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Abstract

It is a commonly agreed upon opinion that modernization has harmful and destructive impacts on folk culture through the homogenizing and homologizing effects of popular culture. This perspective perceives modernization as cultural diffusion and popular culture is indicated as a tool for the diffusion of modern culture within this process. Accordingly, the asymmetrical and causative relation is emphasized between the popularization of modern culture and the deactivation of traditional folk culture. These approaches interpret the potency element in the culture concept as a one-way process operating from the global to the local and from the government to society. However, some recent studies on popular culture have diagnosed a resistance against global and modern culture as well as an opposing element of potency. Popular culture executes this potential through its tactics and strategies. Such concepts and suggestions used in studies of Michel de Certeau and John Fiske on popular culture are analyzed in this study, which is supportive of the alternative modernization approach. It is discussed that this creative resistance, which is immanent to popular culture and reproduction elements, feeds on the folk culture. Accordingly, the reproduction of creative and rich meanings of folk culture elements within popular culture leads to the emerging emergence of extremely creative and modernist meanings as unique experiences of modernization. Therefore, it is aimed to empower theoretical and abstract claims mentioned in alternative modernization discussions with the help of concrete and empirical findings.
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1. Introduction

Modernity, whether it considered Western-based cultural expansionism's ruling impact on other cultures or as a given culture imposed on a society through a central administration, or whether it comes as a result of a society's decisive and deliberate preferences and demands, is the mainstream that shapes today's world. However, today's new modernity discourses and policies seek alternatives to the universalist and eurocentric modernity discourse and to the culture that modernizing administrations as followers of this discourse and practice desire to build, thus leading to the allegation of alternative modernities. While culture, in the context of these pursuits, is presented as a space that has established its own context in the modernization process and incorporates authentic languages and lifestyles,
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the question of authenticity in cultural production has not been subject to studies to include its phenomenological and empirical indicators. From this perspective, studies should do more than use the local, authentic, and alternative characteristics of culture as a theoretical argument, and focus on through which channels and instruments culture has acquired authenticity in the context of modernity, highlighting its practical and functional aspects. Today's cultural studies and particularly some new propositions on popular culture argue that culture cannot be reduced to a field over which modernizing national and global powers struggle. Yet culture is an arena in which societies fight against both modernizing elitists and the world's global powers through popular culture.

It is widely acknowledged among different groups with very different views that modernity distorts authentic folk culture by means of popular culture and mass culture becoming increasingly widespread, and thus folk culture should be considered a "virgin and vulnerable national treasure" to be protected against the expansionist popular culture. The truth to note is that modernity, indeed, embodies such invasive logic. However there are mistakes to note as well. The first is that popular culture is matched with modernization's instrumental logic and attributed an external, "non-national" characteristic. The second is that creative languages and talents of actors who use everyday popular language are not taken into consideration. Finally the third is that the role that modernization plays in the reproduction of folk culture through popular culture, and thus paradoxically at the level of immunity that folk culture has acquired against modernization cannot be seen. This study will adopt a method related to the following framework in order to provide insight into these issues in the light of some new studies in popular culture.

Language games that are important in the symbolic system of a folk culture and oral tradition in particular, at times, deconstruct modernity's universal and holistic language, while they, at times, provide input to the same language. Such production and deconstruction functions are indeed among popular culture's features. As to certain tactics and strategies that are inherent to the language of popular culture, they are largely fed by folk culture. After all, concepts such as creative destruction, tactic, and game that are referred to while construing language games of popular culture in social sciences can be used to describe the features that transgress unitary and universal language. We believe that the Turkish culture responds to modernity by the reproduction of creative and rich meanings of traditional folk culture elements in modern popular culture. Folk culture is conveyed to popular culture through modern methods of communication and sharing.

2. Method

Literature review method is utilized in this study in order to determine the role that creative meaning production and tactics of folk culture's language games play during the modernization process. Thus, the paper will discuss how these alternative modern practices that correspond to everyday life, culture, and language alter the hegemonic modern discourse, by means of its own tools and methods on the one hand, and how it "resists" against this discourse through the "language games" and "tactics" of popular culture fed by folk culture, on the other hand. As the theoretical and methodological discussion of such an approach entails a comprehensive analysis per se, this study does not target a concrete and empirical domain related to the field. Thus, the study aims, in a restricted manner, to provide a theoretical and methodological foundation for field studies, as it suggests.

3. Relationship between Folk Culture and Popular Culture

Rıza Tevfik, in a periodical called Peyam defined folk culture as "the wisdom of lower classes" in 1913. According to Tevfik, folk culture incorporates not only the wisdom of people but also every type of literature. Moreover, folk culture, compared to history, is more important in understanding a nation (Eberhard and Boratav, 1945: 252-253). Benjamin's view supports Tevfik's idea on the historic significance of folk culture. According to Benjamin (2001: 84), “traces of the storyteller cling to the story the way the hand-prints of the potter cling to the clay vessel. Storytellers tend to begin their story with a presentation of the circumstances in which they themselves
have learned what is to follow." The elements of folk culture, in this sense, are indispensable in analyses of social history and culture as they embody cultural materials that are conveyed from one place to another and from one time to another and interpreted (Amos, 1972: 53). After all, as "folk culture is the collective objectification of emotions such as joy, sorrow, concern, and desire that are shared among a social group" (Rysan, 1952: 10); it includes the most vital materials of social history.

It is important to mediate between popular culture and folk culture and not to identify these two types. However, mass culture is increasingly predominant over these two domains, which indicates that it can assimilate these products. One of the major reasons is that popular culture is directly eligible for such assimilation, as it is very closely related to everyday life, as is mass culture. To make a definition here: "popular culture is the culture of everyday life. In the strict sense of the word, it involves entertainment as an input of the everyday reproduction of labor. In a broad sense, it provides the preconditions to ideologically reproduce a certain lifestyle." (Oktay, 1994:17).

According to Türkdoğan (1992, 102-106) who assesses the difference between folk culture and popular culture in a similar way, folk culture is not organized and structured, thus is more open to attacks by popular culture. According to Türkdoğan, popular culture, in this sense, is a "counterculture".

With regards to the difference in definition between these two types of cultural forms, their characteristics are highlighted; but their structuring relationship and functions are not really taken into consideration. Beyond this definitional determination, there is a need to shed light into the following matters: First, at which level and through which instruments are the elements of folk culture reproduced in popular culture? Second, given the aspects of the so-called "popularization" that correspond to the modernization phenomenon, how do the language, meaning, and symbols of popular culture equip modernization with new meanings and how do they "resist" against the hegemonic and external impacts of modernization? Third, how is this resistance fed by folk culture?

This subject entails an interdisciplinary study in folklore, anthropology, and sociology. Folklore studies ordinarily generate rich and extensive information in folk culture; however, they are generally restricted to inventorying the elements of folk culture. Yet it is more important to study how people use the elements of folk culture and what they serve, instead of the elements, per se. On the other hand, sociology does not use knowledge-based studies produced by folklore while interpreting modernity in culturist terms, even when it adopts the culturist method. In this context, the relationship between disciplines in terms of method and knowledge can present the role and functions of folk culture during the processes of social change and modernization with its operational and concrete indicators.

This paper will suggest a series of concepts and theories that are based on certain characteristics innate in everyday life and popular culture as a space of cultural production and consumption throughout the modernization process. In other words, the study will attempt to suggest a model for studying tactics and games developed against the sovereign modernity discourse in everyday life and popular culture in Turkey by construing the following field referred to by Fisk as a new tendency in popular culture studies and addressing modernity as a space of power and struggle at cultural level.

4. Popularization of Folk Culture Elements and Alternative Modernity

Turkey's various groups involved in the social sciences criticize modernity's universal and eurocentric discourses through "alternative", "multiple", and "non-Western" modernity discourses. In this context, these theoretical arguments indicating that culture and particularly folk culture are not dependent and subordinate throughout the modernization process in the changing world and Turkey; they serve as an intermediary and contribute to the performance of the modernization are certainly right and true. However, the approaches underlining the pluralism of modernism and emphasizing the originality of Turkish Modernization cannot be said to be successful in explaining in which sense the cultural practices are original, using empirical indicators as a requirement of "cultural studies".
Culture, referred to as the ground of originality and altertiveness and used as an argument in this sense, is introduced as an intangible and raw fact in these theoretical searches, and then abandoned. At this point, one of the most appropriate attempts to be conducted in naming such modernism is to prefer "alternative modernity'†, which underlines the cultural context of modernism; and the second is to be open to the contributions of the growing body of knowledge on "cultural studies" to culturist and alternative modernization theory.

Within the scope of such attempts, cultural studies and folklore should not only list the everyday life factors of the culture, but they also should analyze the empirical results and functions of these factors carefully. This is because, "... a characteristic of cultural studies, from the viewpoint of post-modern critics, is not the only factor that undermines the Western-based modernism, and that attacks the teleological proposals, meta-narrative position, essentialism, and economism of the philosophy, and its place within the whole Enlightenment project" (Mc Robbie, 1999: 69). Nevertheless, during a period that can be called back to culture, culture did not only occupy a place as the subject of increasingly specializing interest, but it also began to be taken into consideration as an "independent variable" by sociologists working in the fields in which it had almost been totally avoided (Robertson, 1999: 59). Based on this development, popular culture studies began to develop a new context. There are generally two dominant tendencies in popular culture studies. One tendency acclaims popular culture without setting it in a power model. It constitutes a model based on a consensus that considers popular culture, which creates a final harmony from social differences, as a ritual form of social differences management. Moreover, this tendency is a democratic adaptation of elite humanism, which argues that a nation's cultural life develops among its people rather than its intellectuals. The other tendency thoroughly placed popular culture in a power model; however, it focused so much on domination power that it became totally impossible for a real popular culture to exist. Popular culture was replaced with a mass culture, which is imposed through a culture industry with the powerless and passive society interests in the opposite direction of theirs. Mass culture creates a motionless and passive mass of community that can be defined as a group of atoms with poor connections to their social status, who do not have any class consciousness, are not aware of this and several social and cultural solidarities, and hence who are totally weak and helpless. However, there is an emerging third tendency, and on one hand this tendency sees popular culture as an arena, on the other hand it acknowledges the power of domination, and focuses on popular tactics used to resist, eliminate, and cope with these powers. However, instead of following inclusion, it researches popular spirit and creativity, which require constant inclusion. Deep down it is positive because in the vigor and liveliness of the community, it does not only find the traces of motivation to manage such change, but it also finds social change.

This third tendency embraces a viewpoint required to be followed to create the content of alternative modernization theory, and to attach importance to culture creating its own scope. The dominant tendency in studies and discussions on folk culture is to establish an asymmetric relationship between modernization and folk culture. In other words, it is a very common opinion that the modernization process causes a decline and 'decadent' in folk culture, the authenticity of the culture suffers from erosion, and is manipulated by a foreign culture invasion. At this point, a factual grain of truth is undeniable; however, another formation left out should not be ignored. The creation of an alternative modernity may be realized and structured through the forms of folk culture, which is then taken into possession by popular culture. Furthermore, popular culture, emerging over folk culture, does not only serve in creating an alternative modernity, but it also works as a source of "production" and "resistance" against eurocentric modernity, using its "tactics" and "games" to be analyzed in the following sections. It is ironic that during the theoretical researches of social scientists, "the average man", activities and cultural practices of whom they attempted to present in an alternative way, was very successful in the alternative "interpretation" of modernism. However, before explaining that point, one must define folk culture and popular culture semantically, and illustrate how folk culture is taken into possession by popular culture.

† Today, as matching modernization with the West is rejected, and the number of supporters of Europe-centered discourse reduces, different names such as "alternative modernities", "multiple modernities", and "non-Western modernities" are gathered together under the "culturalist modernity" concept of C. Taylor. See Charles Taylor, "Two Theories of Modernity" (ed.) D.P. Gounkar, Alternative Modernities, Dule University Press, Indiana, 89.
5. Alternative Production Tools of Modernity: Tactics of Popular Culture and Language Games

Folk culture is significant in terms of realism levels and its authenticity as it covers the direct reflections of everyday life of the community and is not transformed due to external influences. As a result, folklore products include *entertainment* and *evasion* elements together with self-protesting ones. Evasion is not an inherent bourgeois art as presumed. Peoples can only overcome sufferings and constraints of everyday life by means of artistic/cultural activities such as songs, ballads, plays, and dance including elements of amusement/recreation. Similarly, popular culture, as the culture of everyday life, helps people eliminate negative aspects of reality and produce artificial happiness (Oktay, 1994: 20). However, as Fiske (1999: 27) argues, it is not possible for authentic folk culture to be alternative to modernity; thus popular culture is a genuine space of protest action as an art of managing with available functioning resources. Nonetheless, unlike Fiske, De Certeau (2009: 49) sees an “art of action” in folk culture as well. We can say that "folk culture", and of course folk literature, demonstrate themselves in a different way: This culture or literature, in one way or another, turns into an "art of action", or in other words to articulated and functional consumption styles. These practices reveal a "folklore mentality"; an art of combination and creation that emerges with a certain movement and act, which cannot be separated from the art of use and utilization; and a cast of mind (De Certeau, 2009: 49). The only difference, as we believe, between folk culture and popular culture, is strategic quality. While it is *evasion* that is predominant in folk culture, it is *resistance* in popular culture. Folk culture translates into the language of power in a modern context only, in other words, through its form that disseminated to popular culture. However, it does not occur as a voluntary and political attitude by people against modernity. It originates as a reflex of mentality emanating from the depths of "collective consciousness".

Popular culture is the culture of subordinate and powerless people, and hence it bears the indicators of power relationships and traces of domination and subordination, which is at the center of our social system and consequently social experiences. Popular culture reveals the indicator for resisting those powers and eliminates them; popular culture is contradictory in itself. Popular culture represents a series of dominant culture, and a level of resistance to them (Fiske, 1999:15). When we consider this in terms of modernity, it can be interpreted as: modernity installs itself into a culture without confronting any pragmatic and planned counteraction in everyday life and popular culture. However, it does not mean that popular culture is unanswered and passive. A normal person resists the invasion of dominant (modern) culture using "guerrilla tactics". The final culture revealed in the final analysis is an unfinished modernism, which is very different from that which is defined as an "unfinished project" by modernists. In this sense, unfinished does not mean a fact inspired by Enlightenment tradition, nor does it mean modernity’s constant restoration and reinforcement through its own mental and reflexive principles; it means a modernity that could not be completed due to the response of those who have issues with modernity. This corresponds to the determination of A. Giddens (1999) stating that "decisiveness of unintentional results of an act" is one of the typical features of modernity. It means that modernization can be a rational and voluntary project; however, this process proceeds in an involuntary manner. This is a result of new meanings people create to make the situation fit to live in for themselves, and of the fact that productions carry modernization to the final point. The situation defined as the dominance of popular culture today should be approached as a site of domination against the "cultural invader" aspect of modernization. This is the characteristic of self-contradiction of popular culture. This contradiction was strengthened by modernization; however, it is not an extension of it, and this gives power to popular culture. As stated by Hall (1981:238), "People against power: This opposition is different from "class against class", and it is the central contradiction line around which cultural area is polarized. Popular culture is organized within the scope of contradiction: Popular powers against power.

The principal point of the relationship between popular culture and modernity is "... production and creativity; however, both production and creativity are hidden, because it spreads on and sneaks in the regions which are determined by, and under the yoke of "production" systems. This kind of production is shrewd, messy, and sneaks into every corner, it is quite, and almost invisible because this production does not reveal itself with its own products, it reveals itself with the *forms it uses* the products imposed by the dominant economic and cultural order." (De Certeau, 2009: 45). In other words, it recreates them in different shapes. It does not reject or change them (De Certeau, 2009:46). Instead it uses everyday life tactics such as *adaptation, use for its own purposes*, and *deceit.*
There are countless ways to play the other's game, and to prevent their play. As they are deprived of their own space, they determine the shrewd and persistent resistance movements of the groups that have to act within the scope of pre-organized powers and representations. People have to content themselves with what they have. In these warrior strategies, there is an accurate art in avoiding the move of the component, and a pleasure taken while avoiding the restrictive rules of space—even when using it for its own purpose and enjoying it (Fiske, 1999:48).

De Certeau's interpretation of popular culture expresses "a community introduced by Lyotard in explaining postmodern society, in which individual fights in several language games in an opponent environment that can be defined through diversity and conflict" (Sarup, 1997). In fact, Lyotard (1997:32) states that in this sense, the observable social "context" is formed of language movements. However, language games should not be perceived as different language use and life style of a (marginal) group, because "...today, the figure of marginality does not indicate small marginal groups, it indicates the masses out of the line; being out of the line is the cultural activity of those who cannot produce a culture." (De Certeau, 2009: 51).

In understanding this activity, it is worth mentioning the "language games" of Wittgeinstein, having a similar functional practice to the concept of "tactic" introduced by De Certeau. The concept of language games indicates that the language events are structured with practices in the areas related with the level of life (Achard, 1993:81). Telling an event that has been experienced or a tale; reading a book; describing a room; commanding in a military training or commanding a child studying mathematics, and fulfilling this comment; telling a joke; and meaningful hand gestures based on social convention are examples of language games. Furthermore, Wittgenstein does not give a general definition of a language game. This is interpreted as such because the language game is the main point for Wittgenstein (Soykan, 1995: 87).

Wittgenstein, in the post *Tractatus* period, abandons his mentalist and positivist opinions on language. By saying "language games", he mentions the everyday practices of language. This is only possible by defining language as a "lifestyle". Hence, language games are not created to illustrate how to play with languages, but to demonstrate that language itself is a life practice. This (starting with semantic and cultural roots of a language instead of analyzing it in terms of pragmatism and syntax) should be seen as a methodological change. "In this sense, analysis is not a logical one, it is an attempt to 'analyze the structure' through more plain elements of everyday talk, and to present the cores developing the concept of talking that enables people to communicate. The subject of this analysis is to remove the mist covering the natural use of language." (Rossi, 2001: 40). We can illustrate the contextual and semantic relationship between Wittgenstein's language games and Certeau's concepts of "tactic" and "games" through the following sentence of Certeau (2009-58): "Users of a language transform the language with their accents, "games" of their own, tales, and messages they transfer from their own language; they spread it, they create such transformation with the roads they walk for their desires and interests."

The language game is important in terms of popular culture since common man can produce two different functional pleasures from them. Firstly, common man enjoys playing with the different uses of language as a micro-universal perception within the unchangeable game of the differences at a class and community level. The language game ensures that the meanings that are " contrary to the accepted measures" are observed to be more powerful than the "more accurate" and well-accepted ones. The pleasure in language games lies behind the fact that it messes with the power that structures social relations. The second pleasure is productivity. Language games encourage constructive readings; individuals enjoy the pleasure of distinguishing a language game and solving it, which creates a greater pleasure when the individual makes his/her own sense out of the conflict in the discourse of a language game (Fiske, 1999:73). It means that the language game is a part of authentic and verbal culture. Apart from the "high culture" that represents the grammatical and serious part of a language, and literature, which is one of the forms of articulation of language, language game is more independent and open for associative productivity. In this sense the language game both manipulates the language of high culture, and adapts and re-creates it for itself.

A language game is a kind of characteristic possessed by both folk culture and popular culture. However, in the language games of folk culture, a language against indirect modernity is not used, this is a modern concept and it is done by the language games of popular culture, which is a modern context. As authentic folk culture is far away from solid modernity, while popular culture is hand in glove with it, one can think that folk culture is more of a secure shelter from modernity; this is wrong. The reason behind this misperception is the misunderstanding of the
concept of alternative modernity. Alternative modernity is not about an alternative totally independent from modernity; it is about the opportunities for varied readings in modern culture and for original cultural productions. Hence today, if we accept the principle that alternativeness cannot be ensured without modernity, elements of folk culture, which have not been taken into possession by popular culture, cannot have "tactical" and "resistance" functions. In other words, the important thing in terms of alternativeness and alternative modernity is expressing the language system of a culture, not the language system itself. For example, there may be rich lampoons and language games in folk speech for "non-genuine westernization". However, as the language games are "bound to the context", these protest elements should also have a context. That scope is modernity. However, what is created by the language games of popular culture is an expression of modernity, not using the language of it. Expression means adapting a language to use it on someone's own behalf, using the current language system (economizing with what is possessed), it is different from speaking a language.

Modernity discourse is in a constant contradictory relationship with tradition, while a certain part of modernity criticisms attempt to present authentic folk culture and tradition as an alternative, apart from modernity. Those two approaches strengthen the ethnocentric characteristic of modernist discourse, as they both place the issue into modernity - tradition dilemma. The creative aspect of popular culture is the fact that it can overcome the modernity discourse and culture using their own tools without taking a side against them. Popular culture does so by adaptation, using modernity for its own purposes, and transforming its non-voluntary and unplanned results to its own behalf.

6. Conclusion

The greatest effect of the modernization process is on culture, and this emerges as the global culture industry penetrates each cell of culture and life beyond local levels, and via the bureaucratic intervention of a central state tool at a national level reaching the peripheries, general culture, and culture policies. Folk culture and popular culture are seen as an issue which is shared and competed over by these two (national and local) sources of cultural power. In the sense of 'struggle', popular culture is approached to be an example of "non-genuine westernization", as it is seen as insubstantial and unreliable culture of wide community masses, which are the most defenseless part against the effect of West. However, folk culture and its maneuvers, which were not taken into consideration during the modernization process of its “front-line”, popular culture, are very important. For the determinative role of the response of the community to modernity policies and global culture are disregarded during the process in which modernization is transformed into a product. As a matter of fact, modernity is a language, while modernization is expression of that language. As expression means structuring a language by talking, modernization expressed through the language games of popular culture is now not an "imported substitution", but it embraces an original form likely to be approached by culturist readings.

When this active and determinative role of popular culture is demonstrated by applying the theories of certain writers such as De Certeau, Fisk, Hall, and Harvey, who are counter-powers in popular culture, an exciting creativity element is observed. To explain popular culture, these writers used certain warfare terminology such as "tactic, "guerrilla", "invading power", and "resistance", because everyday life and cultural expressions are seen as vital 'positions' by people. However, thinking through these terms does not mean that modernity is illustrated as an invader power, while the local culture is demonstrated as a land to be protected; what's more an alternative interpretation of modernization is not the same with essentialist and ethnocentric understanding. Modernization of non-Western countries is not equated with westernization, and modernity is evolving through a universal and even anonymous identity. Behind this development, culturist readings of modernization have the equal role with the role of popular culture in cultural change.

‡ In this sense, F. Saussure's differentiation between language and parole, which he called an abstract body of rules, was an inspiration for the difference between language and expression. See Ferdinand de Saussure, Genel Dilbilim Dersleri, Çev. Berke Vardar, Multilingual Yay, Istanbul, 1998.
§ Similarly, Umberto Eco (1991) titles this cultural fight "indicative guerrilla warfare".
Theoretical claims spinning around the alternative modernity concept cannot offer a real and practical input for culturalist modernization; however, "the average man" seems to accomplish this using popular language games, and tactics. Nature and the results of this success can be illustrated with an inter-disciplinary cultural study, likely to use the methods and findings of folklore and sociology. The attempt of the study is limited to presenting a methodological proposal by introducing the approaches, which are the base for such studies, within the scope of modernity problem. However, in light of this method, certain study recommendations can be presented to enlighten how popularized aspects of tangible cultural heritage offer a resistance and an alternative to modernity's certain aspects perceived as westernization. This is worth analyzing the perception and discourse of the characters, elements, and discourse of the traditional folk drama spreading through the first Turkish novels and to today's literary and visual arts. Widespread elitism criticism in folk drama reflecting the division of elitism and folk culture in Turkish culture world maintained itself as non-genuine westernization and European style ** criticism in the first Turkish novels. For example, elitist Hacivet taking a stand against Karagöz in Turkish shadow play called Hacivat Karagöz appears as the same person in the snobbish character Bihruz who westernized in a wrong way in the well-known novel of Reçaizade Mahmut Ekrem called 'Araba Sevdası'. Furthermore, “the criticism against European style did not begin with the novel Araba Sevdası, nor its first seeds were placed in Çamlıca. This criticism includes an anti-foreign culture approach, pride, anti-intellectualism, and regional diversities. We have to consider Ahmet Mithat in the anti-foreign culture approach, and *snop* and *dandy* characters in Western Europe literature, as we are required to remember the arrogant statements of Hacivet, and laugh of Kavuklu. Araba Sevdası hosts a humor produced on several different channels. Bihruz is not a character that emerged from nowhere; it is based on a mentioned and known mentality" (Radikal Kitap / 24/09/2010). The comic book version of Araba Sevdası was published in 2010, and this indicates the continuity of a non-genuine Westernization and European style theme, while evidencing that it gained a place in today's popular culture discourse. These examples indicate the continuity of the relationship between folk culture and popular culture, and it also illustrates the non-modern resources of the "modern" styles of reaction against Westernization. This kind of comparative study can be a very good example in analyzing the alternative products of popular culture as a resistance against modernization and as an element of counter-culture, as discussed throughout the study.

When the model attempted to be developed in this work is united with the proposed studies: 1) Original cultural styles of modernity, which are expressed with a local viewpoint at the rear of "non-national" and modern forms of popular culture, will be able to be revealed; 2) It will make great contributions to the analysis of the "art of action" belonging to social actor, which is not analyzed adequately in terms of cultural studies in Turkey; and 3) It will offer the opportunity to analyze popular culture based on the irreducible nature of innovative action of the social actor, going beyond East-West and state-society dilemma, which is frequently repeated in mainstream discussions.
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** The term "European style" is started to be used against the term "Turkish style", began to be used in Europe in the XVIIth century. In time, "Turkish style" gains the meaning of "being an Easterner", while the term "European style" began to be used for "being a Westerner" (Enginün, 1995:15).

††Gümpar, who adopts social criticism in his observation-based works, preferred an ironic and humorous language like the language used in folk drama. In this sense, he is the continuation of Ahmet Mithat, and he enhanced the irony in his works focusing on the European style (Akpınar, 2008: 65).
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