual is born in a society and hence she/he acquires the cultural attributes of that

---

[15] *"The child learns to believe in many things. According to these beliefs she/he learns to be in action. Parts of a system of believers arise, and in this system some things are steadfastly stable, and some things are very playful. It is not because the steady thing is self-evident or convincing in itself."* Wittgenstein, **Kesinlik Üstüne + Kültür ve Değer**, p31.

society such as a safe dependency, proximity distinction and usefulness. The virtual environment totally ignores this reality (Wittgenstein, 2009, p33). The redundancy of situations such as safe dependency, proximity, protection, etc. in virtual environment creates a different sense of space in which the the self will express itself. The world we exist in always leads the other to a conclusion, due to the quest for certainty, that she/he needs to be convinced by the expressions of certainty. Since learning includes an orientation towards the certainty (satisfaction), the reliable evidence sought for encounters with a situation where the illusion disappears[16]. The possibility of being in action will provide an action orientation with this credible evidence. In the virtual environment, there is no effort of the learner to acquire certainty. It might even just be moving her/him away from the learning where there is a classical quest for certainty. We learn not only the result of experiments in learning, but also the judgments derived from them. Of course there is nothing wrong with us to act like this. An established proposition is known to be a tool for a particular use. "I am completely confident" does not mean that every single person is sure, but means that we are part of a community that science and education have assembled together (Wittgenstein, 2009, 49). While being in a sense of belongingness, if the certainty acquired as a result of experience cannot build rapport with the unity (the culture) we are in, then we would tend to choose the unity where we belong to. Hence, the effort to define the different as autonomous and to define it as a separate being remain superficial. Representation of the different within the virtual environment is representation of the other in terms of the self, while the self turns out to be the other in virtual world in terms of representation[17]. As descriptions of culture emphasize that she belongs to the self, her individuality and subjectivitiy are emphasized accordingly too. Emphasizing the self's and culture's authonomy produces a problem regarding possibility of togetherness to take place. Accordingly, culture must be independent of external control and protected from/independent of the other who bears the possibility for practice (Tomlinson, 1999, 147-148). She can keep the society as a whole together as long as its autonomy is maintained. Her continuity is guaranteed to the extent that she is integrative. In the virtual environment, there is no emphasis on this autonomy. Because everything there belongs to everyone. Once the represented starts to share, it also turns out to be available to

---

[16] There is proving for the existent in learning. Moving from the premises, which are considered to bear the truth, to reach the truth of conclusions, that is to say, starting from the acceptance of the initial proposals, and being forced for conviction at the end of the chain. Abraham M., **Belirsizin Bilimleri**, p122.

[17] According to Connolly, "the identification process takes place within the 'paradox of difference' defined by it: the individual does not have identity without an 'other' that will differentiate itself; And in the 'other' she/he finds, it becomes a threat for her/his own existence in this process.". Ongur, H.Ö. (2010). "Kimlik, Uluslararası İlişkilerde Kuram Yapımı ve 11 Eylül 2011 Olayları" **Istanbul Commerce University Journal of Social Sciences**, p153-163.

the other and there will not be a negative effect regarding what is shared. She/he will not have a problem in terms of representation, unless there is a real value created (Kuban, 1999). In this respect, belonging to an individual will not produce an authentic possibility. Since there is no authenticity to mention, centralization does not hold too.

Definitions of culture have a possibility of practical concern, as well as a system of meanings attributed to the field of thought and actual reality. For this reason, as well as the practical aspect of the culture, she also has an influence on the intellectual structure. Therefore, her effect on socioeconomic structure would not be one dimensional. Culture has always been a historically specific phenomenon which is authentic and conditioned by social class structure of the society. The contradictory class structure in a capitalist society has led to the emergence of a divided cultural space, essentially parallel to the class structure. Again, Giddens argues that structure should be deemed as something external to individuals (Smith, 2005, 196-201). Aside from sharing a common knowledge and culture, he asserts that human action is one the reasons to culture's creation as it tends to reproduce the social order. He says that people need to have a sense of trust and are afraid of uncertainty. He calls it as ontological desire for security. Much of the social life has become routine and ordinary, whereby people feel safe, open to encounters, and can negotiate. In the virtual environment, culture lacks the possibility to reveal its practical concern. As to the representation, the effect that the practical concern produces will not be the same as in real world experiences. For this reason, routinized intellectual patterns will not be able to represent themselves at the same level as in real world. For the self, there is the possibility of a decentralization and mobilization (Russell, 1975, 93).

Goffman asserts that much of the everyday social life is made up of small ceremonial exchanges whereby people re-identify their identities as talented people (Smith, 2005, 87-94). Mauss defines this change as gift culture (Smith, 2005, 106-109). Ceremonial exchanges such as the obligation to give a gift, the corresponding obligation to respond the gift with a gift, the necessity that the latter gift needs to be different from the former, etc. are the means of culture's adaptation effort to the new world and display realization of culture's desire for harmony. These small ceremonial exchanges are compulsory actions of living together for the self. Culture, in this way, is able to reproduce itself at every level. Through continuity and a dynamic structure, it will be able to maintain its certainty and authority. In the virtual environment, however, these small ceremonial exchanges do not provide the potential for togetherness as they do in real environment.

The logical emphasis in this distinction between the virtual environment and the real environment (the real world, the physical world) is that the latter neglects the diversity it contains in itself for the sake of certainty in expressing itself. In the real world, the quest for recovery from mistake and protection of the existent have been perceived as formalism. Approaching to the existent and the culture with our precise laws and measures, has made us object of these laws and measures over the time. The virtual environment, however, provides opportunity to the self to express her/his objection to this. The individual, who has became to be expressed statistically in the world which is again expressed with statistics, gains the possibility to have a space where she/he can express her/his own existence in the virtual environment. This space, which produces an ambiguous environment, has a potential for the individual to understand herself/himself and reveal herself/himself as the other. We can only experience the opportunity to avoid rational thinking in an environment that is not rational (Moles, 2012, 321-335).

Social sciences, since early times, have always encountered vague phenomena and ambiguous concepts. They have established their entire world with the desire to get rid of these ambiguities. However, efforts to escape from this ambiguity have led them to get away from the existent. This is the reason for our concern and confusion considering all our experiences. For today, concern and confusion stand as a psychological problem when there is lack of solution. Therefore, the possibilities of living together could not be derived from itself or with its own dynamics. Since the effort of determination and centralization has no intention of creating limits of tolerance for togetherness for the individual, hence the individual strives to exclude the other and thereby remove her/his practical concerns. For the individual, suppressing this vague situation by force and usefully seem far from saving her/him from the problems. For this reason, presence of an environment where the concern and the other can can express itself and herself/himself respectively will produce a possibility for the existent to reveal herself/himself. Expressing herself/himself as the other, leads the self (the self, the other) to see that ambiguity is not something to be afraid of in understanding the other and this leads to mobilization.

References

Açıkgenç, A. (2008). "Yeni Bir Toplum Felsefesine İlk Adım", *Teoman Durali'ya Armağan* (ed. Cengiz Çakmak), Istanbul: Dergah Publicaitons.

Agamben, G. (2013). "Kişisi Olmayan Kimlik", *Bir Arada - Das Zwischen - In-Between* (trans. Meryem Mine Çilingiroğlu), (ed. Sanem Yazıcıoğlu), Istanbul: İşbankası Publishing.

Akarsu, B. (1998). *Felsefe Terimleri Sözlüğü*, Istanbul: İnkılap Bookstore.

Ayer, A.J. (1984). *Dil, Doğruluk ve Mantık* (trans. Vehbi Hacıkadiroğlu), Istanbul: Metis Publishing.

Badiou, A. (2015). *Model Kavramı* (trans. Alp Tümertekin), Istanbul: İthaki Publishing.

Bauman, Z. (2105). *Akışkan Modern Dünyada Kültür* (trans. Ihsan Çapcıoğlu-Fatih Ömek), Ankara: Atıf Publishing.

Berger, A.A. (2014). *Kültür Eleştirisi* (trans. Özgür Emir), Istanbul: Pinhan Publishing.

Cushing, J.T. (2006). *Fizikte Felsefi Kavramlar 2* (trans. B. Özgür Sarıoğlu), Istanbul: Publications of Sabancı University.

Eagleton, T. (2011). *Kültür Yorumları* (trans. Özge Çelik), Istanbul: Detay Publishing.

Gramsci, A. (2003). *Hapishane Defterleri* (trans. Adnan Cemgil), Istanbul: Belge Publishing.

Jenks, C. (2007). *Altkültür* (trans. Nihal Demirkol), Istanbul: Detay Publishing.

Karsli, Ö. (2016). "Ernst Cassirer'de Kültürün Anlamı", *Journal of Management, Economic, Literature, Islamic and Political Sciences, vol 1(2).*

Kuban, B. (1999). "Technological Determinism and Social Control of Technology", *International Symposium on Science, Technology and Society*, Istanbul: ITU Institute of Social Sciences Publishing, vol 1(1).

Levinas, E. (2011). *Maurice Blanchot Üstüne* (trans. Kudret Aras), Istanbul: Monokl Publishing.

Levinas, E. (2016). *Sonsuza Tanıklık* (trans. Gaye Cankaya), (ed. Zeynep Direk-Erdem Gökyaran), Istanbul: Metis Publishing.

Lukacs, G. (1978). *Birey ve Toplum* (trans. Veysel Atayman), Istanbul: Günebakan Publishing.

Mejuyev, V. (1987). *Kültür ve Tarih* (trans. Suat H. Yokova), Ankara: Başak Publishing.

Moles, A. (2012). *Belirsizin Bilimleri* (trans. Nuri Bilgin), Istanbul: YapıKredi Publishing.

Monod, J. (1997). *Rastlantı ve Zorunluluk* (trans. Vehbi Hacıkadiroğlu), Ankara: Dost Bookstore.

Ongur, H.Ö. (2010). "Identity, Theory of International Relations and the Events of September 11, 2011", *Istanbul Commerce University Journal of Social Sciences*, Istanbul: İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Publishing, Vol 9 (17).

Russell, B. (1975). *Yetke ve Birey* (trans. Ayseli Usluata), Istanbul: Cem Publishing House.

Smith, P. (2005). *Kültürel Kuram* (trans. Selime Güzelsarı-İbrahim Gündoğdu), Istanbul: Babel Publishing.

Soykan, O.N. (2015). "İnsanın Bir Varoluş Tarzı Olan Kültür, Neden Çatışmalara Yol Açıyor?", *Ortak Yaşama Kültürü ve Felsefesi* (ed. Celal Türer), Ankara: Turkish Philosophical Society.

Tomlinson, J. (1999). *Kültürel Emperyalizm* (trans. Emrehan Zeybekoğlu), Istanbul: Detay Publishing.

UNESCO (1982). *Final Report of the World Conference on Cultural Policies: Mexico City*, Paris: SoreGraph. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0005/000525/052505eo.pdf.

Uygur, N. (2013). *Kültür Kuramı*, Istanbul: YapıKredi Publishing.

Welsch, W. (2013). "Heidegger Ontological Human Centricism", *Bir Arada – Das Zwischen – In-Between*, trans. Mehmet Baris Albayrak (ed. Sanem Yazıcıoğlu), Istanbul: İş Bankası Publishing.

Wittgenstein, L. (2009). *Kesinlik Üstüne + Kültür ve Değer* (trans. Doğan Şahiner), Istanbul: Metis Publishing.

Zellini, P. (2011). *Sonsuzun Kısa Tarihi* (trans. Fisun Demir), Ankara: Dost Bookstore.