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Abstract
People describe street by “the place identity; the street culture; people feelings and use of space; everyday life; people and characteristics; shared space; land use and transportation; change in the aesthetic of the place; street economy and politics; and mythologies.” This paper pursues the philosophical discussions to dig into values of street as the common space.
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1. Introduction
‘Identity is ‘people’s concepts of who they are, of what sort of people they are, and how they related to others (Hogg and Abrams, 1988),’ In this sense, the street ritual characterizes the place where people learn about their social-political situations. The young use public space to present their socio-political identity. The carnivals and socio-political activities inscribe street with the layers of meanings which enhance the sense of attachment. The concrete everyday practices enhance ‘the structure of feeling (Williams, 1977, Lotfata, 2015).’ The ambiguity of place is linked to the ambiguity of identity. The lack of sense of existence results in the stressful place of inhabitants through insulation of individuals of the communal life. Under the modern liberalism, the communal culture of public spaces is in decline (Ambinakudige et
al, 2017). The public space belonging to the particular groups might cause urban polarization and the reduction sense of belongings and appropriation of diversity (Lotfata, 2008).

The urban context with the multifarious identities embraces the diversity of users, in that sense, public space does not close to the particular groups. The synergy of multi-identities profiles the dynamic image of space than the monotonous identity. The synergic relations between identities might exhibit the emergent identity, take an example the synergy of carnival and political rituals of street might give birth to the national identity of street. These processes enhance a sense of community and assume that all individuals have the common values and goals (Lotfata, 2013).

The public space uses as the prestige identity of those have potential to use public space and who reside in urban space. This presents conflicts relationships of parochial spaces (Jenkins, 1996 and Lofland, 1989) (neighborhoods spaces) and public space activities. This type of insight on public space transforms it as the closed community of who can use it.

Wendt (1994) explains identity as the cognitive schemas. The cognitive schema enables people to determine who they are in a situation and position of social understanding. Wendt (1994) identifies identity as the essential part of social-being. To social-being, people need the emotional, meaning attachments and the spatial profile. Take an example, the national identity triggers the common emotions brings people together around common goal of public. Moreover, the aesthetics of physical space encourages peoples’ socialization (Lotfata, 2013). Bloom (1990) ‘describes the condition in which the mass of people have made the same identification with national symbols have internalized symbols of the nation.’ Public space presents people-place bond. People of a nation expresses their common emotion, common dependency, rootedness (Tuan, 1980) and insideness (Relph, 1976) of space.

According to Hall (1989), ‘identity emerges as a kind of the unsettled space between a number of intersecting discourses, until recently, we have incorrectly thought that identity is a kind of fixed point but an ambivalent point. Hall explains that identity in the evolutionary process through changes in context dynamics. Identity as the whole is open to re-structuring. This view underlines that identities such carnival identity, political identity, public space identity and national identity appear during the process.

Take an example, the carnival identity with the potential of socialization is not fixed embraces changes during the process. According to Bakhtin (1984), festivals are as the spatial tactics to save selves of the nihilistic insight of traditional identity. ‘Where psychoanalysis says, stop find your-self again, let’s go further still we have not dismantled our self’ (Ibid p.167). Carnivals are the cultural tactics to enhance the socialization. For Bakhtin (1984), carnivals are fests outside of hierarchical power control and it is the type of liberation temporarily refutes existing social order. Bakhtin (1984) writes carnival is life in itself is under influences of the cultural pattern as the whole. Bakhtin (1984) stresses ‘at any given time, in any given place, there will be a set of conditions that will insure that a self-acting (participating) in that place and at that time will have an identity different than it would have under other conditions.’

The carnival concept debates the ongoing process of becoming. Becoming does not mean leave roles and liberation of any necessities; indeed, it is something in between of rules. This
is other type of definition re-contextualization and even adaptation. According to Delouse and Guattari (1987), ‘the self is only a threshold, a door, a becoming two multiplicities’. The self is in the completion or in the adaptation process. Moreover, according to Lawrence (1992), the carnivals as the socio-spatial experience can shift the public space to site of the political contest. He explains that the carnival tactics, spatial tactics and political tactics discursive relations might results in the production the site of contest. Alonso (1988) explains that history is the central focus of contest, the past collective actions define present.

In addition to carnival, national and political identity, public space identity of street invites people to leave the meaningful traces. According to Sennett (1997), public space is where people act socially than economically, their values do not depend on their economic values. He drives attention on public space definition as the place of the civic activities. For Sennett (1999), public space is as the site of subjectivities in mutual relationships. This view inspires the deep emotional association with the place consciousness. Sennett concern returns back to the nineteenth century urban society how urban life declines through industrialization and modernization which decreases the place consciousness. The place consciousness refers to people-place attachments and or Tuan’s ‘topophilia’ (Tuan, 1974).

“A good place is one which, in some way appropriate to the person and her culture, make her aware of her community, her past, the web of life, and the universe of time and space in which these are contained.’ So that, the good public space where shapes in the relational setting (Lynch, 1981).

2. Street Culture

‘Culture is the complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society (Tylor, 1870)’. For Hofstede (1994), culture categorizes to symbols, rituals, values, and heroes. Symbols suggest the verbal and non-verbal language. Ritual is the collective activity such resistance culture. Values, they are feeling and non-visible and heroes are the role models of behaviors express in myths. The symbols, rituals and heroes are the common meaningful interpretations which define the rationale behind peoples’ actions.

Culture compounds of the various experiences of implicit and explicit transmitted during process (Schwartz, 1992). The implicit meanings lie on the way of interpretation by the observers. He drives attention on the term of cognition, people cognition embraces the previous cultural modules, and indeed this view refers the slow adaptation process of human minds to changes and moreover, human knowledge is built upon in the layers accumulation, the previous knowledge does not replace by the novel knowledge, only the embodied knowledge magnifies its domain of influence and might changes the form of influence with the same message. In this regard, culture is in the line of development regulates survival of people (Damasio, 2010). Cresswell (1997) explains tactics ‘furtive movement, short cut and routes.’ This process suggests that space is incomplete phenomenon, people tactically reconfigure space.

Peoples are in lines of flight. The line of flight refers third space between past and present (Delouse,1986). Delouse defines human world mobility between the perceived and cognitive space. Tactics are as the art of the creative mind ‘the artistic surfing’ (de Certeau, 1984,
Lotfata, 2013) actualizes the real world outside of world of false consciousness, ‘generation the model of reality without originality’ (Baudrillard, 1988). The false consciousness presents the hyper-reality worlds which fully underlines the past cultural models and or fully annihilate the past.

For de Certeau (1984), culture is the battlefield both powerful and weak are in challenge, powerful is vulnerable and weak is not hopeless. de Certeau (1984) explains the resistance culture in daily walking and shopping. People brain do not adapt as fast as changes happening in the strategic decisions. In this view, Nassauer (1988b) writes people do not adapt changes since culture imbues landscape with the connotations about the person, indeed values can change through changes into social characteristics of landscape. Nassauer (1997b) claims resistance in ‘both the scenic aesthetic and the aesthetic of care are culturally ingrained and conceptually well developed. They are resistant to change.’ He presents that the socio-spatial productions are not the value-free to easy changes. For Sun Tzu, ‘To fight and conquer in all our battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting.’

Furthermore, the study investigates the popular ritual of street. According to MacDonald (1957), mass culture shapes the homogenous culture. According to him, mass culture which is the revolutionary and democratic force breaks down barriers between classes by producing the homogenous culture. For him, the only threat of mass culture undermines cultural values (local) but according to him difference on the cultural values implies discrimination. However, the mass culture is the danger of the shrinking and annihilation of public space through presentation reality outside of humans’ cognition which ends up with the detached individuals-world and or disruption the meaningful structure of space (Lotfata and Lotfata, 2018).

According to Chambers (1986), in popular culture, people are not passive as the mass culture. People creatively appropriate and manipulate cultural productions of city. Popular culture influences urban agenda from different facets, these are economic, social, political and spatial, indeed through interaction with the public space gives birth the liminal space of public space and popular culture. For MacClancy (1996), currently powerful form of the popular performance is found in sport. It is the cultural tactic situates in everyday life of many people. Sport identifies as the popular ritual as serious as the national performances.

3. Discussion and Conclusion

Identity does not anymore conceptualize as the static and closed phenomenon. Identities reconfigure through changes in socio-economic and spatial profiles of context. Modern philosophy encourages ‘de-territorialization’ (Delouse, 1980), Outlandish (Mellvile, 1990) concepts. Delouse explains ‘new logic’ which challenges the traditional understanding of identity. For Delouse (1980), ‘the one becomes two’. This view criticizes the traditional static and the oneness of identity. In reality, there is not the universal propositional logic. The concept of identity as well as other concepts should identify in the discursive process. The identity oneness personalizes differences (Naficy, 2001) and reduction commonality of public space. The static approach of identity might decrease the context coherency and then self-organization capacity of space.
According to Clifford (1988), ‘what if identity is not conceived as a boundary to be maintained but as a nexus of relations and transactions actively engaging a subject’. He drives attentions on conceptualization of identity as the whole interacts with other elements. Breakwell (1986) conceptualizes identity with inspiration of biological process which defines through interaction with the context dynamics. The process understanding of identity internalizes the adaptation concepts. In this sense, not only community maintains its uniqueness as the traditional identity perspective but also identities have opportunity to reconfigure according to other patterns effects. The process understanding of identity is significant to the sense of continuity with the local changes, indeed the attached values are in change.

Cultural system summarizes to the following characteristics:

(1) Culture is the holistic system; the substructures and or cultural tactics interlink one another, for Parson (1974), the interconnected tactics produce the common language of the cultural system defines the whole vision of context. Under the relational approach, cultural system keeps balance of multi-goals of system. Culture includes both structure and agency and macro and micro attitudes. Under the holistic approach, culture does not reduce to the subjective and invisible attitudes and or define s as the structural approach of space. Culture is the complex whole which includes knowledge and any other capabilities gained by humans as the members of society (Lotfata and Lotfata, 2018).

Culture as the self-regulating system resists to the outsiders. For Goodenough (1961), a culture is like grammar includes the rules which allow people to interact within inner regulations. The relational cultural system is open system and exchanges values with the environing system. The influences of outsider depend on the solidarity of the cultural system, if system does not collapse over time and resists to change, it is possible to say that system has the self-sufficient structure.

(2) Culture is the adaptive complex system; similar to the biological system, culture tries to maintenance patterns to survive organism. For Meggers (1971), ‘Man is an animal and, like all other animals, must maintain an adaptive relationship with his surroundings in order to survive. Adaptation principally through the medium of culture, the process is guided by the same rules of natural selection that govern biological adaptation.’

(3) The cultural system preserves equilibrium in the negative feedback loops. The cultural system maintains internal stability through the (re) production the similar patterns of system. According to Rappaport (1971), Harris (1964), a culture is the self-regulating system with feedback loops tends to keep the cultural system in balance (Lotfata, Sadeghi, 2009).

(4) Culture produces the shared meanings; people who belong to the same culture interpret the world in roughly similar manners. Geertz (1973a) says ‘culture is the fabric of meanings.’ The meaning production is the incomplete process; interpretation never produces the final moment of truth. Subjects dis-embody and re-embody meanings. For Derrida (1981), writing always leads to more writings. The study aims to present the evolutionary meaning changes in the cultural system
Culture as the whole way of life (Williams, 1965) includes both static and active attitudes. According to Durkheim (1965a); Geertz (1973); Madsen (1984); and Parsons (1968), culture as the system of meanings both open to outsider and able to produce cultural patterns according to inner rules is resilient.
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