Research Article
Araştırma Makalesi

A. Kadir ÇÜÇEN

Prof.Dr. | Prof.Dr.
Uludag University, Department of Philosophy, Bursa, Turkey
kadir@uludag.edu.tr

The Culture of Living Together, Democracy and Human Rights

Abstract

The aim of paper is to show the necessity of human rights, which is the mandatory element of democracy, by putting the relation between democracy and human rights. We can consider the human rights and its compulsory imitative of being the base of democracy is mainly possible by analyzing and redefining all those concepts of 'human', 'rights', 'human rights', 'the philosophical base of human rights', 'culture', intellect of the city', 'love', 'respect' and 'the culture of living together in the city' from the philosophical points. This is because philosophy, being producing concepts and with its concept formation structure, will dismiss the possible misunderstandings arising in daily speech. Accurate and vigorous communication is the fundamental clause of living together.

Keywords

Democracy, Human Rights, Culture, City, Love, Respect and Living Together.

While redefining the philosophical concepts, I will explain the human rights within the frame of the question "if democracy is possible on the basis of living together". On the other hand, 'the possibility of human rights on the basis of democracy' will be called into question, henceforward, by considering the 'intellect' and 'humanity'; we will explain the question of how human rights can be established. Later, the question of how we will state expressly democracy and human rights in the city culture where these two come out together. For that reason, at the very beginning of my presentation, ultimately, I will reveal the locations where living- together life occurs by pointing out the culture and city, and I will show how democracy and human right come out, and then I will point out how democracy and human rights emerge in that city-culture, especially having the character of the thinking-city, and then I will show the possibility of the ways of living together.

Firstly, ıt is necessary that we would take up the first term of the terms of human rights. If we take the historical process, we see that there are three theories on humans or three definitions for them. They are philosophic, religious and scientific approaches. Naturally, as a philosopher, I will ask the question "what the human is?" from the philosophic point, then consequently I will try to model the human rights. Now, when we look, we see that from the antiquity, human beings are the creatures capable of thinking, showing intellect, making devices, establishing economy and society, producing strategies and politics, making arts, science and culture, improving language and symbols. From those characteristics of human beings we distinguish humans from the other creatures. Now, ıf we take one of those talents of humans and their characteristics being explained philosophically and put it on the center; and if we depict what humans are, the idea of living together disappears. Fort that reason, human rights and democracy seems not possible to arise in the city culture together. Therefore, we should look at the definition of humans by Takiyettin Mengüşoğlu (who was a Turkish philosopher). According to him, we can say that we should take the human beings by not single characteristics of them but the whole, we should study; take them up from all aspects. The second concept of the human-rights terms is the concept of 'right'. What do we understand from the term of 'right'? Of course we can make lots of definitions for 'right'. But I will focus on one. 'Right' whatever it is, is to give it back to its owner, to put it in his service, to release it to its owner to be used freely. Here, the creature we take up was 'the human'. So, what is the thing to be owed to the 'human'? When we ask; what is wanted, desired to be owned by humans? The answer is the possibility of humans being human- beings; in other words, carrying themselves in execution. That is why a system, an organization is needed for humans to show, to prove themselves to be the human beings. Now, ıf we give a general definition for human –rights, in a usual classic defination, we can say that human –beings as being the living creatures by birth, carry the thought that they have brought some charecteristics and qualities with themselves. The fact is that those rights and opportunities come by birth, but they are not known in advance because rights are not known unless they are learnt enough. In that case, the humans primarily should learn their rights, then they should use them and then they should improve their rights, and should be on alert for them. For that point, the idea of coming out all these characteristics in the historical process, whıch we adopt that every person is equipped with, brought up the matter/concept of 'human rights'. As

we said before, if we take human-being from all aspects of his talents and portray him, and even ıf we do that on the philosophic base, we had better ask the question 'why have the humans got the human-rights?' and explain it. Why have the humans got some privileged rights unlike the other living creatures? What is the reason for having those beneficial rights? Of course, we should ask this question. In that case, what is 'it' making the humans valuable and superior to have human-rights, whıch is just a prerogative for them? Here I will explain the concept of 'value' by means of İoanna Kuçuradi's concept of value. Most things, I will mention here, are basically her own views. So, what is 'value?' Unless we build up our life on the values in our society while living together and keeping our values with us, and if we take 'the value' for only one reality, belief, only one culture of an ethnic group or nation, just then conflicts and dissociation emerge.

Because, we are generally confuse 'value' with 'values' and ' value judgment'; and accept them as subjective, -not concrete. So, in that case, ıf 'value' is subjective, how can we erect a common point or human-rights on the base of 'value' concept to live together in society? So, 'value' –not being objective should not be based on a single religion, and should not be defined by depending on only one culture or belief, either.

Therefore, we should take the definition of 'value', from the points of ıt's explanations; and how and in what sense ıt is used. We can talk about three sorts of 'value'. One is, by İoanna Kuçuradi, value attribution, whıch emerges at the end of subjective relations, ıt is just imposing. This is attributing value of a human to a plant, or to a person, or to any belief or concept only by her psychological reasons. The person is attributing a special value to it because ıt expresses a special meaning to him. For example, ıt is given to her by someone who loves him, he might be his friend or a relative; or else he is from the same race or religious sect, so when to attribute value to anything here, ıt is the value for one, not general because the person values him and brings him out individually. For that reason, establishing human rights only by imposing values will lead to dissociation, fractions, subjectivity, diversity and variability. The second value definition is 'evaluation'. Evaluation is social or communal. I mean, every individual is born in a certain period, in a certain place, in a certain society and culture; hence certain prearranged values are being taught him depending on his environment. So, in that life, the person having certain prearranged values has no right to speak. He becomes socialized as long as he adopts those values surrounding him. He becomes a piece of his society and culture into whıch he was born, and the prearranged values fix his life. For that reason, ıf we socially shape living together and human rights by valuation, then discrimination emerges.

Then, what values, imposed by whom, by whıch society they are taught and imposed, what era they belong to; all these offered to humans and society will make the human beings 'valuable'? In that way, we must mode the human rights and the supply the process by i attributing and imposing values. We should ask the question 'what is to be done for the humans to be defined as valuable and appreciated?' Here, just the 'knowledge' arises. Kuçuradi calls it 'right valuation'. In that case, what is the meaning of valuation and valuating correctly? Or else, what is the right valuation? So, knowledge comes out here and ıt is the source of valuation. For the thing the right evaluation is applied, the main point is to define its existence, structure and place in its entity field

and to depict its existence. In other word, ıt is the structural knowledge of the entity. This knowledge is not subjunctive but universal.

Now here, the entity, we mean the valuable entity regarding 'human rights', is human. The main theme of our question and investigation is getting to be like that: what is the thing making the humans worthy? Or, why are the humans worthy? We should handle that question by means of the last definition of 'the right evaluation' of the concept of 'value'. For the question: 'Why are humans valuable?' In order to realize the value of the humans we should take the question; what is the place of human – beings in entity? And here again we should answer the question, 'What is the special and specific place of humans in entity?' In other words, what are the characteristics of humans as species distinguishing them from the other genus? And then, we can take the point of that structural characteristics of humans, we can explain the human rights. Because human-being among the living creatures are the only creatures that are capable of valuation, creating and adding values to the world. And from that point, culture is the leading value humans being able to produce.

I will take the matter of 'culture' briefly. In his speech, Professor Korkut Tuna could have explained ıt as a sociologist, but I am not sure about it. But when we look at the matter, we see that culture is not a commodity human-beings have already got from the nature, on the contrary, we call all the things as 'culture' humans have added to the nature. The classic definition of 'culture' is like that: Culture is everything spiritual and material humans have added to the nature. If this were considered of any kind of success within the historical process, I will go to the question whether we can succeed living together by means of that enchanting success, whıch is 'the culture' itself. And later I will try to fix my words on the city culture, democracy and living together. Let's take the features of 'culture': we can easily see that culture is relative, historical and human based but not static, -on the contrary, ıt is variable. So, we can even say that all these features make humans individuals, make social order, make social unity and integration; we can also say that they help the individual to be socialized, and they are the means to live together. When we touch the concept of 'culture' a bit more, we see that there are definitions as lower/root identity, upper/gained identity and popular identity. In that case, we ask the question: how can we manage living together? Here, we understand that there are dissimilarities among the cultures, and from that unlikeness, some societies have reached postmodern culture, upper culture: and other social groups have already partaken in imperialism lose their real identity, their real characteristics, and they currently change by cultural corruption.

But in 21th century in which we came to the living together process there is not a particular culture. We cannot talk about living together in a body with single culture; on the contrary we refer to living in multicultural unity. In that case, we should ask the question; a 'multicultural prosperity?' or a' risk for living together? 'Because, in our time multicultural status is exaggerated so much that is considered marvelous for living together. 'But here we possibly ask the question ıf any plan of separation or disintegration is aimed or wanted?' Here, when we explicate the concept of culture we see that it offers us the matters of multiculturalism, me and the other, the others and others. The necessity of living as man-woman, universal-local, intellectual-uneducated or living in the upper culture coming out by the white men's hegemony, or in the low

cultures, with all forms of modern art, popular art, arabesque (reflecting the structural features of communities) should also be discussed.

Here, now we can ask the question: Is the multiculturalism advantage for living together, or else, might it be a solution for human- rights and democracy? On the other hand, to what degree will the multiculturalism provide the social unity? Will it also actualize socialization and living together in peace? I wonder if multiculturalism carries upper culture; or, does that common upper culture be a joining factor for living in multiculturalism? We cannot say that the various religions have achieved that unity. If they had done, there would have been no wars. So, religions cannot perform the function of multiculturalism on the base of living- together because all of them insist on their own truths to be the only fact(s). On the other hand, ıf we say ethnic groups can do that, they cannot, now we can ask if the languages can achieve that. In short, how can we highlight our common culture and identity in that way? Here, my purpose will be launching it by democracy and human rights and then bringing an offer of solution, if we can? Naturally, democracy is not a magic innovation of our present time but ıt is a way of administration known from Ancient Greek. It is known as system of the community self-governing; and we can see democracy has been defined in many forms and applications throughout the historical process. Moreover, we have got elections soon. It also appears with the argument that if we would set up democracy by narrow zone system. For that reason, I will not discuss the matter of democracy types.

But on the basis of human-rights and democracy, there are some inevitable concepts and all of whıch is necessarily to be internalized and improved by every individual. But what concepts should be internalized for democracy to be a form of life, by every single individual? I will name then one by one but not launch. 'Republic', 'Law', 'Human-rights and freedom', Peace', 'Tolerance', 'Justice', 'Equality', 'well educated and independent citizen', 'feeling of citizenship', 'independent communication and freedom of statement', and finally 'respect'. These are popular concepts wanted and wished for by everybody in our times, but how well do we succeed in implementing all those? For the idea of living together, the point I will emphasize will be 'respect' to establish both democracy and human- rights on a stable basis.

Neither we are respectful to setting up human-rights and make use of them nor did we find democracy and living- together ideally well. But what 'respect' will it be? Will it be to a human only -or to a single person, to coreligionist, or to someone using the common language with me, or anyone of the same race? I think you notice that I have listed various respect situations and cases in categories beginning from general. But, primarily we should be respectful to the universe and the world first.

Similarly, we should be sensitive and respectful to the nature, the living creatures all, the law, the humans, the human rights, humane thoughts, beliefs, life styles. Now I may possibly be asked what I mean by all those.

For 'respect' we should admit that the other creature has also got to live and it has a right to do so, It can possibly be a concept, too, ıt can be alive or something living, and it can be even a human, so I am very willing to look at all those positively but I am not negative for the right to survive for them each. Then, when we should consider all those together, the only place where it is possible for living altogether will be 'the city'.

The majority of the people are living in cities. So, how can we live together in the cities? We should discuss that. All of us have no chance to be retired and settle down somewhere apart. Then, how can we live altogether in metropolis? Shall we make the urban transformation by erecting physically huge buildings, apartment blocks (of ten or twenty floors), and shall we succeed in living together in those enormous buildings? In my block of flats where I live, there are 120 houses, and 120 families live there. I hardly know 10 at the most, but we are living together. We have employed a security guard outside at the gate, he asks the identity of the visitors, guests; but anyone having come in uninformed is not allowed to get in. If we are to live together, why should we need security? In that case the question how we will succeed being 'city-dweller, living together? Should it be asked? The answer is certain; it is being city-dwellers on the basis of living together and being respectful to living together as well. Because, living together requires that we know all those rights, and accept and obey them all, and we should also know that the others have the same rights in fact.

Consequently, the concept of 'respect' should be laid on the basis of living-together, thus the concept of respect would bring democracy and human-rights, and this will lead to peace and friendship.

In conclusion, I want to difine that: On the basis of democracy, I wonder ıf only we would possibly solve the problems and conflicts by surmounting human -rights and democracy together?

Birlikte Yaşama, Demokrasi ve İnsan Hakları

Özet

Bu bildirinin amacı, demokrasi ile insan hakları arasındaki ilişkiyi kurarak, demokrasinin gerekli bir koşulu olarak insan haklarının zorunluluğunu göstermektir. İnsan haklarını, demokrasinin olmazsa olmaz zemini olarak görmenin açılımını ancak, 'insan', 'hak', 'insan hakları', 'insan haklarının felsefi temelleri', 'kültür', 'kent', 'kent kültürü', 'sevgi', 'saygı' ve 'birlikte kentte yaşama kültürü' kavramlarını felsefi açıdan yeniden tanımlamak ve belirgin anlamlarını açıklamak ile olanaklıdır. Çünkü felsefe, kavram üreten ve kavram oluşturan yapısı ile gündelik söylemde ortaya çıkabilecek yanlış anlamları giderecektir. Birlikte yaşamanın temelinde önce doğru ve sağlıklı bir iletişim olmak zorundadır.

Bu nedenle, kavramları felsefi açıdan yeniden tanımlarken de 'acaba birlikte yaşamanın temelinde demokrasi olabilir mi?' sorusu çerçevesinde insan haklarını ele alıp açıklayacağım. Diğer yandan ise 'demokrasinin temelinde de insan hakları olabilir mi?' sorulacak ve buradan da 'akıl' ve 'insanlık' kavramlarından yola çıkarak, insan haklarını nasıl temellendirebiliriz açıklanacaktır. Sonrada birlikte yaşamanın bir arada gerçekleştiği kent kültüründe, demokrasi ve insan haklarını nasıl ortaya koyabiliriz irdelenecektir. Bu nedenle sunumun en başında insan hakları kavramını felsefi açıdan temellendirmeye ve ne olduğunu ortaya koymaya çalışacağım. Sonuçta ise kent ve kültür kavramlarını açarak birlikte yaşamanın gerçekleştiği gerçek mekânların ne olduğunu ortaya koyup, bu kent kültüründe de özellikle düşünen kent olarak demokrasi ve insan haklarının nasıl ortaya çıkabileceğini gösterip ve buradan da kent kültüründe birlikte yaşamanın olanaklılığını göstermeye çalışacağım.

Anahtar Sözcükler

Demokrasi, İnsan Hakları, Kültür, Kent, Secgi, Saygı ve Birlikte Yaşama.

REFERENCES

Çıvgın, Ayşe Gül, (2003) "Takiyettin Mengüşoğlu: The Importance and Place of Human Perception in Our Time". Master Thesis. (unpublished), Uludağ University, Bursa.

Çüçen, A. Kadir, (2014) *Human Rights*, Sentez Publication, Bursa.

Güriz, Adnan (Editor), (1994) *Concept of justice.*Turkish Philosophy Association Publications.

Güvenç, Bozkurt, (1974) *Humans and Culture,* Remzi Publications, İstanbul.

İyi, Sevgi, (2003) "Culture Evaluatin in modern Modern Reforms and İoanna Kuçuradi", *Journal of Facuty of Science and Social Science, Maltepe University,,* Maltepe University Publications, Issue no 1, İstanbul.

Kuçuradi, İoanna, (1996) *Ethics,* Turkish Philosophy Association Publications, Ankara.

Kuçuradi, İoanna, (1997)*Among the Events of Our Time,* Ayraç Publishing House, Ankara.

Kuçuradi, İoanna, (1996) *Uludağ Lectures,* Turkish Philosophy Associaton Publicataions, Ankara.