

SOYUT KONULAR OKUMA 1

Deconstruction does not aim to provide answers. It does not seek to prove an objective truth or to support any one particular claim to justice over another. For this reason, deconstruction itself is indeterminate. In *Force of Law* Derrida concedes that deconstruction is 'impossible'. The 'happening' of deconstruction is not going to lead to a determinate outcome. It will not reveal the one true meaning of justice that can be embodied in law. Rather, deconstruction requires first and foremost the relentless pursuit of the impossible. What is 'happening' is not the pursuit of an answer which marks the end of the inquiry, but rather the ongoing questioning that keeps our minds open to the idea that there may be alternative views and understandings of the meaning of justice. When seen in these terms, it is not a method but simply a way of reading, writing, thinking and acting. Rather than seeking an endpoint or a solid conclusion, the means cannot be distinguished from the end. The ongoing process of questioning is the end in itself. It is about negotiating the impossible and the undecidable and, in so doing, remaining open to the possibility of justice.

angora
inSilizcenot
ratherangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizce

Deconstruction does not aim to provide answers. It does not seek to prove an objective truth or to support any one particular claim to justice over another. For this reason, deconstruction itself is indeterminate. In *Force of Law* Derrida concedes that deconstruction is 'impossible'. The 'happening' of deconstruction is not going to lead to a determinate outcome. It will not reveal the one true meaning of justice that can be embodied in law. Rather, deconstruction requires first and foremost the relentless pursuit of the impossible. What is 'happening' is not the pursuit of an answer which marks the end of the inquiry, but rather the ongoing questioning that keeps our minds open to the idea that there may be alternative views and understandings of the meaning of justice. When seen in these terms, it is not a method but simply a way of reading, writing, thinking and acting. Rather than seeking an endpoint or a solid conclusion, the means cannot be distinguished from the end. The ongoing process of questioning is the end in itself. It is about negotiating the impossible and the undecidable and, in so doing, remaining open to the possibility of justice.

angora
in Dilizceangora
in Dilizceangora
in Dilizceangora
in Dilizce

Are the following statements TRUE or FALSE according to the passage?

- 1) If there is one thing that deconstruction does not do, it is definitely not aiming to offer answers. T / F

Deconstruction does not aim to provide answers. It does not seek to prove an objective truth or to support any one particular claim to justice over another. For this reason, deconstruction itself is indeterminate. In *Force of Law* Derrida concedes that deconstruction is 'impossible'. The 'happening' of deconstruction is not going to lead to a determinate outcome. It will not reveal the one true meaning of justice that can be embodied in law. Rather, deconstruction requires first and foremost the relentless pursuit of the impossible. What is 'happening' is not the pursuit of an answer which marks the end of the inquiry, but rather the ongoing questioning that keeps our minds open to the idea that there may be alternative views and understandings of the meaning of justice. When seen in these terms, it is not a method but simply a way of reading, writing, thinking and acting. Rather than seeking an endpoint or a solid conclusion, the means cannot be distinguished from the end. The ongoing process of questioning is the end in itself. It is about negotiating the impossible and the undecidable and, in so doing, remaining open to the possibility of justice.

angora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizce

- 2) Deconstruction can, in fact, verify an impartial truth or support any one specific statement to justice over another. T (F)

Not given

||

Deconstruction does not aim to provide answers. It does not seek to prove an objective truth or to support any one particular claim to justice over another. **For this reason, deconstruction itself is indeterminate. In *Force of Law* Derrida concedes that deconstruction is 'impossible'.** The 'happening' of deconstruction is not going to lead to a determinate outcome. It will not reveal the one true meaning of justice that can be embodied in law. **Rather, deconstruction requires first and foremost the relentless pursuit of the impossible.** What is 'happening' is not the pursuit of an answer which marks the end of the inquiry, but rather the ongoing questioning that keeps our minds open to the idea that there may be alternative views and understandings of the meaning of justice. When seen in these terms, it is not a method but simply a way of reading, writing, thinking and acting. Rather than seeking an endpoint or a solid conclusion, the means cannot be distinguished from the end. The ongoing process of questioning is the end in itself. It is about negotiating the impossible and the undecidable and, in so doing, remaining open to the possibility of justice.

angora
inJilize
let's not stop

- 3) The pursuit of the impossible is not a futile commitment for those following in the footsteps of Derrida. (T) F

angora
inJilizeangora
inJilizeangora
inJilize

Deconstruction does not aim to provide answers. It does not seek to prove an objective truth or to support any one particular claim to justice over another. For this reason, deconstruction itself is indeterminate. In *Force of Law* Derrida concedes that deconstruction is 'impossible'. The 'happening' of deconstruction is not going to lead to a determinate outcome. It will not reveal the one true meaning of justice that can be embodied in law. Rather, deconstruction requires first and foremost the relentless pursuit of the impossible. What is 'happening' is not the pursuit of an answer which marks the end of the inquiry, but rather the ongoing questioning that keeps our minds open to the idea that there may be alternative views and understandings of the meaning of justice. When seen in these terms, it is not a method but simply a way of reading, writing, thinking and acting. Rather than seeking an endpoint or a solid conclusion, the means cannot be distinguished from the end. The ongoing process of questioning is the end in itself. It is about negotiating the impossible and the undecidable and, in so doing, remaining open to the possibility of justice.

4) Law may have to seek to find one true meaning of justice or answer which marks the end of the inquiry. / F

30 sn

Deconstruction does not aim to provide answers. It does not seek to prove an objective truth or to support any one particular claim to justice over another. For this reason, deconstruction itself is indeterminate. In *Force of Law* Derrida concedes that deconstruction is 'impossible'. The 'happening' of deconstruction is not going to lead to a determinate outcome. It will not reveal the one true meaning of justice that can be embodied in law. Rather, deconstruction requires first and foremost the relentless pursuit of the impossible. What is 'happening' is not the pursuit of an answer which marks the end of the inquiry, but rather the ongoing questioning that keeps our minds open to the idea that there may be alternative views and understandings of the meaning of justice. When seen in these terms, **it is not a method but simply a way of reading, writing, thinking and acting. Rather than seeking an endpoint or a solid conclusion, the means cannot be distinguished from the end.** The ongoing process of questioning is the end in itself. It is about negotiating the impossible and the undecidable and, in so doing, remaining open to the possibility of justice.

angora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizce

- 5) Derrida most probably would support the Machiavellian statement "the end justifies the means". T / (F)

L 5 s
//

Deconstruction does not aim to provide answers. It does not seek to prove an objective truth or to support any one particular claim to justice over another. For this reason, deconstruction itself is indeterminate. In *Force of Law* Derrida concedes that deconstruction is 'impossible'. The 'happening' of deconstruction is not going to lead to a determinate outcome. It will not reveal the one true meaning of justice that can be embodied in law. Rather, deconstruction requires first and foremost the relentless pursuit of the impossible. What is 'happening' is not the pursuit of an answer which marks the end of the inquiry, but rather the ongoing questioning that keeps our minds open to the idea that there may be alternative views and understandings of the meaning of justice. When seen in these terms, it is not a method but simply a way of reading, writing, thinking and acting. Rather than seeking an endpoint or a solid conclusion, the means cannot be distinguished from the end. The ongoing process of questioning is the end in itself. It is about negotiating the impossible and the undecidable and, in so doing, **remaining open to the possibility** of justice.

angora
inSizilizeangora
inSizilizeangora
inSizilizeangora
inSizilize

- 6) Even amid the ambiguity and relentless search for the impossible, the deconstruction adherents do not find it impossible to reach T / F

justice

Deconstruction does not aim to provide answers. It does not seek to prove an objective truth or to support any one particular claim to justice over another. For this reason, deconstruction itself is indeterminate. In *Force of Law* Derrida concedes that deconstruction is 'impossible'. The 'happening' of deconstruction is not going to lead to a determinate outcome. It will not reveal the one true meaning of justice that can be embodied in law. Rather, deconstruction requires first and foremost the relentless pursuit of the impossible. What is 'happening' is not the pursuit of an answer which marks the end of the inquiry, but rather the ongoing questioning that keeps our minds open to the idea that there may be alternative views and understandings of the meaning of justice. When seen in these terms, it is not a method but simply a way of reading, writing, thinking and acting. Rather than seeking an endpoint or a solid conclusion, the means cannot be distinguished from the end. The ongoing process of questioning is the end in itself. It is about negotiating the impossible and the undecidable and, in so doing, remaining open to the possibility of justice.

angora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizce

- 7) The primary aim of the author is to inform about what deconstruction is and its implications in various fields like law. (F)

with a focus on what it is not

=

SOYUT KONULAR OKUMA 1

1. Deconstruction **does not** aim to provide answers.
2. **It does not seek** to prove an objective truth or to **support any one** particular claim to justice **over another**.
3. For this reason, deconstruction **itself** is indeterminate.
4. In *Force of Law* Derrida **concedes** that deconstruction is 'impossible'.
5. The 'happening' of deconstruction is not going to lead to a **determinate** outcome. **determined azimli**
6. It will not reveal the one true meaning of justice that can be **embodied** in law.
7. **Rather**, deconstruction requires **first and foremost** the **relentless pursuit of** the impossible.
8. **What is** 'happening' is **not the pursuit** of an answer which marks the end of the inquiry, **but** rather the ongoing questioning that keeps our minds **open to** the idea that there may be alternative views and understandings of the meaning of justice.
9. **When seen in these terms**, it is **not** a method **but simply** a way of reading, writing, thinking and acting.
10. Rather than seeking an endpoint or a solid conclusion, **the means cannot be distinguished from the end**.
11. The ongoing process of questioning is **the end in itself**.
12. **It is about** negotiating the impossible and the undecidable **and, in so doing**, remaining open to the possibility of justice.

angora
in Dilizce

angora
in Dilizce

angora
in Dilizce

angora
in Dilizce

1. **Yapısöküm** cevap vermeyi amaçlamaz.
2. Nesnel bir hakikati kanıtlamaya ya da **herhangi bir** adalet iddiasını **diğerine karşı** desteklemeye çalışmaz.
3. Bu nedenle yapısökümün **kendisi** belirsizdir.
4. Force of Law'da Derrida yapısökümün 'imkansız' olduğunu **kabul eder**.
5. Yapısökümün 'gerçekleşmesi' **kesin** bir sonuca yol açmayacaktır.
6. Adaletin hukukta **somutlaştırılabilecek** tek gerçek anlamını ortaya çıkarmayacaktır.
7. Aksine, yapısöküm **her şeyden önce** imkansıza **amansızca takip** edilmesini gerektirir.
8. 'Olan' **şey**, sorgulamanın sonunu işaret eden bir cevabın peşinde koşmak **değil**, zihinlerimizi adaletin anlamına dair alternatif görüş ve anlayışlar olabileceği fikrine **açık** tutan sürekli sorgulamadır.
9. **Bu açıdan bakıldığında**, bu bir yöntem **değil**, **sadece** bir okuma, yazma, düşünme ve eyleme biçimidir.
10. Bir son nokta veya kesin bir sonuç aramaktan ziyade, **araçlar sondan ayırt edilemez**.
Sonuç
11. Devam eden sorgulama süreci kendi içinde bir **sondur./amaçtır**.
12. İmkansız ve karar verilemez olanı müzakere etmek **ve bunu yaparken** adalet olasılığına açık kalmakla **ilgilidir**.

Translated with www.DeepL.com/Translator (free version)

2

Deconstruction by its very nature defies institutionalization in an authoritative definition. The concept was first outlined by Derrida in *Of Grammatology* where he explored the interplay between language and the construction of meaning. From this early work, and later works in which he has attempted to explain deconstruction to others, most notably *the Letter to a Japanese Friend*, it is possible to provide a basic explanation of what deconstruction is commonly understood to mean. Three key features emerge from Derrida's work as making deconstruction possible. These are, first, the inherent desire to have a centre, or focal point, to structure understanding (logocentrism); second, the reduction of meaning to set definitions that are committed to writing (nothing beyond the text); and, finally, how the reduction of meaning to writing captures opposition within that concept itself (différance). These three features found the possibility of deconstruction as an on-going process of questioning the accepted basis of meaning. While the concept initially arose in the context of language, it is equally applicable to the study of law. Derrida considered deconstruction to be a 'problematization of the foundation of law, morality and politics.' For him it was both 'foreseeable and desirable that studies of deconstructive style should culminate in the problematic of law and justice.' Deconstruction is therefore a means of interrogating the relationship between the two.

angora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizce

21

One of

Deconstruction by its very nature defies institutionalization in an authoritative definition. The concept was first outlined by Derrida in *Of Grammatology* where he explored the interplay between language and the construction of meaning. From this early work, and later works in which he has attempted to explain deconstruction to others, most notably *the Letter to a Japanese Friend*, it is possible to provide a basic explanation of what deconstruction is commonly understood to mean. Three key features emerge from Derrida's work as making deconstruction possible. These are, first, the inherent desire to have a centre, or focal point, to structure understanding (logocentrism); second, the reduction of meaning to set definitions that are **committed** to writing (nothing beyond the text); and, finally, how the reduction of meaning to writing captures opposition within that concept itself (différance). These three features found the possibility of deconstruction as an on-going process of questioning the accepted basis of meaning. While the concept initially arose in the context of language, it is equally applicable to the study of law. Derrida considered deconstruction to be a 'problematization of the foundation of law, morality and politics.' For him it was both 'foreseeable and desirable that studies of deconstructive style should **culminate** in the problematic of law and justice.' Deconstruction is therefore a means of interrogating the relationship between the two.

angora
inSivilizasyon
angora
inSivilizasyon
angora
inSivilizasyon
angora
inSivilizasyon

Are the following statements TRUE or FALSE according to the passage?

1) Among the things that deconstruction does challenge is authoritative definition. () F

defy: challenge, oppose

30 sn' defy = explanation = it is hard to explain

Deconstruction by its very nature defies institutionalization in an authoritative definition. The concept was first outlined by Derrida in *Of Grammatology* where he explored the interplay between language and the construction of meaning. From this early work, and later works in which he has attempted to explain deconstruction to others, most notably *the Letter to a Japanese Friend*, it is possible to provide a basic explanation of what deconstruction is commonly understood to mean. Three key features emerge from Derrida's work as making deconstruction possible. These are, first, the inherent desire to have a centre, or focal point, to structure understanding (logocentrism); second, the reduction of meaning to set definitions that are **committed** to writing (nothing beyond the text); and, finally, how the reduction of meaning to writing captures opposition within that concept itself (différance). These three features found the possibility of deconstruction as an on-going process of questioning the accepted basis of meaning. While the concept initially arose in the context of language, it is equally applicable to the study of law. Derrida considered deconstruction to be a 'problematization of the foundation of law, morality and politics.' For him it was both 'foreseeable and desirable that studies of deconstructive style should **culminate** in the problematic of law and justice.' Deconstruction is therefore a means of interrogating the relationship between the two.

angora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizce

- 2) Derrida attempted to explain deconstruction to others in his early work. T/F

W
a
f
b

Deconstruction by its very nature defies institutionalization in an authoritative definition. The concept was first outlined by Derrida in *Of Grammatology* where he explored the interplay between language and the construction of meaning. From this early work, and later works in which he **has attempted to explain** deconstruction to others, **most notably the Letter to a Japanese Friend, it is possible to provide a basic explanation of what deconstruction is commonly understood to mean.** Three key features emerge from Derrida's work as making deconstruction possible. These are, first, the inherent desire to have a centre, or focal point, to structure understanding (logocentrism); second, the reduction of meaning to set definitions that are **committed** to writing (nothing beyond the text); and, finally, how the reduction of meaning to writing captures opposition within that concept itself (différance). These three features found the possibility of deconstruction as an on-going process of questioning the accepted basis of meaning. While the concept initially arose in the context of language, it is equally applicable to the study of law. Derrida considered deconstruction to be a 'problematization of the foundation of law, morality and politics.' For him it was both 'foreseeable and desirable that studies of deconstructive style should **culminate** in the problematic of law and justice.' Deconstruction is therefore a means of interrogating the relationship between the two.

angora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizce

- 3) One can **reach** a basic explanation of what deconstruction **is through** the *Letter to a Japanese Friend*. **T / F**

Deconstruction by its very nature defies institutionalization in an authoritative definition. The concept was first outlined by Derrida in *Of Grammatology* where he explored the interplay between language and the construction of meaning. From this early work, and later works in which he has attempted to explain deconstruction to others, most notably *the Letter to a Japanese Friend*, it is possible to provide a basic explanation of what deconstruction is commonly understood to mean. **Three key features** emerge from Derrida's work **as making deconstruction possible**. These are, first, **the inherent desire to have a centre, or focal point, to structure understanding (logocentrism)**; second, the reduction of meaning to set definitions that are **committed** to writing (nothing beyond the text); and, finally, how the reduction of meaning to writing captures opposition within that concept itself (différance). These three features found the possibility of deconstruction as an on-going process of questioning the accepted basis of meaning. While the concept initially arose in the context of language, it is equally applicable to the study of law. Derrida considered deconstruction to be a 'problematization of the foundation of law, morality and politics.' For him it was both 'foreseeable and desirable that studies of deconstructive style should **culminate** in the problematic of law and justice.' Deconstruction is therefore a means of interrogating the relationship between the two.

4) If we had a desire to have a centre, or focal point, to structure understanding (logocentrism), deconstruction would be possible. T **F**

45 in innate ✓
inborn ✓

if we had
= we do not have

Deconstruction by its very nature defies institutionalization in an authoritative definition. The concept was first outlined by Derrida in *Of Grammatology* where he explored the interplay between language and the construction of meaning. From this early work, and later works in which he has attempted to explain deconstruction to others, most notably *the Letter to a Japanese Friend*, it is possible to provide a basic explanation of what deconstruction is commonly understood to mean. **Three key features emerge from Derrida's work as making deconstruction possible.** These are, first, the inherent desire to have a centre, or focal point, to structure understanding (logocentrism); **second, the reduction of meaning to set definitions that are committed to writing (nothing beyond the text);** and, finally, how the reduction of meaning to writing captures opposition within that concept itself (différance). These three features found the possibility of deconstruction as an on-going process of questioning the accepted basis of meaning. While the concept initially arose in the context of language, it is equally applicable to the study of law. Derrida considered deconstruction to be a 'problematization of the foundation of law, morality and politics.' For him it was both 'foreseeable and desirable that studies of deconstructive style should **culminate** in the problematic of law and justice.' Deconstruction is therefore a means of interrogating the relationship between the two.

- 5) An avid follower of Derrida most probably would look for definitions beyond the text. T / F

Deconstruction by its very nature defies institutionalization in an authoritative definition. The concept was first outlined by Derrida in *Of Grammatology* where he explored the interplay between language and the construction of meaning. From this early work, and later works in which he has attempted to explain deconstruction to others, most notably *the Letter to a Japanese Friend*, it is possible to provide a basic explanation of what deconstruction is commonly understood to mean. Three key features emerge from Derrida's work as making deconstruction possible. These are, first, the inherent desire to have a centre, or focal point, to structure understanding (logocentrism); second, the reduction of meaning to set definitions that are **committed** to writing (nothing beyond the text); and, finally, how the reduction of meaning to writing captures opposition within that concept itself (différance). These three features found the possibility of deconstruction as an on-going process of questioning the accepted basis of meaning. **While the concept initially arose in the context of language, it is equally applicable to the study of law.** Derrida considered deconstruction to be a 'problematization of the foundation of law, morality and politics.' For him it was both 'foreseeable and desirable that studies of deconstructive style should **culminate** in the problematic of law and justice.' Deconstruction is therefore a means of interrogating the relationship between the two.

- 6) According to the author, while the concept of deconstruction originally emerged in the context of language, it is **hardly** pertinent to the study of law. T /

F
 ✓
 X
 s very related to
 barely
 not

angora
inSilizce

angora
inSilizce

angora
inSilizce

angora
inSilizce

Deconstruction by its very nature defies institutionalization in an authoritative definition. The concept was first outlined by Derrida in *Of Grammatology* where he explored the interplay between language and the construction of meaning. From this early work, and later works in which he has attempted to explain deconstruction to others, most notably *the Letter to a Japanese Friend*, it is possible to provide a basic explanation of what deconstruction is commonly understood to mean. Three key features emerge from Derrida's work as making deconstruction possible. These are, first, the inherent desire to have a centre, or focal point, to structure understanding (logocentrism); second, the reduction of meaning to set definitions that are committed to writing (nothing beyond the text); and, finally, how the reduction of meaning to writing captures opposition within that concept itself (différance). These three features found the possibility of deconstruction as an on-going process of questioning the accepted basis of meaning. While the concept initially arose in the context of language, it is equally applicable to the study of law. Derrida considered deconstruction to be a 'problematization of the foundation of law, morality and politics.' For him it was both 'foreseeable and desirable that studies of deconstructive style should culminate in the problematic of law and justice.' Deconstruction is therefore a means of interrogating the relationship between the two.

angora
inSözleşme

angora
inSözleşme

angora
inSözleşme

angora
inSözleşme

7

The underlined phrase "committed" in the text is closest in meaning to ----.

- A) attributed
- B) enthusiastic
- C) assigned
- D) peculiar unique to
- E) loyal

rise = increase

only within the limits/confines of writing

45 sn

to

//

Deconstruction by its very nature defies institutionalization in an authoritative definition. The concept was first outlined by Derrida in *Of Grammatology* where he explored the interplay between language and the construction of meaning. From this early work, and later works in which he has attempted to explain deconstruction to others, most notably *the Letter to a Japanese Friend*, it is possible to provide a basic explanation of what deconstruction is commonly understood to mean. Three key features emerge from Derrida's work as making deconstruction possible. These are, first, the inherent desire to have a centre, or focal point, to structure understanding (logocentrism); second, the reduction of meaning to set definitions that are **committed** to writing (nothing beyond the text); and, finally, how the reduction of meaning to writing captures opposition within that concept itself (différance). These three features found the possibility of deconstruction as an on-going process of questioning the accepted basis of meaning. While the concept initially arose in the context of language, it is equally applicable to the study of law. Derrida **considered** deconstruction to be a 'problematization of **the foundation** of law, morality and politics.' For him it was both 'foreseeable and desirable that **studies** of deconstructive style **should culminate** in the problematic of law and justice.' Deconstruction is therefore **a means** of interrogating the relationship between the two.

8) The underlined phrase "**culminate**" in the text is closest in meaning to ----.

A) trigger — *cause*

B) stop

C) end

D) bear

E) try

Deconstruction by its very nature defies institutionalization in an authoritative definition. The concept was first outlined by Derrida in *Of Grammatology* where he explored the interplay between language and the construction of meaning. From this early work, and later works in which he has attempted to explain deconstruction to others, most notably *the Letter to a Japanese Friend*, it is possible to provide a basic explanation of what deconstruction is commonly understood to mean. Three key features emerge from Derrida's work as making deconstruction possible. These are, first, the inherent desire to have a centre, or focal point, to structure understanding (logocentrism); second, the reduction of meaning to set definitions that are **committed** to writing (nothing beyond the text); and, finally, how the reduction of meaning to writing captures opposition within that concept itself (différance). These three features found the possibility of deconstruction as an on-going process of questioning the accepted basis of meaning. While the concept initially arose in the context of language, it is equally applicable to the study of law. Derrida considered deconstruction to be a 'problematization of the foundation of law, morality and politics.' For him it was both 'foreseeable and desirable that studies of deconstructive style should **culminate** in the problematic of law and justice.' Deconstruction is therefore a means of interrogating the relationship between the two.

angora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizce

- 9) The author is **neutral** in his stance to deconstruction and formal **in terms of language**. T / F

=

1. Deconstruction **by its very nature defies** institutionalization **in an authoritative definition**.
2. The concept was first **outlined** by Derrida in *Of Grammatology* **where he explored the interplay between** language **and** the construction of meaning.
3. From this early work, and later works in which he has **attempted to** explain deconstruction to others, most **notably** *the Letter to a Japanese Friend*, it is possible to provide a basic explanation **of** what deconstruction **is commonly understood to mean**. **for**
4. Three key features **emerge from** Derrida's work **as** making deconstruction possible.
5. These are, **first**, the **inherent desire to have a centre, or focal point**, to structure understanding (logocentrism); second, the reduction of meaning to set definitions that are **committed to** writing (nothing **beyond** the text); and, finally, **how** the reduction of meaning to writing **captures** opposition within that concept itself (différance).
6. These three features found the possibility of deconstruction as an **on-going process** of questioning **the** accepted **basis of** meaning.
7. **While the concept initially arose** in the context of language, **it is equally applicable to** the study of law.
8. Derrida **considered** deconstruction **to be** a 'problematization of the foundation of law, morality and politics.'
9. For him it was both 'foreseeable and desirable that studies of deconstructive style **should culminate in** the problematic of law and justice.' **be expected to + verb**
10. Deconstruction is **therefore a means of** interrogating the relationship between the two.

angora
in Dilizce

angora
in Dilizce

angora
in Dilizce

angora
in Dilizce

1. Yapısöküm, **doğası gereği otoriter bir tanımla** kurumsallaşmaya **meydan okur**.
2. Kavram ilk olarak Derrida tarafından dil **ile** anlamın inşası **arasındaki etkileşimi incelediği** *Of Grammatology*'de ana hatlarıyla **ortaya konmuştur**.
3. Bu erken dönem çalışmasından ve **başta** Japon Bir Arkadaşa Mektup olmak üzere yapısökümü başkalarına açıklamaya **çalıştığı** daha sonraki çalışmalarından, yapısökümün yaygın olarak **ne anlama geldiğine dair** temel bir açıklama sağlamak mümkündür.
4. Derrida'nın çalışmalarında yapısökümü **mümkün kılan üç** temel özellik ortaya çıkmaktadır. **olarak**
5. Bunlar, ilk olarak, anlayışı yapılandırmak için bir merkeze veya odak noktasına sahip olma arzusu (logosentrizm); ikinci olarak, anlamın yazıya dökülen tanımlara indirgenmesi (metnin ötesinde hiçbir şey); ve son olarak, anlamın yazıya indirgenmesinin bu kavramın kendi içindeki karşıtlığı **nasıl yakaladığıdır** (différance).
6. Bu üç özellik, anlamın kabul edilen temelini sorgulamaya yönelik devam eden bir süreç olarak yapıbozum olasılığını ortaya çıkarmıştır.
7. Kavram başlangıçta dil bağlamında ortaya çıkmış olsa da, hukuk çalışmalarına da eşit derecede uygulanabilir.
8. Derrida yapısökümü 'hukukun, ahlakın ve siyasetin temelini sorunsallaştırılması' olarak görmüştür.
9. Ona göre "yapısökümcü üslup çalışmalarının hukuk ve adalet sorunsalıyla sonuçlanması hem öngörülebilir hem de arzu edilir bir şeydi.
10. Dolayısıyla yapıbozum, bu ikisi arasındaki ilişkiyi sorgulamanın **bir aracıdır**.

Translated with www.DeepL.com/Translator (free version)

3

Derrida takes as his starting point the assertion that modern Western philosophy is characterized by and constructed around an inherent desire to place meaning at the centre of presence. Put simply, what this means is that philosophy is driven by a desire for the certainty associated with the existence of an absolute truth, or an objective meaning that makes sense of our place in the world. Derrida terms this desire 'logocentrism'. Its effect is the placing of one particular term or concept, such as justice, at the centre of all efforts at theorizing or **interrogating** meaning. The term becomes the core around which meaning is constructed, the reference point that determines all subsequent knowledge. Derrida highlights how logocentrism assumes the existence of set and stable meanings that exist to be discovered. The way in which this term—the logos—is made known is language, the translation into words of a concept or a way of thinking. This is described as the 'metaphysics of presence'—the way in which we make present the objects of our thought. The logos represents nature, which is something different from the instituted form embodied in language or in text. Crucial therefore is the idea of a rigid separation of the origin of meaning (the abstract idea of justice, for example) and the institutionalization of that meaning in 'writing' (or law).

angora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizce

121

Derrida takes as his starting point the assertion that modern Western philosophy is characterized by and constructed around an inherent desire to place meaning at the centre of presence. Put simply, what this means is that philosophy is driven by a desire for the certainty associated with the existence of an absolute truth, or an objective meaning that makes sense of our place in the world. Derrida terms this desire 'logocentrism'. Its effect is the placing of one particular term or concept, such as justice, at the centre of all efforts at theorizing or **interrogating** meaning. The term becomes the core around which meaning is constructed, the reference point that determines all subsequent knowledge. Derrida highlights how **logocentrism assumes the existence of set and stable meanings that exist to be discovered. The way in which this term—the logos—is made known is language, the translation into words of a concept or a way of thinking.** This is described as the 'metaphysics of presence'—**the way in which we make present the objects of our thought.** The logos represents nature, which is something different from the instituted form embodied in language or in text. Crucial therefore is the idea of a rigid separation of the origin of meaning (the abstract idea of justice, for example) and the institutionalization of that meaning in 'writing' (or law).

Are the following statements TRUE or FALSE according to the passage?

- 1) Language is the source of logocentrism. T F

means

Derrida takes as his starting point the assertion that modern Western philosophy is characterized by and constructed around an inherent desire to place meaning at the centre of presence. Put simply, what this means is that philosophy is driven by a desire for the certainty associated with the existence of an absolute truth, or an objective meaning that makes sense of our place in the world. Derrida terms this desire 'logocentrism'. Its effect is the placing of one particular term or concept, such as justice, at the centre of all efforts at theorizing or **interrogating** meaning. The term becomes the core around which meaning is constructed, the reference point that determines all subsequent knowledge. Derrida highlights how logocentrism assumes the existence of set and stable meanings that exist to be discovered. The way in which this term—the logos—is made known is language, the translation into words of a concept or a way of thinking. This is described as the 'metaphysics of presence'—the way in which we make present the objects of our thought. The logos represents nature, which is something different from the instituted form embodied in language or in text. Crucial therefore is the idea of a rigid separation of the origin of meaning (the abstract idea of justice, for example) and the institutionalization of that meaning in 'writing' (or law).

angora
inSilizce

angora
inSilizce

angora
inSilizce

angora
inSilizce

- 2) Derrida believes that a desire for the certainty associated with the existence of an absolute truth is **not** common in modern Western philosophy. T / F

- - +

45 in

Derrida takes as his starting point the assertion that modern Western philosophy is characterized by and constructed around an inherent desire to place meaning at the centre of presence. Put simply, what this means is that philosophy is driven by a desire for the certainty associated with the existence of an absolute truth, or an objective meaning that makes sense of our place in the world. Derrida terms this desire 'logocentrism'. Its effect is the placing of one particular term or concept, such as justice, at the centre of all efforts at theorizing or **interrogating** meaning. The term becomes the core around which meaning is constructed, the reference point that determines all subsequent knowledge. Derrida highlights how logocentrism assumes the existence of set and stable meanings that exist to be discovered. The way in which this term—the logos—is made known is language, the translation into words of a concept or a way of thinking. This is described as the 'metaphysics of presence'—the way in which we make present the objects of our thought. The logos represents nature, which is something different from the instituted form embodied in language or in text. **Crucial therefore is the idea of a rigid separation of the origin of meaning (the abstract idea of justice, for example) and the institutionalization of that meaning in 'writing' (or law).**

angora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizce

- 3) A rigid separation of the origin of meaning (the abstract idea of justice, for example) and the institutionalization of that meaning(or law) **is paramount** to Derrida school of thinking. T F

///

✓

Derrida takes as his starting point the assertion that modern Western philosophy is characterized by and constructed around an inherent desire to place meaning at the centre of presence. Put simply, what this means is that philosophy is driven by a desire for the certainty associated with the existence of an absolute truth, or an objective meaning that makes sense of our place in the world. Derrida terms this desire 'logocentrism'. Its effect is the placing of one particular term or concept, such as justice, at the centre of all efforts at theorizing or interrogating meaning. The term becomes the core around which meaning is constructed, the reference point that determines all subsequent knowledge. Derrida highlights how logocentrism assumes the existence of set and stable meanings that exist to be discovered. The way in which this term—the logos—is made known is language, the translation into words of a concept or a way of thinking. This is described as the 'metaphysics of presence'—the way in which we make present the objects of our thought. The logos represents nature, which is something different from the instituted form embodied in language or in text. Crucial therefore is the idea of a rigid separation of the origin of meaning (the abstract idea of justice, for example) and the institutionalization of that meaning in 'writing' (or law).

angora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizceangora
inSilizce

4) The underlined phrase "interrogating" in the text is closest in meaning to ----.

- A) attributing
B) explaining
C) conveying
D) inquiring
E) acquiring

Dr

Derrida takes as his starting point the assertion that modern Western philosophy is characterized by and constructed around an inherent desire to place meaning at the centre of presence. Put simply, what this means is that philosophy is driven by a desire for the certainty associated with the existence of an absolute truth, or an objective meaning that makes sense of our place in the world. Derrida terms this desire 'logocentrism'. Its effect is the placing of one particular term or concept, such as justice, at the centre of all efforts at theorizing or **interrogating** meaning. The term becomes the core around which meaning is constructed, the reference point that determines all subsequent knowledge. Derrida highlights how logocentrism assumes the existence of set and stable meanings that exist to be discovered. The way in which this term—the **logos**—is made known is language, the translation into words of a concept or a way of thinking. This is described as the 'metaphysics of presence'—the way in which we make present the objects of our thought. **The logos represents nature, which is something different from the instituted form embodied in language or in text.** Crucial therefore is the idea of a rigid separation of the origin of meaning (the abstract idea of justice, for example) and the institutionalization of that meaning in 'writing' (or law).

angora
inSilizce
angora
inSilizce
angora
inSilizce
angora
inSilizce

m.k.

5) The representation of nature in the form of logos is **not the same as** the instituted form embodied in language or in text. T F

notion

3

1. Derrida **takes as his starting point** the **assertion that** modern Western philosophy is characterized by and **constructed around** an inherent **desire to place meaning at the centre** of presence.
2. **Put simply**, what this means is that philosophy **is driven by a desire for** the certainty associated with the existence of an absolute truth, or an objective meaning that makes **sense of** our place in the world.
3. Derrida terms this desire 'logocentrism'.
4. Its effect is the placing of one particular term or concept, such as justice, **at the centre of** all efforts at theorizing or **interrogating** meaning.
5. The term becomes the **core around which** meaning is constructed, the reference point that **determines** all subsequent knowledge.
6. Derrida highlights how logocentrism assumes the existence of set and stable meanings that exist **to be discovered**.
7. The way in which this term—the logos—is made known is language, the **translation into** words of a concept or a way of thinking.
8. This is described as the 'metaphysics of **presence**'—the way in which we make present the objects of our thought.
9. The logos represents nature, which is something different from the instituted form **embodied in** language or in text.
10. Crucial **therefore is** the idea of a rigid separation of the origin of meaning (the abstract idea of justice, for example) and the institutionalization of that meaning in 'writing' (or law).

3

1. Derrida, modern Batı felsefesinin, anlamı varlığın merkezine yerleştirmeye yönelik içsel bir arzu ile karakterize edildiği ve bu arzu etrafında inşa edildiği **iddiasını çıkış noktası olarak alır**.
2. **Basitçe ifade etmek gerekirse**, bunun anlamı, felsefenin mutlak bir hakikatin varlığıyla ilişkili bir kesinlik ya da dünyadaki **yerimizi** anlamlandıran nesnel bir anlam arzusu tarafından **yönlendirildiğidir**.
3. Derrida bu arzuyu 'logosentrizm' olarak adlandırır.
4. Bunun etkisi, adalet gibi belirli bir terim ya da kavramın, anlamı kuramsallaştırma ya da sorgulama çabalarının merkezine yerleştirilmesidir.
5. Bu terim, anlamın etrafında inşa edildiği çekirdek, (ve) sonraki tüm bilgileri belirleyen referans noktası haline gelir.
6. Derrida, logosentrizmin **keşfedilmek üzere var olan** sabit ve değişmez anlamların varlığını nasıl varsaydığını vurgular.
7. Bu terimin -logos- bilinir kılınmasının yolu, bir kavramın ya da bir düşünme biçiminin kelimelere çevrilmesi olan dildir.
8. Bu, '**mevcudiyet** metafiziği' olarak tanımlanır – ki bu düşüncemizin nesnelere sunma şeklimizdir.
9. Logos, dilde ya da metinde **somutlaşan** kurumsallaşmış biçimden farklı bir şey olan doğayı temsil eder.
10. Dolayısıyla, anlamın kökeni (örneğin soyut adalet fikri) ile bu anlamın 'yazı' (ya da hukuk) içinde kurumsallaşması arasında katı bir ayrım olduğu fikri çok önemlidir.

Translated with www.DeepL.com/Translator (free version)

4

For Derrida, it is this logocentrism, and the idea of the **exteriority** of meaning, that opens up the possibility of deconstruction. He examines how the natural 'origin' of meaning and its 'institution' in writing cannot be so easily **separated**. Rather than nature (justice) and institution (law) existing independently of each other, Derrida suggests that nature itself is constructed only **with reference to** the institution. **So** rather than law being a direct **embodiment** of justice, how we understand both justice and law is determined by the interplay between the two. This is a rejection of the rigid **separation** that makes the **quest for** certainty possible — of **the very idea that** justice **exists as a prior objective** standard to be discovered. **By reading** law as reflecting or embodying the natural origin of justice, what is ignored or **concealed** are all the other possible interpretations of justice that are not embodied or encapsulated in the law. In this way writing **defines** nature, as well as **reflecting** it.

angora
inJilizeangora
inJilizeangora
inJilizeangora
inJilize

Derrida'ya göre, yapısöküm olasılığını ortaya çıkaran şey bu mantık merkezilik ve anlamın dışsallığı fikridir. Anlamın doğal 'kökeni' ile yazıdaki 'kurumunun' nasıl bu kadar kolay ayrılamayacağını inceler. Derrida, doğa (adalet) ve kurumun (hukuk) birbirinden bağımsız olarak var olmasından ziyade, doğanın kendisinin yalnızca kuruma referansla inşa edildiğini öne sürer. Dolayısıyla, hukukun adaletin doğrudan somutlaşmış hali olmasından ziyade, hem adaleti hem de hukuku nasıl anladığımız bu ikisi arasındaki etkileşim tarafından belirlenir. Bu, kesinlik arayışını mümkün kılan katı ayırımın - adaletin keşfedilmesi gereken öncelikli nesnel bir standart olarak var olduğu fikrinin - reddidir. Hukuku adaletin doğal kökenini yansıtan ya da somutlaştıran bir şey olarak okumakla, göz ardı edilen ya da gizlenen şey, adaletin hukukta somutlaştırılmamış ya da kapsanmamış diğer tüm olası yorumlarıdır. Bu şekilde yazı, doğayı yansıtmanın yanı sıra onu tanımlar.

The idea of deconstruction is therefore concerned with **countering** the idea of a transcendental origin or natural referent. It **refutes** the **notion** that it is possible to transgress the institution in order to discover something **beyond** — the existence of an independent origin. This idea is famously **encapsulated** in the phrase 'There is nothing **outside of** the text', which is often used to summarise Derrida's work.

angora
in Dilizceangora
in Dilizceangora
in Dilizceangora
in Dilizce

Dolayısıyla yapıbozum fikri, aşkın bir köken ya da doğal gönderge fikrine karşı çıkmakla ilgilidir. Ötesinde bir şey keşfetmek için kurumu aşmanın mümkün olduğu fikrini - bağımsız bir kökenin varlığını - reddeder. Bu fikir, Derrida'nın çalışmalarını özetlemek için sıklıkla kullanılan 'Metnin dışında hiçbir şey yoktur' cümlesinde meşhur bir şekilde özetlenmiştir.

For Derrida the origin does not exist independently of its institution, but exists only 'through its functioning within a classification and therefore within a system of differences...'. In his own words, Derrida terms this phenomenon 'différance', and it is this idea that forms the basis of deconstruction. Différance refers to the fact that meaning cannot be regarded as fixed or static, but is **constantly** evolving. It **arises from** the constant process of negotiation between competing concepts. Rather than **pursuing** the truth of a natural origin, what deconstruction requires is the interrogation of these competing interpretations that combine to produce meaning. The act of institution—or writing—itself captures this constant competition **between** the differing possible interpretations of meaning **within** the institution.

The effect of the **translation** of thought **into** language is therefore to **inscribe** différance **into** the structure of meaning. It **simultaneously embodies** the desired meaning as **intended** by the author, and the **constraints** placed on that meaning through the act of interpretation of the text. **In this regard**, meaning is defined equally by what is included in the institution and what is not. At any one time, one concept will be **dominant over** the other, thus **excluding** the other. **However while** the idea of exclusion suggest the absence of any presence of that which is excluded, in fact that which is instituted depends for its existence on what has been excluded. The two exist in a relationship of hierarchy in which one will always be dominant over the other. The dominant concept is the one that manages to **legitimate** itself **as** the reflection of the natural order **thereby squeezing** out competing interpretations that remain trapped as the excluded trace within the dominant meaning.

angora
in Dilizceangora
in Dilizceangora
in Dilizceangora
in Dilizce

Derrida'ya göre köken, kurumundan bağımsız olarak var olmaz, ancak 'bir sınıflandırma ve dolayısıyla bir farklılıklar sistemi içindeki işleyişi aracılığıyla var olur...' Derrida bu olguyu kendi sözleriyle 'différance' olarak adlandırır ve yapısökümün temelini oluşturan da bu düşüncedir. Différance, anlamın sabit ya da durağan olarak görülemeyeceği, aksine sürekli evrim geçirdiği gerçeğini ifade eder. Rakip kavramlar arasındaki sürekli müzakere sürecinden doğar. Yapısökümün gerektirdiği şey, doğal bir kökenin hakikatinin peşine düşmek yerine, anlamı üretmek için bir araya gelen bu rakip yorumların sorgulanmasıdır. Kurum -ya da yazma- eyleminin kendisi, kurum içindeki anlamın farklı olası yorumları arasındaki bu sürekli rekabeti yakalar.

Dolayısıyla düşüncenin dile çevrilmesinin etkisi, anlamın yapısına différance'ı yerleştirmektir. Aynı anda hem yazar tarafından amaçlanan anlamı hem de metnin yorumlanması eylemi yoluyla bu anlam üzerine yerleştirilen kısıtlamaları somutlaştırır. Bu bağlamda anlam, kuruma neyin dahil edildiği ve neyin dahil edilmediği ile eşit olarak tanımlanır. Herhangi bir zamanda, bir kavram diğerine baskın olacak, dolayısıyla diğerini dışlayacaktır. Ancak dışlama fikri, dışlanan şeyin varlığının yokluğunu düşündürürken, aslında kurumsallaşmış olanın varlığı dışlanmış olana bağlıdır. Bu ikisi, birinin her zaman diğeri üzerinde baskın olacağı bir hiyerarşi ilişkisi içinde var olur. Baskın kavram, kendisini doğal düzenin bir yansıması olarak meşrulaştırmayı başaran ve böylece baskın anlamın içinde dışlanmış bir iz olarak sıkışıp kalan rakip yorumları dışarıda bırakan kavramdır.

In *Positions* Derrida explains **how** the first task of deconstruction is to **overturn the hierarchy**. This is necessary to highlight the 'conflictual and **subordinating** structure of opposition'. It emphasizes the **dominance** of one particular way of thinking **over** others, and **believes** the idea of fixed meaning, overturning, and **therefore exposing**, the existence of the binary and destabilizing previously fixed categories of understanding. However, this is only the first stage. Derrida emphasizes **how to remain** in this phase **is to remain** within the oppositional structure, **allowing** the hierarchy to re-establish itself. If deconstruction is limited **to** the simple **inversion of** binaries, then inquiry remains trapped '**within** the closed **field** of these oppositions'. What this means is that instead of making any real change to structural conditions, what is happening is simply **swapping** the positions of dominant and subordinate, allowing the same conditions to **persist**. In order to move **beyond** this dynamic, and to break open the structure itself, a second stage is necessary.

This second stage is **where** the indeterminate element of deconstruction becomes **visible**. Rather than **resting with** the inversion of the binaries, and by extension accepting a different manifestation of fixed meaning, the second phase requires us to step outside the oppositions, to remain **in search of** new meanings, not by repeating ideas but by analyzing how ideas are framed, how arguments are made. Speaking at the Villanova Roundtable, Derrida described this as searching for the 'tensions, the contradictions, the heterogeneity within [the] corpus'. **It is only through** this element of endless analysis, criticism and deconstruction **that** we can prevent existing structures of dominance from **reasserting** themselves.

angora
inJilizeangora
inJilizeangora
inJilizeangora
inJilize

Derrida Pozisyonlar'da yapıbozumun ilk görevinin hiyerarşiyi nasıl altüst etmek olduğunu açıklar. Bu, 'karşıtlığın çatışmacı ve ikincil yapısını' vurgulamak için gereklidir. Belirli bir düşünme biçiminin diğerleri üzerindeki hakimiyetini vurgular ve sabit anlam fikrini yalanlar, ikiliğin varlığını tersine çevirir ve dolayısıyla açığa çıkarır ve daha önce sabitlenmiş anlayış kategorilerini istikrarsızlaştırır. Ancak bu yalnızca ilk aşamadır. Derrida bu aşamada kalmanın, hiyerarşinin kendini yeniden kurmasına izin vererek muhalif yapı içinde kalmak olduğunu vurgular. Yapısöküm ikiliklerin basitçe tersine çevrilmesiyle sınırlandırılırsa, sorgulama 'bu karşıtlıkların kapalı alanı içinde' sıkışıp kalır. Bunun anlamı, yapısal koşullarda gerçek bir değişiklik yapmak yerine, olan şeyin basitçe baskın ve ikincil konumları değiştirerek aynı koşulların devam etmesine izin vermek olduğudur. Bu dinamiğin ötesine geçmek ve yapının kendisini kırmak için ikinci bir aşama gereklidir.

Bu ikinci aşama, yapısökümün belirsiz unsurunun görünür hale geldiği yerdir. İkililerin tersine çevrilmesiyle yetinmek ve dolayısıyla sabit anlamın farklı bir tezahürünü kabul etmek yerine, ikinci aşama karşıtlıkların dışına çıkmamızı, fikirleri tekrarlayarak değil, fikirlerin nasıl çerçevelendiğini, argümanların nasıl yapıldığını analiz ederek yeni anlamlar arayışında kalmamızı gerektirir. Villanova Yuvarlak Masa Toplantısı'nda konuşan Derrida bunu 'külliyyat içindeki gerilimleri, çelişkileri, heterojenliği' aramak olarak tanımlamıştır. Ancak bu sonsuz analiz, eleştiri ve yapıbozum unsuru sayesinde mevcut tahakküm yapılarının kendilerini yeniden ortaya koymalarını engelleyebiliriz.

In this context, deconstruction is concerned not with the discovery of 'truth' or of **distilling** correct conclusions, but rather with the process of questioning itself. It is a process **characterized by** uncertainty and **indeterminacy**. For this reason, Derrida explains, deconstruction is not a 'method', and it cannot **be transformed into** one. One cannot **'apply'** deconstruction to test a hypothesis or to support an argument. Rather it is an ongoing process of interrogation concerned with the structure of meaning itself. As explained in 'Letter to a Japanese Friend', for Derrida deconstruction is **neither** analysis **nor** critique. It is not **done with a particular aim**. It is not a search for a 'simple element' or **'indissoluble** origin'. The consequence of this is that its value is not linked to any **subsequent** reconstruction.

As discussed above, it does not exist to take apart one structure to replace it with another, but exists simply to reveal the inner logic of that structure **so as better to** understand it. This has led to the charge that deconstruction is **insufficiently** concerned with questions of justice and ethics. Derrida is clear, **however**, that although deconstruction is not primarily concerned with **advocacy** or activism, nor is it nihilistic or anarchic. It does not reject the **need for** law and institutions, but rather **seeks to work within** those **structures** to reveal new possibilities. It consists of **dismantling not** institutions themselves, **but rather** 'structures within institutions that have become too **rigid**, or are dogmatic or which work as an **obstacle to** future research'. Deconstruction is **therefore** an **affirmative** force that opens up possibilities that have been suppressed **by virtue of** the dominance of one particular way of conceptualizing justice.

Bu bağlamda yapıbozum, 'hakikatin' keşfedilmesi ya da doğru sonuçların damıtılmasıyla değil, daha ziyade sorgulama sürecinin kendisiyle ilgilidir. Bu, belirsizlik ve bilinmezlikle karakterize edilen bir süreçtir. Bu nedenle Derrida, yapısökümün bir 'yöntem' olmadığını ve bir yöneme dönüştürülemeyeceğini açıklar. Bir hipotezi test etmek ya da bir argümanı desteklemek için yapısöküm 'uygulanamaz'. Aksine, anlamın yapısıyla ilgili devam eden bir sorgulama sürecidir. 'Japon Bir Arkadaşa Mektup'ta açıklandığı gibi, Derrida için yapıbozum ne analiz ne de eleştiridir. Belirli bir amaçla yapılmaz. 'Basit bir unsur' ya da 'çözülmez bir köken' arayışı değildir. Bunun sonucu, değerinin sonraki herhangi bir yeniden yapılandırmaya bağlı olmamasıdır.

Yukarıda tartışıldığı gibi, bir yapıyı parçalara ayırıp yerine başka bir yapı koymak için değil, sadece bu yapının iç mantığını ortaya çıkarmak ve böylece onu daha iyi anlamak için vardır. Bu durum, yapısökümün adalet ve etik meseleleriyle yeterince ilgilenmediği suçlamasına yol açmıştır. Ancak Derrida, yapısökümün öncelikli olarak savunuculuk veya aktivizmle ilgili olmamasına rağmen nihilist veya anarşik olmadığı konusunda açıktır. Hukuka ve kurumlara olan ihtiyacı reddetmez, aksine yeni olasılıkları ortaya çıkarmak için bu yapılar içinde çalışmayı amaçlar. Kurumların kendilerini değil, daha ziyade 'kurumların içinde çok katı hale gelmiş, dogmatik ya da gelecekteki araştırmalara engel teşkil eden yapıları' ortadan kaldırmayı içerir. Dolayısıyla yapısöküm, adaleti kavramsallaştırmanın belirli bir yolunun hakimiyeti nedeniyle bastırılmış olan olasılıkları ortaya çıkaran olumlu bir güçtür.

Finally, deconstruction is **not** an act or an operation. **Rather**, it is something that happens, something that takes place. It takes place everywhere. It does not **require deliberation** or consciousness, but rather its potential exists **within** our structures of meaning. It is interested in **exploring** and **revealing** the internal logic of ideas and meaning. It is concerned with **opening up** these structures and revealing the way in which our understanding of foundational concepts is constructed. This is **internal to meaning itself** and not **dependent on** external factors. **What** this suggests is that the possibility of deconstruction exists **within** the structure of meaning itself, within the structure of différance, and is not something to be found and **applied from the outside**. It is primarily **concerned with** understanding ideas, **not with** their application.

angora
in Dilizceangora
in Dilizceangora
in Dilizceangora
in Dilizce

Son olarak, yapıbozum bir eylem ya da işlem değildir. Aksine, olan bir şeydir, gerçekleşen bir şeydir. Her yerde gerçekleşir. Müzakere veya bilinç gerektirmez, aksine potansiyeli anlam yapılarımızın içinde mevcuttur. Fikirlerin ve anlamın iç mantığını keşfetmek ve ortaya çıkarmakla ilgilidir. Bu yapıları açmak ve temel kavramlara ilişkin anlayışımızın nasıl inşa edildiğini ortaya çıkarmakla ilgilidir. Bu, anlamın kendisine içseldir ve dış faktörlere bağlı değildir. Bunun önerdiği şey, yapıbozum olasılığının anlamın kendi yapısı içinde, farklılığın yapısı içinde var olduğu ve dışarıdan bulunup uygulanacak bir şey olmadığıdır. Öncelikle fikirleri anlamakla ilgilidir, onların uygulanmasıyla değil.