

Response to ted talk: the revolutionary power of diverse thought.

As the beginning of the talk, Elif says: "you can taste words."

She continues to mention that "we are emotional beings" and "we have entered the new stage." But one problem is that there are a lot of collective sentiments guide and misguide politics, where media amplifies and polarizes them and make them travel around the world. She finally addresses that we are in the "age of anxiety, anger, distrust, resentment, and even fear."

People always consider economic factors in a lot of studies. however, emotional factors are underestimated. Political systems are replete with emotions and illiberal politicians exploiting these emotions.

With intelligentsia and academia, we should take emotion seriously, recognize emotional and cognitive gaps worldwide and figure out how to bridge these gaps.

Up till now, I am confused by what she is addressing. All of these seems to be unrelated to the topic of her ted talk.

Then she goes on to mention about woman right. She made the metaphor of liquid countries: choppy and unsettled. Also there are solid world, where people do not have to struggle for the basic democracy.

However, she believes that "even the most unsteady lands will catch up."

And that "This hierarchical geography was shattered to pieces. And our world no longer followed the dualistic pattern in this scholar's mind." And "there is no such things as liquid or solid."

I come to see that she is trying to convey the idea that we should make simple assumptions about anything and divide them into categories. But that is the most intuitive thing human beings would do. It is impossible for anyone to know everything so well that they would explain things in the most well-rounded way instead of make simplifications. It doesn't necessarily mean that simplifications are wrong and bad.

Turkey is struggling, so we can say, this country is struggling; America is not, so why can't we just say it out? Aren't those people who don't wish this kind of classification themselves afraid of it, and want to hide the fact forever?

She goes to to say that "We are all living in liquid times. We are all being waling on moving sands. If the world goes back, woman have much more to loose."

I don't see that either. How can you say who has more to loose? Why would you make the assumption that men are living better in the old days and women are not?

I believe women think they live a fairly happy life back then. Because they live in that moment. They don't know what's happening in the future. And every man and woman live like that. That's their assumption as well as view of life. We can not say that we are doing good now either. Because we are also restrained in this moment.

She mentions also that "Maybe there are more of us now, feeling like strangers in the motherland." And "When things get complex, people wants simple."

As I argued before, I don't see any problem with that, making things simple. Because making things simple doesn't necessarily means prejudice. There are positive stereotypes also.

Also she said that demagogues, they strongly dislike plurality. And "What if it's the mark of our time we are living in." There are a lot of clashes between two certainties and we are being denied the right to be complex.

She was asked once "why do you feel sorry for them" she says "We can feel sorry for and stand in solidarity for victims" "We don't have to pick one pain one place over others."

That's true. But I think its individual differences and diversity also that we can have both people that are very sentimental and those who cannot empathy.

She talks about "global citizens" also. In her mind, singular identity is an illusion.

But I don't agree that global citizens all have multiple identities. I can be a global citizen and care about what things are happening around the world and try to help. But that doesn't necessarily mean that I should feel sorry and cry for them, it doesn't mean I should have multiple identities, either. I am still myself, but I am a global citizen, there is no conflict between these two statements.

Maybe homeland can be portable for her and she can take it anywhere, but for me homeland is unique and I would cherish it instead of taking it with me. That is also plurality as she mentioned, isn't it?