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Abstract

Articulation, as an approach, is the core pursuit of Stuart Hall in his cultural studies and a survey of its complicated dimension is the main question of this research. The paper seeks to shed a light on and investigate the interdisciplinary field of culture in which forces from diverse layers of society are in unceasing encounter and transformation in everyday life. This study is carried out by examining the significance and performance of the concept of ‘articulation’, based on two variables of ‘space’ and ‘culture’. In so doing, the researcher advocated inductive method and brought under the spotlight five pairs of key concepts in Hall’s studies. Comprehensive relational study of ‘periphery & center’, ‘resistant & dominant’, ‘textuality & punctuation’, ‘other & self’, ‘local & global’ was aimed at an exploration into their modes of (inter)connectivity. The findings showed that Hall’s articulation approach to cultural studies, far from being a simple joint of elements or eclecticism, signifies a range of complicated parallel movements, namely, simultaneous struggles for positions as well as negotiation over those positions. The outcomes would likely caution the researchers against simplifying the issue by theorizing and closing the frontiers of popular culture for temporary gains.
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1. Introduction

It is neither viable nor possible to lay absolute claims on cultural space (Stuart Hall, 1992a, p. 272).

I begin with this quote since it addresses the motivation behind this paper which deals with the examples of everyday cultural activities, “which depending on whether good or bad the developments are outside the local borders we live in” (Gunduz, 2017, 9). Recent developments in the sphere of popular culture pose certain challenges to traditional and even some contemporary disciplinary positions ready to enclose space. The challenges mean to impart serious problems when theoretical studies are put in practice in social and material life. In this paper, the terms of space and culture serve as the dependant and independent variables respectively for the formulation of assumptions of the research. With the changes anticipated in the texture of culture, the outcomes of the study will be outlined in the jargon of space. To examine the correlation between space and culture and for testing the hypothesis of this study, the theoretical studies of Hall serve as the experimental ground. It is assumed in this research that 'If living spaces are related to everyday practice of cultural encounters, then the structure of relevant regimes of truths will undergo "trial [and retrial] by space".’ To test the assumptions of the study, the researcher advocates inductive method. He starts with particular and individual moments of culture to evaluate the constructions and representations of cultural space, to discuss their significance and to make statement.

This paper, firstly, reviews historical developments in the theory of space under the title of Thinking Space. The discussion comprises two major areas of mental spaces, which uphold the assumptions that space does not exist outside of the mind, as well as material spaces, which emphasize the relations in the actual world. Then, the theoretical discussion turns to Hall to exclusively study his theoretical position within the interdisciplinary sphere of culture. Major ideas and key concepts from Hall’s criticism on culture are brought into focus and the significance of his articulation approach, for spatial analysis, is further explored. In so doing, five sets of binary oppositions, namely, 'periphery and center', 'resistant and dominant', 'textuality and punctuation', 'other and self', and 'local and global', as the recurrent reference points in the studies of Hall, are re-viewed through his cultural lenses for the specificity of their relations.
2. Thinking Space

Space and time have long been the subjects with ontological and epistemological values for human being. Space, for its turn, has undergone a developing process to the present time. In the past, its use was mostly associated with and limited to the mathematical and geometrical applications by a number of great thinkers. Besides, through the studies of metaphysical and empirical tradition, the concept of space could not go beyond the absolute and abstract apprehensions. More recently, trends among academics have provided opportunity for alternative studies of the concept and have displayed a broad range of twists and turns in the relevant theories. Despite all these expansions, conservative views on space still remain a core/cusp issue in academic circles.

2.1 Mental Spaces

Traditional anti-realist position advocates a worldview that space does not exist outside of mind and is not independent from it.

Euclid (300 BC) is a very well-known philosopher who abstracted the components of space and argued for its independence from the material world. His matter-independent space with “strictly geometrical meanings,” outlines the basic principles of knowledge out of which further truths can be derived. Huggett explains that in Euclid’s sense all the geometrical rules, as the components of abstract space, are “contained in the axioms, waiting to be unpacked as theorem” (Huggett, 1999, 22). Euclidean abstraction reduces the space to a two-dimensional flat coordinates which function as a paradigm of knowledge and a model of reasoning, which makes space transparent and discernible. Such a space is defined by its homogeneity which, if extended to social and cultural practices, guarantees political utilities and power over it.

Moreover, Cartesian thought endorses mental reasoning as a sole medium for learning about reality by dichotomizing space into space of mind and space of body. In such a moment, material and experimental tools are not reliable in learning about reality. Huggett suggests that within the Cartesian mental-rational space, which Euclidean geometry to some degrees accords with, true knowledge starts from “basic axioms” or first cause and then “all the facts about the world” follow (Huggett, 1999, 160). Lefebvre further argues that spatial coordinates of Cartesian thought and its notion of space as a “divine property” has “homogenous (isotopic) characters” (Lefebvre, 1991, 3). This allows for some forms of uniformity in space with matching features.
and hierarchical representations. Such a space is featured with transparency and resolving ambiguities, which are also favored by idealists like Immanuel Kant (1724–1804).

Idealists describe space as a, necessarily, apriori knowledge and apriori existence of all appearances in the mind, which allow for the outer world to be known. According to Kant, “Space is not an empirical concept which has been described from outer experience…. Space is a necessary apriori representation which underlies all outer intuitions” (Huggett, 1999, 217). Human knowledge, in this sense, is already supplied with pure universal judgments, a certainty, as geometrical rules may suggest. Huggett maintains that such a pure notion of space cannot be “discursive”, but a pure intuition, hence, “transcendental”, “infinite given magnitude” and even beyond geometrical truth (Huggett, 1999, 218-9). Apriori propositions of space guarantees universality of meaning as well.

Rationalists’ dichotomy and idealists’ absolutism alongside Euclidean abstract spatial coordinates all feature a homogeneous configuration of space where relations are hierarchical and knowledge about reality is matter-independent and presupposed. This is at odds with social theories of space which emphasize the study of relations in the material world.

2.2 Material Spaces

Social theorists have called for an unending challenge to those perceptions of space which do not study the concept pragmatically but isolate it from any impact of change and development. Lefebvre is perhaps the most well-known social scientist to point at the "faultlines" of traditional intellectual positions. The theory of space which detaches itself from the bounds of actual life and living spaces, as Lefebvre observes, lays claim on immortality, certainty, transcendentality and uniformity (Lefebvre, 1991, 3). Contemporary social scientists downplay any claim which legitimizes space and its coordinates.

Lefebvre, as a social thinker, is against the knowledge of space purged from contradictions. As a socialist, he is critical of capitalist claim for legitimacy and states that although the capitalist space is claiming for the legitimate knowledge, it is in fact a hegemonic moment, conflictual within and dialectical. He puts emphasis on the “dialectical character” of space and views social codes “as part of practical relationship [and] as part of interaction between ‘subjects’ and their space and their surroundings” (Lefebvre, 1991, 18). Material space, in the focus of his studies, evades social hierarchization and homogenization which might emphasize global similarities rather than differences. In effect, despite all the claims for
uniformity and originality, Euclidean abstract space and idealists’ spaces of pure mentality harbor specific contradictions.

For that reason, most of the contemporary social thinkers study space pragmatically and consider the impacts of change and development in material world and actual life. Based on this outlook, material space is sketched with relational contours, and is represented as the site of ambivalence. To a certain degree, social and cultural intellectuals are sympathetic over relational features of cultural space, but change directions on the circumstances when groups of socialists (in) tend to essentialize a statement or a proposition. Among cultural critics, Hall is the one whose innovative ideas on the concept of space would probably put both the advocators of mental and material scholarship at discomfort.

3. Thinking Cultural Space

Perhaps, one of the most capacious material spaces in which human being faces never-ending challenges is that of culture. Contemporary readings of space through the lenses of culture endorse complicated and unmapable dimensions of life within such a space. In his cultural studies, Hall adopts the strategy of articulation to achieve the dynamism of some key concepts translatable from one moment to another.

3.1 Spaces of Articulation

3.1.1 Periphery and Center

Hall favors peripheral standing in cultural studies, seeking to constantly question the “faultlines” and inadequacy of assumptions developed to theorize culture. He fears that cultural science becomes a grand narrative and an institutionalized discipline. According to Procter, Hall prefers to work in more open, “less disciplinary” and “unconventional setting” of academic centers of Britain (Procter 2004, 7). This has helped Hall to decentralize concepts aimed to dominate the theoretical circle. Besides, Procter contends that Hall’s strategy in writing on cultural studies follows the strategy of avoiding being settled. Getting involved in group work for the sake of "relative anonymity", preference for "the provisionality of the essay [journal article, conference paper] over the permanence of the book" and resisting "the production of a comprehensive reader or anthology of his writings" in the fear of imposing upon his mind “a false unity and coherence" (Procter, 2004, 7) have helped him refuse to take the central role in cultural studies. This has provided him with a chance to revise and update his key ideas and to
interfere with the attempts which force cultural studies to a unified, self-contained discipline or a set of formal and institutionalized theories.

Standing in periphery and viewing the issues from the same angle, Hall readily recognizes the perils of defining cultural studies by some abstract/absolute concepts and policing its boundaries by axiomatic concepts in some academic circles. Hall cautions, in an interview by Chen that "I have always been slightly wary of defining too precisely what is and what isn't cultural studies, because of danger of 'policing' its boundaries" (Chen, 1992, 396). He insists that cultural studies is the site of overlapping and transgressions and this should be intensified and added rather than policing its boundaries. Besides, Morley and Chen have discussed, in length, Hall’s non-essentialist methodology and confirmed that his tendency in dealing with other positions "has always been to the most productive sort of eclecticism" (Morley and Chen, 2005, 7).

Inclusions and blends play a twofold parasitic-pragmatic part in Hall’s theoretical approach. It is parasitic since by including periphery, he disturbs the theoretical comfort and prevents cultural studies from turning into a settled discipline and implies that vitality of center, ironically, relies on the interference of periphery. Besides, like Lefebvre, Hall is in favor of unceasing production of spaces, since, otherwise, in his eyes, cultural studies will turn merely into a sign and will lose the edge. The distinctive feature of Halls’ production of space is necessarily an interdependent character of its constituent parts. Such a space necessitates dynamic relations between center and periphery, between certain academic attempts and Hall. It is a tendency which prefers dialogue and inclusion of different and even opposing points of views over exclusion and rejection. In “Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms” (Hall, 1980, 57-72), for instance, Hall couples earlier humanist position with the non-humanist structuralist thought of twentieth century to reinforce the idea that, on its own, neither humanist nor structuralist position is sufficient, though necessary. Hall proceeds to articulate the working non-reductive affinities of both thoughts while revealing the shortcomings and limitations of each. His peripheral position has helped "the identity of cultural studies" to be "constituted and reconstituted by its dialogues with the issues raised in and by particular historical conjunctures" (Morley and Chen, 2005, 2).

Dialogic relations within cultural studies feature a space which shows a tendency to close and open its boundaries at the same time. Within cultural studies, Hall suggests that there are urges which push for centralizing and institutionalizing theoretical comfort, and, at the same
time, there are peripheral forces at work to constantly question the taken-for-grand aspects of theory, disrupt the moves to establish and prevent them from turning into a settled discipline (Morley and Chen, 2005, 2). Hall’s methodology is an unwilling, but necessary, consensus between center and periphery; and collaborative work in producing such a space is a dismissal of exclusive and permanent ownership of space. The struggles for temporary positions produces a political space, which is strongly suggested by Hall for cultural studies. The politics of articulation and political articulation of cultural studies is closely linked to Gramcian discussion on hegemony and unending struggle between dominant and resistant.

3.1.2 Resistant and Dominant

Hall politicizes culture, but, in developing his methodology, he is very cautious not to be trapped by the classical methods of exclusion/inclusion or by the orthodox modern revolutionary ideas of absolute ruptures and polarization. To put in other words, Hall’s approach in politicizing culture goes beyond the classical distinction of dominant versus resistant, and it is against the revolutionary thoughts in traditional Marxist school. Popular culture, Hall’s main contribution to cultural thought, has been demonstrated as the host of diverse practices. Favoring challenging views of Gramsci, Hall contends that there exists no urgent thing of authentic or revolutionary politics in ever-changing, unpredictable and complex contemporary cultural views.

In his studies on Gramscian notion of hegemony, Hall explains that rather than holding onto the traditional spaces at which binary conceptualizations gain significance, it would be advisable to work in favor of never-ceasing every day contestation and negotiation for temporary positions. Cultural studies, in this sense, would offer more space to multiplicity of voices, seeking “to develop a non-essentialist cultural politics which is sensitive to discursive issues" (Morley and Chen, 2005, 5). For Hall, popular culture is a proper ground to practice discursivity which undermines orthodoxies of culture-as-authentic of any kind and de-sanctifies statements of administration. In line with the argument, Procter states that for Hall “there is no authentic popular culture uncontaminated by dominant culture … no youth culture free of parent culture … no English culture without its overseas history … no self-contained identity untouched by the identity of others” (Procter, 2004, 5). Hall himself, in the interview with Grossberg, further reveals his stance on popular culture which houses uneasy coexistence of "different regimes of truth" (Grossberg, 1986, 136) Here, the unstable relations between base and superstructure, economy and culture appeal to Hall’s intellectual mind. With such developments, he contributes to the New Left and breaks with the traditional left’s alienating binarisms.
In the meantime, advocates of deconstructing "metaphysical" canon find space of popular culture the site of diverse pushes for emergent concepts. In Hall’s view, and under the influence of Gramsci, culture is the site of “contradictory spaces” at which oppositions struggle for containment and counter-containment projects. In Morley and Chen’s words, Hall departs from “Simplistic metaphors of transformation [thought in terms of mere reversal and substitution] to the more complex metaphors of transgression” (Morley and Chen, 2005, 7) which is suggestive of both differentiation and contamination. Hall’s innovative contribution to cultural studies is an explanation of simultaneity and parallelism. While he argues for the concepts of ambivalence, hybridity and interdependence to shake the structure of hierarchical binaries, at the same time, in “For Allon White: Metaphors of Transformation”, he is fully aware that this does “not destroy the force of the operation of the hierarchical principle in culture” (Hall, 1992b, 301). Popular culture is, then, a locus where one can assume with it intrinsic values, with the implications of pushing for preference and privilege. In the meantime, it is a space of struggles against self-enclosed approaches.

To translate Hall’s assertion of "popular culture as a site of ongoing process of struggles", I would rather argue that this is not, however, to say that everything is on the endless go with it, not to say that indeterminacy and multi-accentuality dislocate power practice of any sort even for a given moment. If Hall prefers to claim that resistance unsettles dominant’s pushes for legitimization of meaning and perpetualization of position, he is also inclined to think that there are always positions to be won via claims to legitimacy. Hall views this double movement as the dynamism of space of articulation within popular culture. His stance is further revealing when he elaborates on the concept of textuality. Hall borrows a lot from contemporary language studies, appropriates them and then articulates their working parts with his projects.

3.1.3 Textuality and Punctuation

One of the key points, which Hall capitalizes in his theoretical studies, is the critical impact of linguistic turn and textuality, over the past decades, on the intellectual orientations. Popular culture was also influenced by linguistic turn which, in Hall’s terms, was a “theoretical gain”. It accommodated multiple accents and, therefore, the concept of culture was entangled with the metaphors of textuality and signification.

Hall argues that linguistic turn in cultural studies has been a breakthrough but it has not been enough to work with. Asked by Grossberg in an interview about the relations between
popular culture and the operation of language in post-structuralism, Hall stated that by discursive operation of language the whole dimension of subjectivity was put in play. However, in “Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies” (Grossberg, 1986, 146-7), Hall explains that the imprint, the signature and the trace of punctuating, positioning, representation and resistance “cannot be erased from the cultural studies … because what is asked us to do is to say ‘yes’ and ‘no’ at one and at the same time” (Hall, 1992a, 270). He argues that although recent linguistic studies have greatly contributed to the significant break with the traditional reductionist “notion of empirical sociological subject”, the history, the space and the politics without subject would be impossible (Grossberg, 1986, 146). Playful subject within history, in his terms, is a language that has no voice, and the space which is not featured by a subject is identical to Zeno’s abstract space of inaction re-negotiated by contemporary poststructuralists. He comments on this moment in cultural studies as “reductionism upward” which is featured with unbounded discursivity.

Hall fears that discursive performance of language within poststructuralist reading and the subsequent generalizations of undecidability may lead to the loss of “its reference to material practice and historical conditions” (Grossberg, 1986, 146-7). Hall’s approach to textuality of culture is neither total refusal nor a defense of poststructuralist position but an “unnecessary” coherence of selected elements of culture and language. This makes space “a field of tension” where neither the politics of resistance to discursivity nor that of discursivity gains absolute upper hand, Hall states in another interview by (Chen 1992, 404). This is Halls’ version of space of equilibria that can be located in any instance of his discussions on popular culture.

Hall’s interpretation of equilibria is revealing as he calls this moment a space of “unstable balance” (Hall, 1986b, 423). His discussion resonates that cultural signs cannot be guaranteed to belong to a particular position forever. They are rather subjects to the balance of forces which are incessantly established and contested. In this way, “the popular [culture] is neither a pure sign of resistance by the people nor of total domination of the people. It is not the point at which the fight has been won, lost or settled but, rather, it is a site of continual struggle and negotiation” (Procter, 2004, 28) between cultural signs.

Besides, as with communication theories, meaning creation during sending or receiving information is rarely a linear, static and unchanging operation. Throughout communication, it is possible for the initial intended message to escape from being reproduced. However, letting the indeterminacy of signification overwhelm communication process is not Hall’s strategy. His method of encoding and decoding the message in a text is that of articulation in the sense that the
signification process is not the site of intended meaning and, at the same time, it is. Procter says that, for Hall, “The process of production, circulation, and so on, may be both determined and determining” (Procter, 2004, 61-2). Based on Hall’s approach, building in referential meanings in popular culture is an illusion, and, at the same time, endorsement of infinite play of signification process is a futile attempt. He simultaneously favors multi-accentuality and recognizes punctuating. The discussion of articulation also encompasses the controversial spheres of self and other and goes beyond.

3.1.4 Other and Self

Space of articulation, in Hall’s cultural studies, is further a locus where complicated relations between the concepts of self and other can be re-explored. Hall significantly draws on two theoretical moments of "racist" culture and that of outcast in Resistance through Rituals (Hall, 1976). Dissatisfied with the totalizing tendencies of the former and subversive moves of the latter, he launches a project to study the relational case of British Thatcherism and British youth subculture which he thinks is a way out of this dilemma.

When Hall studies the youth subculture in the 1970s Britain, he learns about the accusations of mugging leveled against it. Hall instigates an investigation into the causes of social and moral panics in that period in Britain. Procter says that the youth subculture and black immigrants were, then, constructed as scapegoats by British racist lobby as a result of “displacement of a deeper set of problems” and the emerging social and economic crisis. According to him, the escapegoated subculture, as the object of moral panics for the dominant culture, was the site of ambivalence and articulation, the site of both desire and fear for Britishers (Procter, 2004, 76-80).

The self-centered British culture, of that period, simultaneously needed subculture to reproduce itself and feared incorporation of its culture which was already degraded as low and other. Hall reveals that subculture was once the site of desire when it came to the postwar boom in Britain, however, when the counter-values arouse due to the emergence of the consumer culture, it was perceived as a threat to the Thatcherist culture and was dismissed as the site of panic. Besides, Britishness rejected subculture as a threat to the uniformity of its space. Gunduz in his paper argues that 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 (Gunduz, 2017, 948). This is the point where the outsider starts to make a counter moves to undermine the dominant’s claims to the total ownership of space.
According to Hall’s studies, when the totalitarian culture tried to construct and to
demonize subculture as the muggers in an attempt to restore the ideological homogeneity, the
escapegoated object defied the uniformity of value-centered culture by performing mixed drama.
The performance was conducted through rituals as the youth gathered and fought for positions
which, they thought, they were deprived of. By means of rituals, the performers reacted to and
resisted against the totalizing ideological moments by localizing styles of rhetoric, games,
clothing and dressing their hairs (Procter, 2004, 76-80). Hall borrows the terms “war of
positions” (Hall, 1986b, 421) from Gramsci to point at some aspects of counter moves of
subculture in his contemporary Britain and says that the youth subculture made spaces by using
rituals and appropriating them to resist uniformity of space and its hegemony.

Hall states that, however, the ritual performance by subculture was not virtually aimed at
total subversion of the values of old spaces. He means to say that alternative spaces made by the
youth were not autonomous but were positions adopted through negotiation with the existing
community. In other words, the youth made differences and negotiated them; they borrowed the
styles of ruling culture, disarticulated their associated significations and rearticulated other
possibilities. According to Hall’s readings, resistance through rituals is not a permanent solution
to the conflicts within hegemony, but it is an ever-going process of struggles and negotiation of
differences. In this sense, both the spaces of self and other are already the sites of ambivalence.

For Hall, Britishness or any claim for spatial entity is already a space of articulation. Hall
(1978, p. 25) declares that the subculture black who in the face of Britain’s economic crisis, in
1970s, was escapegoated as outsider is, in fact, “in the sugar you [Britishers] stir; it is in the
sinews of the famous British sweet tooth; it is in the tea-leaves at the bottom of the next British
cuppa” (Hall, 1978, 25). Hall is seeking to note that no British history or culture has been made
without an active engagement of the outsider. In other words, not only does the space of other
become the site of blends and hybridity, it also hybridizes self’s culture in its own way. In Hall’s
eyes, cultural space is a complicated process of negotiated hybrid identities and, at the same
time, struggles for specificities and differences. Hall’s approach to the cultural concepts of race,
self and other is intimately associated with the rise of globalization.

3.1.5. Local and Global

Hall uses the terms local and global in discussing worldwide mobilization and flow of
immigration. Through his elaboration on the two terms in "The Meaning of New Times", we
learn that as the pace of global compression accelerates the uniformity of space, other paradoxical movements of dividing lines push to customize it (Hall, 1989a, 236). A review of these parallel movements and an exploration into their relationship will further reveal the significance of Hall’s articulation approach to the space of culture.

Transnational movements can be viewed as the cause and effect of global space compression and official borders’ transgression. This has put in trouble the concept of nationhood and nation-state and has de-centered their signification. In this context, nationhood has become more “imagined community” and less integrated and self-sufficient geography. The flexibility of belongingness that follows globalization has caused insecurity with long-term boundness to geography and threatened coherent and enclosed identities. Globalization, in this way, affects cultures and diversity of their components. Hall states that, from this angle, global movements have disrupted the settled character of traditional ideas of nationality and has put the legitimacy of closed cultural spaces in trouble.

In the meantime, discourse of globalization is the locus of ambivalent forces urging us to recognize diversity of trends. With reference to Hall’s comprehensive study, the rise of global movements and flow of migration has also produced a defensive call for cultural differences. When he discusses differences from local direction, he finds serious challenges and unveils the inherent struggle within globalization theories where the ideal representation of postmodern multicultural space is shattered by never-ending challenge between homogenization and localization. Hall asserts that “the question of ethnicity reminds us that everybody comes from some place…. A politics which neglects that moment of identity and identification – without, of course, thinking of it as something permanent, fixed or essential – is not likely to be able to command the new times” (Hall, 1989a, 233). Hall is speaking of seriousness of difference seriously but never intends to essentialize ideological borders.

In such a space, global movements both incorporate cultural differences and have worked with them. Hall writes that the new times “have gone ‘global’ and ‘local’ at the same moment”. Such an observation, he contends, is due to the close study of ethnicity question, the question which necessitates both common concerns and re-articulation of identification and belonging (Hall, 1989a, 236). According to him, the disinterested spirit of postmodern has neglected to spare a space for interested specificities. Coy in her paper investigates the cause of Somali migrants in the United States and expresses that among them there was “a desire to understand the American culture, as well as adapt their own cultural inclinations to accommodate their new
environment.” She maintains that “even when faced with hostility in the current American political climate, they still rallied as a community to advise one another on how to better integrate, wanting to better adapt to their new home,” (Coy, 2017, 857-858). Addressing the proponents of the space which undermines seriousness of local cultures under the mask of plurality, Hall elaborates on his Caribbean liminal migrant identity and ironically notes that “Now that, in the postmodern age, you all feel so dispersed, I become centered” (Procter, 2004, 109). To put in other words, simultaneous movements of homogeneity/difference, transnational/national and global/local are the inherent spatial features of globalization.

Hall pictures the politics of identity by inviting us to recognize both differences and ongoing dialog between local and global, between particular and general. He argues that the new times have gone global and local at the same time. The meaning of articulation in the context of globalization, for him, is the inclusive strategy, i.e., simultaneity of differences and similarities. He maintains that globalization would, then, make it possible for the cultural issues to be addressed "from within the ‘local’ specificities of our own cultural situations" (Morley and Chen, 2005, 407). In this sense, certain western and American cultures, as the more globalized communities, appear more like the spaces of articulation which should respect and take into account double concerns for particulars and the generals.

4. Conclusion

Discussion on the key concepts in cultural studies revealed dynamism of Hall's articulation strategy. It was shown that his approach to address the popular topics signifies a range of parallel double movements in the space. The researcher argued that space of culture is the site of challenges between central and peripheral theoretical positions. There are forces at work which push for institutionalizing theoretical comfort in cultural studies, however, the interfering questions unceasingly disrupt the attempts and prevent it from turning into a settled discipline. In the meantime, center and periphery unwillingly, but necessarily, come to terms to keep cultural studies updated. As for the dominant and resistant, Hall’s strategy is to deal with hegemonic moments. In other words, culture is a space where power relations are in the process of settling and unsettling. He means to proclaim that, in the hegemonic moment, cultural values and ideologies, privileges and preferences matter, and at the same time there are pressures against self-contained approaches. Halls’ methodology is also suggestive of simultaneous
operation of the openness of linguistic signification process and temporary punctuating within the cultural space. Hall suggests that linguistic turn in cultural studies, with the implications of multi-accentuality, discursivity and openness of signification, is a breakthrough in cultural studies, but, he argues that, the imprint, the signature and the trace of punctuating, positioning, representing and resistance to the playful aspect of language matter as well. Besides, within the discourse of self/other in cultural studies, Hall asserts that there are totalizing forces to authorize self at the expense of demonizing other. In Hall’s eyes, while there are illusions to exclusions on the basis of racist drives, there are also disillusions to the effect of negotiated identities. Through Hall’s elaboration, the pace of global trends accelerates uniformity, and, at the same time, other paradoxical movements of specificity push to customize the space. In other words, the flexibility of belongingness that follows globalization has produced a defensive return to official national identity.
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