Moment JOURNAL

Articles (Theme)

ON THE REMAINS OF GUESSES: SEARCHING FOR A PHILOSOPHY OF COMMUNICATION IN ACADEMIA[1]

Burcu Canar[*]

Abstract

This study focuses on the first phase of my ongoing research project, *The Case of Ulysses: A Comparative Analysis on How to Study Philosophy of Communication*. I try to examine a feature of current philosophy of communication both in the USA and in Turkey. Through this project, I also develop 'a novel method', *The Case of Ulysses*, which does not read but *performs* James Joyce's *Ulysses*, for studying philosophy of communication. My research area is academia, departments of philosophy, communication, media and/or visual studies, in particular. This article reveals findings from semi-structured interviews with academics at Boston University (BU), Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and University of Massachusetts (UMASS Amherst) on what they think about philosophy of communication. When searching philosophy of communication becomes an improvisation on philosophy of communication, this does not only depict the field but also reveals how to change it.

Key Terms

philosophy, communication, (dis)connection, improvisation, creativity

[*] Ph.D., Lecturer, Hacettepe University, Faculty of Communication, Department of Communication Sciences, canar@hacettepe.edu.tr

TAHMİNLERDEN GERİYE KALANLAR ÜZERİNE: AKADEMİDE İLETİŞİM FELSEFESİNİ ARAMAK

Öz

Bu çalışma, *Ulysses Vakası: İletişim Felsefesinin Nasıl İnceleneceği Üzerine Karşılaştırmalı Bir Çözümleme* başlıklı devam eden araştırma projemin ilk aşamasına odaklanmaktadır. Söz konusu araştırmada hem ABD'de hem de Türkiye'de iletişim felsefesinin bugünkü görünümlerini incelemeye çalışıyorum. Buna ek olarak, araştırma boyunca iletişim felsefesinin nasıl inceleneceği üzerine James Joyce'un *Ulysses*'ini okumak yerine, onu *icra eden* 'yeni bir yöntem'i, *Ulysses Vakası*'nı, geliştiriyorum. Araştırma alanım akademi, belirgin olarak da, felsefe bölümleri ile iletişim, medya ve/veya görsel çalışmalarla ilgili bölümlerdir. Bu makale, Boston Üniversitesi (BU), Harvard Üniversitesi, Massachusetts Teknoloji Enstitüsü (MIT) ve Massachusetts Üniversitesi'ndeki (UMASS Amherst) akademisyenlerin iletişim felsefesi hakkında ne düşündükleri üzerine yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşmelerin bulgularını ortaya çıkarmaktadır. İletişim felsefesini aramak; iletişim felsefesi üzerine bir doğaçlamaya dönüştüğünde, bu sadece alanı resmetmekle kalmaz aynı zamanda onun nasıl değiştirileceğini de gözler önüne serer.

Anahtar Terimler

felsefe, iletişim, bağlantı(sızlık), doğaçlama, yaratıcılık

Introduction

Among the many different ways of studying the concept of communication, philosophy of communication is probably one of the uncanny ways to develop an understanding of the concept. First impressions regarding this term tend to be 'too general' since philosophy of communication is more like 'a label' rather than a field of study. However, if we metaphorically divide the concept into two pieces, its uncanniness can be seen clearly.

The first piece, philosophy, provokes us to think that philosophy of communication seems to be involved with philosophy without becoming a branch of it. It *should be* referring to a mode of thinking, something more specific, to differentiate itself from the field of philosophy. Underlining the concept of 'philosophy' surprisingly implies an unattached, rather a distant connection, which creates a gap between philosophy of communication and philosophy itself. When philosophy becomes deep down in thinking 'something' thoroughly, it would not be an exaggeration to say that nothing will come out from the first piece. That is, philosophy as 'a word' is full of ambiguities to determine what the philosophy of the philosophy of communication is.

If we consider looking at the other piece, communication will give rise to think the beginning of communication. In other words, communication implies thinking *what communication is*. The history of communication has already determined the knowledge of it. Philosophy of communication may also reveal another definition of communication. However, it is necessary to consider what else can be done in this area of study. The combination of the two fields –i.e. philosophy and communication- provokes us to mention that the name itself, philosophy of communication, is too broad for thinking what the term actually refers to.

The field is not only difficult to define because of the broadness of the terms, 'philosophy' and 'communication' but also because of the preposition, 'of', which by connecting the two areas of study implies an interdisciplinary study. The literature of philosophy of communication has already shown us the fact that such interdisciplinary study is one-sided. That is, philosophy of communication changes depending on whether you are thinking about the field in terms of philosophy or communication.

Looking more closely at current studies of philosophy of communication, we can see that they are a collection of essays that mainly focus on philosophers who, implicitly or explicitly, thought on communication. The question is, however, whether taking these philosophers' ideas as a sign of philosophy of communication is enough to say that the text *is* philosophy of communication.

In the literature of philosophy of communication, several collections of essays that usually bring 'communication' and 'philosophy' together with a philosopher stand out. *Perspectives on Philosophy of Communication* (2007), edited by Pat Arneson can be given as an example on this issue. This study takes Martin Heidegger, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Hannah Arendt, Jürgen Habermas, Emmanuel Levinas, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Roman Jakobson, Michel Foucault, Jean Gebser, José Ortega y Gasset and Mikhail Bakhtin as *philosophers of communication*, and asserts that "they teach us to think about how we are communicatively situated in the world" (2007, p. 1). Each philosopher is introduced with 'a biographical sketch' and an essay, focused on each philosopher's ideas on understanding what communication is by various authors. As Arneson briefly explains:

> Philosophy of communication both reveals cracks in the smooth surface of scholarship and cracks the smooth surface by tearing open meanings to release new possibilities. As understood in this work, 'philosophy of communication' investigates philosophical thought

about how humans are communicatively situated in the lived world. Philosophy of communication pertains to the study of ideas used to analyze, describe, and interpret communication as lived experience (2007, p. 7).

There is no doubt that reading philosophers in terms of philosophy of communication is thought-provoking and *Perspectives on Philosophy of Communication* is one of the well-written collections of essays that focus on certain philosophers' understanding of human communication. Yet there is no single way of reading a philosopher. Each philosopher can certainly be considered as if they are also writing, specifically, on communication. The strength of reading comes from the various ways of reading: Anything can become a philosophy of communication.

Since *to philosophize communication through a philosopher* is the most noticeable way of studying philosophy of communication, let me focus on another study: In *Philosophy of Communication* (2012), Briankle G. Chang and Garnet C. Butchart stress that "to philosophize is to communicate philosophically, and to communicate philosophically is to impart the wisdom of which philosophy speaks and which is spoken at the same time" (2012, p. 1). According to Chang's and Butchart's *Philosophy of Communication*, "philosophy and communication have belonged together from the beginning (…) we need to recall the idea of communication back into philosophy's own orbit, to seize it in such a way that it stands ready as an object of philosophical inquiry" (p. 2). This study provides another interesting collection of philosophers' own texts. The titles of each chapter reveals how Chang and Butchart take philosophy of communication into account: 'Overture' begins with Chang's 'Of 'This' Communication'. Plato's, Leibniz's, Hegel's, Heidegger's and Deleuze's texts are the 'openings' of this philosophy of communication. The chapter, 'Architecture of Intersubjectivity', is determined by Husserl, Heidegger, Schutz and Serres. 'Language before Communication' *is* Benjamin, Heidegger, Apel, Foucault and/or Malabou. 'Writing-Meaning and Context' could not be considered without Wittgenstein, Hamacher, Derrida and Deleuze. When it comes to talk about 'Difference, Subject, and Other' here are there Levinas, Benveniste, Lacan and again Derrida. On 'Exchange, Gift, Communication', it is time to take Marx, Marion, Derrida and Lyotard into consideration. On 'Community and Incommunicability', there is so much to learn from Nancy, Agamben, Vogl and Sloterdijk. The content of the book indicates that issues regarding philosophy of communication can be demonstrated from the language, meanings and texts of philosophers that are *of communication*.

Problematizing the notion of communication may be 'philosophical' but it is also important to differentiate philosophy of communication from the theories of communication. One of my interviewee's views will shed light on this issue:

> I treat philosophy and theory as two different concepts, each involving different practices, different question formulation, and the problematic and so on (…) One can be very very philosophical but without having any pretention to address any theoretical issue. And one can [try] to be a theorist without ever having need to answer any philosophical questions. They're just, seems to me, descriptively true. We haven't really gotten to the real core difference between philosophy and the theory. Now, in order to make the distinction between the two to be meaningful we have to invoke, we have to so … take in a particular subject that's to say philosophy… Sure, but philosophy of what? The theory of what? (…) I do think once we speak of a specific theory and knew that theory, a particular theory as… if we can agree… this is a theory of communication and then we could examine it… to see to what degree or if that all… if it's philosophical.[2]

In searching for a philosophy of communication, we are not seeking philosophy of communication itself but what approaches can be part of it. Mari Lee Mifsud's *Rhetoric and the Gift* (2015) is actually 'a gift' in this case since this study connects Ancient Rhetorical Theory with Contemporary Communication. Mifsud's work can be considered as an instance of philosophy of communication without calling the book, *philosophy of communication*. *Rhetoric and the Gift* is aware of Eric Severson's point about "multidisciplinary conversations" (p. 5) and Henry W. Johnstone Jr.'s emphasis on "creative communication" (p. 12). According to Mifsud, "we can create our way out of problems, oppression, dehumanization, othering, and eradication by imagining an elsewhere and by writing ourselves out of our histories into new worlds and into new ways of relating" (p. 15). The expression, *new ways of relating*, is also crucial to differentiate philosophy of communication as a field of study.

If we are searching for 'a philosophy of communication' from within communication studies, issues concerning communication once again seem to become philosophical by reference to certain philosophers. For instance, Martin Heidegger, also known as 'a philosopher of technology' can be considered as a unique source for

---

[2] Interview with BNC., Department of Communication, UMASS Amherst (December 8, 2016).

understanding the meaning of technology in communication/media studies. As Van Loon puts it, "technologies allow us to understand our environment, act upon it and recreate it (also destroy it). This is what Heidegger (1977) meant by *enframing* [*Gestell*]. Every medium creates its own structures/codes of understanding and relation to the environment" (2008, p. 42). With Heidegger's help, communication and philosophy easily come together. Yet, referring to a philosopher in communication studies seems more like creating a patchwork of two fields, philosophy and communication.

There is no doubt that each definition is a restriction. Yet, defining in order to find out what makes philosophy of communication, 'a philosophy of communication' is necessary to turn the term into a 'different' field of study. Because philosophy of communication is almost everything involved with philosophy and communication. Yet, it is interesting to note that it does appear *much* in academia. The observations in the field reveal that the academics in departments of philosophy and communication, media and/or visual studies[3] do not show much interest in this research field. Although there is a literature on philosophy of communication, it is still waiting to be studied in academia.

On the other hand, disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary conferences and journals that encourage new perspectives have nourished studies of philosophy and/of communication. International conferences and publications of *The International Communication Association* (ICA), *The International Association for Media and Communication* (IAMCR) and *The European Communication Research and Education Association* (ECREA)[4] are well-known examples. These associations' related sections not only offer a platform to discuss philosophy of communication but also link philosophy and communication. However, it is still important to search for a philosophy of communication within academia since a field of study needs scholars that study it. Undergraduate and graduate level courses on philosophy of communication may

---

[3] I conducted interviews in the departments of communication at UMASS Amherst and Boston University. I also conducted interviews both in the *Department of Visual and Environmental Studies* at Harvard and in the *Department of Comparative Media Studies/Writing* at MIT. I prefer to call these four departments, "departments of communication, media and/ or visual studies" when I refer to all of them to differentiate their multidisciplinary features in this study. Although the *Department of Linguistics and Philosophy* at MIT is not only a "department of philosophy", all departments of philosophy are called "department of philosophy" in this study.

[4] Various peer reviewed journals related to these associations are also worthy of notice. For instance, "*Empedocles* which is published in cooperation with the Section for the Philosophy of Communication of ECREA, aims to provide a publication and discussion platform for those working at the interface of philosophy and the study of communication, in all its aspects", see https://www.intellectbooks.co.uk/journals/view-Journal,id=163/.
See also http://sections.ecrea.eu/PC/news_empedocles.php

designate both the field's present and the future. In other words, to ensure a continual dialogue on philosophy of communication among scholars and students within departments of philosophy and/or communication may help not to restrict the platform of discussion on the date of a conference.

The research field of this study which you are about to read, took place in philosophy departments and departments of communication, media and/or visual studies. However, to find scholars who were willing to be interviewed on philosophy of communication was not an easy task. Throwing the theoretical philosophy of communication into a field was equally challenging since the term does not seem to imply empirical research. In other words, 'think and then write' seems to summarize what to do regarding philosophy of communication. Although this study threw philosophy of communication into a research field that did not *imply* philosophy of communication, *this* academia provided the perfect field of what I was looking for in order to make philosophy of communication noticeable among other studies of philosophy and/or communication.

On Creating an Inharmonious Fieldwork

Participants of this study are academics whose field of study is not particularly philosophy of communication. The landscape of the study provokes one to consider the features of current philosophy of communication actually lie in creating an inharmonious research field. Departments are crucial since they implicitly or explicitly designate how a discipline *should be* studied. Searching for a philosophy of communication in the realm of the departments also reflected how academia *decides* how to study a discipline.

Including two different departments in each university, I interviewed nine academics from the departments of philosophy and nine academics from the departments of communication, media and/or visual studies. Academia is represented through the participant academics' own views and their views should not be considered as a 'departmental view' of their universities. On the other hand, the academics' opinions not only indicate how they see academia but also give clues about how academia is in my research field. Although there are various subfields within each discipline, the academics in these selected departments certainly have an understanding about philosophy and/or communication. Surprisingly, what comes out from the fieldwork is that the academics are not familiar with the expression, 'philosophy of

communication'; indeed most of them had not heard the expression before. Those who have heard the expression either admitted that they do not know the field at all or are not certain whether they know it or not. Only four academics, BNC., DN., ER. and JL.[5] *directly* defined *what philosophy of communication is* in their own terms.

BNC. pointed out that "it is more important to focus on communication as a concept" in terms of this field and "philosophy of communication must begin by treating 'the idea', 'the word', 'the concept' [of] communication as a 'qualified' (…) identifiable, distinct, philosophical concept"[6]. DN. is interested in *cultural philosophies of communication* and taking philosophy as "the systematic critique of presuppositions". Therefore, "all of us who study communication are in practice implementing a philosophy of communication or multiple philosophies of communication".[7]

According to ER., philosophy of communication refers to a sort of large abstractions or generalizations about communication, the world, people and meaning: "when I think of philosophy, broadly speaking, I think of ontology, epistemology and axiology. (…) So for me, a philosophy of communication that is a … if you will … it's actually a theory of communication."[8] In JL.'s point of view, "philosophy of communication has been largely worked on media theory". Since philosophy of communication is linked to *philosophy of emerging media*, everyday life is the key to grasping the field: "when we talk about philosophy of communication, we have to talk about all kinds of things that people who study the philosophy of everyday life do (…) So I think, everyday life is very important."[9]

What is striking is that, even if I asked all the participants to answer each question in their own terms, most of the academics questioned my intention as a researcher by asking these questions. While answering the questions, not knowing how I understood philosophy of communication became a hesitation on whether their answers would fit into my project or not. Phrases such as "I don't know if that's what you're looking for (…)"; "I am not sure how you are understanding it (…)" or "I am not sure in your understanding of it, what goes under the heading of philosophy of

---

[5] I refer to each participant by letters. Although I could not refer to all of them because of the limitations of this article, each views and/or guesses on philosophy of communication were essential in my research field. To me, the interviewees are not 'eighteen academics', but 'academic personae'. The semi-structured interviews were also video recorded. I am grateful to all participant academics for giving consent to being recorded throughout the interviews and letting me use the transcriptions for academic purposes which I mentioned in the consent form.

[6] Interview with BNC., Department of Communication, UMASS Amherst (December, 8, 2016).

[7] Interview with DN., Department of Communication, UMASS Amherst (November 15, 2016).

[8] Interview with ER., Department of Comparative Studies/Writing, MIT (December 15, 2016).

[9] Interview with JL., Department of Philosophy, Boston University (December 7, 2016).

communication (…)" emphasize the fact that when the academics hesitate like this, open-ended questions became questions as if they had one correct answer. When the biggest question was the researcher or the purpose of this study, the reactions of the interviewees first and foremost showed how to handle *that question* before answering the questions.

Another difficulty lies in the differences in the academics' research interests. To put it differently, the participants do not actually *participate* in the research project's subject matter. Breaking the simplest rules of preparing a research project provokes one to consider this study of philosophy of communication as not a well-designed study. In order to prevent this 'impetuous inference', there is a need to look more closely at the inharmoniousness of searching philosophy of communication in academia which is not itself particularly interested in philosophy of communication.

To begin with, not looking for an academic who specifically studies philosophy of communication is inharmonic with the purpose of finding out how it is studied in academia. This inharmoniousness was inevitable because only one academic, BNC.[10] specifically studies philosophy of communication. Rather than accept this inharmoniousness as a disadvantage, I took it as an opportunity to grasp the issue within different areas of study. What comes out in the end was rather an experimental inharmoniousness in the fieldwork that turned out to be a source for developing a new sense of understanding philosophy of communication.

When seventeen out of eighteen interviewees do not study this field then their views are inharmonious with the researcher (interviewer) or vice versa in terms of understanding philosophy of communication. Since these academics were usually uncertain about the issue under discussion, I was able to collect *inscrutable data,* which does not depend on collecting but formulating for the sake of philosophy of communication. To capture how the academics thought out loud while answering my 'unexpected questions' about philosophy of communication was challenging since the prerequisite of thinking is first and foremost to follow the 'academic custom' regarding how to think about the subject matters in academia.

The visibility of the academics' views in this study was definitely inharmonious with concealing what I understood about philosophy of communication. I did not want to bias their answers by talking about the questions and/or explaining what philosophy

---

[10] The professor was also my Faculty Associate at UMASS Amherst during the fieldwork for my research in the USA. I am grateful to his guidance and support.

of communication was to me. I was therefore extremely reticent about my own understanding which makes each interview a 'talkative monologue' rather than 'a silent dialogue' that reflects each interviewee's 'uncertain' sense of philosophy of communication. It was not always easy to ask them to spare half an hour at most for the interview without providing them with any clues about the focus.

Because of this silence, their volunteer participation could easily have become 'discontented participation', answering questions *as if* this participation was obligatory. Since this inharmoniousness was created deliberately, this study demands to be seen from a different perspective. Even if you are aware of the inharmoniousness and difficulties of this project as a researcher, it does not mean that this will also be accepted by all interviewees. This conflict characterized the context of the interview scene more than anything else.

An Interval: A Praise to Walk along the Corridors

The Host University of my research project was UMASS Amherst and this research began in its campus, which is nearly all of the Town of Amherst whereas the other three universities are located in Boston. Conducting the research entailed several roundtrips from Amherst to Boston and vice versa. The images of Amherst and Boston formed part of how I searched philosophy of communication. Two main *acts* were noticeable in experiencing the field of philosophy of communication in this project: walking in Amherst and catching the red and green lines[11] in Boston.

The campuses are huge, cultural and scientific environments. The words that suggest the first and the last impressions of my research area can be written as follows: MIT: Metallic Sense of Science. In other words, *Project of the Muses*[12]. Harvard with its historic bookstores: to store the *reading.* UMASS, Amherst: Panoramic view of walking, writing 'philosophy of communication'. Boston University: *Lines of Communication*

---

[11] The Red Line and Green Line are lines of the Boston Subway. Both Harvard and MIT (Kendall/ MIT) are stations on the Red Line. In order to go to Boston University, I had to switch to the Green Line. My research area began as a line of communication, written on a public transportation map, before I came across academia.

[12] *Project of the Muses* refers to Jacques Lipchitz's magnificent work of art, *Birth of the Muses,* which I had seen at MIT. To me, it symbolizes not only how MIT was but also the multiple beginnings and endings of this project. *Project of Muses* also refers to an 'interesting' mistake: After I first saw Lipchitz's work, I remembered it as *Project of the Muses*. I realized that the name was actually different to how I remembered when I looked at the photo of it that I took later on. That is how MIT became not *Birth of the Muses* but *Project of the Muses*. Yet this difference is still a slight difference. It might also be interesting to note that, *Project of the Muses* does not refer to the scholarly database of Project MUSE here, and that any similarity regarding the name of 'this mistake' is unintentional. For more on Lipchitz's sculpture and its story see https://listart.mit.edu/public-art-map/birth-muses

refers to making a connection, an interdisciplinary study[13]. This partial image of my research area combines with walking along the corridors of the departments to find a volunteer academic. Since there was a time-limit, the corridors metaphorically became an ongoing labyrinth. While a visiting scholar become a walking scholar, the pedestrian researcher can be considered as 'a praise to walk along the corridors' unlike Erasmus's *Praise of Folly.* An interval is written to emphasize the mood or the landscape of searching philosophy of communication and it should not be taken as *a scientific fact*.

On Guessing Philosophy of Communication

The first question that I asked in each interview concerned defining philosophy of communication. This question comprised three sub-questions: what philosophy of communication is, what it might be and what it should be. *Is, might and should* imply that there is no way out, so only a phrase like *please define even if you don't know what philosophy of communication is,* can explain how my first question was received. While answering these questions, I wanted the academics to explain what they think about the questions in their own terms. Each answer implies the volatility of making a definition rather than making a definition.

What comes out from the first question is worthy of notice: philosophy of communication is not within the realm of academia. Being in the research area seems to be in the wrong address because of uncertain responses. However, this was just an illusion. Guessing does not imply 'to know nothing' regarding this field. Academics who are not interested in philosophy of communication may still show how to consider philosophy of communication.

There is no doubt that saying 'I don't know' is not easy for academics because being an academic implicitly means "to know". In addition, when this answer is not taken as an obstacle to answering the first question by the researcher, how to handle that difficulty becomes as important as the answer itself. It is interesting to note that making a speculation on the meaning of philosophy of communication mainly emphasizes that this area of study involves understanding what communication is. The questions (is, might and should) regarding to defining philosophy of communication

---

[13] In terms of establishing a collaborative relationship between the departments of philosophy and communication, my research field was silent. Only Boston University can be taken as an exception in this case. In 2016, Juliet Flyod (Department of Philosophy, BU) and James E. Katz (Department of Communication, BU) recently edited a book, *Philosophy of Emerging Media* (New York: Oxford University Press). This book and their collaboration can be taken as one of the finest, productive dialogues between philosophy and communication departments.

seem very difficult since they are almost the same as asking what communication is or what philosophy is, which are both too general and therefore difficult to answer.

Two distinct academic attitudes -answering the question and playing with the question- were noticeable on making guesses regarding answering the questions[14]. 'To play with the question' refers not to criticizing the question but to taking the question *as if* it is a puzzle to solve. As a result, the response to the question of 'what philosophy of communication should be' does not mean 'putting boundaries to a field' or 'unanswerable because it is irrelevant to the academics' research interests' but an opportunity, for contemplating an 'unknown field' with curiosity.[15]

The guesses of the academics from the departments of philosophy underline that philosophy of communication would be overlapped with philosophy of language. In addition, even the expression had not been heard before, it was not surprising that the concept exists, as expressed by JS. as follows:

> I think since sort of a 1960s or 70s when philosophy took a very naturalistic turn the idea that philosophers should devote themselves to the sort of conceptual foundations of individual fields in the sciences like psychology, biology, physics, communication, chemistry. It is just a bit more popular than it was before that period. So, it does not surprise me and I think that is the reason there is so many 'philosophy of's.[16]

DV.'s answer was also worthy of notice in this regard. Although Professor DV. emphasized that he almost never spoke of 'philosophy of…', his areas of study and how he understood *Logos* can be taken as a contribution to *a new way of relating* philosophy with communication:

> Yes, we have fields… There is the philosophy of science, the philosophy of mind, the philosophy of art…You are asking about the philosophy of communication (…) I would phrase the question very differently. If you are… to ask me what would a philosopher think about communication. I would … maybe respond. But I don't know that there is anything like a philosophy 'of communication'. (…) So, I am not sure where we go

---

[14] Although I asked five questions in each interview, I mainly discuss the responses of the first (is, might and should) and the third question (how would you define academic study) in this article.

[15] I use the concept of 'play' to stress a mode of creativity. The interviews with SR., Department of Visual and Environmental Studies, Harvard (December 19, 2016) and PA., Department of Communication, Boston University (December 7, 2016) are valuable examples of playing with the question in this sense. As a researcher, their answers were inspirationally very philosophical to me and their approach to making guesses did not refer to a problem.

[16] Interview with JS., Department of Philosophy, UMASS Amherst (December 6, 2016).

from that… Communication for me… I study Ancient Greek Philosophy so my word is always Logos. Logos is a very broad word in the Greek Language, Greek philosophical language. It means language, it means speech. It can be more precise. It can mean rational speech, it can mean sentence, it can mean story, it's really any form of human discourse. So if you're now asking what is the philosophy of Logos? Or what do philosophers' think about Logos?... Again it's very difficult to answer. Of one reason for this I didn't mention yet is that the word, Logos, for the Greeks is not just communication externally where I speak to you, it is also internal. The Greeks, Plato famously once described thinking as a conversation you have inside your mind. So, Logos also means thought. So means internal and external discourse. Logos, communication if you will, is the medium of philosophical activity.[17]

Searching philosophy of communication in the field refers to seeing "thinking as a conversation" in many ways. This conversation is multiple, inharmonious and based on guesses. What remains of guesses is the opportunity to not only think about the unknown field of study, namely philosophy of communication, but also re-think academic study. I therefore also asked how the academics would define academic study. This was another question, which was also difficult to answer. Academic study is defined specifically as "some kind of communal, structured, intellectual inquiry"[18]; or one that "involves a subject matter that has a history, a tradition of learning or a tradition of production."[19] Or, as SR. puts it:

Academic study is… let's see… I would define it as studying certain fields, certain defined fields. And… It's interesting because I think, academic study is usually thought of as scholarly study but I would extend that kind of research to say it is of a visual artist or a poet or a musician or a composer, dancer and so I think a pursue… a way of knowing, pursuing a way of knowing. And there are all different ways that we can pursue, how we collect and understand things.[20]

To me, this question is crucial: how we -as academics- see academic study reflects what academia *really* is instead of what academia could be. However, the

---

[17] Interview with DV., Department of Philosophy, Boston University (November 10, 2016).
[18] Interview with JA., Department of Philosophy, Harvard (December 19, 2016).
[19] Interview with RI., Department of Philosophy, Harvard (December 21, 2016).
[20] Interview with SR., Department of Visual and Environmental Studies, Harvard (December 19, 2016).

answer of the question, what academia is, may still reveal how to think academia differently.

Conclusion

Searching philosophy of communication in academia was an experience in improvisations. How the expression is seen by the academics with different areas of interests reveals how to consider not only this field specifically but also academic study in a general sense. In the interviews, the academics usually made guesses on what philosophy of communication is. According to the academics from philosophy departments, there is a field of study called philosophy of communication but it is more like another too general "one of the philosophy of's". For those in the departments of communication, media and/or visual studies, it is more like thinking in terms of a basic introduction to communication studies or a starting point for what communication is, which asks what communication is, what its meaning is and so on. Although this answer seems specific, the academics usually stressed that it is an assumption more than knowledge of philosophy of communication. Thinking the idea of communication, is an ongoing question. However, what are we going to do next in terms of studying philosophy of communication? This was the biggest question for me while researching philosophy of communication in the field.

Currently, philosophy of communication seems to lie neither within the realm of communication nor philosophy. This lack of attention makes it difficult to suggest a new methodology for studying philosophy of communication. Making a guess should not be considered as 'going nowhere" or 'being lost in the field' but as an opportunity for thorough thinking. My experience of the field has shown me that the uncertainty regarding philosophy of communication actually reflects a certain answer. That is, finding philosophy of communication entails taking the (dis)connection of different areas of study into consideration. Making guesses reveals the improvisation of philosophy of communication. As a conclusion, I also give up being a reticent researcher and I wish to present the abstract of *The Case of Ulysses*, the novel method for studying philosophy of communication. This methodology will be the closure regarding what we know of philosophy of communication:

Philosophy of Communication will no longer be a study on what communication is or what communication is not.

It will not be a collection of philosophers' writings that are explicitly or implicitly, on communication.

It will not take into consideration how 'philosophy' is used as a reference by communication scholars.

Although it is a study on philosophy of communication, it will not say a word on the connection between communication studies and philosophy.

'Media and philosophy' will be out of sight. Therefore, it will not be surprising to see that new media/digital media/social media will not appear as references or contemplations.

Obscure expressions such as 'everything involves philosophy' or 'everything is communication' will not be used.

The *Case of Ulysses* will not discuss ethics since it creates a new sense of 'obscene writing' in contrast to Ulysses or any other texts.

The abstract of *The Case of Ulysses* should be mysterious not informative. After all, how can one describe a study, which will not begin as a study?

As a methodology, it will follow an untraceable methodology, which readers should pay full attention and be ready for an *unknowing* participation (cf. *inscrutable data*)

As a closure, this study is an introduction to the future of philosophy of communication.

The Case of Ulysses will continuously dive on its own prelude even when it is no longer a prelude. It is barely old-fashioned.

It is the incomplete, imperfect textual performance of its writer.

The Case of Ulysses is about to be written, philosophy of communication is about to happen. Since performing extracts the text, the abstract should come to an end.

References

Arneson, P. (Ed.). (2007). *Perspectives on philosophy of communication*. Indiana: Purdue University Press.

Birth of the Muses (Jacques Lipchitz) Retrieved May 26, 2017, from https://listart.mit.edu/public-art-map/birth-muses

Chang, B. G. & Butchart, G. C. (Eds.). (2012). *Philosophy of communication*. USA: MIT Press.

Empedocles: European Journal for Philosophy of Communication, Retrieved May 27, 2017, from https://www.intellectbooks.co.uk/journals/view-Journal,id=163/

ECREA and the Philosophy of Communication section, Retrieved May 27, 2017, from http://sections.ecrea.eu/PC/news_empedocles.php

Flyod, J. & Katz, J. E. (Eds.). (2016). *Philosophy of emerging media*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mifsud M. L. (2015). *Rhetoric and the gift: Ancient rhetorical theory and contemporary communication.* Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Van Loon, J. (2008). *Media technology: Critical perspectives*. New York: McGraw Hill Open University Press.