# Derrida and Language: Deconstruction

Ceren Yegen

Muş Alparslan University, Faculty of Communication, 49250 Muş, Turkey

Tel: 90-043-6213-0013        E-mail: c.yegen@alparslan.edu.tr


Memet Abukan

Muş Alparslan University, Faculty of Education, 49250 Muş, Turkey

Tel: 90-043-6213-0013        E-mail: memetabukan@hotmail.com

**Abstract**

Derrida's deconstruction aims not only to understand language, text or meaning but also the postmodern universe which replaces the modern one and in which we live. Derrida thinks that the meaning can be attributed to other meanings or significance than the Western metaphysics deem by means of deconstruction. Therefore he considers the saying and writing - just like the meaning- to be behind this thought; the structures which are stereotyped by the aforesaid thought and the actions of which freedom is bereaved. Derrida thinks that the Western thought is completed with the deconstruction; however, he emphasizes that the meaning can be reconstructed.  Within this context, this study will discuss Derrida's war waged with the deconstruction against the dominant meaning conception within the scope of Derida's "difference", "trace", "decentralization", "undecidability" and "metaphor" perceptions after the explanations to be made regarding modernism and postmodernism; and the way to understand how the differentiation potential of the deconstruction, text and the meaning inside is realized shall be traced.

**Keywords:** Modernism, Postmodernism, Language, Meaning, Writing, Saying, Metaphor, Deconstruction.

## 1. Introduction

In parallel with the importance attached to the language phenomenon in 20th century, the meaning phenomenon, apart from being linguistic, has been a philosophical and sociological study subject just as the language and text. In this sense, according to Derrida the language which formalizes the meaning became a problem in aforementioned period. Derrida developed the "deconstruction" concept in order to solve this problem and pointed out that the meaning can be constructed independently. Derrida's deconstruction concept is in fact a pursuit that suggests postmodernism. This is because of the fact that, Derrida criticizes the Western thought system which is the hegemony of the meaning constructing and legalizing the modernity by mans of deconstruction; and he to liberate the meaning. Moreover the metaphor phenomenon as an auxiliary element for the West thought is on the target board of Derrida.

The deconstruction which is the critical thought method of Derrida is established on graphemics and via this deconstruction Derrida criticizes the linguistics and its positivist bases. His deconstruction has appealed to numerous fields other than linguistics and even affected the architecture. For example Derrida's text disintegration idea has led to the wide use of fragmatism of forms in architectural design. Fragmatism refers to the disintegration of basic forms and at the same time this process paves way for the conceptions with different and potential meaning. (Kurt, 2010: 1-2).

In this sense, the function of the deconstruction and the contributions that Derrida endeavored to bring into writing, saying, language and meaning via the deconstruction are needed to be analyzed. Therefore in this study the "metaphor" term which can be seen as the guardian of the meaning with the concepts such as "difference", "trace", "decentralization" and "undecidability" suggested by Derrida like the modernism and postmodernism terms based on the deconstruction concepts of Derrida has been analyzed and so that the deconstruction has been discussed in general terms. This is because of the fact that, the deconstruction concept of Derrida is actually *"a firm criticism of postmodernism"*. (Uçan, 2009: 2283).

## 2. Modernism and Postmodernism

While the modernization terms expresses that societies show developments related with the renovations in national and international fields, the modernity is used in the meaning of separating the modern structure from conventional structure in a certain period of time. On the other hand, modernism can be defined as the thought and information system formed in modernity and it includes cultural, economical, political etc. circumstances within its body.

Modernity is a situation which is closely related with rationalism and acted and defended by many philosophers such as Marx and Weber acted at the point of understanding the world. (Ritzer, 2011: 100).

> *"Modernus is a Latin word. This fascinating word indeed was used firstly in 5th century in order to point out the Christian societies in the meaning of refusing the irreligiousness (paganism). (...) The first meaning of modernism term was to be Christian and its current latest meaning is to be Western. Today in our country, the word modern has*

*often positive connotations. The word modern includes the meaning of transition from "old" to "new" and makes us to imagine a new age, to be beneficial and to be good. Modern means to be new and according to the modernism the "new" is beneficial, permanent, good and is indispensable for the happiness of human." (Uçan, 2009: 2285).*

Modernism refers to the development, transition and more accepted situation of an individual during modern process. In this respect, modernism can also be defined as development, transition and renovations on individual basis. On the other hand, Özbek (2005:5) reports *"modernism is in favor of accuracy and always follows consistency"*.

However the "postmodernism" which has been discussed with its all positive and negative aspects and can be defined as the reinterpretation of modernism is an age claimed to have liberating and innovator aspects. Özbek (2005: vii) states that many things have been said and written about postmodernism up to now, however most of them could not get beyond creating confusion.

The post modernity term which expresses the age after modernism is seen as the reinterpretation of modernism. However, the postmodernism which expresses an attitude is an approach that has taken the place of modern age approaches and it expresses an age in which everything is melded. The postmodernism, like art, also refers to the invisible. The narration term will become a considered fact in postmodernism if it is useful; otherwise, the aforesaid narration will not be regarded as considerable no matter what the narration is about. In this respect, it is clearly obvious that the "pragmatism" is attributed a great importance in postmodernism. While Lyotard, who ensured postmodernism to be a subject in which sociology is interested, aims to put forward the situation of information in developed societies, he considers the post modernity as "an information type". *"When Lyotard discusses the postmodernism, he defines it as a situation corresponding to the society after today's industry or postindustrial society."* (Cevizci, 2009: 1273). Lyotard describes the *"postmodern situation"* as the *"an extraordinary social life literature"*. The aforementioned situation has affected many art branches such as history, sociology, geography, , architecture and linguistics in terms of human life. (Ecevit, 2001: 57-58). Postmodernism, in fact is not only a life or approaching style, also a confusing fact which is related with many situations and is difficult to understand.

The postmodernism term has gained importance for the last twenty years. When we ask*"What is postmodernism?"* it is also significant how much we are interested in this term. Because, postmodernism is a complex and sophisticated fact. However, to express simply the postmodernism is a cultural image, an ignored fact and beyond the modernism (Featherstone, 2007: x-xxiii).

While Jameson (1991, 1-15) states that the postmodernism is a necessary trend and it is a kind of response to the paradoxes of the modernism, Ecevit (2000: 59) defines the postmodernism as *"the environment that does not allow the loneliness of absolute truths and morals"*.

Iggers defines postmodernity as (2000: 14): *"it reflects the society and culture which is transforming and in which the old acceptances related to the industrial development, the uprising economical expectations and the conventional middle class rules have been distrusted."*

While the modernism supports universality, the postmodernism does not believe in universality, it refuses a unique truth and adopts a pluralist approach and supports the principle "anything is acceptable". Furthermore, in this respect Feyerabend, who is one of the postmodernist philosophers, suggests "anything goes" principle at the point of method especially in terms of science; he rejects method limitation in science and shows postmodernist effort by supporting that everything can be useful, there should be pluralism in science and method and everybody should participate in science freely (Feyerabend, 1996) .

Feyerabend's reaction to the western science perception is similar to the reaction of Derrida –a significant postmodernist theorist- to the western metaphysics. Because while Derrida thinks that the meaning in language is determined by the western metaphysical thought and imprisoned and in this respect he supports that both meaning and language should be liberated; Feyerabend states that the science is imprisoned in method by the conventional western thought and it should be liberated. It is in this sense that, both of them assigns the duty to individual. Because according to Derrida, the individual is able to realize the different and postponed meanings in the text and liberate the language; and according to Feyerabend the individual will escape from the method cage and adopt pluralist methodologies and liberate science.

> According to Kurt (2010: 1) *"the age we live in is a confusing age and the postmodernism which came out to remove this confusion has become the confusion itself in time. There is no better way to kill modernism to revive it and the postmodernism is its "Tabula rasa". (Jencks) For some, the postmodernism is a thought movement which dooms to use up itself"*

The postmodernism is an indefinite fact and expresses the revulsion from modernism by adopting a new postmodern perception.

> *"The postmodernism is generally thought as the reflection of the modernism, the rationalism which is one of the basic perceptions of the modernism and the scientific representative philosophy (epistemology)… Within this framework, it is not possible to define the postmodernism as a theory or a complement of theories. The postmodernism should be thought as a field in which it competes, which has different tendencies and approaches and of which boundaries are not definite."* (Yüksel, 2002: 21 cited from Şaylan, 1999: 21).

Ritzer (2011: 99-101); defines the postmodern social theory as *"it is a new improvement in social sciences and it expresses the new world and the thoughts of this new world"*. The postmodernism plays a role in understanding this new universe, challenges the rationalism in the modernity and puts forward the irrationalism. Because in the postmodernism, people should discover beyond everything; in other words, the meaning, convention and even the

violence.

> *"Postmodernity . . . brings "re-enchantment" of the world after the protracted and earnest, though in the end inconclusive, modern struggle to dis-enchant it (or, more exactly, the resistance to dis-enchantment, hardly ever put to sleep, was all along the "postmodern thorn" in the body of modernity). The mistrust of human spontaneity, of drives, impulses, and inclinations resistant to prediction and rational justification, has been all but replaced by the mistrust of unemotional, calculating reason. Dignity has been returned to emotions; legitimacy to the "inexplicable," nay irrational… 7° The postmodern world is one in which mystery is no more a barely tolerated alien awaiting a deportation order. . .. We learn to live with events and acts that are not only not-yet-explained, but (for all we know about what we will ever know) inexplicable. We learn again to respect ambiguity, to feel regard for human emotions, to appreciate actions without purpose and calculable rewards."* (Ritzer, 2011: 102 cited from Bauman, 1998: 33 ).

Bulunmaz (2013: 13) states that the postmodern world we live in has differentiated, isolated and alienated people. According to Bulunmaz the technology has a great impact on it.

> *"The postmodern perception challenges the modernity in almost every subject; denies the modernity and criticizes it. While the modern thought tries to break its connection with the past, in order to say it tries to break away from classics and tries to impose the beauty and the usefulness of "new"; the postmodern perception tries to establish a connection with the past. However, this effort is not for glorifying the past. There is nothing sacred in the postmodernism. The principle of a thought type, which has nothing sacred, has no definite judgment and utopia. In a place where there is nothing sacred, everything is arguable. In the same way the postmodernism can also argue everything in such a perspective. It can take one from everything; a complicated narration can put forward a literature much more differently than it is in classic. Because the postmodernism is the enemy of absolute understanding; it foresees a mixed structure, a mixed narration, a mixed language and a mixed discourse."* (Uçan, 2009: 2289-2290).

## 3. Derrida and Deconstruction

The philosophers such as Baudrillard, R.Barthes, Derrida, Deleuze, Foucault, Lyotard and Wittgenstein present the poststructuralist thought after structuralism and they support postmodernist thought at the same time. The modernity is questioned in the postmodernist understanding together with meta-narrations such as science, art, religion, history and ration which has reached up to now by the poststructuralist philosophers in terms of liberation of human being. Derrida also criticizes almost everything in this sense, even himself; and he wages a fierce war with his deconstruction against the western thought based on common rules (Uçan, 2009: 2292).

The duty of the postmodernism that Derrida supports is indeed to deconstruct the world and today. The terms "self" and "other" have come out together with the deconstruction and the understanding that everything exists with its opposite and in fact it exists thanks to its

opposite is suggested. The "binary opposition", in other words, those which are different from one another, for example the perceptions such as beautiful-ugly and good-bad, can express a meaning as much as they are together, not by themselves. Derrida by using the deconstruction *"has suggested a method in which we can subvert these oppositions only by showing that one of the opposite terms can only exist within another"* (Ongur, 2010: 142 cited from Sarup, 2004:60).

The deconstruction is firstly a detailed, popular, a bit narrow and technical phenomenon. Secondly it expresses the text reading techniques developed by Derrida, Paul de Man and others. The deconstruction first came out in the United States as the literal criticism of texts and the technique to interpret them. Consequently, it can be interpreted as a situation that expresses the response of the reader to the text at the point of producing the meaning even if it is confused with other trends. From a different aspect, the deconstruction has developed as a response to the structuralism in Europe. Because according to the structuralism, the thought of an individual is shaped via language, but according to Balkin the structuralists ignore the relation of language with the culture at this point and according to him the deconstruction feeds the language with the assumption that it has cultural, universal, historical and flexible meanings. He remarks that the importance of meaning should not be reduced by adding perception and the role of culture to the lingual praxis. The deconstruction is a useful practice in unfolding the concealed meanings and perceptions in texts, and it is in fact an interpretation style that is sometimes leading to find out unexpected meanings. The deconstruction indeed aims to reveal the concealed and other implicit meanings, not to show up the meaningless of the text by separating it (Balkin, 1995-1996: 1-3).

Derrida targets the reality search firstly with the deconstruction; because the period that is called reality has not ended, not completed. In this sense, a unique reality concept is rejected and it is already one of the most significant claims of the postmodernist thought. In other words, a definite unique reality never exists. In the deconstruction of Derrida who finds the western metaphysics facile, the aim is not to distort the structure, on the contrary the aim is to restructure it. While in the deconstruction which is a "playground" for Derrida the suspicion has the prominent role, Derrida deconstructs the interpretation types and indications. According to the structuralists such as Saussure the language includes systematical, regular, logical and continuous relationships and therefore it is a structure. According to Keat and Urry (1994: 149), *"the language is structure of regularities, so every natural language lies under the words of those who speak that language as their mother language; the word addresses the actual linguistic action.* However, there is some opposition to this structuralist language concept. At this point Derrida seriously criticizes the Western metaphysics and its rationalism. According to Derrida this thought is *"frozen perception and it could not run away from the meaning"*. Therefore Derrida puts forward the deconstruction to discuss the basic judgments in a different rationalist way. Because according to him, the language is full of deep-rooted meanings and preconceptions; and the deconstruction method should be applied to understand the language and meaning. Because the meaning can be understood or discovered from what the deconstruction reveals. The idea "ending of philosophy" that has been put forward together with the deconstruction does not mean the end of philosophy

according to Derrida, on the contrary it refers to the start of a new age for philosophy, in other words it refers to the end of metaphysical age (Kurt cited from Keat, Urry and Yırtıcı, 2010: 2).

Derrida states that the deconstruction is not a method but a reading activity. According to Derrida, the emphasis of the deconstruction is about the plurality of meaning. In other words, texts may include many meanings that are different from one another or in similar characteristics (Balkin. 1995-1996: 2).

Derrida stated that the language has become problematic due to metaphysical problems. Derrida who asks *"What does it mean?"* presents a sign as the response. To mark the meaning of a thing is nothing but to replace one sign with another one. According to Derrida, the language has become a marking inflation as a sign itself. The language is still a sign and going or being not able to go one step back or forward the language addresses a crisis for Derrida. The deconstruction of Derrida is to end up the hegemony of the determined meaning. The meaning indeed has developed in a systematical period during metaphysical period. Derrida who mentions the power hereby states that the meaning and language is not free of power and they do not improve. Derrida who mentions the live energy of the meaning stated that the meaning will stay blank and desolate when this liveliness is ended up and therefore the meaning becomes naive yet blank (Bal, 2004: 54-55 cited from Derrida, 1998: 6).

Even though critical law theorists state that there are some problems in the deconstruction, they discussed it adding three approaches to it. Firstly, the deconstruction claims that the meaning is naturally inconsistent and according to them the meaning is flexible. Secondly, the deconstruction considers the language as a fluid phenomenon which supports many notions of social structure, can draw the meaning anywhere.. Thirdly and finally, the deconstruction may sometimes prune texts as it aims to find out the meaning under the text. In this sense, the deconstruction which assumes the meaning as flexible is the separation of the meaning itself to understand the meaning, rather than the text. Like critical law theorists, the feminist theorists have also discussed the deconstruction and they have benefited from the deconstruction in feminist theories. Because, according to feminist theorists the pressure and alienation over female and feminity phenomenon involved in texts can be revealed by analyzing the meaning when the arguments are handled via the deconstruction (Balkin, 1995-1996: 5-6).

Derrida, due to his deconstruction concept, was accused of being a nihilist. The deconstruction was interpreted as a situation that *"it is composed of a game of signifiers that are stuck in the language"* and was accused by the claim that *"it precludes person from maintaining a politic and ethical attitude"*. However Derrida stated that he used the deconstruction to translate Heidegger's words, "destruction" and "abbau", and the deconstruction was put forward with the necessity of distorting, but not destructing, the structure of the meaning or text to understands it (Sağlam, 2012: 290).

According to Derrida who states that *"there is nothing other than the text", "the meaning changes in accordance with permanent conditions and the meaning does that by itself"* (Bal, 2004: 57).

Caputo, who made an interview with Derrida on the deconstruction, states that Derrida –about the question what the deconstruction is- said that the deconstruction had been in his mind for a long time and he started out to point out this problem thematically in previous years. Bennington (1993: 27-38) states that the philosophy of Derrida is never a language philosophy; on the contrary it includes a meaning beyond it. Because, according to Bennington, the language needs a renovation in terms of meaning –as the deconstruction of Derrida foresees- to be analyzed and escape from the western metaphysics.

## 4. Writing and Saying

Derrida, who believes that the Western way of thought is voicecentral/logocentral, claims that the aforesaid system perceives the writing only as an "addition", in other words as an "accessory". As Nalçaoğlu conveys (2004: 163), the writing has been seemed as the "parasite" of the saying throughout the history. According to Derrida, the saying was given priority compared to the writing; and this situation is a problem for Derrida. Because according to him, the writing comes before the saying. After this approach, Derrida observes the saying/writing dilemma and puts forward the "voicecentralism"; *"the voicecentralism is the name Derrida gave to the assumption of the fact that the saying is superior to the writing"*. According to Derrida, while the writing deserves a priority, the saying has been given more importance than the writing even in all belief systems. Derrida *"thinks that the indicated thing cannot be thought to exist by itself; there is certainly an indicative before the indicated thing, there is language."* In this sense, the deconstruction of Derrida, who gives priority to the writing, comes out as a reading recommendation and it aims to find an answer to the question "*How does the writing transmit a reality? How does it destruct or distort?"* Derrida tries to find an answer to this question in *De la Grammatologie (Graphemics).* According to Derrida, *"The writing exists before anything. There is no graphemical signifier before the writing. The writing comes first."* (Uçan, 2009: 2295-2297).

The writing, according to the western thought, is the second metaphysic which is both phonetical and alphabetical. The writing which has some advantages and disadvantages is also a way that is applied in expressing a thought or a manner when it cannot be uttered. In this sense the writing is perhaps an alternative for the saying; and not the saying but the writing deserves the priority in the expression or the language (Bennington: 1993: 42-43).

> *"Derrida, (Hekman, 2012: 244 from 1976: 27-8.) claims that the writing is prior, not the speech. He states that the writing opens the history and the historical existence. He suggests that the source of the language and the source of the writing cannot be separated from each other."*

To express ironically, according to Derrida; while the saying is a "father", the writing is an "orphan". In other words the writing which is reason of the saying has been pushed into the background and written off. Yet the writing is the fact which indeed provides the expression of the meaning and the language. *"The meaning needs the writing to live on. If the writing is primary for the meaning, the writing always tells us that the existence has already started."* The writing is a mark that has brought out the speech; but it leads to its oblivion with the speech (Bal, 2004: 57 cited from Derrida, 1978: 9).

When Derrida, who gives more importance to the writing than the saying on all occasions, states that the saying has been in the front since Plato, he classifies the voice of the saying perceptively. The "speaking voice" is the raw material of the graphemics, and the "human voice" is the "human conscious" according to Derrida.

## 5. "Différance"

"Différence" which means "difference", "alterity" in French has been produced by the verb "differ". The verb "différer" has double and different meanings like "to make different" and "to postpone". Yet, according to Derrida, the aforementioned verb only expresses to be different. In this case Derrida changes the "e" in the " ifference" into "a" and makes the word "différance" which means both to make different and to postpone. We can say that Derrida is hereby separating the meaning, not the word, via the deconstruction. (Kurt, 2010: 2 cited from Timur).

The deconstruction, with the "différance" concept revealed by Derrida, in fact expresses the process of reinterpretation of the text as a philological method. Therefore the deconstruction is the separation of the meaning not the text itself. According to Derrida, the deconstruction is the separation of the text by itself. (Kurt, 2010: 2 cited from Proudfoot). The deconstruction basically analyses how the text differentiates itself and how the meaning changes. In this sense, the deconstruction, in opposition to the western metaphysics, is indeed the questioning of the language and the meaning again and always.

While Saussure stated that the unique and real subject of the graphemics is *"an analysis in the language itself and only for it",* he isolates the language from all facts except for itself. (Kıran and Kıran; 2000: 46). Saussure also discusses the language as "differentiations" and he cuts the connection reality with the language and he stated that the reality is only a sign of language. From this point of view, Derrida starts out with the difference concept of Saussure and states that every difference is a meaning. (Bal, 2004: 59). According to Lacan, it is the fact which has come out as a result of the distortion of the reality. Hudson (2000: 33), states that the language in a way cannot go beyond or out of the reality as it is meaningful when it only portrays the reality. *"Because the language cannot find anything to portray if it goes out of the reality." In this respect, as Wittgenstein states, ," we cannot say only this exists or does not exist in the word".*

The prominent post-structural philosophers "*Derrida, Deleuze and Guattari emphasize the slickness of the language."* According to Derrida and deconstructionalists, *"there is no direct and overlapping relation between the signifier and the signified, conversely to the Saussurist graphemics. According to them, the signifier and the signified are always separated and produce new meanings"* (Uçan, 2008: 49).

Derrida tries to show the radical effects –in reality- of the model of Saussure that the language is unsuccessful in realizing itself. Derrida who struggles with the metaphysical meanings remarks at the same time that the meanings produced by the western metaphysics are blank. In this sense, Carnap, also in the same respect, gives the example of the word "God" and states that *"it is metaphysical use and it becomes meaningless as it is beyond*

*experiment."* (Ko ç, 1995: 145).

Derrida who adopts Saussure's "difference" model to himself as "différance" discusses the concept of Saussure in the real nature of interpretation. Derrida's aim is to emphasize what we call the metaphysic of existence paradoxically within Saussure's difference concept without any positive existence (Clarke, 2004-2205: 1-2).

While Ecevit (2000: 263) states that the meaning is never identical with itself on the basis of the postmodern thought in Derrida's language concept, and there cannot be any mutual relationship between the signifier and the signified; he emphasizes that the actual thing he noticed in the language philosophy of Derrida is the interaction between the reader and the text.

According to Derrida the conventional integrity of the text is distorted by the deconstruction; the meaning is left blank by postponing it and each meaning send another perception and meaning to the reader. According to him, *"the signified part of the signifier cannot be limited",* in other words the meaning continuously postpones itself. Because every signifier indeed leads to another perception and meaning of every perception, and so it postpones the meaning. Therefore, the hypothesis that the meaning is a phenomenon which cannot be limited comes out.   As the meaning cannot be limited and always postponed, according to Derrida the meanings called "correct" or "definite" naturally cannot exist. Derrida leaves the meaning blank in this way. This is at the same time the basis of the postmodernist thought. Because according to the postmodernists, there is no unique reality, meaning or fact; there are variety and plurality in the universe (U çan, 2009: 2294-2295).

## 6. "Metaphor"

Derrida's metaphor concept can be expressed as "inexistence of clear meaning". According to Derrida, the Western idea has always obsessed with reality and self; and it has suppressed the meaning of language in itself. In other words, it has immobilized the meanings. According to Derrida the "metaphor" is indeed a way of immobilizing the meaning and according to him, it is not innocent at all. Because the metaphor, whether it is a discourse, a narration/story, an expression way or whatever it is; directs searching and immobilizes the results. The metaphor is a tool and invention of the Western metaphysics; the analogies and metaphors have been used for perceiving a concept and idealism and making it perceived. According to Derrida (1978: 3), the analogy *"is an impulse that is above the language and is hard to overcome."* The analogy is a mute and strange development; and it can be discussed as the natural development of the language. In this sense, Derrida redefines the idealism on the basis of the metaphors which were brought up to create a concept and to make the idealism be perceived: *"It is a thought, which prioritizes a piece and which is its expression, an idea or 'an inner order', it is a prejudice; the conventional criticism defines this prejudice as 'idealism'."* (Bal, 2004: 55-56 cited from Derrida, 1978: 17).

To summarize, it can be said for metaphor is an abstract but an effective tool which was the Western metaphysics in imprisonment of meaning in order to create a concept, comprehension and perception.

## 7. "Trace" and "Decentralization"

According to Derrida, the "Trace" is neither visual nor verbal. According to him, everything is concealed in the meaning. The trace cannot be explained by metaphysical concepts. Derrida destructs the context and changes it by putting forward the trace concept. The existing meanings are distorted by the deconstruction and a trace is followed continuously for the meaning. Derrida *"reads the 'trace' concept in a general writing problematique which cannot be degraded to the grammè and only to audible things; in other words, the record of symbols, and which therefore resists to any sensual or symbolic definiteness and to the ontic reductionism"* (Başaran, 2013: 160).

Derrida turns the trace concept into a problem in terms of the psychological analysis. Notwithstanding, the trace becomes significant when the texts which are present and here are discussed. The trace of an event, a text or a meaning is followed; even if the meaning is past, its trace brings the individual towards it. On the purpose of existing and breaking the continuity, Derrida uses the trace term and uses *"the expressions of convergence, immediacy and existence to position the thing which we suppose that we understand should not be understood"*. According to Derrida, the trace itself, just like the ifference, cannot be degraded (Direk, 2004: 146).

One of the concepts that Derrida puts forward with the deconstruction is the "decentralization". The decentralization expresses that there is no self or centre and therefore there is also no self which can be degraded to it. In this sense, the hypothesis that there is no unique reality and the reality cannot be oversimplified, which is supported by the postmodernists like Derrida, can be set as an example of this concept of Derrida.

## 8. "Undecidability"

The "undecidability" has an important place in deconstructionalist understanding of Derrida. With Derrida's own words, the undecidability *"is not only an oscillation between contradictory rules which are very well determined and both equally peremptory."* The undecidability, in contrast to what is estimated, is not being mixed up between two or more decisions or not being able to know which of the situations can be chosen; it is a situation to be a stranger to an order. A decision that did not pass within the order of the undecidability cannot be a free decision; perhaps it can be in accordance with the rule or law. However it can never be fair. If the decision has not passed within the order of the undecidability even once, it could follow a rule or established a rule to itself or discover a rule for itself. Even so, the decision is still not going to be fair. Because the rule or law must be re-evaluated and be reconstructed in accordance with the situation in order to have a fair decision. *"The time of decision, in the moment of its uniqueness, is both in order and out of order."* (Cengiz, 2007: 80).

> *"According to Derrida there is no free decision if there is a conditioning and allegiance to the condition; therefore disengagement has to be occurred with the existing information and rules to make the free decision possible. The free decision cannot be determined by traditions and methods (neither the norms in the past nor an ideal to come*

*true in the future). Furthermore, a discrimination of "we/they" does not come out in the time of deciding or the existence of an undivided integrity cannot be reached. Then why is the free/dominant decision, which experiences the singularity and therefore opens itself to exception, political? Like Schmitt, Derrida also finds the politics in creating exceptions, not in the application of norms and laws. For both, the exceptions bring up the reality of norms. The exception causes a new norms-system. However, in contrast with Schmit, the exception is not a war according to Derrida; it is an ethical relation established with singularity. Derrida discusses it in a messianic style and includes it into his democracy experience. The messianic cannot be found in historical present; it suspends a historical present. Schmitt criticized the liberalism as it ignored the decisive essence of the politics and degraded it, in a hypocrite way, to universal ethical rules. The criticism of Schmitt can be directed to the Habermasist democracy concept. Derrida, in Rule of Law, develops a new decisiveness which establishes a relation with ethics. However he does it on an aporetic undecidability basis: "Without having an undecidability experience…there is no decision given…Ethics and politics start with undecidability therefore…"[1]*

## 9. Conclusion and Evaluation

In conclusion, we can say that the deconstruction is a method that tries to bring up the meaning by dividing the language or text. Therefore, Derrida states that the deconstruction is a kind of reading. According to Derrida, we cannot see the meaning as it is postponed; but we can stop being blind and we can reveal postponed and different meanings and perceptions by deconstructing the text or the language. Because, according to the postmodernist thought, Derrida also defends and supports this thought, there is no unique meaning as there is no unique reality. The meaning and the perception might be different for everyone. It can be possible by deconstructing the text or the language.

The deconstruction criticizes the thought and language within itself and therefore it struggles to bring up the concealed, implicit or postponed meanings in the language or in the text even though it seems like an enemy for them; it asks them perceptional and expressional questions. It is in this since that apart from being useful, the deconstruction is needed for bringing up the meaning as well.

While Derrida states that the traces must be followed for the meaning, he multiplies the meaning in itself via différance. Derrida puts forward the idea that every difference is a meaning itself.

The war, which Derrida waged against the metaphysics of the western thought in the universe that passed from modern to a postmodern order, shows itself within Derrida's decentralization, undecidability and metaphor concepts. Derrida's deconstruction , which left the saying behind its reason, the writing; targets the priority of the writing as much as the meaning. Because the writing has always fallen behind during the historical process due to the saying; and according to Derrida it should be driven forward as it does not have less

---

[1] *Access, http://zeynepdirek.wordpress.com/2012/12/12/derridanin-siyaset-felsefesi/, 02.01.2014.*

importance than the saying and it has existed before the saying.

As a result of all these efforts and methods, Derrida supports the necessity of the deconstruction with postmodernist aspects which aim to multiply the meaning of the language, not to distort it. However, there is no unique reality according to the postmodernist thought. Taking stand from this point of view, there is no unique meaning for Derrida; on the contrary there are meanings and differences. This is all because of the fact that every difference is a meaning itself.

## References

Bal. M. (2004/2). *YAPISALCI ANLAMDAN YAPISÖKÜMCÜ İZ'E: DERRİDA*, Maltepe University Art-Sciences Journal, İstanbul. Pg. 51-62.

Balkin. J. (1995-1996). *Deconstruction*, Access: htp://www yale.edu./lawweb/jbalkin/articles/deconesay. pdf, 19.12.2013.

Başaran. M. (2013). "*Derrida ve Yapıçözüm*" veya "Vav". *Kaygı, 2013*(20), 153-163.

Bennington. G. (1993). *JACQUES DERRIDA*, The University of Chicago Press, USA.

Bilgili. C., & Ulagay. Ş. G. (Ed.). (2013). *Medya Eleştirileri 2013, Kitle İletişiminde Yaşanan Değişimler,* Association of Advertisement Creator, İstanbul.

Bulunmaz. B. (2013). *POSTMODERN DÜNYANIN GERÇEKÜSTÜ MEKANLARI: SOSYAL PAYLAŞIM SİTELERİ*, İstanbul, Association of Advertisement Creator & Grafik Tasarım Publishing, 1st Edition.

Caputo. J.D. (Edt.). (1997). *DECONSTRUCTION IN A NUTSHELL, A Conversation with Jacques Derrida,* Fordham University Press, USA.

Cengiz. E. (2007*). Paradokslar ve Karar Verilemezelik*, Law Society of Ankara Journal, Yıl: 65, Sayı: 2, Bahar 2007, Pg. 77-81.

Cevizci. A. (2009). *FELSEFE TARİHİ Thales'ten Baudrillard'a*, İstanbul, Say Publishing, 1st Edition.

Clarke. R. (2004-2005). *DERRIDA'S PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE: AN OVERVIEW.* [Online] Available: http://rlwclarke.net./courses/LITS3304/2004-2005/08BDerridaOverview.pdf, 15.12.2013

Derrida. J. (1978). *WRITING AND DIFFERENCE,* Transl & Additional Notes: Alan Bass, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Direk. Z. (2004). *Derrida'nın Düşüncesinin Fenomenolojik Kaynakları (Çağdaş Fransız Düşüncesi içinde*); Complier: Zeynep Direk, Ankara, Epos Publishing, Pg.133-156.

Ecevit. Y. (2001). *TÜRK ROMANINDA POSTMODERNİST AÇILIMLAR,* İstanbul, İletişim Publishing.

Featherstone. M. (2007). *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*, London, Sage Publications, 2nd Edition.

Feyerabend. P. (1996). *YÖNTEME KARŞI,* Transl. Ertuğrul Başer, İstanbul, Ayrıntı Publishing.

Hekman. S. (2012). *Bilgi Sosyolojisi ve Hermeneutik; Mannheim, Gadamer, Foucault ve Derrida*, Transl. Hüsamettin Arslan & Bekir Balkız, İstanbul, Paradigma Publishing.

Hudson. D. (2000). *Wittgenstein'ın Din Felsefesi*, Transl. Ramazan Ertürk, Ankara, A Bookstore.

Iggers. G. G. (2000) *BİLİMSEL NESNELLİKTEN POSTMODERNİZME YİRMİNCİ YÜZYILDA TARİHYAZIMI,* Transl.Gül Çağalı Güven, İstanbul, The Foundation of History Counrty Publications.

Jameson. F. (1991). *POSTMODERNISM or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, Duke University Press, USA.

Keat. R., & Urry. J. (1994). *Bilim Olarak Sosyal Teori,* Transl. Nilgün Çelebi, Ankara, İmge Publishing.

Kıran. Z., & Kıran. Eziler. A. (2000). *Dilbilime Giriş (Dilbilgisinden Dilbilime)*, Ankara, Seçkin Publishing.

Koç. T. (1995). *Din Dili,* Kayseri, Rey Publishing.

Kurt. E. K. (2010). *Derrida, Post modernism ve Dekontstrüktivist Mimarinin Anlamı*. [Online] Available: http://alanistanbul.com/turkce/wp-content./uploads/2010/08/1b.pdf, 18.12.2013

Nalçaoğlu. H. (2004). *Kültürel Farkın Yapısökümü,* Ankara, Phonix Publishing.

Ongur. Ö. H. (2010*). KİMLİK, ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLERDE KURAM YAPIMI VE 11 EYLÜL 2001 OLAYLARI*, Istanbul Trade University Social Sciences Journal, Year: 9 Spring 2010/17 Pg.135-163.

Özbek. Y. (2005). *POSTMODERNİZM VE ALGILAMA ESTETİĞİ*, Konya, Çizgi Bookstore.

Ritzer. G. (2011). *Büyüsü Bozulmuş Dünyayı Büyülemek, Tüketim Araçlarının Devrimcileştirilmesi,* Transl. Şen Süer Kaya, İstanbul, Ayrıntı Publishing, 2nd Edition.

Sağlam. R. (2012*). DERRİDA VE DWORKİN ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ: YAPIBOZUM VE YARGIÇ HERKÜL. Ankara University Faculty of Law Journal, 61*(1), 275-320.

Uçan. H. (2008). *DİLBİLİM, GÖSTERGEBİLİM VE EDEBİYAT EĞİTİMİ,* Ankara, Hece Publishing.

Uçan. H. (2009) *MODERNİZM/POSTMODERNİZM VE J.DERRIDA'NIN YAPISÖKÜMCÜ OKUMA VE ANLAMLANDIRMA ÖNERİSİ*, Turkish Studies International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, Volume 4/8, Pg.2283-2306.

Yüksel. M. (2002). *Modernite, Postmodernite ve Hukuk*, Ankara, Siyasal Publishing.