

WestminsterResearch

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

**Patriarchal theory reconsidered: torture and gender based
violence in Turkey**

Akgul, F.

This is an electronic version of a PhD thesis awarded by the University of Westminster.
© Miss Filiz Akgul, 2016.

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch: (<http://westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk/>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail repository@westminster.ac.uk

PATRIARCHAL THEORY RECONSIDERED:

**TORTURE AND GENDER BASED VIOLENCE IN
TURKEY**

SUBMITTED

BY

FILIZ AKGUL

PhD Candidate

SUBMITTED

ON

07/02/2016

UNIVERSITY OF WESTMINSTER

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

ACADEMIC SUPERVISOR: DR. MARIA HOLT (DIRECTOR OF STUDIES)

**SECONDARY SUPERVISOR: DR. DIBYESH ANAND (HEAD OF
DEPARTMENT)**

Section

page

1.	DECLARATION.....	3
2.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	3
3.	ABSTRACT	5
4.	CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	8
5.	CHAPTER II: METHODOLOGY.....	16
6.	CHAPTER III: UNDERSTANDING PATRIARCHAL THEORY.....	42
7.	CHAPTER IV: THE CONTEXT OF TURKEY.....	92
8.	CHAPTER V: HOUSEHOLD.....	131
9.	CHAPTER VI: STATE REPRODUCTION OF PATRIARCHY.....	163
10.	CHAPTER VII: BETWEEN WOMEN AND THE STATE: THE MALE POLITICAL SUBJECT	215
11.	CHAPTER VIII: CONCLUSION.....	290
12.	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	297

DECLARATION

I DECLARE THAT ALL THE MATERIAL CONTAINED
IN THIS THESIS IS MY OWN WORK.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are so many people to whom I owe gratitude and appreciation. The narration should not imply hierarchy or a priority since each individual has made an unrivalled and indispensable contribution to my studies in the UK.

I am, first and foremost, grateful for Dr. Maria Holt who was the reason why I chose the University of Westminster. As a scholar who has specialized in the Middle East and its intersection with gender, I knew we could cooperate on similar understandings and approaches in my research topic. In addition to this, she suggested I work with Dr. Dibyesh Anand who is a rare and profound male feminist and surprised me by never challenging any feminist arguments I made but rather my argumentation and approach to produce knowledge. I am tremendously grateful for both professors for keeping their faith in my ability to become a committed PhD student. Afterwards, the PhD level research I embarked on was nothing but a delightful experience and I am well aware that the relationship I had with both of my attentive and collaborative supervisors is at the heart of my success.

Second, I must thank the Canadian government, which has given me financial security for six consecutive years of post-graduate study in the UK. In addition to this, it was Canadian doctors that diagnosed me with a mental illness, which allowed me to access certain medication, structuring my life, and enabling me to function like everybody else.

Third, I must thank my father, a professor himself, who has supported my education in the UK to the best of his ability. His resources were limited but he offered time and consideration every time I felt lonely at the British Library by being available for a brief chat over the phone.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my high school sociology teacher, Ms Neslihan Karanfil, who introduced the world of social sciences to me and made me aspire to become a social scientist.

ABSTRACT

Gender theory in general, and patriarchal theory in particular, have been explored in this research to describe the procedures, processes, norms, values and, most importantly, structures that define the subject. Patriarchal theory mostly perceives men as the abusers and women as the abused. However, the nuances and particularities of these oppressive structures have not been explored in detail. In this research, the reader is introduced to the various manifestations of how being privileged and underprivileged is constructed. This research focuses on processes and structures and it mostly explores alternative approaches towards political sociology and its intersection with gender theory.

The thesis adopts a multi-level analysis that involves the different manifestations of the ruler-subject binary at the societal and interpersonal levels of analysis. The so-called private and public spheres with their fluid identities have been analyzed after descriptions of internal mechanisms reproducing the social construction of oppression are understood. Similarities between analysis concerned with the household and the public sphere reflects on how binaries such as the masculine and feminine, and the ruler and the subject, reproduce, mirror and reinforce one another.

This research, therefore, focuses on structural and systematic ways of reproducing patriarchy as a system that affects the society in an inclusive way. This required and understanding of norms and values that have been analyzed as a reflection of processes that accommodate oppression. The intersection of these processes has led the author to argue that ‘women are to men, what the citizen is for the state, in the context of Turkey’.

The feminization of the male political subject has been argued after presenting three chapters that represent my original contribution to knowledge. Through utilizing

interviews conducted by other scholars, I initially analyzed male and female statements on domestic violence in Turkey. Second, I analyzed written texts, including official documents, which inform the reader of state officials' views on gender inequality. Third, I have analyzed the relationship between the state and the citizen through the research I conducted, on police violence during the Gezi Park protests and other interviews include the research conducted with feminist and human rights lawyers.

The similarities between the manner, processes and values between the male and female (as well as the ruler and the subject) led to a discussion that the male political subject is simultaneously masculine and feminine. The feminization of the male political subject represented an alignment between two spheres that reinforce one another, through mirroring the public and the private. These two systems created a contradiction within the subject often leading him to over-compensate his damage. Therefore, patriarchal relativity was introduced to discuss a perspective on over-compensation amongst subjects and agents that coincide and conflate within vertical patriarchy.

Accordingly, new concepts of patriarchy were needed to capture the nuances within a system that defines the subject at macro and micro levels. Throughout this research, the contributions produced by scholars during the past forty years over debates on patriarchal theory have been reproduced to a great extent.

This research has utilized a multi-level analysis through comparisons made by references to metaphors. Metaphoric reproduction is a rare approach within patriarchal theory, often different to utilizing a single theoretical framework. The employment of semi-structured and unstructured interviews with additional content analysis substantiates the author's subjectivity. This subjectivity reflects a feminist understanding of politics, political sociology, philosophy, and gender theory. As a

result, political structures, processes, privilege, and vulnerability have been explored with a view understanding and empowering the marginalized.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

As I embarked on a PhD program to understand the dynamics of oppression, I developed an understanding that the oppression of women is linked and, to a large extent, attached to the oppression of men. To this extent, the concept of compound patriarchy had to be introduced and explored to demonstrate that the elimination of an individual's oppression is often entangled to the oppression of others. For this reason, patriarchal structures consist of oppressive practices that form a pattern and similarity across a diverse range of subjects and agents.

Research on patriarchy not only needs to address relationships, which involve oppressive practices amongst two agents or subjects, but also needs to address patterns of behavior amongst similar subjects that represent the ruler-subject binary. Furthermore, research on patriarchy is needed to analyze patriarchy as a system of oppression that restricts and suppresses the people within public and private spheres. In other words, patriarchy as a system has to be analyzed and research is much needed to understand multiple levels of analysis that define different yet similar agents.

For this reason, the Turkish nation, with various different power dynamics operating, provides an interesting case study towards the understanding of oppressive practices. The Turkish state and its subjects have had a relationship that resembles patriarchal relationships amongst the so-called private sphere. For this reason, I argue that through the deployment of a metaphorical analysis, exemplifying the “family as nation” metaphor, it is possible to explore and understand the different types of patriarchy that are reproduced.

Ortner (1978) has been a strong influence in my research as she was a prominent scholar of gender theory who was one of the first to utilize a metaphorical analysis when she stated that women's relationship with men, to an extent, resembled nature's relationship with culture. For this reason, I argue that my metaphorical analysis is

extremely insightful as I demonstrate that in the Turkish context, women are to men what the citizen is for the state. Metaphorical analysis allows researchers to connect multiple levels of analysis with one another, demonstrating their similarities and various ways that each level of analysis reinforces one another.

Furthermore, my multi-level analysis allows the allows me to demonstrate that the male political subject is, in fact, feminine and for this reason, the oppression of women has to be taken seriously by men, as an urgent issue, since that is a prominent strategy which allows the whole society to escape oppressive practices, processes and procedures and will eventually emancipate men.

In this research, I have embarked an examination of two different types of violence, to understand the dynamics of oppression. I was intrigued to find the similarities between the subject who was the dominant, oppressive force and the subject who was the subordinate agent. For this reason, I have found a logical pattern amongst oppressive practices and I found that oppression that took place in one domain often reinforced the oppression that took place elsewhere.

This research and its findings are not intended to impose a framework on other scholars who has been specializing in the study of oppression in Turkey and at occasionally in the Middle East. However, I firmly argue, utilizing a multi-level analysis, that oppression in Turkey has similarities with Egypt (during Nasser) and Iraq (during Saddam Hussein's rule) in which the state and its ideology represented the sacred entity that deserved and required the citizen's self sacrifice. Indeed, it was the citizen who made the sacrifice needed to sustain the state's glory and reason of existence. The research findings and artifacts intend to explain research in the name of the most vulnerable subjects in a given collectivity. This research, for this reason, aims to situate itself far from essentializing arguments. However, similarities between

Turkey as a collectivity, and other collectivities should be expected to emerge once similar methodologies are deployed, especially when utilizing a metaphorical analysis whilst analyzing multiple levels of the society. I argue that the rarely utilized approach could be deployed in similar yet different context across Muslim majority collectivities.

Turkey is an important case study for understanding oppression. First Turkey, as a nation and a state, has often been scrutinized by European audiences, due to its so-called barbaric and oppressive practices, as if Europe was detached, if not exempt, from all forms of oppression. The self-proclaimed 'Western identity' that has been often excluded and almost never recognized by Western agents, has left the male political subject rejected and excluded the male political subject. This research excludes this particular dynamic. Nevertheless, the identification of multiple sources of oppression, marginalization and ostracism is needed to approach and reach an understanding and recognize that the agents of oppression are also oppressed within multiple dimensions. It is this understanding that this research aims to identify.

In this research, I ask, 'Why does the state allow, if not encourage, the male political subject to oppress women?'. Although this might require strong evidence of feminist research, I also strongly argue that this research aims to understand oppression for its sake and, for this reason, it is an intellectual outcome of political sociology instead of being limited to a piece of research serving feminist goals on its own.

The primary goal of this research, and the question that I am interested in answering is 'why would the state allow oppression to happen?'. The answer to this question, by feminist scholars, is to indicate that the state was a masculine agent and for that reason they have always made judicial adjustments and public policies that propagated the male view. I firmly believe and argue that this explanation is rather

simplistic and needs urgent reevaluation. There are, as I argue, further motives that needed to be considered far beyond what the current literature has to offer.

This research, as I argued above, attempted to understand behaviors of endorsement, at times of sexist, patriarchal and misogynist policies that are enacted, in the name of pursuing the common good. I argue, openly and firmly, that the state prefers (if not encourages) the male political subject to oppress women, because the male political subject is oppressed by the state in Turkey and this is a form of compensation on behalf of the state to conceal their male subjects' oppression of the female.

For this reason, I argue that analyzing torture and domestic violence enables a researcher to trace patterns and similarities as well as particularities amongst agents that are different yet identical at the same time. This comparison of the levels of analysis allowed me to find three similarities amongst oppressors that are dominant within the so-called private and public spheres. These similarities or patterns are, yet never limited to, overcompensating one's damage, helplessness as a privilege and building power through power-over instead of power-within.

These three tendencies made it clear that oppression is a culture and for that reason, the male political subject is oppressed, in the public sphere, in the same manner women are oppressed in the private sphere. This had led to a bold statement of suggesting that, the male political subject is in fact feminine in the public sphere. For this reason, structural patriarchy reproduces itself by creating masculine and feminine subjects across the collectivity. In this context, biological and sexual identities do not seem to have been assigned by birth but rather fostered by political processes.

This research commenced with a research question that focused on the female subject, who was often confined within the so-called private sphere and somehow, to an extent, and under certain circumstances, excluded from the public sphere. This

research, however, indicates that, understanding the female subject is likely to lead to an understanding of the male subject. Her oppression is in fact, his oppression. As men oppress women they are drafting the same blueprint of their own oppression. This research, to this extent, aims at attracting the attention of a male audience, to understand that oppressing women would create a culture, pattern, process and procedure that would inevitably be the template of their own oppression.

In summary, there are minimal differences between a male subject oppressing women, and the state that oppresses male subjects. Indeed, they have a culture of subordination in common and masculine subjects seek, if not create, their own feminine subjects. For this reason, men do not escape, avoid or prevent oppression by being men, because other masculinities create their own feminine subjecthoods. As a result of this, masculinity and femininity are enacted through metaphorical systems that I have been tracing through an analysis of the ruler-subject binary. By simply analyzing the ruler-subject binary across different societal levels of analysis, we can gain insight into the nature of the oppression and how men, at times and under certain circumstances, enact and perform femininity.

Other binaries, in addition to the ruler-subject binary, could have been deployed in this research. In an attempt to specify and narrow down this research, other metaphors such as the core-periphery and patron-client relationships were excluded. This research aims to shed light on how oppression is produced between two agents, masculine and the feminine, that could possibly be the basis of oppression that takes place at other spheres of the society. For this reason, research on gender has serious implications for scholars studying oppression at different levels of analysis (state vs individual), amongst different agents (male vs female).

If this is an outcome validated by fellow researchers, committed to alternative understandings of the study of oppression, this research might possibly argue that the oppression between men and women might be, to an extent, a model for oppression across multiple spheres, including domestic, structural, national, international and global spheres of analysis. My research, beyond anything else, claims to introduce a model to understand oppressive behavior that has been evident across two levels. Further research is much needed to explore whether the multi-level analysis employed in this research could be insightful in understanding the Turkish government's (and to an extent the nation's) oppression with regards to EU and US relationships.

It is my responsibility, in this research, to provide insightful recommendations on how particular metaphorical analysis could be deployed and utilized to understand and itemize a discerned culture of oppression as it becomes clear from a distinct pattern across multiple levels of the society. I argue, in this research, that oppression, beyond gender, race and class, has to be expanded, as a culture of oppression is relatively easy to detect. This research will allow me to introduce a pattern that was traced by deploying a tool that was often neglected in both feminist and political sociology endeavors. The outcome of my research might appear to be feminist at first glance however, I strongly argue, that this research is a contribution to both political science and political sociology in addition to being a contribution to gender studies, and to an extent, gender theory.

My contribution to political sociology stems from my ability to demonstrate how subjects enact their status in the society and my examination of the traditional distribution of power within the society. As I argue in further chapters that both agents and legal entities enact their power and create their own subordinates through contestations and negotiations of power both within the private and public spheres. As we recall, the primary research question for this study is why the state gains from the

subordination of women. As a result of this research, I argue that the state gains from the subordination of women mainly because this subordination enables the male political subject to tolerate his own oppression and most importantly, men are oppressed in the same manner women are the state feminizes the male political subject. For this reason, the male political subject needs to compensate for his own damage of being subordinated by the state.

Furthermore, the state is aware that a patriarchal society is needed to create a citizenry (male political subject and/or national subject) that is tolerant to patriarchal abuse, often caused by the father state (devlet baba). To this extent, patriarchy beyond its practice on a daily basis, exemplifies a political system of rewards and punishments, which leads to a centralization in power, often benefiting men and the state. This research, for this reason, should qualify as a well-equipped case study, as I attempt to portray patriarchy as a system not just an enactment within the private sphere.

In summary, for this reason, this is a detailed case study of demonstrating that the oppression of women is not just a case of a crisis, shortage or deficit in women's rights, but rather an illness of the society that affects us all. Patriarchy is a system above everything else that is in need of confrontation and contestation. Therefore, most male subjects are oppressed in the same manner women are oppressed, since a culture of patriarchal oppression creates its own masculine and feminine subjects in order to sustain the order preserving centralization of power.

As I utilized state-society relations, as a level of analysis I took into consideration the power abuse that took place at the national level. This was contrasted with the power abuse that took place in the household. It was inevitable before I found three particular similarities within two different types of exercising power. These

particular similarities led me to argue that the male political subject is feminine and the abuse of women is an issue for all citizens and not just feminists or male-feminists.

This research consists of eight chapters, in which the initial four provides the theoretical framework and the latter four provide empirical evidence to support my conclusions and substantiate my claim. The second chapter involves the analysis of the research methods deployed and utilized in this research. The third theoretical chapter is on the analysis of patriarchy as a cultural construct but more importantly a system of subordination. The fourth chapter consists of the analysis of the power dynamics and political structures that situate both female and masculine subjects as well as the state and other selected and appointed officials in Turkey.

The empirical chapters written in this research consist of three chapters in which the first analyzes the masculine feminine binary within the household with relevance to domestic violence and gender-based violence and torture. In the second chapter I utilize content analysis to understand state intentions and positioning towards gender equality, domestic violence and the masculine-feminine binary. The third empirical chapter of this research involves the analysis of the male political subject and his feminization by the state. Evidence is provided to describe, detect and understand the ruler subject binary and its similarity with relationships in the household.

CHAPTER II: METHODOLOGY

RESEARCHER AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF SUBJECTIVITY

Born and raised in Canada and the United States and migrating to Turkey at the age of eight, I do not remember a time where I actually felt that I fitted in a social context and felt a sense of belonging. My difference, with reference to my assertiveness and American notions of freedom, was my reason for marginalization. I always thought that difference, as opposed to homogenization, was a source of tension within the

Turkish society. If nothing else, at early stages of my life, I had power within and indeed, that power had to be scrutinized by forces that defined the social norm. For this reason, whilst applying intersectional methodologies to non-western contexts, I have felt a deep connection between me and other subjects within Turkey, who have been marginalized by other vectors of inequality often different than those suggested by Patricia Hill Collins (ie race and class), since oppression is exclusive to the subject.

To this extent, would the universal and the particular live within a subject constructing her subjecthood? Indeed, there is some truth to that claim. For this reason, we must ask, whether it is Turkish (authentic) culture that led men and the state officials to claim superiority over others or whether these are socially constructed phenomenon that are negotiated and contested on a daily basis? Nevertheless, often the state has argued that the dynamics I term oppressive structures are endemic across the nation, which led me to believe that, at times, oppression replaces or takes place in the form of nurture.

Some masters' students apply for PhD programs due to their romantic and idealistic feelings about their potential to produce knowledge that could change the world whilst writing one chapter at a time. I thought my voice, my main argument or thesis statement was needed to fill a gap in the literature. However, as I embarked on content analysis whilst elaborating state reproduction of patriarchy, I would analyze the sections of the text or artifact in a manner exclusive to her, far from the subject's (in my case the authors) intentions. For this reason, I decided to include information on my personal background and its intersection with patriarchal mentalities to give future researchers evidence of my subjecthood to ensure that they could draw conclusions between experience and knowledge wished. However, the inclusion of personal experiences and autobiographical content had a greater motive apart from hypothetical

situations but rather something profound and significant. To this extent, the autobiographical elements of my research are a contribution to discussions relevant to the methodology of this research.

As I started a PhD at the Politics and International Relations department at the University of Westminster, I was partially sad to leave SOAS and more importantly I was partially scared and intimidated by the workload I was expected to undertake, as I entered the unknown. The romantic and idealist feelings were replaced by the intimidation that stemmed from being the lowest ranking academic who barely knew how it felt to embark on academic work 10 hours a day, five days a week. After this realization, I focused on patriarchal theory and noticed its inability to explain Muslim feminist subjects. To this extent, discerning patriarchal relativity enabled me to utilize tendencies of over-compensation that my Middle Eastern upbringing had taught me. Needs that were not urgent were compensated by forcing and/or imposing sacrifice or the disposal of someone else's primary needs and freedom.

My research on patriarchal theory and the introduction of five concepts, horizontal, vertical, compound, structural patriarchy and patriarchal relativity delivers more nuanced and particular ways of approaching gendered subjugation. Nevertheless, oppression of women needs to be further explored in relation to men's oppression and their tendency to correlate and reinforce each other.

The point I would like to make here is that as the context shapes the subject who later becomes the researcher, it is often the case that the research shapes the researcher and that often shapes her subjecthood. I believe structures have power over subjects to the extent that understanding free will becomes problematic. However, agency is something we need to believe in because the difference between being violated in 2009 and reporting in 2014 is the difference between the reactions we give to structures that

remain the same. Therefore, agency, in other words, proactive and reactive behavior stems from being situated between time and space whilst struggling between ‘knowing and being’ in a manner exclusive to existentialist debates.

It could be argued that a PhD thesis challenges on our ability to produce knowledge; however, this knowledge cannot sustain and flourish itself unless the researcher allows it to be shaped by the concepts it produces. As is often said, the researcher writes the report but the report writes the researcher. For this reason, my subjectivity had to be included in my research to demonstrate to fellow researchers that my research shapes me in a certain way that led me to believe in the power of structure, more than anything else.

Therefore, moments of vulnerability are needed to be addressed and they stem from our ability to embrace our oppression, being seen in the public sphere, and allow the topic to get under our skin; leaving us challenging old experiences and questioning everything we took for granted. A feminist would need to understand that conducting research on gender includes all subjects, as there is no “un-oppressed” subject because at the least there would be oppressive structures.

Empirical and Theoretical Research

Throughout my PhD, I have analyzed concepts related to patriarchy, oppression, structures and their reproduction with reference to binaries and metaphors in the context of Turkey. To ensure tendencies of generalization and essentialization were eliminated, the findings of this research were not generalized across the Middle East, although I firmly believe my research could be used as a case study for scholars of Middle Eastern research and possibly offer an understanding towards deducing knowledge on oppression in the Middle East.

In this research, I argue that ‘women are to men, what the male political subject

is for the state'. This required me to compare the ruler-subject binary in the public and private domains. For this reason I have chosen, domestic violence that took place in the privacy of one's home as well as torture that was often defined as state violence. To this extent I have compared male violence and state violence to understand dominant masculine approaches on patriarchal practices and the manner in which they collide. My empirical research often supported my theoretical approach, particularly patriarchal relativity and compound patriarchy. These two concepts were exceptionally important. The former allowed me to demonstrate how overcompensation took place amongst the ruler and the subject, at multiple levels. Compound patriarchy, as a concept, allowed me to demonstrate that multiple oppressive forces that might appear to be independent from one another, are in fact related, conflated and reinforced by one another. For this reason, the oppression of a subject is, as argued here, very much related to the oppression of other subjects. We are, to an extent, reproducing the oppression of ourselves in the manner we oppress others. As a result of this, the theoretical and empirical sections of this research aim to describe, analyze and situate oppression within a system that consists of its own reproductive mechanisms.

My initial research question was determined to be, 'why does the State allow (if not encourage) men to oppress women in the so-called private sphere?'. I believe the answer of that question stems from the state's efforts to create a subject that is submissive and tolerant towards abusive uses of power and being an abuser allows the male political subject to tolerate his own abuse.

Often feminist scholars have argued that the state represents the male point of view and for that reason it acts as an agent of oppression by tolerating (if not promoting) men who abuse their power over women. What are the dynamics of the male centric views of the state? Do they identify with the male subject whose interests clash with

women or are they just being strategic and/or being supportive towards their electoral base? Alternatively they could also be identifying themselves with the male political subject and enact policies based on interpersonal and intrapersonal motives.

Below, I will discuss the specific research methods I have adopted for gathering data and data analysis with reference to their advantages and disadvantages. Particular experiences will be discussed as a different form of manifestation, intent, and political positioning often beneficial to the field researcher as opposed to the researcher using desk-based methods.

Qualitative Methods

Whilst conducting this research I aimed to utilize methods and discern approaches in accordance to detect structure, process and procedure. As I embark on this realm that is situated in political sociology, concerns introduced by feminist scholars were particularly insightful. A few concerns have been raised by feminist researchers that have particular relevance to my construction. According to Holland and Ramazanoglu (2002), one of the main goals of feminist research is that knowledge production mostly involved male subjects, their concerns, needs and everything else was understood in relation to them, since the 'others' were not autonomous. Women have often been seen in relation to men, relative to men, rather than an independent entity on its own right. Within this framework, I sought to attract attention that women's oppression was not entirely a women's issue since it was that oppression that took place within the male-female binary had the power to re-structure political processes and procedures and consists of the blueprint of the oppression of males. To this extent, my aim was to demonstrate that the oppression of women, by far, is not a women's issue, since men are subjugated in the same manner. I also took the feminist initiative to trace,

track and discern oppressive patterns between two binaries, to describe the manner of which both women and the male political subject are oppressed.

Another feminist concern that draws my attention is the feminist concern of research that often reinforces the power dynamics that define the status quo within a given collectivity. I felt the urgency to initiate research that takes an oppositional stance on a given distribution of power in Turkey. My main accomplishment towards the realization of this goal is to attract attention to oppressive patterns that create oppressive structures (both macro and micro) that leads to the subjugation of subjects that are different in some manners and similar in others. For this reason, beyond the concerns of feminist researchers, it is my personal ethos to challenge authority, established ways of distributing power, the hegemonic subjectivity and therefore, the status quo. To this end, this research qualifies to be categorized as a feminist research since the ethos of this research and my subjectivity has always aligned with feminist researchers across multiple disciplines.

My aim whilst making the comparison of two binaries was to inform my peers that oppression is endemic across all levels of the society and the logic and insight involved in oppressive practices had to be revealed. For this reason, my feminist standpoint involves making an analysis that would invite people from all spheres of the society to take ownership of oppression. I had no intention to conduct feminist research that situates women in relation to men; my aim was to situate both men and women, in the same category of being underprivileged.

This research does not evolve around debates concerning domestic violence and torture. This research revolves around the oppressive practices that characterize certain patterns of behavior. For this reason, torture had to be analyzed within the ruler-subject binary to the same extent domestic violence was examined within the same binary. As

a result of this, content analysis had to be deployed to detect the hidden messages given within the obvious-openly stated messages. Semi-structured and unstructured interviews were utilized to understand, similarly, the hidden messages given underneath the openly stated messages.

Qualitative methods will be used in this research because it allows detailed analysis of a particular data set to take place. Qualitative methods will allow me to see the insider's perspective and learn from first-hand experiences.

Qualitative research methods aim to construct the subjective reality by focusing on meaning through the involvement of the researcher (Atkins, 1984). Interviews and content analysis are preferred because of their exploratory nature.

Despite the advantages to qualitative research, there are certain disadvantages. According to Mays and Pope (1995:2), qualitative methods, such as interviews, are subject to researcher bias and the research lacks reproducibility. The effects of an evident bias can be reduced by acknowledging its existence and by taking alternative constructions into account. Also, qualitative analysis is fairly complex to analyze, as the data gathered requires meticulous attention to detail and coding in several phases (ibid).

These research methods, qualitative assessments, often allow the research to unfold unexpected aspects of the topic. Furthermore, the researcher could break into the artificial image provided and resistances towards the subject. For example, whilst I was conducting an open-ended interview with a government official who worked to enforce gender equality, she appeared as if the government had taken sufficient measures and that she was willing to work to ensure gender equality. However, as the conversation unfolded she suggested that feminism put women in the forefront¹ in

¹ By the term forefront, I stress a meaning of which women are taking leading

social life and for that reason she was skeptical of it. She also recommended a book on gender equality (which was used for content analysis) as a valid argument against feminism.

Analyzing torture and domestic violence was, indeed, extremely problematic due to the sensitivity of the issue. For example, intimate partner violence was difficult to investigate because I was not allowed to interview violence survivors for security reasons. Furthermore, torture was a highly sensitive issue because most survivors were afraid or refrained from making public statements. Since I was only aiming to adopt a herstory approach not being able to access torture survivors was a challenge in my research. In addition to this, government specialists were highly defensive since they were first and foremost committed to protecting the state they have refrained from giving any knowledge on the topic. For this reason, this research had to focus on conducting interviews with human rights scholars and content analysis as other means were not accessible in any known way.

Content Analysis

Content analysis is “a research technique for the objective, systematic and qualitative description of the manifest content of communication” (Lewis *et al*, 2013: 18). According to Shorideh *et al* (2012:12), “content analysis is an analysis of the text that deals with the relationship aspect and involves an interpretation of the underlying meaning of the text”. This content analysis tries to give meaning to a certain text or speech made by a policy actor.

In order to utilize content analysis, I have chosen three documents in particular; first, a book published by a retired judge who gave personal insight into his experiences

roles in society and somehow the government consultant interviewed suggested that was a problem.

and thoughts in regard to verdicts on domestic matters. Second a document published by Hacettepe University and third a document issued by the Turkish Grand National Assembly.

The reason these three texts were chosen was due to their significance. For example, the retired judge who wrote a book about men's marginalization in the process of divorce and relevant settlements. The authors' book was written with honesty and sincerity. It is indeed these sentiments of utmost honesty that made this book an ideal sample for this research. Furthermore, whilst deploying content analysis I have had the opportunity to describe the forces that combine and conflate compound patriarchy. For instance, the state's enactment of patriarchy; has reinforced patriarchy within the household as explained through the analysis of government documents. As discussed in chapter VI of this research, officials were seriously concerned about the unity of the family and the possible effects feminist policies and debates would cause and potential threats it posed towards the unity of the family, the patriarchy enacted within and amongst family members was reinforced. In addition to this, the enacted and performed patriarchal practices and sentiments underlining such behavior were also re-created and reinforced by patriarchy at the structural level. To this extent, I argue that, patriarchy in the household is in correlation with patriarchy within other binaries in which ruler-subject relationships are defined. For this reason, compound patriarchy defines the complex composition of a net or web of patriarchal practices across the Turkish collectivity.

The above mentioned authors' book, written by a retired judge who was deeply concerned with the negative effects of feminist thinking on the fabric of the society and the unity of the family, was titled, "A man losing his respect and the feminist order" by Onder Kanyilmaz published in 2013. One reason, I chose this book was because it was

recommended by a research participant who was a government official and she was responsible for ensuring women's protection from domestic violence. She informed me that women were subject to violence because of the bad things they did, which I found highly problematic; she blamed the victimized women for their own victimhood. By bad things she meant like wearing a sexually suggestive dress or burning dinner. This made me decide that I could benefit from a participant leading my research to ensure my own perceptions do not control all circumstances and allow the research take its own course. For example, in the book by a retired judge, it seems as if he regards women highly as he discusses how sacred motherhood is. However, from the way he mentions "the wife" and a man's emasculation that stems from her earnings being higher than his, it was the selfless women that was being uplifted rather than motherhood or womenhood.

Another document I have chosen for content analysis was the only document that solely stated the state's position towards domestic violence. This document was chosen because it was evidence of the state's intentions towards the dominant status quo in the family and how the ideal subjectivity needed to be constructed in accordance with state initiatives. The concept of the "State" has been chosen instead of "government" or "administration" because as soon as a party is elected they are perceived and they present themselves as the representatives of the State.

With regard to content analysis, all three documents have been selected for their ability to discern incentives, motives and true intentions of the state and the male political subject on issues pertaining, violence, equality and ultimately, family and co-existence. The third document, I have chosen for content analysis, is a document issued by the Grand National Assembly (or the Turkish Parliament). This was chosen for its insight into the context of decision-making amongst Turkish officials.

Content analysis has its limitations. Often, it can be perceived as time consuming, but mostly since the analysis involved engaging with extreme detail, an extended use of content analysis would take several chapters to complete. This method is highly recommended for researchers who investigate institutions which are often too scared to be open for questioning and lack transparency.

I have introduced several concepts with regards to patriarchal theory, namely; vertical patriarchy, horizontal patriarchy, structural patriarchy, patriarchal relativity, collective and compound patriarchy. This literature review will include the analysis of the research published by scholars such as Suad Joseph (1993), Deniz Kandiyoti (1988,1991), Nadjé Al-Ali (2005) as well as Western scholars such as Carole Pateman (1988), Anne Phillips (1994), Nira Yuval Davis (1997). This prepared me for the second stage of my research which included carrying out both participant observation and interviews in Turkey. Having carried out content analysis, I eventually had a theoretical framework on patriarchy that would be the basis of my research I conducted in Turkey.

Participant Observation

This method has been explored for the sake of further data analysis in this research. However, due to differences in work ethics and intentions, I found that my efforts in committing to participant observation whilst working at a leading feminist NGO in Turkey, was fruitless. For this reason, without establishing any hierarchy with any host institution I found that my research was mostly informative through the utilization of other methods, such as content analysis and interviews.

Interviews

In my research, I have used in-depth semi-structured and unstructured interviews. There are certain strengths and weaknesses of semi-structured interviews. One advantage that can be identified is the opportunity of observing social cues, such as voice intonation or body language as this gives the interviewer a lot of extra information (Opdenakker, 2006). Another advantage is that it allows detailed analysis and gives further insight into a particular phenomenon. As a result, semi-structured interviews were chosen because they reveal personal information about participants. One identified disadvantage is that the interviewer can drive the participant to a certain direction (ibid). Such as making them feel overly defensive about the state when obviously state leaders are being scrutinized.

Whilst utilizing the concept of compound patriarchy, I attempted to explore one phase (and/or layer) of patriarchy in isolation and make deduction by noticing similarities amongst similar applications of the 'ruler' and similar applications of the 'subject'. Analyzing each layer in isolation allowed me to understand oppression does not exist in a vacuum but rather interacts with other forces that reinforce oppression at multiple layers. For this reason, whilst conducting this research I asked for their sincerity. I requested that they shared their experiences as a lawyer or a human rights activist or government official. As they shared their stories with me, they gave insightful information on the ruler subject binary and patriarchal power abuse at multiple levels.

My questions during semi-structured interviews could be exemplified as "What do you see as the state's position to gender equality/domestic violence?", or "What are the human rights violations that occurred during the Gezi Park protests?" These were sample questions to initiate a conversation. However, unstructured interviews were mostly informative because once they heard the topic of research over the phone, they

knew what I wanted to explore.

Due to this, they would begin talking themselves, which was highly appreciated. I believe unstructured interviews are very therapeutic for the participant, if the participant feels marginalized and it allows the researcher to bond with the participant. Additionally, an unstructured interview should be chosen for its ability to construct the research theme and topic beyond the researcher's research plan.

My research question remained the same; however, my answer to the question evolved. The first answer to my research question was "the state allows men to oppress women so the state could compensate for oppressing men"; however, my answer changed over time and I said "the male political subject becomes constructed within a system of abuse that allows him to be produced within the ruler subject binary as part of an oppression that is more structural". The unstructured interviews and the comparison of state violence to male violence enabled me to understand structural reproduction with reference to both norms and procedures of enactment, which were helplessness as privilege, power over instead of power within and overcompensation of damage.

As I was trying to conduct an interview at the Judicial Palace (Adliye Sarayı) about a few state officials' view on torture in Turkey, I was shouted at by a senior official as he said 'There is no torture in Turkey, go away!'. The majority of officials had difficulty expressing an opinion and I was passed from one official to another only to see that they had nothing to express on the topic, or felt too afraid to share their insights. Even academics were seen as a threat for the government officers working in the palace. This due to the state's incompetence to detail with descending voices without exercising power over due to the lack of power within.

Although, I could not reach any state official on torture and public speeches that

were made by the then Prime Minister, Tayyip Erdogan, his public stance on ‘Zero-Tolerance to Torture’ seemed to be more propaganda rather than the actual truth since torture was still widely practiced. Indeed, both male and female judges were all committed to gender inequality, sexist and patriarchal views of the family either knowingly or unknowingly. This was evident in the way issues pertaining gender equality were discussed. Their reasoning was still patriarchal even when their intentions were liberal. It is important to share a case with a research participant about how values on gender equality were examined by the researcher through context rather than oral statements. As I went to the office of a male family judge located at the Judiciary Palace in Ankara, I saw a man sitting behind a desk with three other visitors sitting opposite to him.

The guests at the Judicial Palace were smoking cigarettes inside the judge’s office, which is illegal in Turkey. The significance of this experience to my research, as I argue, is that, even in something tangible and evidently harmful for the public is violated by judges who are primarily responsible of providing the public good. To this extent, I cannot help but wonder what would the position of law enforcement officials would be in matters of gender equality, for that matter, matters of controversy and conflict of power. For this reason, this thesis had to question the authorities’ commitment to equality and law enforcement after the incident of smoking in non-smoking areas within the Judicial Palace.

I asked him questions about domestic violence. Such as why it occurred at the first place and whether current laws were sufficient or not. He first replied, “men are under constant provocation”. As the topic unfolded, he said, “Women do not want to make tea anymore because now they are equal”. At this point, it was clear that he was against this random manifestation of equality or inequality in the sense that regardless

of women's status in society and in the family, she should make her husband tea. At this point, one of the guests (government officials) stood up and went close to him to whisper in his ear after he made the comment about making tea. I could not hear what he said, but afterwards they were both laughing. It was clear that law enforcement officers were not only against equality they also had a vague idea of what equality represented and what should be expected from it.

In this study I have used two methods of sampling: purposive and snowball sampling, with regards to interviews. Purposive sampling refers to finding individuals who can provide rich and varied insights to the phenomenon under investigation so as to maximize what we learn (Dorneyi, 2007).

Purposive sampling is judgmental in nature. It involves "the conscious selection by the researcher of certain subjects or elements to include in a study" (Shorideh *et al*, 2012). This method was also utilized during the selection of certain texts whilst employing content analysis. Content analysis required a selection of texts that exemplified the true intentions of agents under scrutiny.

Snowball sampling refers to having a starting point in research by having a list of key participants who are then asked to recruit further participants who are similar to them in some respect to the investigation (Dorneyi:2007). Snowball sampling has been used with government officials. This was partially successful however some officials refrained from giving any interviews.

Similarly, whilst selecting interviewees, I selected human rights lawyers and NGOs activists as participants as they have an established track record as liberal activists. To this extent, it has been my insightful decision to trace the agents who represent the vulnerable against the powerful and it is indeed the contradictory positioning between this power dynamic that was the most informative for this research.

I often asked a retired judge or other state official to recommend an appropriate colleague. As I interviewed eight government officials, I was aiming to interview twenty of the officials in Ankara. This allowed me to approach state officials much more easily. As I heard them saying, “Mr Karınca recommended that I called you”, the other judge then had more sympathy towards the situation. Nepotism was endemic throughout Turkey. However, internet searches allowed me to approach human rights lawyers and NGO workers easily, who were keen on sharing their experiences in court hearings on torture by the state and/or violence against women were.

I conducted forty-five interviews in Istanbul, Ankara and Mersin. I have chosen these places because they were a good selection of cities of urban development and political activism. I approached professors either through nepotism or personal reference. I approached human rights lawyers through recommendations from NGOs, and I also conducted interviews with state officials through either nepotism or snowball sampling. Human rights lawyers were the keenest participants to be involved in my research.

As one human rights lawyer suspected that I was critical of the Turkish state as well as the Turkish nation he started lecturing me about Turkish history, including the war of independence and how poor Turkey was at the time, how we (or they) were learning democracy from scratch and how gender equality was an issue that is still being learnt. I remember his entire speech was spoken in anger as he felt insulted since he thought my research would denigrate being Turkish.

Men and government officials were too defensive and ready to offend another person in the name of defending the nation. They had no idea that the defense of the nation, by refraining from giving any information about torture, was more informative than content of the words they would have uttered. My silence seemed like a weakness

to them; however, it was my researching skills that allowed me to believe that his narration needed to be explored.

Whilst interviewing a human rights lawyer, through his narration, I witnessed that there was no sense of ‘responsibility’ amongst the male political subject he perceived, nor an acknowledgement of our contribution to the difficult conditions that had defined, and still, does define Turkey. I remember hearing his narration as if God created the British rich and Turks poor, or as if the citizens of Turkey had nothing to do with the failure or success of the reproduction of that wealth.

At times, evidence suggested that lawyers had little faith in human rights and equality; however my interviews with the majority of them, enabled me to gain access on certain legal cases and which gave evidence of commitment.

Process of Unstructured and Semi Structured Interviews

In-depth semi-structured interviews have been chosen because they are best suited for sensitive topics such as domestic violence (Elmire et al 2011) and torture and/or state violence.

Before conducting in-depth semi-structured interviews, I approached the participants over the phone and introduced myself and the university I was affiliated with and the scope of my research. This allowed me to give potential participants the opportunity to discuss their involvement as suggested by some academics (Swift and Draper , 2010). Not a single participant wanted to sign a written consent form, as they did not want to provide evidence of their involvement.

I introduced myself as a PhD student at the Westminster University (the Turkish translation of the University of Westminster) and I said that I was conducting feminist

research that would benefit women in the future or on torture with regards to the Gezi Park protests. This raised ethical concerns amongst researchers however, the research did contribute to other research conducted on oppression and for this reason, it was a reasonable incentive. The verbal consent was obtained over the phone. They were often skeptical in the first instance because I was not just Turkish but rather a PhD researcher from the UK.

However, as they saw that I was doing research on behalf of the vulnerable and against the state (as I was investigating my hypothesis that women are for men what the citizen was for the state), most people were willing to speak as long as I did not mention their name anywhere in the document, with few exceptions of retired officials.

This research has implications for research conducted in political sociology in addition the gender. I had informed the participants that I am happy to stop the interview in cases of emotional distress. However, I never had a single situation, other than with state officials, in which participants did not wish to speak out loud. State officials, had very little information to provide and I did not elaborate any further if they did not want to speak on the matter. Their intimidation was informative on its own merit. Similar to the discussion above, their inability to speak was informative more than the words they would have uttered if they spoke. This silence indicates a lack of transparency of the state and freedom of speech.

I started with general, broad questions about the participant's career and professional background. This allowed me to build a relationship with the participant. I used response markers such as "hmmm" and saying "that is interesting" to confirm my engagement with the conversation. I also probed questions by asking follow on questions such as "You used the word freedom three times, what do you mean by that?" (Silverman, 2011). The advantage of this method was to find the meaning associated

with certain concepts and gain insight to the values and norms of the participant. It was often learning through “reading between lines” by utilizing the data I gained.

Some interviews were recorded and around 30% of interviews were not. Participants were mostly afraid of giving evidence that they had made statements as this could possibly lead to prosecution. There was evident fear amongst the majority of participants because I was not allowed to either take their signature for consent or record the interview. I tried to explain that this research would be published in an English speaking country without disclosing any personal information, to assure them that their identity would remain confidential, and that the knowledge produced through this research would only be accessible for a small portion of interested readers. However, my efforts made no significant difference towards their anxieties.

In total, I interviewed 56 people. They consist of government officials , eights, human rights lawyers, 24 and civil society activists, 24. I mostly heard similar statements being made. What I was interested to learn was the state’s attitude towards gender equality as well as these interviewees position on gender equality.

Triangulation

Triangulation can be defined as “a way of validating a hypothesis by examining it through multiple methods”, (Dorneyi, 2007: 43), In this study, I have used methodological triangulation. According to Bekhet and Zauszniewski (2012) methodological triangulation uses more than one kind of method to study a phenomenon. Methodological triangulation is beneficial in providing confirmation of findings, more comprehensive data, increased validity, and enhanced understanding of the studied phenomenon (Redfern and Norman, 1994). Triangulation decreases the weaknesses of an individual method and strengthens the outcome of a study (Denzin,

1978).

I have adopted a positivist approach whilst triangulating data. Triangulation has led to divergent findings or complementary findings (Dootson, 1995). In my research, I have used crossed triangulation methods by verifying data obtained from human rights lawyers with data gathered through content analysis. Through content analysis, I gained insight into state behavior that complemented the view of NGO activists and human rights lawyers. State officials often made contradictory statements. As discussed above, on one hand, a state official would mock and denigrate gender equality, whilst openly stating his commitment on the other. Some government officials, family judges that were mostly female were more willing to share a story, a narrative with me compared to male officials. Therefore, the information gathered through government documents on domestic violence was contrasted by information gained by officials' statements and their reaction to context.

In addition to this, information gathered through Hacettepe University's research on domestic violence, a research they conducted as a University, and how men and women evaluate the situation was triangulated with the data gathered by human rights lawyers. As men openly stated that they were provoked by women whilst being interviewed, human rights lawyers suggested that men would batter women without provocation. In this regard, it was clear that men would share information in a manner that justifies their over-compensation; however, all the lawyers who were interviewed suggested that violence was endemic across the society regardless of circumstance. Therefore, this leads the researcher to perceive the male political subject as helpless and unable to exist without oppressing another subject.

For this reason, the means became the message themselves, as they whispered into each others' ears, smoked in a smoke-free government palace, or officially and

actively worked on gender equality whilst they degraded feminist goals without hesitation.

As content analysis involves reading between the lines and highlighting the significance of the subtext of each text, meeting government officials in person allowed me to verify the information I could ‘sense’, but not yet verify, which allowed me to further substantiate my claim. Similar compatibility was observed between the judge who strongly believed that men were almost always provoked and the retired judge who wrote imaginary scenarios of men who were often provoked and found themselves entrapped and helpless, which led them to be violent. Therefore, the difference amongst and within different sample groups and research methods, utilizing content analysis whilst using three different documents, and examining the subjects reaction to context, enabled me to verify the validity of the information I gathered and allowed me to further substantiate my arguments.

Participants

My research participants were selected from Ankara, Istanbul and Mersin. These three cities were chosen in accordance with logistic concerns such as transport, hotel and population intensity. Also, Ankara was deliberately chosen for being the capital. Istanbul was chosen for NGOs and human rights lawyers’ activities and being the most diverse and cosmopolitan city of Turkey. Mersin was chosen for being amongst the rural coast of the Mediterranean Sea, but not so rural as to tolerate human rights violations.

I conducted interviews with lawyers representing clients whose rights were curtailed by the government. I also conducted interviews with lawyers who provided

voluntary legal services to human rights NGOs such as the Human Rights Foundation in Ankara, in which one male and one female lawyer gave documented evidence to the interview meeting and showed how the state verbalized and contextualized protestors as terrorists. The claim of protestors being claimed as terrorists is further analyzed in chapter 10. Lawyers assisting NGOs were very informative participants as they were the ones criticizing the status quo the most.

I conducted research with NGO activists and human rights lawyers who either gave insight into the government's attitude towards domestic violence human rights violations, and the arbitrary use of state violence during the Gezi Park protests in 2013. State officials were mostly approached to discuss domestic violence and the Family Protection Act.

The issue of torture and sexual torture was incredibly difficult to discuss with state officials since the majority were scared of making statements, and secondly, the official policy is to deny accusations rather than to take responsibility, of officials responses were official responses instead of individual responses. I also visited four professors in leading Turkish universities to see how they would interpret gender inequality and the Gezi Park protests. These protests are discussed in chapter 10. They mostly made minimal contributions to my research, as one academic denied torture in Turkey and the other made controversial statements on secularists or Kemalists being more feminists than the Islamists.

In order to recruit participants, I wrote 'lawyer torture' or 'lawyer violence against women' in the online search engine and found a number of lawyers who have clients that suffered from either state violence or male violence. Additionally, as I contacted NGOs, I gained access to lawyers who voluntarily worked for those contacted organizations who showed me official state documents where a man was accused of

being a member of a terrorist organization although there was no evidence that he was affiliated with any organization. In other words, for joining protests in 2013, he was a terrorist but the state was still undecided about which one. These documents have substantiated my arguments and claims, and aims of providing evidence on the states' helplessness against dissent

Methods used to analyze data

There are two meanings that will emerged from the interview; first, the literal meaning and second, the researcher's meaning that is labeled according to certain themes (Dootson, 1995). I will focus on both meanings and try to hear "her/his story" in order to avoid 'otherizing' the participant (Reinharz, 1992). Also, privileging the researcher's voice over the participant can be seen as a form of othering (Vetere, et al 2012).

One advantage of data analysis is that, "you can direct, manage and streamline your data collection and, moreover, construct an original analysis of your data", (Charmaz, 2006:2). Once I gather data, I have coded them (Dornyei, 2007: 260). I asked, "What is this piece of data an example of?" and "What does it actually mean?" Each data segment has been interrogated before assigning meaning to it.

Data segments were selected based on my approach that was decided at the beginning of field research. As I decided that I would compare the different manifestations of the ruler-subject binary in order to approach the continuum of private and public patriarchy in Turkey, I coded male-female violence and compared it with state-citizen violence. The different manifestations of the binary had an evident pattern. I looked at how "the other" reproduces "the self" and how violence occurs under similar justifications.

In order to draw these conclusions, I read the transcribed interviews and I made several headings such as “Domestic Violence”, “State Governance of Domestic Violence”, “Sexual Torture”, and “Torture” “Privilege” and “Compensation”. After the 90-page document of transcribed interviews was numbered and coded, I looked at the similarities and patterns between the comparisons of two binaries. Clearly, the state enacted the same mentality of the male political subject; therefore, the femininity of men in the public sphere became clear. As a result, data analysis found roots after deciding on a theoretical framework and the adaptation of public/private patriarchy concepts introduced by Walby (1990); this allowed me to see the ruler-subject binary as a pattern and continuum amongst them.

Ethical considerations

In order for the research to be ethical, the identities of the participants needed to be protected. Before carrying out each of the data methods, I ensured their verbal consent was obtained and no written evidence would be provided to third parties’ as they were often scared of the current restrictions of the AKP government. I adhered to this at all times. I tried to refrain from demonstrating personal opinions whilst interviewing them, especially with men, as my feminist ideas and perceptions can often be intimidating.

However, as I argued elsewhere, being a researcher at a British university, given that Turkey –EU relations evolve around condemning Turkey’s human rights record, made my participants feel intimidated by my British affiliation, especially with regards to state officials. For this reason, my participants were selected from human rights lawyers and NGO activists who were also resentful about the status quo and the sense of betrayal that was endemic, caused by distasteful sentiments they had towards their

own government. To this extent, if the Turkish government appears to be in scrutiny throughout this research, it is indeed confirming the view that was widespread across all participants who were mainly human rights activists. Their voices conflated with mine, as I defended the rights of those who were most deprived of them. I have, at times, perceived the Turkish government as a villain. However, as this research suggests, the villain is socially constructed and oppression that takes place elsewhere would reinforce oppression that takes place in a totally different setting. I also put emphasis on the secrecy of torture survivors' identities as given by human rights lawyers. My major ethical consideration was to construct an argument, or thesis statement, that centered the vulnerability of the masses instead of only women. Additionally, the male political subject and his oppression became increasingly significant in comparison to my findings of domestic violence. As this research began as a feminist enquiry, it evolved into an understanding of patriarchy as a system that centered vulnerability at multiple levels often marginalizing men and women alike.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have outlined the different data methods used in order to answer my research questions. I have discussed the efficient and inefficient aspects of each data method in terms of reliability and validity, and highlighted why each data method is suitable for the particular research question. I then demonstrated how I triangulated the data, and I have also shown how I analyzed the data.

CHAPTER III: UNDERSTANDING PATRIARCHAL THEORY

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to introduce a definition that is applicable to my research on patriarchy. In addition, I will analyze and interrogate other aspects of patriarchy, including gender-based violence. My discussion of gender-based violence will highlight the limitations of the concept² with relevance to my argument. I argue that the male political subject is oppressed in the same manner women are and as they oppress women, at times and under certain circumstances, they define the norms they will be oppressed by. The male political subject prepares the pattern for their own oppression. For this reason, in order to examine patriarchy I will explore the frameworks introduced by various scholars to exemplify my contribution to the concept, with relevance to Turkey.

Analyzing the contexts of patriarchy will allow researchers to further understand how men and the state produce patriarchy, in relation to women, and how

2 By expressing my intention to discuss my limitations, I particularly refer to the extensive literature on the topic and possible shortcomings of relevant scholars who have examined the concepts of patriarchy and gendered violence whom have examined the concepts of patriarchy and gendered violence.

the state reproduces patriarchy in relation to men. Observing how these forms of patriarchy reinforce each other gives patriarchy its compound form, which is reflected in my own definition that will be introduced later in this chapter. Compound forms of patriarchy will be understood and analyzed in relation to understanding the oppression experienced by more than one subject.

A discussion of patriarchy should not only include the various definitions and an elaboration of their limitations but also be able to put these definitions into context and exemplify by giving their practical implications. In this chapter, first I define and elaborate the concept of patriarchy and discuss its limitations through evidence provided by feminist scholars. I introduce an alternative definition of patriarchy. The next section will place this definition into context. I further discuss relevant feminist perspectives to further understand the context and circumstance in which the discussion of oppression in Turkey is situated.

In the section below, I discuss the limitations of various definitions of patriarchy. Nevertheless, the definition I introduce has also have various limitations. For instance there is no mention of male domination in patriarchal structures. Then again, the definition aims to explain the complex composition of patriarchal oppression, as a system, in which certain similarities in particular are evident and ultimate patterns of patriarchal behavior and structures are established.

Defining patriarchy

There are various definitions of patriarchy, which focus on different aspects of the concept. We must ask whether the subordination of women is universal: Is patriarchy universal? This section will discuss the universality of patriarchy and the achievability of introducing a one size fit all definition of the concept.

The principles of patriarchy, according to Kate Millet, are twofold, “Men dominates female and elder dominates young” (Millet, 1977:36). But is this all there is to it? Is patriarchy simply male and senior privilege? Research indicates the complexity of the concept either related to the subject or to the structure in which the subject is situated.

A definition introduced by Lerner claims that “patriarchy refers to the system historically derived from Greek and Roman law, in which the male head of household had absolute legal and economic power over his dependent female and male family members” (1986: 217). A similar definition offered by Morrissey explains that patriarchy is the relations of governance presided over by a father (2003:24).

Patriarchy is a concept that refers to power and control between an object and subject and subsumes, among others, the relationship between the father and the son; therefore the ruler-subject binary. Additionally, this relationship could be observed between a hegemonic state and a developing country. It can be observed between two women and it can be exercised against a queer individual.

On the other hand, patriarchy is also observed in the relations between a brother and a sister that is based on the construction of selfhood (Joseph, 1994), as one defines their self-based relationship with others. This construction of selfhood is based on a certain type of love that enables people to define their masculinity and/or femininity based on their connection to one another (ibid). Girls are restricted and their behavior is nurtured, by their male kin, in order to ensure that men would not have to interfere in the name of preserving family honor. Since, at times and under certain circumstances, love is exercised and expressed in the form of control, women learn that male dominance is in fact a part of the nurturing felt in the nuclear family and equate control and dominance with love and intimacy.

Although there is an element of governance in the relations between brothers and sisters, patriarchy is observed through the efforts made by defining oneself through the action of another. For this matter, patriarchy has an existential element in which one person's existence is reduced to an artifact that defines another subject's existence which is often reflected within the power dynamics between a brother and a sister. Indeed patriarchy is observed through interpersonal relations, and also it is justifiable to assume that there is an aim to govern another but there are also other aims in which patriarchal relations are constructed and maintained and the construction of selfhood could be accounted for one of them.

In addition to this, Morrissey suggests that the father is a key oppressor in patriarchy. Scholars such as Ferguson have also identified patriarchy as the rule of the father (Ferguson, 1999: 1048). This is debatable. To start with, patriarchy could be observed in the relations between a mother in law and a bride (Kandiyoti, 1988) or a white woman from the west and a non-white woman from a developing country (Williams, 2000). Although the rule of father is commonly observed, it is not a precondition for patriarchal relations.

According to Steven Goldberg, patriarchy is any system of organization (political, economic, financial, religious or social) in which the overwhelming number of upper positions in hierarchies is occupied by males (Goldberg, 1979). The female politicians are, usually, a lower proportion than males.

It is common to observe that the citizens of the industrialized world politicians are often male and men hold most of the senior positions of companies. However, we should ask which one is the independent variable and which one is the dependent variable? Which comes first, the society being patriarchal or politicians being male? I argue that the society is patriarchal because the politicians are male and

therefore, the state is patriarchal. The metaphorical reproduction of oppression results in different subjects being oppressed in similar manners by different agents who enact power in the same manner. As will be discussed in the case of Turkey, and I will demonstrate that oppression is reinforced and manifested in patterns. These patterns, as explored in the chapter on the male political subject, indicates a ruler subject binary that reproduces itself across different layers of the society. These patterns define subjects more than their biological or sexual identity.

For this reason, as I will argue, the male political subject is feminine and the citizenry, which is represented by the male political subject, define their own oppression by enacting the oppression of women in the so-called private sphere.

I would argue that patriarchy could not be defined with the overwhelming male population in upper positions because that is a natural result of patriarchy and by itself it cannot define the concept. Patriarchy is produced within the construction of gender (Butler, 1990: 5) and affects the construction of selfhood (Charrad, 2001). This selfhood affects all spheres of the society and results in male supremacy. Therefore, the male-female dynamic of the household reflects the core-periphery relationships in the so-called public sphere. This selfhood leads to relational selves and this contributes to fluid boundaries between the public and the private spheres (Joseph, 1997).

These fluid boundaries are observed in interpersonal relations as well as citizens' encounters with the state. As patriarchy constructs the selfhood of a subject it also determines the boundaries between the self and the other and public and private (Joseph, 1997).

As argued by Walby, patriarchy is a system of social structures and practices, in which men dominate, oppress and exploit women (1990: 24). However, the multiple structures in which this oppression takes places are explored to a limited extent.

Another description, depicted from a Marxist perspective, also aims at theorizing women's oppression, which implies there is a "sex class system" amongst men and women. This description refers to social arrangements rather than values and norms that affect the political, economic and social spheres of life. "Patriarchy (can be) defined as social arrangements that privilege males where men as a group dominate women as a group, both structurally and ideologically." (Hunnicut, 2009: 78). This definition is significant for three reasons.

First, it recognizes that patriarchy is a system of social structures. To this extent, it is important to realize that there is a particular pattern observed in patriarchy. For instance it is a system and has a reproductive mechanism. This system subsumes, among others, seniority. As we see in the definition provided by Geetha, "patriarchy is the absolute rule of the father or the eldest member over his family" (Geetha, 2007: 8). Another definition offered by Kandiyoti reinforces this understanding; "patriarchy, defined as a system of social relations privileging male seniors over juniors and women" (Kandiyoti, 2000: 8) Power is, at times, centralized over seniority which comes from age and tradition (this includes the power of the state as a father which is reflected in kinship idioms) not only gender which magnifies engendered hierarchy. Therefore, it is important to recognize that patriarchy aims to define hierarchical relationships. These hierarchical relationships can be observed between the state and the citizen, the teacher and the student, brother and sibling and father and son (Sharabi, 1998: 7).

Second, in Walby's definition women are portrayed as victims of a system. This system involves the state, the capitalist economy as well as commonly shared identities such as race and class. It implies that women have limited agency. This is debatable. To begin with we cannot simply argue that women are victims in patriarchal structures. And one must ask, 'are there no differences amongst women?' As Yuval-Davis argues,

“...not all women are oppressed and/or subjugated in the same way or to the same extent, even within the same society at any specific moment” (Yuval-Davis, 1997:8). Not only are women, at certain times, free from subordination, they have, to an extent, learned how to navigate and negotiate their positions within patriarchy.

According to Kandiyoti’s article “Bargaining with patriarchy” (1988) women learn how to use patriarchy to make room for themselves and secure a privileged position. This is also applicable to other spheres of life within public and private settings. Women use the norms of patriarchal values in order to make room for themselves within the system in public and private spheres. To be more specific, Kandiyoti gives an example of a woman who is subordinated by her husband and her husband’s family. When she gives birth to a son she gains certain privileges. When her son gets married she exercises control over her daughter in law and this enables her to escape her own oppression by becoming an oppressor, which could be avoided if, the citizenry believed in tackling patriarchy. Through this case we see how women can use the system of patriarchal oppression to negotiate a place for themselves and we see how patriarchy reproduces itself through relationships.

Kandiyoti’s concept of bargaining could be interpreted in multiple ways. It could be argued that the concept attracts our attention to female to female violence that stem from patriarchal beliefs and conduct. It could also be argued that women manipulate their position within given circumstances to secure privilege to an extent that the patriarchal order seems tolerable. I believe in both interpretations, and many more, in particular when Lan (2000) argues that, within a given patriarchal order, economic relationships at the macro-economic level are also affected by patriarchal bargains.

Lan (2002) provides an example of middle class women in Taiwan who recruit lower class women as caregivers and domestic workers in order for middle class women can both be a devoted women at home and have access to financial security and be dutiful at home at the same time. From this example, it is clear to see that a form of difference, or class emerge based on having the means to recruit someone for domestic work, for this reason, there is a sex-class system amongst women. More importantly, it is interesting to observe that despite being breadwinners they are still expected to perform domestic duties. Clearly, this is a constraint that is yet to be contested: recruiting lower class women, allows her to be dutiful without burdening the task. For this reason, it could be argued that in economic terms, domestic work could be abolished for those who are secure enough and yet that is their bargaining potential. In the macro level, women with greater means can avoid the challenges that lower class women face on a daily basis by employing economically underprivileged women.

The mother, as exemplified by Kandiyoti, is not simply subordinated as she acquires the status of an oppressor. Kandiyoti leads us to question the women's role in patriarchal structures. Also Kandiyoti leads us to question the origins of patriarchy. Can the origin be biology if patriarchy is constructed amongst two women who are identified by their relationship to the same man? It could be argued that both the bride and the mother-in-law define themselves within a relationship to the male political subject and they contest and compete with one another, dependent on their relevant status. To this extent, two women compete with each other in accordance to rank, within classical patriarchy. We must ask, are women simply oppressed or are they perpetrators of patriarchy? I argue that women learn to exist within oppressive practices and they accommodate a certain status within it. According to Lerner, the system of patriarchy can only function with the cooperation of women (Lerner, 1986).

The third reason I interrogate this understanding introduced by Walby, is that this definition totally ignored the subordination of men by other men. Men, heterosexual and homosexual, are often marginalized and not all benefit from their masculine identity. In this research, I argue that men are dominated in the same manner women are dominated. At times, and under certain circumstances, men are indeed, feminine, with their political and social identity.

According to Eisenstein, patriarchy consists of a sexual hierarchy, which is manifested in the women's role as mothers, domestic laborers and consumers within the family (Eisenstein, 1979). It is important to notice that patriarchy is autonomous from and interdependent to, other forms of oppression and this is mainly due to the gendered nature of hierarchy. Patriarchy is a matter of, among others (and dependent on context), gendered subordination. In this regard, it is important to consider other scholars' views on gendered hierarchy such as Hunnicutt; "a theory of patriarchy would retain gender as a central organizing feature". In this context it should be noticed that men are subordinated and marginalized due to their masculinity and women are subordinated due to their femininity (Hunnicutt, 2009: 554), which ultimately links with race, ethnicity and class.

Mitchell introduces an alternative description that emphasizes a system of engendered domination, "patriarchy is defined to mean a sexual system of power in which the male role is superior in possession of power and economic privilege" (Mitchell, 1974:414). This sexual system of power not only operates between men and women but also within the categories of men and women. In other words, the oppression that non-white women are subjected to in the U.S, is a product of a gendered system, which interacts with race and class. This system leads white women to obtain certain privileges over others that allow them to exploit women of color.

White women are empowered by capitalism but also gender divisions (within women) that contribute to capitalism. Gender is the central principle of patriarchal oppression even if oppression takes place between two women (Nash, 2008: 10). Another element of Eisenstein's definition is the identification of family as an important patriarchal site that oppresses women. This implies a white middle class experience. In other words, for women of color, the family is barely an oppressive unit of socialization but rather, it is a sphere in which strategies against racism are taught (Holvino, 2010: 54). To this extent, we can argue that Eisenstein is a liberal feminist, despite her emphasis on class, due to her white-middle class concerns over the subordination of women. Indeed she generalized women's experiences looking at a particularity and assuming it conflated all contexts. Despite her class-consciousness, she represents a privileged group of scholars who was born into wealth and defines subordination within particular circumstance.

Alternatively, according to Joseph, patriarchy is "...the privileging of males and seniors and the mobilization of kinship structures, morality and idioms to legitimate and institutionalize gendered and aged domination" (Joseph, 1993: 23). In this definition we see the significance of kinship in patriarchal structures, which attracts attention to patriarchy within the patriarchal belt. Kandiyoti locates patriarchy, but does not limit it to a specific geographical zone which stretches from Northern Africa across the Middle East to the northern plains of the Indian subcontinent and parts of rural China which is known as the patriarchal belt (Kandiyoti, 1988). This concept can imply that patriarchy is more common or distinct in some ways in the patriarchal belt. However, patriarchy could be observed in the UK (Walby: 1990) and the US (Hunnicut, 2009). For instance, in the UK and US, women are still paid less than men for the same work (Walby, 1990). Also women still assume the primary role of a housewife (or

caregivers) even if they are working full time in the work force. Women's contributions are not paid for and empower men in their work life by providing them a stable home. On the other hand, what is evident in the patriarchal belt perhaps is the structure that is mobilized by kinship systems. In the Middle East, politicians often refer to themselves as fathers of the nation (Sharabi, 1988: 7). Their kin monitors women's behavior closely. Kinship structures are a distinguishing feature between patriarchy in the East and the West.

On the other hand, the description Joseph provides does not account for the importance of "virtue". In the context of the Middle East and North Africa patriarchal practices are centralized around controlling, maintaining and monitoring a women's virtue, which is known as a woman's sexual purity (Moghadam, 2004). According to Moghadam women are subject to control but nowhere does she imply that patriarchy subordinates the citizen to the state or that there is a hierarchical structure.

As stated by Kandiyoti "...in classic patriarchy, the senior man has authority over everyone else in the family including younger men and women are subject to distinct forms of control and domination" (1998: 22). In this description we do not observe the significance of a women's virtue for patriarchal control, which is endemic in the Middle East. These distinct forms of control are observed with regards to women's sexual purity and at times, her virginity. Thus a definition that aims at explaining patriarchy in the Middle East and North Africa should make reference to the significance of virtue as a vector of inequality to be more context-specific.

Patriarchy is not only observed in the private sphere, the family or interpersonal relationships. It can also be observed in macro structures such as the state-society relationships that are evident through the analysis of the ruler-subject binary and the society through ideological constructs such as nationalism and citizenship. Patriarchy

is descriptive of state-society relations. According to Morrissey, patriarchy consists of “...the structures of power in a society between the tsar and his servitors, the lord and his serfs, the husband and his wife, the master and his apprentice, the officer and his soldiers and so forth.” (Morrissey, 2003: 24). Power distribution takes place in binary mechanisms and it subordinates the other. This is probably the most significant definition of patriarchy that built the foundation of my research. Morrissey has demonstrated that patriarchy is not an issue that is limited to the male female binary but rather all ruler-subject binaries that conflate and collide. To this extent, Morrissey deserves recognition for the research on patriarchy and relevant power dynamics that define a system of oppression.

Morrissey has researched patriarchal structures in Russia and concluded that the society in general was vertical. Another scholar who recognizes vertical relations as a key element of patriarchal power structures, whilst analyzing the Middle East, is Sharabi: “Between ruler and ruled, between father and child there exist only vertical relations, in both settings the paternal will is the absolute will” (Sharabi, 1988:7). This separates Middle Eastern scholars from liberal scholars such as Pateman who claims that after the French Revolution, within the western context, men are not subordinate to the state and there are only vertical relations between men and women (Pateman, 1988:7). However, the relations between the state and the citizen are now diminished, as argued by Pateman. In non-western contexts, we might argue that the French revolution never took place at all. To this extent, vertical relations might activate, beyond and above its evidence in western contexts.

Is the western context applicable to non-western contexts? I argue that not all societies evolved in the aftermath of the French revolution. Indeed, one must ask

whether the vertical relations in the society, between the state and the citizen, are related to the power asymmetry between men and women in society.

In this regard, Ismael and Ismael provides a relevant description of patriarchy, within the context of the Middle East, “modern patriarchy may be defined as a system of male privilege in the social order that functions as a recompense to men for their disempowerment vis-a-vis the state” (Ismael and Ismael, 2000: 38). There is a distinction between state violence against woman and a man’s violence against women. This definition does not build the foundation of this research, yet, it is a research finding that understands that patriarchy of one subject produces the patriarchy of another subject. To this extent, Ismael and Ismael have produced knowledge on patriarchy that recognizes the importance of compensation and helplessness that will be further elaborated in later sections of this research.

At times and under certain circumstances, the state proactively oppresses women for the sake of the nation, such as in cases of which women represent cultural authenticity (Yuval-Davis, 1997: 96). For instance in 2005, the Turkish Prime Minister intended to criminalize adultery. The timing was very convenient. It was on the eve of EU accession negotiations. The law would ultimately limit women’s behavior and men would be exempt from it, since most women lacked the will to even file for a divorce in cases of adultery. The aim to restrict women’s behavior on the eve of negotiations symbolized how women were seen as markers of cultural authenticity, in this case, Turkishness and Turkish identity, was seen essential to nation building efforts and matters of authenticity.

Another description that should be considered for the purpose of this research, is introduced by Sharabi “patriarchy as a socio- economic category refers to traditional, premodern society” (Sharabi, 1988:16). This definition is significant for two reasons.

First it emphasizes that patriarchy is observed in social, political and economic spheres. Also it analyses the patriarchal domination, requiring an understanding that applies the intersection of social class and gender. Second, Sharabi argues that patriarchy refers to traditional and pre-modern society. However, Marxist feminist discourses argue that patriarchy is ahistorical (Eisenstein, 1979), suggesting that the order was present before and after a patriarchal order was established. This implies that patriarchy was prevalent in pre-capitalist societies and it is still observed in post-capitalist societies. Therefore patriarchy could not be restrained to any time period or geographical area or polity; it is highly possible that it is timeless.

As nuanced concepts are needed to capture extreme detail and particularity as discussed below, it is important to emphasize why the case of Turkey and the examination of violence is significant for scholars of gender studies, political sociology and patriarchal theory. First, this research compares the logic, practice, justification and prosecution of male to female violence and searches for similar practices in state to citizen violence. Often feminists (Kandiyoti: 1990, Walby: 1990) would argue that the state is a masculine actor; however that is too broad and already well established. The validity of the statement is still well established however the supremacy of the state and its masculine character should be well analyzed. By comparing two subjects and their methods, practices, processes and procedures we can clearly discern three tendencies amongst the decision making processes of privileged actors. As I asked, what defines privilege, I responded by stating that, at times, helplessness is argued to be a privilege amongst the male political subject and the state. This is a pattern worthy of recognition and three common features I found from this comparison demonstrate that oppression in no way is random or circumstantial. Second, the case of Turkey demonstrates that, regardless of our gender assignments by birth, we can all be feminine or masculine,

dependent on the enactment of power dynamics in the society and what defines the masculine and feminine binary is indeed socially constructed. To this extent, this research contests an understanding of gender that situates biology and other constraints assigned by birth.

We must broaden our definition of patriarchy and search for alternative approaches that build on present scholarship and aims to capture what has been neglected. This definition should depict the privilege of males, vertical and horizontal relations in society, gendered domination and a system of power relations. To this extent, limiting the definition to the scope of the Middle East, I argue that **Compound Patriarchy** is a *social structure of multilayered oppression, in which more than one oppression operates at the same time, created by horizontal and vertical relations in the society, causing and resulting from gendered, racial, ethnic and international hierarchy to control, among others, men and women and through a system of metaphorical reproduction of oppression and at times, the ruler-subject binary.*

This definition is significant because it claims that patriarchy is triggered by another form of patriarchy. This understanding, which differentiates the compound form of patriarchy with the one-dimensional form of patriarchy, will allow the researcher to discern the origin of patriarchy. For this reason, it is important to notice that patriarchy is a multilayered construct and that separates patriarchies' which operate together. For example, male supremacy over female subjects will operate at the same time state's supremacy over civilian subjects will operate. Patriarchy can be the independent variable and the intervening variable at the same time, making it the means and ends of oppression. The oppression faced by western actors in terms of patriarchal oppression is independent from the subordination of women. However, these two independent forms of oppression reinforce each other and form a compound structure.

This definition also reinforces an understanding based on relationships. For instance horizontal and vertical relations create patriarchy in different ways. The emphasis on horizontal relations is less common in the Middle Eastern literature since most relations are vertical and horizontal patriarchy, within present scholarship, has often being excluded.

Finally, it is important to notice the significance of virtue (or honour). Since patriarchal oppression is gendered oppression, then, understanding Middle Eastern patriarchy could not be without understanding virtue or honor. The analysis of honor leads to an understanding of patriarchal connectivity and existential patriarchy in which one subjects entire existence is limited to being the reflection of someone else's vision.

I argue that women in the Middle East are mostly oppressed by their male kin, partners and the state, due to the concept, which defines difference in a particular way that often differentiates them from their western counterparts. Since the female subject in the Middle East is expected to live according to what is deemed honorable, by their peers and kin, their behavior is sanctioned accordingly. Therefore a definition of patriarchy, within the context of the Middle East is expected to discern power dynamics that attract attention to the significance of honor.

Patriarchy and Its Universality

As discussed above, patriarchy is a system of domination. But is this system autonomous or is it related to other systems such as capitalism and militarism? Indeed there is a certain level of interaction between patriarchy and other systems of oppression. In fact, patriarchy changes its form as it interacts with race, class and nationality. However, there are certain types of oppression that could not be explained by class and race.

Gender and gendered oppression in this regard remain prominent as a divisive force in society. The gendered nature of male and female starts to shape human experiences at a young age far before an understanding of a particular economic class could emerge in a subject's intellect. For this reason, patriarchy is autonomous because the interpretation of female nature as distinct from male (and therefore the dominant norm) might create an impact on a girl's consciousness and self esteem. That would be the first effects of patriarchy.

Therefore, patriarchy is an independent system, which influences the consciousness of women prior to race and class. For this reason, patriarchy should be seen within a gender binary that is independent than other forms of oppression. As mentioned earlier, patriarchy interacts with other forces of oppression but without those forces patriarchy would not be evident.

We must ask, are white middle class women raised with a feminist consciousness? I would argue that not all of them are. To this extent, the difference of awareness towards gender discrimination amongst white women could be seen as evidence of an autonomous patriarchy that exists apart from race, class and nationality.

Last, but not least, we should ask the inevitable question: Is patriarchy universal? According to scholars such as Connell (1995) and Goldberg (1979), the subordination of women is a global phenomenon. However, the views of some scholars are more different and more complex. If we look at the lower income women generate (in comparison to men) and the lower proportion they have in political representation, then we can claim that the subordination of women is universal. It is possible to argue that women are subordinated throughout the globe simply because they are women but then we must consider a few things; first, who is the subject of oppression and who is the object of oppression. Then we must look at the subject and question, whether it is

masculine and feminine or perhaps even both. Then we should question, whether as an oppressed subject, they are oppressors of anyone (i.e. junior men, women of color). Then we must consider their social class, nationality, ethnicity, race and sexual orientation. This will lead to an analysis of patriarchy not just the subordination of women.

Patriarchy is a system of dominance and subordination but we can argue that patriarchy is not universal since there is no universal woman and therefore the patriarchy that is experienced is not universal. Second, the choice of the researcher also defines how patriarchy is understood. If a scholar defines patriarchy as a oppressive practice taking place between male and female subjects, then discussions on the universality might concur as a widespread existence. However, if the scholar defines patriarchy as a socio-political system that affects the unequal relationships between politically, socially and economically privileged men, including leaders of countries of different wealth, then the universality of patriarchy should be contested. In this research, I follow Sharabi (1988) who states that the difference between the Middle East and so-called West is the difference between vertical and horizontal structures that construct political, social and economic reality. For this reason, I disagree that patriarchy is universal since different macro structures interact with micro structures on a unique, case by case basis.

Furthermore, as Butler reminds us, “the notion of a universal patriarchy has been widely criticized in recent years for its failure to account for the workings of gender oppression in the concrete cultural contexts in which it exists” (Butler, 1990:5). This needs further elaboration. For example, understanding structural reproduction of oppression and patriarchy requires understandings of vertical patriarchy in some collectivities and horizontal patriarchy in other collectivities.

To this extent, it becomes clear, that there are a variety of different patriarchies in which subjects co-exist and for that reason, patriarchy is unique in manifestation but somewhat widespread in essence. For this reason, we must summarize it succinctly, the subjugation of a subject, the subjecthood and oppression that are internalized are exclusive to each male/female subject however, the essence of the sentiment, emotion, positioning that defines exploitation, disposal and dismissal remains a familiar phenomenon across borders.

In this research I strongly argue that subordination and the feelings and related existences associated with it, is universal; however, circumstance and context is exclusive to the subject. Within the context of Turkey and in this research we must acknowledge that patriarchy being approached as a system with a distinctive reproductive mechanism could easily be applied to other non-western contexts. To this extent, we might be able to argue that patriarchy is universal since each collectivity has a reproductive mechanism. However, the particularities of these mechanisms would defer in accordance to levels of analysis. For this reason, whilst analyzing patriarchy in western contexts, we must utilize frameworks that draw attention to the problems associated with horizontal patriarchy. However, both whether vertical and horizontal, each patriarchal system would have a reproductive mechanism. As a result of this, this thesis is universally applicable for its approach to tackling patriarchy within a given reproductive system; indeed, as argued above, each reproductive mechanism has its own particular differences that hinders our efforts to universalize our findings on patriarchy.

Therefore, even if we assume that the subordination of women is universal (and to an extent and under certain circumstances, it is) since patriarchy is a compound form of oppression and subordination, we cannot claim that patriarchy is universal. I argue

that there is no universal, single, one size fits all, patriarchy or definition of patriarchy but rather there are multiple patriarchies that operate within different contexts and circumstances.

Concepts and Approaches To Patriarchy

Patriarchy is a broad and overly encompassing concept which, at times and under certain circumstances, neglects the instantaneous and nuanced particularities that describes the process and procedures, if not the mechanisms that operate within patriarchal oppression.

For this reason, a concept that is truly original is in need of introduction to understand how disposable human needs are, whilst opposition of the needs of others takes place on a regular basis. The concept that attracts attention to the disposability of needs and, for that reason, subjects, is not intended to follow the research of my peers and seniors in patriarchal theory, but rather requires recognition for its ability to approach patriarchal oppression and privilege by comparing loss and compensation amongst opposing, if not competing, subjects and for this matter male and female.

The needs of human beings are studied amongst many social scientists as they take alternating approaches. It could be argued, without doubt, that the relativity of needs that is (overly) compensated through violating others' needs is a methodological perspective on how to approach patriarchy. This gives patriarchy a relative understanding. This relativity is indeed introduced to mark the boundaries of the privileged and underprivileged.

Nevertheless, this approach is very controversial. To begin with, who decides what an urgent need is and what is not? I believe that this is the basis of **patriarchal relativity** in which, to a large extent, a man's needs are always seen as taking priority

over a woman's need, regardless of the merits of the needs themselves. It implies a hierarchy and a certain assigned value on needs in which urgency of meeting them and possible compensations for sustaining those needs are represented through privilege amongst entities which compete for power and co-existence.

Patriarchal relativity is a concept that draws attention to expense, disposal and compensation, more than anything else. Efforts to address and situate this sentiment by research that is inspired by similar research, has proven to be fruitless. For this reason, the need to introduce a concept that connects patriarchy, privilege and compensation, within a framework, is indeed necessary. This concept is a true contribution to knowledge since patriarchy has never been seen within a cost benefit analysis. In other words, compensation and rewards within patriarchal frameworks still remains an issue to be explored within the current literature.

If there is an understanding towards appreciating needs within a given hierarchy then we can appreciate how patriarchal oppression stems from a subject's, at times, self-inflicting need as they assign value to a need that had to be sustained in the expense of another subjects' more prevalent needs.

Urgency, nevertheless, has proven to be a matter of subjectivity at certain times. It is safe to assume that physical needs are more urgent; however assigning value to emotional and social needs is more complex and difficult to detect. The assignment of value to our most prevalent social needs that has to be met by both agents, the ruler and the subject, signifies privilege, hierarchy and subordination.

As will be discussed in further sections, patriarchy can be vertical as well as horizontal. Asymmetry of power is considered essential in understanding both horizontal and patriarchal power. Horizontal patriarchy, produced in conditions of equality, is also observed whilst constructing the subjectivity of a subject that, at times,

is imposed, if not structured, amongst other subjects. For this reason, patriarchy is not only a concept that situates people whose needs are sacrificed for the sake of an oppressor's needs that had to be overcompensated, but rather a position of being dictated, situated against one's will as one of the many defining elements amongst all concepts that refer to patriarchal oppression. It situates helplessness of a subject in accordance to circumstance and for this reason; patriarchal relativity is needed to understand both vertical and horizontal forms of patriarchal oppression.

The inequality we observe within legal conditions of equality (as being the same) stems from differences in power-within. Therefore, the patriarchy is rationalized and naturalized yet social structures, metaphors and norms that shape the society have constructed their own winners and losers. This type of patriarchy should be seen as **Horizontal Patriarchy**, it is inequality within equality. At times, it is observed between a husband and wife whereby a woman would give up her own career for the sake of supporting her husband's career, which is often chosen in the name of love. Yet it is that love that disempowers her position in the society by reducing her to be the ambassador's or professors' wife, in a supporting role as she settles for being second best.

Although Sharabi (1988) has elaborated on horizontal and vertical structures within the society whilst analyzing neopatriarchy and industrialized societies, he did not apply this understanding towards different types of oppression that have been endemic in industrialized and rural societies, both within and between contexts. For this reason, this concept is a contribution to knowledge, which has not been borrowed but rather applied, from fellow researchers or scholars in the field such as Sharabi.

A personal example I would like to give is my own mother who is married to a professor with a nationwide reputation for either being the 'father of internet' or simply;

‘the man who introduced the internet to Turkey’. She once told me ‘marriage gives you status’. What she meant was marrying a man with status would give a woman status. For some reason, I always thought earning a PhD and benefitting from the character-building experience of it would give me status. It was clear that her life was shaped around her husband’s career and she earned the title of being his wife. This is indeed, evidence of horizontal patriarchy as no one told her to define herself in accordance to her husband but rather it was her choice to be the proxy of a stronger entity. I argue this is evidence of a patriarchal system, if not public patriarchy (Walby: 1990) that suggests a women’s role is to support a successful male relative .

This was never imposed on her, although she was encouraged to see her marriage that way and my father as the primary breadwinner. Her self-appointed status of being the wife behind the successful man was evidence of horizontal patriarchy. In reality they were equal and had equal access to family resources yet, she has chosen to renounce her independent status in the society by preferring to live in the shadows of others because it would never be able to substitute what could be gained through being married to a privileged, upper-middle class man. This self-imposed inferiority stems from her understanding of what the patriarchal culture presented to her as a form of co-existence. It was related to her subject formation that was shaped by culture and structure respectively. For this reason, her oppression was horizontal because it was partially existential.

Radical Feminism

Radical feminists were the first group to use the term patriarchy to designate the means through which women are oppressed (Whelehan, 1995: 85). According to the radical feminist view patriarchy is universal, ahistorical and cross-cultural and it

signifies that all women are oppressed. Men are the enemy and women's subordination is inevitable (ibid). These arguments are problematic.

To start with, the radical feminist view has either limited the understanding of patriarchy to the oppression of women by men (which is widespread across cultures) or neglected the complex ways women could be subordinated. Initial arguments state that the subject of radical feminist discourses should be questioned. For instance, if the subject is the western woman representing the so-called universal women then it should be questioned. Also, is there a universal patriarchy?

According to the radical view, the oppressive male – female role system is the first and original model of oppression. Radical feminists also held that marriage is the primary formalization of the persecution of women and primary site of patriarchal oppression. The rejection of the family is pioneered by radical feminists (Donovan, 2000: 89). For instance, what evidence does the radical feminist discourse provide us to believe that women's oppression is the first form of oppression? Second, is family an oppressive site for all women? For example, being outside of the domestic sphere and gaining paid work instead of being a housewife has not been the priority of non-white women since they, at times and under circumstances, did not have the option of being a housewife due to poverty and other circumstances (Holvino, 2010).

According to Bryson, it is not appropriate to treat patriarchy as a system in the same sense as the capitalist market economy, for patriarchy does not have an internal dynamic that is equivalent to the capitalist pursuit of profit: even the most well intentioned capitalist must exploit workers or go out of business, but men's relationship with women does not have to be exploitative (Bryson, 2003: 169) It is a system because it is resistant to change and it has taken root. It is a system because it is consistent, men dominate women and some other men, the west dominates the third world, and the

citizen dominates the immigrant. Anyone can be oppressed and anyone can be the oppressor. Patriarchy is a system of domination that operates a multilayered modality. Indeed it is different from capitalism but the dynamics of oppression are evident in patriarchal structures. But most relevant to this research is that patriarchy has a metaphorical reproductive system that operates at multiple levels.

According to Millet's definition that was discussed above, male oppression operates over multiple subjects. However, the subjects of oppression can be male or female. This definition does not recognize how women are oppressed by other women, nor does it claim that some men are oppressed. According to Millet patriarchy refers to a social system characterized by male domination over women (Millet, 1977). She explains male domination by the majority of men in primary social institutions.

She stated that, in the 1970s, "the fact is evident at once if one recalls that the military, industry, technology, university, science, political offices, finances – in short every avenue of power within the society, including the coercive force of the police is entirely in male hands" (Millet, 1977: 30). Although this has changes since the 1970s, male dominance in government offices has remained the same. In this context female subordination is evident from women's exclusion from primary institutions of governance, construction of the hegemonic subjectivity as "masculinist" and women being subject to male authority as citizens. However, it should be noticed that the male political subject, the citizen facing the state, can indeed be feminine.

I argue that women's reproductive role is not the problem. It should not be seen this way. But rather what is important is social structures and political systems that would accommodate them. It is not women who give birth that should be questioned or forced to change but rather labor laws that do not provide enough maternity leave or it is major employers (such as companies with 500 employees) that do not provide day

care facilities for staff with young children that should be accounted for women's disempowerment, which could be observed across multiple contexts on a global scale. This is indeed a structural element to patriarchy in which women are deliberately excluded from what is deemed by patriarchal agents as neutral. This neutrality, nevertheless, has proven to be male oriented. For this reason, patriarchal oppression manifests itself through mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion, on matters that are urgent to the female subject and in contrast, if not in comparison to her positioning within a given socio-economic structure.

Radical feminism chooses to concentrate exclusively on the oppression of women as women (and not as workers). This aspect concentrates on institutions like love, marriage, sex and constructs such as masculinity and femininity (Kreps, 2010: 49). Concentrating on oppression faced by women as woman is problematic because each woman has a social class, an ethnicity, race and nationality. A woman's sexual/gendered identity is related to her other identities. Her womanhood is not independent from her class and race (Lewis, 2009:209). Also, the institutions that have been focused are not enough, or the scope is too narrow, to see the whole picture and draw the contours of women's oppression.

It should be argued that oppression is exclusive to the subject. For this matter, as will be discussed whilst elaborating intersectional methodologies applied to the Turkish context. There are multiple modalities that define difference and therefore, grounds for inequality. To this extent, radical feminists are demonstrating a shortcoming in feminist thinking, assuming women's oppression could be generalized across all women and therefore, it could be tackled together. However, women's oppression can also subordinate men.

If I assume that radical feminism is precisely insightful for stating that all oppression stems from male supremacy, as a result, I will build the intellectual grounds of how the male political subject is feminine. Indeed, in my theoretical and empirical research, I demonstrated that the subordination of women by men in the private domain (through an analysis of domestic violence) was somehow a correlating, if not leading, factor in the reproduction of oppressive practices, especially with regards to the oppression faced by the male political subject. For this reason, this, at times, has similarities with radical feminist understandings on matters that suggest that the oppression women face, at times and under certain circumstances, might reinforce the oppression faced by other subjects dependent on context. However, as discussed below, this research builds on the arguments concerning Middle Eastern scholars.

My personal positioning towards women's subordination conflates with the main arguments introduced by radical feminists in terms of its emphasis on understanding oppression against women because they are women. As a firm believer of particularity, I find myself drawn to scholars of Middle Eastern studies since their approach captures particularity and nuance, amongst and within, a given geography.

Black Feminist Thought

Patriarchal oppression for black women consists of a strong and comprehensive model for understanding oppression at multiple levels. For example, they face oppression from white women since the latter imposes the findings of their own research, thus, creating a tension between two groups of women. Additionally, the male political subject, within an African (diaspora) context, is often in combat and/or competition with white male subjects and this adds a different dimension to the subjugation of black feminist women and scholars who attempt to explain their tension.

To this extent, black feminist scholars had to confront the situation that led black men to oppress black women due to their own oppression by white men.

The relevance of Black Feminist Thought to the research on the male political subject is due to the multilayered and compound structures of oppression on both female subjects. The oppression of both black female and Turkish female correlates with the oppression that black men have faced. In other words, if men were free, to an extent and under certain circumstances, they would have made an influential impact on the social reality of women. For this reason, women in Turkey and African women in the US are, to an extent, in the same circumstance with each other. In both cases women were oppressed due to the subjugation of the male political subject. Two types of patriarchy, in both cases, have produced a compound form of patriarchy, indeed, as they refer to a certain similarity.

This similarity leads to a unique understanding of the marginalization of subjects in accordance with the difference of characteristics of their unique circumstance that shape their inequality. These elements of difference lead to the analysis of the “multiplier” effect.

Hence, intersectionality needs to be understood whilst analyzing oppression that is exclusive to the subject. According to Nash, intersectionality is “...the notion that subjectivity is constituted by mutually reinforcing vectors of race, gender, class and sexuality” (2008). This is highly problematic in the non-western context. To begin with, there is a strong probability that race and class are divisive characteristics in western subjects; however, they are limited in their ability to offer an understanding of difference in the non-western world.

The intersecting vectors that reinforce the magnifying effect has to be depicted with utmost delicacy, to ensure that marginalization in the Middle East, including the

application of an intersectional analysis that reinforces the study of such situations, captures the complexity of the subjects in non-western contexts, such as Turkey.

Of course, the adoption of intersectional methodologies to non-western and western subjects has certain questions in common that need to be addressed. According to Lewis, a few questions should be considered within intersectionality. The first is: how many vectors are there? In other words, “What are the differences that make a difference?” (Lewis, 2009:207). This is an insightful question in which the lines between the west and the east would be situated, differed and drawn. Could it be class? In the context of the Middle East, class is different than the class concept within a Marxist understanding and involves other dynamics. For this reason, different markers of difference need to be discerned.

In order to provide a poignant example, I would like to describe how I was always treated differently by gynecologists in Turkey who were recommended to me by my own mother. She would say they never treat me badly; why do they treat you like that? At that point, it is clear that being married and single is a difference that makes a difference and marks the boundaries between different vectors of inequality.

Another question to be answered is: which women are analyzed within intersectionality? Is it only marginalized non-white women? Can white middle class women - or even men - be analyzed within intersectionality? I believe everyone can be analyzed within intersectionality. Also, the differences that make a difference would vary according to the subject. I am a female immigrant, for instance, so I am likely to be marginalized. I also have a permanent disability. So this should be taken into account whilst analyzing my subject positionality.

Even a white women's experiences would be evident from intersectional analysis because her understanding of subordination would be evident in the liberal and

radical feminist discourses and would be shared by other white women. Intersectionality does not need to be informative of the marginalized subject, but all gendered subjects, including men. I believe black men's and homosexual men's oppression could be analyzed within intersectionality.

Intersectionality has certain limitations. For instance, it describes the subordination of marginalized women; however, it does not describe how a subject can be oppressed and be an oppressor at the same time. This would often be the case in white middle class women and black women in United States where they can be both an oppressor and an oppressed subject at the same time. This can also be endemic across subjects who are male and oppressed by one agent and an oppressor of another agent. For this reason, we must ask whether the male political subject is included despite all of its oppressive tendencies and oppressed existences, within intersectional modalities. They could be analyzed within an understanding of defining vectors of inequality.

Intersectionality, according to Nash, "...neglects to describe the ways in which privilege and oppression intersect, informing each subject's experiences" (Nash, 2008:10). This is a point that is highly relevant for the male political subject in Turkey, who will be discussed in further sections. Although this research does not address how the intersection of being privileged and underprivileged shapes subjecthood, it attempts to provide data for future researchers to understand how subjugation and oppression intersect.

In the context of Turkey, intersectionality should include vectors of inequality that define the subject within a given context rather than adhering to norms that define subjects in accordance to difference as defined within a western context. In this research, I argue that vectors of inequality might be marital status, sexual activism/availability, piety (as understood by individual themselves) and/or adherence to patriarchal values.

To this extent, I argue that the parameters that define “us and them” within the Turkish context, is highly differentiated within a Middle Eastern context, often different from the vision of scholars who have introduced intersectional methodologies at the first instance. My research on Turkey, and to a limited extent, the Middle East, might exemplify different vectors of inequality often distinguished from other vectors of inequality.

An example of how privilege and oppression intersect can be made in the experiences of black women in United States. They are oppressed by multiple agents and they, in turn, oppress other non-white women such as Latino women or Chinese women and this can be essentializing (Bryson, 1999). The intersection of oppression and privilege creates compound patriarchy consisting of layers of other patriarchal formations. This aspect of patriarchal oppression is excluded from debates on intersectionality and patriarchy. Patriarchy is at times a compound structure, which holds the intersection of various modalities. Intersectionality fails to discern this compound structure in which one patriarchal relationship elevates or creates other patriarchal forms of oppression.

Middle Eastern Perspective

Prior to a discussion on patriarchy in the Middle East, an attempt to define the region is needed. According to which criteria should a region be defined? According to Davison (1960:665) the region is defined by a common history and he states that the countries that consist of the region are “Turkey, Iran, Israel, Egypt and the Arab States of Asia”. This is highly debatable.

What if the Middle East was defined by common problematics? For example, what if women’s rights and common attributes towards the problem, defined the Middle

East? What if difficulties in adapting democracy and human rights were a common feature amongst certain countries in the world, which somehow had certain similarities that were endemic across certain countries; would that be sufficient to define a region? Based on merit, characteristics, issues, and compatibilities and positioning towards certain concepts and issues, can a region be defined accordingly? In my opinion, if countries struggle with similar problems, then at times, and under certain circumstances, they might share a certain sense of belongingness. For this reason, I argue, in this research, belongingness should be defined by a certain struggle or confrontational situation that countries strive to resolve similar problems might belong to a similar category, distinction or group.

Indeed there can be no homogenous understanding of the culture of the Middle East. However, certain tendencies within the political culture, as Sharabi discerns, can be considered as a matter of Middle Eastern belonging. For instance, whilst analyzing neopatriarchy, Sharabi identifies a level of modernity that is exclusive to the Middle East (Sharabi, 1988). In fact, neopatriarchy as he suggests, is a Middle Eastern phenomenon. Therefore, although generalizations must be avoided, once analyzed scholarly tendencies in political culture might be observed if similarities within power dynamics were detected.

According to Joseph and Slyomovics (2001:5), “women and juniors must be embedded in familial relationships to make most effective use of institutions in these spheres and are therefore subject to patriarchal norms and relationships even in public spaces”. For those subjects in the Middle East, the influence of kin is so prominent that it affects which party they vote for , which employer they work for and for how long. Therefore, the context of Middle Eastern patriarchy should be elaborated with regard to the importance of family relations and kin structures.

In the words of Ahmed, “the peculiar practices of Islam with respect to women had always formed part of the western narrative of the quintessential otherness and inferiority of Islam” (1992: 149). This argument accurately demonstrates that women were used as a means to measure the East and situate the East in the periphery of the West. Therefore, Middle Eastern women have been subject to patriarchal oppression by the women and men, government and citizens of the West through intellectual constructs and praxis.

In Turkey, I argue, women are subject to multilayered patriarchal oppression for three reasons. First, as we will see later, women are subject to oppression due to the sexist men and women in their region, both male political subjects and the state, at the exact same time. Second, often it is observed that at times, women are subject to patriarchal oppression because Turkey (as part of the Middle East) is perceived as backward (by the West) and women are seen as victims of oppression (Keddie, 2007:10). This influences the subjugation of the male political subject, which leads to the overcompensation of his damage, as he oppresses women of his own region. By perceiving her as a victim she becomes victimized is constructed the this perception..

Another case in which women are oppressed by their peers, in the context of the Middle East, is with regards to virginity and honor. In the Middle East women are subject to control and monitoring by their peers in the name of family honor. In the case of Turkey, families often send their daughters for virginity examinations (Parla, 2001). The state, which reflects the masculine view, often reinforces this behavior and encourages parents to practice this form of control. This can be reinforced by school teachers, nurses and members of the judiciary dependent on their own initiative and their own perceptions of misbehaving girls.

When the Turkish Minister of Women and Family Affairs was told that women were committing suicides whilst protesting this practice in 1997, she stated that “one or two girls don’t matter. What matters is our girls are raised in good upbringing.” (Parla, 2001: 45). She stated that we (Turkey) did not need to Westernize in all aspects and that everyone admires Turkish cultures and values. In this case, we see how Turkish women were controlled in the name of family honor and by being made representatives of the authentic Turkish culture. It was not only her kin (i.e fathers, brothers) but also the state which subordinated them and made the female subject a recipient of distinct forms of control.

Another case in which women are oppressed by their peers is evident from Joseph’s concept of patriarchal connectivity. According to the author, patriarchy is produced through relational selves. In connectivity what is meant is that relationships in which a person’s boundaries are relatively fluid, so that a given person feels a part of their significant others (Joseph,1993: 467). According to this understanding, men controlled women because they saw women as an extension of themselves, in the past and present.

For instance, the school girls’ sexuality and day-to-day conduct was internalized in a way that reflected upon the Turkish men’s masculinity. This construction of masculinity was defined by the school girls’ honor. Men and women socialized to see themselves in relation to others, which lead women to associate control with feelings of love and intimacy. A women’s honor was therefore a part of a man’s masculinity and as a result women were subject to distinct forms of control. In the Middle East, relational selves enable the control to be exercised. This leads women to internalize this control and feel safe because of it.

It could be argued that Joseph's concept of patriarchal connectivity is somewhat endorsing a concept of patriarchal relativity. As subjects identify themselves with other subjects' behaviors they are also suggesting that their needs are more significant than others' needs. For this reason, subjects (male or female) identify with others' needs but they also make them choose between their own needs and other people's needs that could be classified as detrimental and urgent needs and needs that have secondary urgency.

Patriarchal relativity is not an imitation of patriarchal connectivity but rather it is a correlational concept. Patriarchal relativity attracts attention to the expense or disposal of one's needs whereas patriarchal connectivity suggests how they reinforce one another and help the subject to define himself via other people's behavior. For this reason, my claim of patriarchal relativity should be seen in relationship with patriarchal connectivity.

In the context of the Middle East, it is important to notice the significance of virtue or honor. This might imply an understanding of difference in relation to virginity and sexual activism, marital status, education, social class and many others.

The patriarchal connectivity observed in Middle Eastern cultures is mostly evident in sexual conduct. A women's chastity before marriage and fidelity afterwards, "were a direct reflection of her male relatives honor". (Martinez and Beitler, 2010:60). This implies patriarchal relativity. A man's sense of honor is more prominent than a women's sense of sexual experimentation and freedom. For this reason with reference to certain interpretations and circumstances, imply that his need for virtue is more prominent and significant then her quest for experimentation, freedom and power within.

According to Martinez and Beitler, a woman have the ability to threaten the social order through her sexuality (ibid). For instance, “Turkish women could be blamed for bringing trouble on themselves because they were available or in the wrong place at the wrong time, in contemporary Turkey” (White, 2005: 126). A woman who brought trouble on herself (by being so-called promiscuous) is existing within a patriarchal understanding. For this reason, Islamic understandings have to be confronted by feminist scholars who have questioned the needs of one subject over the needs of another. In this research, I argue, that the needs of one subject, the male political subject in comparison to the female subject within the household, are often deemed expendable.

According to White, in Turkish society it is believed that it is up to the society to keep people’s behavior straight (in accordance to patriarchal understandings) because two unmarried people cannot be trusted. It was assumed that “something wrong would have happened” (White: 2005). Since sexuality is a matter of fear and frustration, control must be exercised. Since it is harder to contain men, often a woman is controlled because “she is a threat to the feeling of security of the man” (Salman et al, 1987:9). This also implies a competition of needs between male and female subjects.

In a study on honor killings in Turkey conducted by journalist Ayse Onal, ten interviews were conducted with men who had killed a female family member in the name of honor (Onal, 2008). In the book titled “Honor Killing Stories of Men Who Killed” (ibid), men are portrayed as victims of custom. The man who killed his mother, for instance, killed her because she was committing adultery and she embarrassed her son. Embarrassment at times, could be interpreted as being dishonoured. The sentiment of embarrassment is stronger than her right to be alive since he felt shame and pressure to contain, constrain and punish his mother or female kin. This pressure and the

sentiment expressed by White, with reference to how people could not be trusted, and all women's needs being disposable, represents the sole reason why women's labor force participation and education (within the context of the study which takes place in rural Turkey) is lower than men and their income is so much lower than their male counterparts.

Patriarchal connectivity is rather existential as it assumes that one person solely exists to represent another. This is indeed worthy of argumentation that patriarchal connectivity is therefore a form of exploitation that is often similar to the cases described throughout the empirical chapters of this research.

In the context defined above, patriarchal connectivity and patriarchal relativity operate together. Women, in the (Justice and Development party) AKP era, are deemed to be the representatives of collective identities, often led by men. That representation is not an urgent need, such as food and shelter. Her need of agency is far more prevalent than his need of establishing a collective identity. For this reason, as patriarchal relativity will be discussed in later chapters, it should be understood that mutual agreements, bonds, identities and many plural entities, at times and under certain circumstances, are built on the sacrifices women make of their urgent needs. This signifies patriarchal relativity, which is a concept that is needed to be introduced for reasons relevant to this research.

Honor is practically similar to a right of ownership. Men, at times, have been given infinite access to women's bodies through marriage (in which the bride, at times, might be expected to be a virgin at the time of marriage) and she becomes his territory. Her life after marriage is shaped by his efforts to mark his own territory, through exercising control, distinct from other men. According to Kulczycki and Windle (2011:1448) honor for muslim men rests on socio-economic status within the

community and on the closely policed honor of their female family member. It is clear that Joseph's concept of connectivity successfully addresses the existential exploitation of women as an extension of men and their manhood.

The compound form of patriarchy is evident in how one patriarchy leads to another. For instance, some Muslim women in the United States after the terrorist attack of 9/11 felt empowered to wear the hijab. One woman interviewed by Zahedi said "Even my husband thought at one point that I should take it off, however I refused to give up my Muslim identity" (Zahedi, 2011: 190). According to Mahmood, this practice is seen as a "bodily means to cultivate virtue and an outcome of their professed desire to be close to God" (Mahmood, 2001) .

Further to our discussion about Middle Eastern women and patriarchy that is, at times, observed within the region, indicates compound patriarchy since the women who are oppressed by men, at times and under circumstances define how men will be subordinated within that context. This is indeed, specified within the Turkish context within the scope of this research. It should be noticed that oppression is triggered by the oppression that shapes the subjecthood of others.

Compound patriarchy, within the context of Turkish politics, involves the oppression of men that is triggered by the way and manner they oppress women. For this reason, I argue that oppression is a system of compensating damage, helplessness as privilege and exercising power over instead of power within.

Furthermore, intersectional methodologies need to be adopted within Middle Eastern contexts, for the sake of utilizing the concept and methodologies to subjects who are oppressed differently. As stated before, oppression is exclusive to the subject. For this reason, alternative understandings of vectors of inequality are needed for deployment whilst understanding patriarchy.

Virginity, as I argue, is a vector of inequality. The women, who are sexually active, especially as unmarried teenagers, would face far more prejudice and discrimination than women who are committed to chastity. For this reason, Patricia Hill Collins, who argued that, race and class intersect with gender, must take into account the many factors such as age, marital status, and sexual activity in Middle Eastern contexts, define and mark women far beyond class. In the context of my research, as described across in subsequent chapters, class might be deemed less significant whilst detecting the vectors of inequality as I discern the importance of sexual purity.

Conforming to norms relating to a women's sexuality with patriarchal contexts might have a greater impact compared to race and ethnicity. It seems that a woman's age and sexual contact with a man tend to define her social positioning and oppressive practices define her exclusively.

Throughout different perspectives of patriarchy, we need to understand that Middle Eastern patriarchy, including an understanding of neopatriarchy, are useful to understanding the horizontal and vertical types of oppression that operates in different settings and that implies a difference in status in practice that only suggest a difference in form. Patriarchal oppression, indeed, is endemic across the globe, in accordance to context, circumstance and unique forms of subjecthood.

Furthermore, empirical analysis deployed in this research involves in depth understanding of domestic violence and torture. To this extent, domestic violence is an outcome of a ruler subject binary, in which forces operate similarly to other power dynamics that are endemic within Turkish society. Another similar power dynamic is observed within the state and the citizen in which similar forces operate within a given ruler and subject binary. For this reason, the ruler-subject binary and the enacted dynamics, define why torture and domestic violence were chosen to further understand

the similarities in oppressive practices, which I argue to be common amongst two different levels of the society.

Torture and gender based violence, within the context I have deliberately chosen to analyze, to an extent, is captured within Radical feminist perspectives (oppression as women without referring to vectors of inequality) and Middle Eastern points of views (emphasis on patriarchal connectivity and utilization of neopatriarchy). However, as I argue that the compound nature of patriarchy and the necessity to believe in a vertical understanding towards oppression, I believe my research is mostly grounded within Middle Eastern frameworks. However, often, such scholarship focuses on reactive behavior towards orientalist discourses, which is excluded from this research as the primary aim is stated to focus on understanding oppression for its own sake.

Whilst analyzing patriarchy within given frameworks it is important to understand that there is no magical framework, theory, concept or formula of any kind. They all exist because they fill a void within the literature. As a scholar, I perceive and understand the usefulness of all paradigms; however, I also accept that none are fully inclusive and comprehensive, often failing to capture the essence and complexity of oppression. For this reason, I, as a scholar of oppression in the Middle East, adhere to all to an extent but none of them fully, at the exact same time.

Further to the discussion related to feminist frameworks and their ability to conceptualize torture and domestic violence, these categories requires elaboration. To begin with, the framework discussed above does not capture the complexity of patriarchal oppression as a system with its own reproductive mechanism. For this reason, as the definitions were elaborated, some adhere to notions that recognize patriarchy as a system defined within the macro-economic interpretation of the public sphere. To this extent I argue that comparing state violence (torture) against the citizen

in the public domain and male violence against women in the private domain is needed to capture the reproductive mechanisms, processes and procedures, of patriarchal oppression.

This was an approach much needed to detect tendencies within oppressive practices if and only if patriarchy was perceived as a system that subordinates all subjects: male and female, young and old, rich and poor as well as subjects who represent the universal and the particular. Therefore, radical feminism is, to an extent, limited in its ability to define the subjectification of the male political subject. Furthermore, there exists a system that operates in collaboration of other systems (such as capitalism) but signifies an independent existence that accommodates and subjugates the state and the society.

Particularities of Patriarchal Theory

The clash of two different patriarchal structures lead to **compound patriarchy** in which one force is dependent on the other and the removal of one actor is dependent on a chain reaction amongst perpetuating actors.

Compound patriarchy results from a hierarchy of patriarchy and leads to an evolution. Gender based violence, as women being physically and emotionally oppressed, is directly related to gender based violence as men being oppressed. According to the insight given by Sen, the clash between the local and the global “leads to an understanding that violence against women is a worldwide problem, and that the solution does not lie in western experts” (Sen, 1998:11). As a result, it could be argued that patriarchy and its intersection with global actors is making the oppression individuals face more and more abstract and complex. The compound structure of patriarchy stems from the interference of intervening variables that makes domestic

violence far more complex and multilayered than before. As a result, patriarchal oppression has not been eliminated over the years, but rather it became more and more intelligent and complex.

The growing intelligence, at times, manifests itself amongst the Muslim immigrants in the industrialized world, bartering as a form of existential protest, in order to over-compensate their loss of authenticity and nationalism. Umberson *et al* argue that “men view violence as an instrument through which control and a sense of self-esteem can be reclaimed” (Umberson *et al*, 1998:445). This shows that a patriarchal notion of a gendered binary must be evident amongst intimate partners. It is assumed that men and women are equal partners in a relationship however “reclaiming” a sense of self worth in a manner that implies a hierarchical relationship leads to an understanding of **vertical patriarchy**.

The relationship between the state and the citizen or two different countries (imperial and colonial), as well as a man and a woman, can be vertical. In vertical relationships we observe top down governance and a tendency to overcompensate the damage of the superior actor. However, other theoretical constructs can also be insightful. For instance, patriarchy amongst subjects that are equal can be named **horizontal patriarchy**. In this context, we can examine psychological violence and conclude that it is horizontal patriarchy rather vertical. In cases of psychological violence we can argue that women are verbally more resourceful than men since their access to physical means of power is limited. According to Hirschmann, “The physical beatings are men's way of equalizing the imbalance of power created by women's superior ‘verbal resources’” (Hirschmann, 1996: 138). A verbal confrontation is a case of horizontal relationships since both parties have an equal chance to defeat the other

and that exemplifies how patriarchal oppression does not lead to vertical power structures.

Within this framework we can easily identify the cases that do not fit within horizontal relationships such as sexual violence, physical violence and state violence. These would be cases for vertical patriarchy since both actors have a hierarchical relationship or an elevated status in the nature of the relationship. Amongst the cases that exemplify vertical patriarchy a pattern could be observed. The state would perform the same patriarchal practice that men perform in the so-called private sphere. Vertical patriarchy, once analyzed on a case by case basis, would lead to a greater design, a system or a pattern. This system represents the patriarchal awareness and conduct that leads to **structural patriarchy**, which is abstract, reproductive and metaphorical and could be traced from the consistencies and reproductive mechanisms of the gendered governance in addition to the governance of gender.

An understanding of gender based violence and the reproduction of patriarchy should be introduced to see the significance of the perpetrator. According to Lafta *et al*, “gender-based violence includes the word “gender” because most victims of interpersonal violence are women” (Lafta, 2008:310). Therefore, a general understanding of women’s victimhood is well established amongst policy makers and scholars alike. According to another scholar, “using the term gender based violence implies that considering violence between spouses, more women than men are victims of domestic violence” (Simister, 2012: 1). However, there is evidence to the contrary. For instance, in Romania the perpetuated abuse reported by men was at least as high as the abuse reported by women (p 13).

According to Dobash and Dobash, “...comparing the violent 'acts' of men with those of women is built on the assumptions that the acts of men and women are

equivalent and that the context in which they occur and their meaning for the victim and the perpetrator are not relevant” (Dobash and Dobash, 2004: 330). If men and women are equally abusive or aggressive then women are not victims and policies should be made to protect women from male to female violence. For this reason the perception that both genders abuse equally is highly problematic.

If both parties are equally abusive then, '... the direction of current policies and practices are inappropriate and need to be fundamentally transformed' (ibid). In this regard, I disagree with Dobash and Dobash because the context defines the difference between violence and gender based violence. If women are assaulting men as an act of self-defense then the context states that women are violent but not aggressive. Subsequently, as Parmley states, “there are women who engage in violent behavior particularly in intimate relationships not necessarily as a result of fighting back. These women are the initiators of violence” (Parmley, 2008:92). For this reason, patriarchal oppression cannot be reduced to male violence nor vertical relationships but rather a perceived understanding of asymmetrical power relationships.

The vertical relationships within the gender binary, male-female, forms the basis of masculine and feminine structures within the society. Therefore the vertical patriarchy observed amongst the two sexes is in fact hegemonic. The state and the society, as a separate binary, are in fact based on vertical patriarchy observed at the interpersonal level of analysis. Therefore, men and women sharing a patriarchal relationship that is vertical reproduce, reinforce and create structural patriarchy that manifests itself across institutions, state society relationships as well as the gendered nature of governance. Vertical patriarchy derived from physical domestic violence is the basis of state reproduction of patriarchy vis-a-vis its relationship with its subjects.

To this extent, it should be noted that female-to-male violence has no hegemonic significance. The structure of oppression is exclusive to relationships within the household. For this reason, I argue that women are mainly the victims of gender-based violence because their oppression is incapable of shaping structure. And the model of male to female relationships, structures the status quo, replicates itself across the society, at times, within the Middle East and in Turkey.

A concept that needs to be introduced is **patriarchal relativity**, which will be explored in later chapters whilst discussing empirical evidence gathered from Turkey. What is significant in this understanding in particular, within an assumed hierarchy of need, is that men's non-urgent need of masculine dominance is overcompensated by a woman's primary need of safety, security and integrity. The loss of a man's dominance is not detrimental yet the value attached to his own hierarchy of needs is often compensated out of proportion. However, it should be noted that the patriarchal relativity of loss/compensation is not only an issue manifested in violence but rather in verbal and emotional disputes and/or violence.

In this regard, concepts regarding violence should often be seen as a compound form of patriarchy in which vertical relationships intersect with collective identities. Often the underlining cause and context would demonstrate an existential element to women's physical exploitation. In honor killings, women for example are perceived as the representative of family honor benefitting the senior members and that is also defined over and through the existence of the junior females.

Patriarchal connectivity as discussed by Suad Joseph attracts attention to how people define their identities over each others' existences; however, this is rarely mentioned as a patriarchal aspect within collectivities. As Cinar (2008) explained, both the secularists and the Islamists have defined their ideological standing through

controlling female attire. The exploitation of female existence for the sake of an established identity of political movements, ideologies and collectivities reflect **collective patriarchy**. The main difference between collective patriarchy that I introduce and public patriarchy that Walby (1990) suggested is rather the existential dimension of exploitation, with reference to structure.

Public patriarchy, although useful, is a concept that fails to capture particularities. The concepts of patriarchy I introduce in this thesis attempt to capture nuance, difference and particularities that operate, individually and collectively, to discern the manner the individual is situated. Therefore, a separate concept is needed to define existential exploitation at a structural level, building on Joseph's (2006) patriarchal connectivity and Walby's above-mentioned work.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have demonstrated different aspects of patriarchy. In the first section I articulated various definitions of patriarchy and introduced a new definition as "A compound social structure of multilayered oppression that is created by horizontal and vertical relations in the society that causes and results from gendered, racial, ethnic and international hierarchy to control, among others, man and women's virtue".

This definition, in certain contexts, is applicable to the Middle East. I demonstrated the limitations of various definitions by highlighting what is addressed and what has been neglected. The section on the definitions could have included more definitions but the aim of this chapter led me to limit its scope to the analysis of multilayered oppression faced by black and Middle Eastern people.

In the end, I have made a brief discussion on intersectionality and asked the question "which differences make a difference?" I explored a certain selection of issues

for Middle Eastern women by monitoring the various types of patriarchal oppression they were subjected to. I also highlighted the impact of international relations on the status of women in the Middle East.

In this chapter my aim was to elaborate the concept of patriarchy and demonstrate the different meanings it has with relevance to various contexts. I introduced a new definition of patriarchy to reflect the experiences of Middle Eastern women. There can be no single definition of patriarchy that would be able to explain all cases and experiences observed throughout the world.

I explored the relationship between male to female violence in addition to female to male violence and how they shape societal structures. I argued that male to female violence is more significant, not because of how common it is, nor because of the injuries but rather its implication and potential to reproduce societal structures. For this reason, I argue that violence, whether male to female or state to citizen violence that is analyzed, they has to be seen within its potential to determine macro, public and collective structures.

In this chapter, I aimed to analyze patriarchy according to different subject positions. Each woman experiences patriarchy differently and often each woman experiences a number of particularities at the same time. However, we can still not talk about a global sisterhood or unification of all women due to the oppression they face. Different groups of women oppress each other, second, geography is often the reason of their patriarchal oppression and third, each women experiences patriarchy differently. So patriarchy cannot be universalized nor could there be a universal patriarchy because the experience with patriarchy varies for each woman, as it is analyzed above.

Therefore, we can say there is a general subordination of women but the concept of patriarchy, due to its complex structure, cannot be generalized or universalized across the globe.

CHAPTER IV: THE CONTEXT OF TURKEY

Introduction

In this research I aim to investigate whether the state allows men to dominate women in the private sphere as a result of the state compensating for its various ways of subordinating men. I concluded that the relationship between men and women was a model for the relationship between the state and the citizen. This implies a pattern within oppression and the preeminence of gender in constructing a ruler subject binary. In this chapter, I will discuss the relationship between the state and citizens. Yuval-Davis summarizes a person's entitlements within a polity and a prominent power dynamic they are subjected to, as "the relationship between the individual and the state" (Yuval-Davis, 1997:68). This is an essential analysis for this research, as we examine the ruler subject binary in the public domain; an interrogation of the relationships

between the state and the citizen, to develop a broader view on oppressive practices on a national scale is required.

This chapter gives four perspectives on this relationship within Turkey. First, I will discuss how the citizen is situated against the state and the regime. I will argue that the male citizen to the state is what women are to men. Secondly, I will discuss Kemalism, westernization and secularism. I will discuss how the regime creates its own others. Thirdly, I will discuss the state's situation above the government by elaborating on the military's relationship with the citizen and will claim that the citizen is mature enough to govern themselves without the interference of the state.

Finally, I will discuss women's relationship with the state and discuss whether Atatürk was a feminist or not. The overall aim of this chapter is to discuss the subordination of the citizen (men and women through patriarchal practices) by the state in Turkey.

Citizenship in Turkey

An interviewee who is a lawyer for the Human Rights Association in Turkey, he explains how the regime handles their others. For example, he states that,

“People are imprisoned because of their own views... because of people's political affiliations. They are still put on trial for unfair reasons. Our internet access has been restricted by official forces. When there is a scene where two people kiss on television, the broadcasting network has to pay for a heavy fine”

(Lawyer, mid 40s, male, Human Rights Association, 2014, Ankara)

From this statement, it is clear that the regime is sustained through understandings and policies of power over rather than power within. This is an essential element of privilege, in which opponents are oppressed by a subject instead of competition based on merit. In other words, the rivalry and power contestation could have taken place by power that comes from within, from merit and excellence attained

over the pursuit of the public good, but rather this effort is curtailed through efforts of sustaining the regime (and officials who strive to sustain the regime) to maintain the status quo through power over.

Another important quote that I would state in this section is initiated by a research participant who helped me to discern privilege of those bestowed by the ruling elite.

“There have been no changes in the unjust provocation cause. A man can kill someone [female intimate] and get off the hook because he claimed he had no choice”

(Lawyer, female, mid 40s, Women’s Rights Association)

This is a clear indication of what privilege indicates within a given power dynamic such as the ruler-subject binary and the masculine feminine opposition. In both cases we see that helplessness is a privilege and the above quote exemplifies how the cause of unjust provocation allows a man to claim that he was helpless and request an exemption from penalty. This is also endemic across the state and the citizen relationships.

This above mentioned quote is significant due to its indication of how power dynamics operate within the ruler-subject binary in the public sphere mediated through concerns over the public sphere. Furthermore, this quote is significant for us to understand patterns of oppression that define the privileged and underprivileged. For this reason, the above mentioned quotes and others stated below allow the researcher to discern and understand the dynamics of oppressive practices, often highlighting an element that has been, at times, neglected by fellow researchers. To this extent, the ruler subject binary can be detected through an analysis over the patterns observed amongst the selected group of citizenry in Turkey.

The ruler subject binary cannot be exemplified by rights provided and protected by the state but rather it has been seen as a duty towards the state. As the famous motto states: “There are no rights but only duties” (Kahraman, 2005:77). According to a survey conducted about secondary school textbooks in 2012, the official definition of Turkish citizenship is based on “priority of duties over rights and the elimination of differences in the society” (Ince, 2012a: 137).

Turkish men and women are both discouraged from individualism (meaning they are discouraged from seeking their individual interest above national interest); hence “they first and foremost perceive themselves as Turkish citizens who are responsible for performing certain duties” (Kadioglu, 2005: 106). According to the same research conducted in 2008, “the duties and obligations of citizens towards the state were more important than the rights and protection of those rights by the state”.

Kemalists maintained that Ataturk wanted every right to be complemented by a duty³.” (Ince, 2012b: 122) In other words, Turkish citizens at this time were expected to be self-sacrificing. This self-sacrificing dutiful role characterized the relationship between the male political subject and the state. This will be discussed further in the section on gender and will demonstrate how women are expected to be dutiful towards men in the private sphere. Interestingly women, during the republican project in the 1920s and 1930s were expected to be dutiful at home, often being self sacrificing. This is an interesting observation since this analysis reflect on similarities between women in the household and citizens in the public sphere which often includes discerning certain patterns and expectations amongst both parties.

3 The phrase Kemalist refers to those who adhere to the principles of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, the founder of Turkey. Therefore, Ataturk and Kemalists are used interchangeable through the text. They mostly consist of the military, the judiciary and the Republican people’s party and their electorate.

In this regard, it could be argued that the relationship between the citizen and the state is similar (and equally patriarchal) to the relationship between men and women in the private sphere. My hypothesis reinforces this understanding, since I argue that the male political subject is subordinate to the state in the same manner women are subordinate to men. The compound nature of patriarchy is evident from the male political subject's relationship between the state and his relationship with women in the private sphere. Therefore, the subordination of the male political subject should not only be analyzed in its relationship to the state but also in comparison to women.

In the early years of the republic in the 1920s and 1930s, the relationship between the state and the citizen was based on the project of nationalism⁴ and the needs of the state, partially justified by the insecurities faced in the international arena such as Hitler and Mussolini's aggression. The reason for this characteristic of Turkish citizenship was due to the strong state tradition in Turkey and its definition of modernity as "a state in search for its nation" (Kahraman, 2005: 79). The rights of citizens were seen to be secondary compared to the "need for a strong state" (Vardar, 2005:56).

The state appeared to be at the center and the people at the periphery. For instance, according to research conducted by TESEV in 2009, if a citizen files a complaint against the police for a situation where they feel maltreated, then, according to the judge reporting on the issue, the penalties for the police are reduced to a minimal level (TESEV: 2009). According to another interview conducted with a judge, "every State has to protect itself from its citizens and our State does this protection even more"

4 The project of nationalism refers to vision of the ruling elite with regards to Turkey's position within the world and how the dynamics of power within the polity was disbursed and shared. In other words, the ruler subject binary, which favored the State over its subjects and male over female, was decided by the elite, during the early years of the republic. This status quo has been challenged by several forces within the polity, including feminists and liberals, to situate the public at the center and the state at the periphery.

(TESEV, 2009:135). In this regard, it is evident that the citizen has limited protection from the abuses of the state whereas the state has extensive measures of protection from the abuses of the citizen. This implies certain relativity in the gains and losses that define the ruler subject binary amongst the state and its subjects.

The relationship between the citizen and the state was reflected, among others, throughout the relationship set by the state in the constitution. Evidence can be found of this in secondary school textbooks. Other views support this understanding, for example, “The state had paramount power over society. The establishment deliberately maintained a vague definition of the relationship between state and society.... The state was the sole actor in the public sphere and sole representative of the nation” (Donmez, 2011:6).

According to official discourses, violations of the rights of citizens have often been justified by political actors referring to the “special circumstances” of Turkey (Ince, 2012:186). These special circumstances included times of military intervention and the constant war against terrorism and separatism (with the Kurds). It remains a question among academics to ask whether the Turkish citizenry is obedient towards the oppressive practices of the state (as being willing to comply with state oppression without questioning) or not. These questions are asked with regards to the role of the military in Turkish society and the role of the state.

However, the Turkish citizenry is not obedient but rather the Turkish citizenry is patriarchal. The justification for the limited rights of citizens has been in line with maintaining a strong state tradition in Turkey.

The rights of citizens are not only curtailed during, for instance, times of military intervention but also curtailed as a citizen during times of civilian rule as it is evident from the system in Turkey. For instance, according to a survey conducted on

the Turkish education system in 2012, the emphasis on democracy and participation was poor. The word “state” was one of the most commonly used words which appeared 678 times whereas the word “democracy” was used only 173 times in secondary school textbooks (Ince, 2012: 186). According to this research, none of the books discussed active participation of citizens, apart from voting during elections (ibid). According to interviews conducted with a number of citizens in 2010, both patriarchal and liberal tendencies exist amongst Turkish citizens. The Turkish citizenry however has evolved since the 1930s to question education and generally believed that citizenship “emphasized rights over duties” (Kardam and Cengiz, 2011: 156). In the past, the belief in rights was conditional and this indicated how underdeveloped Turkish citizenship was since the 1980s and 1990s.

For instance, although individual rights were found to be important, citizens were only entitled to those rights “after one’s duties of citizenship are fulfilled” (ibid). This research concluded that the military should continue to be the guardians of Turkish society, protecting the state from internal threats, such as the Islamists. Respondents used the word ‘father’ for the state and ‘child’ for the citizen, which clearly indicated a patriarchal understanding amongst the citizenry in Turkey, which ultimately reinforced Turkey’s strong state tradition.

This ‘father’ not only occupied a position of authority and control but also provided justice by establishing and administering a “legal system that grants equal rights and protection to all citizens” (Kardam and Cengiz, 2011: 155). However, the legal system has a problematic nature. The faith amongst the citizens in the state’s ability to provide justice, implies an understanding of citizenship that is unable to question state authority and capabilities. The citizenry should have been aware that justice is not given to all Turkish citizens including women and Kurds (Arat, 2005).

Previously, the relationship between the state and the citizen included a patriarchal social contract since the ‘father’ protects the ‘child’, against its will and the citizens’ rights and entitlements. Therefore, the state ideology to infantilize citizens and to see them as incapable of telling what is best for themselves are still shared amongst the Turkish citizenry.

Therefore, it could be argued that nowadays, Turkish citizens are less passive and obedient towards the state, whilst they slowly grow out of traditional understandings of governance and citizenship in Turkey. However, the relationship between the state and the citizen remains patriarchal and this should not be confused with a citizens’ obedience but rather its tendency to elect conservative leaders to replace conservative fathers (Lakoff, 1996). According to Lakoff (2002), those who have conservative fathers tend to vote for conservative political parties. He states that the mind operates through metaphors and we think that leaders are our parents. Therefore, instead of thinking that the Turkish citizenry is obedient, it is more accurate to think that Turks just seek to replace their conservative fathers to replicate the patriarchal relationship pattern they are used to have in the private sphere.

The state preferred citizens to be obedient towards the regime since the early years of the republic. An example of this can be found when the Republican People’s Party wanted to “create civilized, modern citizens who were obedient towards the state” (Ince, 2012: 119). According to Ince, citizens value obedience as a criterion for citizenship and this ultimately reinforces the understanding that Turkish citizenry is obedient.

This obedience could be observed in notions that see the “public good before the individual interest, his/her service for society before individual freedom” (Keyman and Icduygu: 2003: 231). In the west, rights were granted after years of struggling and

political activism against the state in the 18th century. In Turkey rights were steered from above (Kadioglu: 2005 and Kahraman, 2005). In other words, in Turkey, the state created its nation and its citizens. Through citizenship, the state legitimizes its strong position over the society (Kahraman, 2005).

The rights of citizens were curtailed from the very beginning of the republic because the state elites prioritized order and stability over democracy (Kahraman, 2005). According to Kadioglu (2005), Turkish citizenship, as defined from above, invades the private space of the family and religion. This understanding of citizenship excludes liberal individualist features of democracy.

In the republic, religion was made a private issue and was “replaced by the western concept of nationality” (Kaygusuz and Icdygu: 2010: 39). As a result of this, citizens found themselves absorbed in national projects such as Kemalism, socialism and political Islamism. Since confining religion to the private sphere and eliminating its visibility in the public sphere (Turkish secularism) in which all citizens were expected to abide to, those who expressed their religious identities in the public sphere were automatically labeled “a political Islamist” (Kadioglu, 2005). Citizens were expected to be obedient to state policy by expressing religious identity in the public sphere, and also by the state’s definition of the borders of the private and public sphere.

Another factor that determines state society relations is how state institutions function. A group interviewed in 2010, labeled the state as being “inefficient”, “slow” and “arbitrary” (Kardam and Cengiz: 2011: 160) For these respondents the private sector and big corporations are more reliable than state institutions. The accountability of the state, limits the ability of the citizen to trust and rely on public institutions. These respondents stated that they were unable to use state channels to solve their problems.

Therefore their faith in the state and the rule of law is limited and for this reason they identify the state with authority rather than protection from abusers of their rights.

The state is not particularly concerned with protecting citizens from the state; it is concerned with promulgating Kemalism. Maintaining the regime as it seems to be the primary prerogative of the state. Citizenship education and construction of the national subject is therefore, a matter of reproducing a Kemalist youth. It is not a matter of giving individuals their rights and entitlements.

According to Article IV of the Law on Higher Education, a student should be loyal to Atatürk nationalism and to Atatürk's reforms and principles. A student should put the common good above his/her own personal interests and have full devotion to family, country and the nation. One question that could be posed is that, whose interest defines the public interest/good? In other words, as citizens pursue the common good, whose interests represent the hegemonic groups? I argue that the male political subject would represent the hegemonic identity whose individual interests would represent collective/national/public interests.

Citizens are therefore told what to believe. Questioning authority is almost never a consideration in citizenship education (Ince, 2012). The Turkish government aims to produce an obedient youth who are, to an extent, obedient towards the state. Moreover, patriarchal relationships between the male political subject and the state are dominated by a strong state tradition and the state's determination to reproduce the regime. The domination of the state, over the citizen, is mostly evident by the prominence of state institutions such as the police, the judiciary and the military.

Kemalism and It "Others"

"The prosecution of a civil servant requires special permission. If needed, the identity of that state official would be found and arbitrary rule would be tackled.

But there is an understanding of protecting the state. The state is not for the individual but rather the individual is for the state. They know that a defendant citizen can apply to the European Court of Human Rights but they still prosecute those who question state authority.”

(The Partner of a Tortured Attorney in Turkey, male, Solicitor)

As stated in the above quote, the state is sacred and it is situated above their subjects. The sanctity of the state and its sacred character, creates its own others, in which, those who question the authority of the state, at times, are prosecuted for the sake of nation building. For this reason, the ruler subject binary, as exposed throughout this research, is understood within a mentality that requires power over, instead of power within. From this quote, it is evident that the state needs power over its subjects in order to sustain itself.

Another participant has made similar, reinforcing statements about the sustenance of the state.

“It [torture] is something the state does in order to maintain its own order, its own existence. It [torture] aims to penalize those who go against their will. ‘How dare you go against me?’ That is their mentality.”

(NGO worker, solicitor, Ankara)

In the above quote we see how order is preserved through violence and oppression, in the name of sustenance, maintenance and existence. This is not only endemic of power over, and therefore the lack of power within, but it is also indicative of how helplessness becomes the reason underneath privilege and disposing one’s primary needs. As the above mentioned concept and reasoning will be further explored in forthcoming empirical chapters, it is important to notice that the state has been perceived as an entity with endless entitlements. This understanding will be the foundation of the chapters that explore the patterns of oppression in Turkey.

Mustafa Kemal was a military officer of the late Ottoman Empire and served in the military during the Balkan Wars and WWI. After WWI the Ottoman Empire was under allied occupation. Mustafa Kemal organized the war of independence in 1919 and established the Grand National Assembly in 1920 (Ahmad, 2003). In 1923, after the war of independence that was fought with the Greeks, British and Italians, Turkey emerged as an independent nation state (Zuhrer, 2004). Following the proclamation of the republic, a series of modernizing reforms shaped the new character of modern Turkish identity, which defined the course of State-citizen relations in Turkey.

Following the proclamation of the republic, a series of modernization came to fruition. The modernizing efforts were centered in two realms; westernization and secularization. According to Heper, “Ataturk and the republican state had one basic mission –elevating the people to the level of contemporary civilization-” (Heper, 1985:51). This civilizing mission was steered from above. The elite however, assumed that the Turkish citizens were not ready for these reforms, which justified how the reforms were imposed upon a population.

Ataturk believed that people were even indifferent towards allied occupation during the war of independence and for this reason they needed to be reminded of the dangers that the country was facing (ibid). This “indifference” that was observed during the war, made the elite believe that modernizing reforms had to be carried out against people’s will. The famous motto stated, “Despite the people for the people” (Vali. 1971:13) giving an elitist approach to modernization and development. Therefore, the elite carried out reforms against peoples’ will.

As stated by Professor Sule Aytac,

“The state protects itself from its people. The state does not see itself as an entity responsible to their own people. What matters is the sustenance of the state, its existence and ability to stand tall. The Kemalist revolution did not reach [remote

locations such as] Afyon. The state wants obedient citizens that are homogenous. Women are expected to be mothers and wives. The state would favor women they can control.”

(Sule Aktas, Professor, Istanbul)

From this quote it is clear to see how the public was deemed (by the state) disposable when state priorities and concerns were at stake. Power over the public has been exercised by state officials, due to a lack of ability to create and exercise power within.

This motto provided significant insight for this research, as evidence showing restrictions on freedom being tolerated in the name of protection. The constant insecurity inflicted on the public and the people’s rights were disposed, which often demonstrated a power dynamic that justifies, if not glorifies, restriction, control and to an extent, oppression.

Therefore, this understanding reflects a dominant perception that is endemic amongst the ranking of the society, which believes that a person and/or entity that restrict your freedom, at times, could be perceived as doing so for your own good. This leads to an understanding that, at times, oppression takes place in the form of nurture.

The imposed reforms were justified by the ignorance of people. “They (the people) could easily be one for all kinds of undesirable ends. Therefore, consulting public opinion really meant shaping it” (Heper, 1985: 51). According to Kadioglu, the question in the minds of the elite was hardly posed as “who are the Turks?” but rather “Who and how are the Turks going to be?” (Kadioglu, 1996). Therefore, the Turkish nation was a manufactured nation whose identity and opinions were shaped by the elite. Kemalism subordinated the citizenry in the name of modernizing reforms that would elevate the society to contemporary civilization.

The civilizing mission aimed to change Turkey and make it more like the west. This orientation was not only evident in Turkey's foreign policy objectives, e.g. Turkey joined NATO in 1952 but it was also evident when Turkey adopted numerous western laws, the western lifestyle and attire. Atatürk's goal was to see Turkey join western civilization as he considered Islam barbaric, backward and oppressive.

In the eyes of the Kemalists, "there was only one civilization, the Western civilization, and they would join it in spite of the West" (Vali, 1971:45). Turkey, which was eighty percent rural at the time, was westernized by an order from Ankara (Pope and Pope, 2004). This self-proclaimed western identity also needed the approval of the west. Therefore reforms were introduced (these will be discussed on the section on gender) to convince a European audience that Turkey was a western, civilized and modern nation.

According to Cinar (2008:903), "the state targeted Europe as the ultimate referee that needed to be convinced of Turkey's new modern western identity". However, this faith in the West was questioned amongst the elite, as the famous nationalist writer Ziya Gökalp, stated that Turks should combine the technical aspects of the west and the spiritual aspects for the East (Kadıoğlu, 1996). The efforts to draw a border around the East and West and the issue of, to what extent, should Turkey be westernized, has always been an issue in Turkish politics, both in the republican era and the contemporary era.

The imposed westernization has created its "others" in which the state elite reinforce their will over the people for the sake of reaching contemporary civilization. This desire has created insecurities and anxieties amongst Turkish people. Turks have always compared themselves with Europe and sought European approval of its

modernity both in the republican era and the contemporary era. For this reason, Europe has been a source of hope and anxiety for Turkish people.

The westernizing reforms included changes in the legal system and in secularization. The proclamation of the republic in 1923 was followed by the abolition of the Office of the Caliphate in 1924. The 1920s and 1930s witnessed further secularization. For example the 1920s, there was the abolition of the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Pious Foundations, abolition of religious courts and proscription of the male religious headgear, dissolution of the dervish orders, reform of the calendar and adaptation of the Swiss Civil Code in 1926 (Kadioglu, 1996 and Zuhre, 2004 and Ahmad, 2003).

By the end of the 1920s, radical reforms had been made such as the disestablishment of the state religion which occurred in 1928, the adoption of the Latin alphabet in 1928 and the use of the Turkish language in the Islamic Call to Prayer in 1932. These reforms “constituted an onslaught to existing cultural practices” (Ahmad, 2003:36). The reforms not only aimed to separate religion from the state but also eliminate religious practices in the public sphere. According to Mardin, Ataturk and the republican elite “...showed a clear distaste for religion” (Mardin, 1990:90).

The westernization in Turkey not only led to a self proclaimed western identity in the country which sought the approval of the West, but it also turned into a self-Orientalizing approach of inferiority for being eastern. According to Ahiska (2003:353), efforts of westernization, both in the republican and contemporary era is a “symptom of internalized inferiority”. Efforts to become a member of the E.U. were a result of a persistent anxiety of “catching the train of modern civilization” in which Turks were already always late (Ahiska, 2003:352).

These modernizing efforts were discussed in the public sphere as solutions to existing problems and as a means to reach the desired level of westernization. Therefore, Turkey was aiming to appeal to the western gaze rather than actually become modern. Westernization can be viewed as a problematic issue and one which subjugates the entire population of Turkey. The male political subject is subjugated by the construction of Turkishness that is not modern enough to be European, because the country lacks the motivation to become modern. People are mostly concerned with getting their modernization and westernization efforts recognized by Europe.

The westernizing elite have often been challenged by the Islamist opposition. This opposition emerged from the gap between the modernizing elite and the rural masses in the early years of the republic (Eligur, 2010). The gap was in education, employment and urbanization. Ataturk's party, between the 1940s and 1970s, remained an elite party, which tried to advance the mission of westernizing Turkey instead of appealing to the rural masses or closing the gap between the urban and rural citizens in Turkey.

This rural population remained excluded from politics until the 1960s when Islamist parties started to form and obtain a share in national elections. The military-bureaucratic elite of the Republican governments had largely overlooked the economic and cultural interests of the larger segments of the society. Instead the party had focused on raising a future generation of middle and upper class urban elites who would protect and advance the westernizing reforms initiated by Ataturk (ibid). "The Republican People's Party (RPP) leadership made no notable effort to broaden the party's popular base and to enlist the support of the peasant masses; instead it concentrated its attention on the small westernized elite. As a result, the rural population did not welcome the

RPP's policy of secularism" (Eligur, 2010:49). This resulted in the emergence of an Islamist populace that consisted of the counter culture in Turkey.

Today, the RPP represents the elite, westernized classes of Turkey and the districts who vote for them are mostly upper class, whereas the districts which vote for Islamist parties are mostly lower class and they represent 'the voice of the excluded' in Turkey. One might ask what they are excluded from. The answer is Turkish modernity, the hegemonic subjectivity and being refused from being considered as the national subject in the eyes of policy makers.

'Political Islam', according to Eligur (2010), emerged as a source of identity and it was defined as "returning to our core identity and not imitating the West", this understanding emerged in the late 1960s (Eligur,2010:30). Since Adnan Menderes, the Prime Minister of the 1950s, religion was used to appeal to the masses and opened religious secondary schools throughout the country, political Islam took root in the early 1960s. Between the 1960s and the 1970s, the main political issue was the relations between and violence amongst the extreme leftists and rightists in Turkey.

The 1968 student youth had turned political issues into violent matters and their activities included kidnapping people and bombing. Under the cold war conditions, the state's (the military and the judiciary) main concern was the communist threat. Religion within this context was supported by the state to counter-attack the growing communist threat within Turkey. Therefore the gap between the urban and the rural did not only grow but also it was deepened by; state officials, who were afraid of losing Turkey's liberal economy.

For this reason, when the Islamists won the 1994 election, slogans in rallies stated that the "other Turkey is coming to power" (Cinar, 2005: 19). This otherness was

initially created by Ataturk but later it was highlighted by the Kemalist military in Turkey.

Tayyip Erdogan (initially Prime Minister, eventually president since 2003) has initially defended a fundamentalist view on religion. Later on, after he was imprisoned for reading a religious poem in public, he claimed that he had changed and now he represented a moderate view of religious influence on politics. Erdogan, who first worked under the Welfare Party that was closed by the state in 1998 on the grounds that it had become the center for anti-secularist policies was a prominent figure in political Islam in Turkey.

The Islamist political parties that were formed before the AKP (Islamist Justice and Development Party) advocated Islamic law openly. The AKP did not advocate religious law and nor did they see democracy as a means to an end. In fact they changed their rhetoric and stated that they needed the west and its notion of human rights in order to claim the religious freedom their electorate was expecting from them. “The AKP realized that they needed the west and modern/western values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law in order to build a broader front against the Kemalist center and to acquire legitimacy through this new discourse in their confrontation with the secular establishment” (Dagi, 2005:31).

The Role of the Military

On September 12, 2010 Turkish citizens held a referendum to vote on a historical matter. The AKP wanted the Turkish population to vote in order to make constitutional amendments to reduce the role of the military in Turkish politics. The victory of the votes in favor, were interpreted as Turks wanting to join the EU (Cizre, 2011). However, the real reasons underlining this vote remains a matter of controversy.

It could have been because the citizenry did not want the state to be situated above themselves and therefore, the Turks felt they might be ready to rule themselves and take responsibility for their own political actions.

The Turkish Armed Forces (TAF) believe that the state was threatened by Kurdish militarism and Islamist politics. This perceived threat has caused the TAF to interfere in Turkish politics on four separate occasions. In 1960, the TAF staged a coup because the governing party was oppressing its opponents (Jenkins, 2007). In 1971, the TAF initiated a coup by memorandum because political leaders were constantly in conflict and the assembly could not function (Jenkins, 2007).

In 1980, Turkey was in a civil war due to violence between the leftist and rightist youth. In 1997, the Islamist Welfare Party (WP) officials made a speech about bringing back the Sharia Law and for the TAF the nation's secular character was under threat (Jenkins, 2007, Ahmad, 2003 and Zuhrrer, 2004). The TAF believed it could close political parties that were found to be too extremist and/or too radical: for instance those "connected to Kurdish demands for autonomy and independence" (Haynes, 2010: 315)

The Turkish military have seen themselves as the guardians of the nation. However, in reality they are the guardians of the regime. For instance, according to Heper, "Ataturkism had repeatedly been used as a justification for military activism and intervention since 1960" (Heper, 2005: 75). A TAF general, Dogan Gures, Chief of General Staff between 1990-1994 stated that the role of the military in Turkish society was "Safeguarding the modernistic and secular features of the Turkish Republic (...) and defending the country against its internal and external threats" (Heper, 2011: 241). The TAF often makes statements declaring that the main aim of the military is to protect the state.

Another military commander, General Ozkok stated that “The TAF is obliged by the relevant legislation to take action against all groups who target the unitary system of the state and act as a guardian of the premises of the Turkish Republic which are stipulated in the first three articles of the constitution” (TSK, 2013). This role of guardianship has been supported in opposition to individual rights in Turkey. As one general stated, “If what is at stake is homeland, other concerns can be overlooked” (Heper, 2011:243). This guardianship is at the expense of citizenship rights and reinforces an obedient citizenry.

In Turkey, the military leaders have little faith in politicians and the citizenry in Turkey. In addition, the public, to an extent has little faith in themselves. For instance, according to Karaosmanoglu (2011:254), “Some academics and columnists believe in the necessity of military guardianship because the population is not yet educated and mature enough to elect the “right” politicians”. This insecurity towards civilians is felt amongst civilians as well. Therefore, on one hand the elite have preferred an obedient citizenry and on the other hand, they are worried that they lack political maturity to govern themselves.

For instance, according to Aydinli, there are “mutually constructed expectations” in the society that the army would interfere when things go wrong and eventually “save the day” (Aydinli, 2009: 585). Nevertheless, in the secularist rallies and wider protests, the secular youth shouted “Neither Sharia nor a Coup, a democratic Turkey” (Somer, 2007:1281). Therefore, it should be argued that the Turkish citizenry and the later generations are ready to take initiative and responsibility for their actions rather than just assuming that the military elite will make everything alright. This requires a certain understanding from the military as well.

The military will have to understand that “civilians have a right to be wrong and that it will not play a guardian role even if, in its view, the civilians have made a mess of things” (Bland, 2001:249). It must be noticed that those who are not interested in having either a coup or Sharia do not represent the entire population and yet represent a minority view.

There are some sections of the youth who see the military as the guardians and can be heard shouting slogans “military back in charge” (Aydinli, 2009, 586) clearly indicating that they would prefer the military to take over the state. In addition, there are those who are reluctant to make decisions on the matter and believe that the military should only interfere from time to time.

Since the military is always at the top of the rank and considered the most trusted state institution in Turkey (Aydinli, 2009 and Jenkins, 2007) they assume their role is legitimate. Even today, Turkish people vote for the military as they see them as the most trusted state institution in referendums and surveys. Civil-military relations in Turkey, therefore reinforcing that the state, not the government, is the highest authority in the country and elected officials are subordinate to the state.

The citizens’ subordination lies within its lack of faith in itself and in elected politicians. Although research indicates that “some” citizens believe that the military should interfere from time to time (Kardam and Cengiz, 2011), the slogans from the rallies, state that youths are ready to assume leadership. For this reason, the citizenry is neither immature nor infantile but rather the Turkish citizenry is ready to take leadership roles in political affairs without the interference of the state.

Arbitrary Use of Power

Certain tendencies in Turkish politics could be observed by examining the processes and procedures through which the AKP government reproduces the state. For example, according an Amnesty report; 14 year old Belkin Elvan died after being hit by a tear gas canister during the Gezi Park protests as he left home to buy a loaf of bread. Activists organized protests holding a loaf of bread with a black ribbon on it. The state officials considered it a form of provocation against the state. The details of the incident might not be relevant if our analysis concerns how the state intends to manufacture consent by limiting access to the public sphere.

The Turkish state is not alone in its decision making process. As protestors, human rights activists, both local and international, have pressured the Turkish Government in an effort to prevent impunity, often the court cases and trials were in favor of the Turkish police. Although the members of the judiciary decided that the police beating a citizen on the street constituted torture, somehow in Berkin Elvan's funeral, according to Amnesty International observers, the police used brutal force against peaceful protestors (Amnesty: 2014).

Therefore, the characteristics of the state needs to be questioned as it becomes evident in brutal use of force, impunity and a certain dynamic against state-society relationships. As will be explored in chapters based on empirical evidence gathered through ethnographic research and content analysis, it is worth noticing that the judges'

verdict is often far from being the final decision in Turkey. The elected officials would often give orders contradicting the opinions of appointed officials in Turkey.

On one side there are the parliamentarians who give orders to the police, either in the manner of representing the public will or in the name of sustaining the supremacy of the state. On the other side, the judiciary enacts measures depending on the pressure they feel from foreign and international actors to protect the citizen when not conforming to the orders from the assembly. The role of organizations like Amnesty and geopolitical entities such as Europe is to give support to the oppressed and to actively shame the Turkish State and the particular administration at the time. Even if, verdicts are made to support victims of state abuse of power, the dynamics of Turkey that produce these incidents remain unchanged.

The illness is tackled through managing the symptom rather than the illness itself, as I have often referred in this research. In addition to the international supporters described above, often the judiciary is forced to choose to make decisions based on the international activist audience or fellow state officers. For example, in the hearing of Ethem Sarisuluk, who died during Gezi Park protests in 2013, his family complained about being insulted and threatened by police officers in plain clothes that packed the public gallery of the courtroom, preventing their supporters from attending the hearing (Amnesty: 2014). It is clear that the police and the state are on one side and the public is on the other.

Therefore, despite arbitrary, abusive and excessive use of power often reflected by criminalizing dissent, the Turkish state that is unable to reproduce its power through peaceful means needed to build the white palace (AK Saray) to glorify its existence. The resources that were needed for the people had to be spent for an 'appearance' of

strength and glory, rather than actually ‘being’ strong, like a women who needs to appear honorable rather than to be.

Gender and Citizenship in Turkey

After the proclamation of the Republic in 1923, a series of modernization efforts led to the emancipation of women in Turkey. The major legal adjustment was the adoption of the 1926 Civil Code, which was based on the Swiss Civil Code at the time, rather than the Islamic Sharia Law (Kandiyoti, 1991). The Islamic Sharia law has been used for centuries and the Civil Code was a setback against religion. The new code abolished polygamy and women gained equal inheritance rights.

Women first gained the right to be elected in local elections in 1930 and gained the right to participate in national elections in 1934. This precedes Switzerland but follows the UK, which were 1971 and 1917 respectively. In the 1937 election, immediately after women gained the right to be elected, “18 women deputies were elected making 4.5 of the National Assembly. This was an all time high never to be equaled again” (Kandiyoti, 1991: 41). Even today, the ratio of female deputies in the assembly is lower than 4.5 percent.

During the Ataturk era, female representation in the parliament was considered an important issue whereas today some politicians within the AKP establishment believe that women should not participate in politics at all. It was stated during the Positive Discrimination Bill voted in the Parliament in 2004 that an MP from the AKP suggested that women who come home at 11:00 pm were not considered honorable and

for this reason, they should not be benefitting from positive discrimination to become MPs in the Turkish Parliament.

Academics and feminists have been asking questions about the reason underlining these reforms. The reason why Atatürk granted women their rights was perceived as a reflection of his strategic leadership and it was a matter of being more democratic than Europeans (Tekeli, 1981). According to Tekeli, Europe was dominated by dictatorships in the 1930s and Atatürk was criticized for being a dictator. When Hitler said a woman's role was "*kitchen, children and church* (Kinder, Kirche, Kuche)" (Tekeli, 1981: 298), Atatürk granted women the right to vote in order to differentiate himself from Hitler who showed admiration towards Atatürk. Other scholars have reinforced this understanding by their arguments about Atatürk's strategic thinking. According to Brocket, women's rights were included as part of a strategic plan to "modernize" society and "gain acceptance as a legitimate nation-state on par with Europe" (Brocket, 2011: 94).

Another view that reinforces this perspective, according to Arat, the founding fathers "used women's citizenship as a ruling class strategy" to promote westernization (2005:108). It is important to notice that women's rights were steered from above rather than emerging from below.

Indeed, it could be argued that democracy itself, along with westernization and secularism was initiated from above. However, it is still important to discern the difference between women's rights in Turkey and the UK in terms of how these rights emerged. One was steered from above, by a ruling elite, and the other, was initiated by movements from below. According to Kandiyoti, women's rights "were granted by an enlightening elite committed to the goals of modernization and 'westernization'" (Kandiyoti, 1987: 320). Therefore, structure, circumstance and

context were essential to the analysis required to understand women's suffrage and their rights in Turkey during the republican project.

Another academic view emphasizes the symbolic use of women's rights for Atatürk's plans with regard to the modernization of Turkey. The "new women" of the Kemalist era, according to Kandiyoti, became "an explicit symbol of a break with the Ottoman past" (Kandiyoti, 1991:41). This was evident from pictures of Atatürk attested with photographs of ballroom dancing and his efforts to increase women's public visibility (Kandiyoti, 1991: 41). The new woman was a symbol of the nation. Her education, emancipation and employment meant that Turkey had become a modern state. The ideal republican woman was bourgeois woman, urban and socially progressive but also "uncomplaining and dutiful at home" (White, 2003: 146). For women; marriage and children was a national duty. It was a woman's duty to be modern in the public sphere and traditional in the private sphere.

State feminism, "did not concern itself with what happened behind closed doors" (ibid). For instance, with regards to polygamous marriages, although the state did not recognize these marriages, in the times they occurred, officials looked the other way. According to Brockett with regards to polygamous marriages, "the state ... tolerating Islamic precepts that conflicted the new republican values vis-a-vis family law and civil rights". (Brockett, 2011: 94)

This difference between legal and substantive equality between men and women has led feminists to speculate on whether the republican reforms emancipated women and reinforced gender equality or not. Although the state reforms emphasized the importance of education and employment for women, the concept of honor remained intact amongst policy makers in Turkey. For example, according to Jenny White (2003), although women were granted rights to access the public domain they were expected to

be dutiful and patriarchal at home⁵. In this regard, education, employment and women's visibility in the public sphere was perceived as a reflection of male success in elevating their women however little attention was paid as towards understanding their entitlements as individuals or as citizens.

The rise in women's public visibility was essential to the republican project. However they were dutiful at home and they were expected, and to an extent, have adhered to the norms of patriarchy, by emphasizing the importance of virginity, chastity, honor and loyalty to the male spouse. Although interviewee, Prof Sule Aktas⁶ has stressed the differences between the secular ruling elite (RPP) and the Islamist ruling elite (AKP), they acted accordingly to suggest that secularists have little incentives to protect a woman's honor and chastity. As I found myself dwelling on her statements and her reliability, I recall Prof. Alev Cinar's statements on how similar the exploitation of women, as reflected over inducing controlling measures over female attire, amongst the Islamists and Kemalists, were actually similar to one another. For this reason, I have very little incentive to believe that the Kemalists were state-feminists in origin, and that they had little influence over women being the honorable gender who represented the nations, cultural authenticity.

A research participant commented on the power of Kemalists reforms with reference to traditional gender norms.

“The Republican People's Party (founded by Ataturk) would not be concerned with citizens living together without being married. For the Islamists, what matters is not the women's wellbeing; they are protecting the wellbeing of the honorable women.”

5 Further to this discussion, the participants of this research, had very little to criticize about Kemalists reforms, as it was taken for granted that Mustafa Kemal Ataturk was a feminist.

6 Interviewed in 1st of December 2013, Istanbul.

(Sule Aytac, Professor, Istanbul University, female)

It is clear from the above mentioned professor that the Kemalist regime is considered to be less involved with the honor of women and to this extent honor is seen as a concern for the Islamists. This, however, implies an us-and-them understanding that stems from the Kemalist (therefore, secular and pro-western) elites' understanding of what patriarchy and conservatism is involved with. Although Jenny White has argued that the Kemalist elite was patriarchal, there is a concern amongst the Kemalist elite to blame the Islamists for patriarchal gender dynamics.

To further understand the Kemalist elite, we must explore the intellectual background of this ideology, led by Ziya Gokalp. The main argument established by state officials, on behalf of Turkish women's rights, was made by the pioneer of Turkish nationalism, Ziya Gokalp who was supported by the secular women for ideological reasons and neglected the pious women in Turkey. As he embarked on women's rights advocacy, he indeed prioritized the need of the pro-western, secular Turkish women, and neglected the women who were deemed more traditional and religiously expressive and devoted. He stated that women were considered men's equals in the pre-Islamic Turkish past (Arat, 2005b:16). Therefore, state feminism was anti-Islamic to start with, and this would make its impact in the 1980s, because the consensus that was formed in the society regarding state-feminism and women's emancipation by the Kemalist reforms, were broken in the 1980s.

Eren Keskin, who is a human rights lawyer in Turkey and fights against torture, sexual torture and gender discrimination in Turkey, has stated the importance of structure, whilst analyzing state violence.

“We cannot perceive state violence, in isolation from the system. There is a patriarchal [male-dominated] system that is evident. There are militant values at present. This had implications on laws. Until 2005, violence against women

was seen as a crime against general morality and order. Therefore, women were seen as a matter of family morality and order. There was no definition of intra-marital rape. Nor was there a definition of police rape in Turkish law.”

(Eren Keskin, 43, lawyer, Istanbul)

The Islamist feminist opposition to Kemalist reforms was slightly more radical. They denounced secular feminism for imitating the west. According to an Islamist critic, feminists included the “psychologically sick, those in search of adventure who run after fantasies, dumb socialites who aspire to give color to their lives and finally those who consider being a feminist is being enlightened, elite, progressive and westernized agents” (Arat, 2005b:22).

According to Arat, this Islamist perspective attributes immoral characteristics in order to create contrasting image of moral Islamist women. In this regard, Islamist women are the true honorable women who are sexually modest, whereas secular feminists are promiscuous by nature. However since the 1980s both secular and Islamist feminists challenge the state with their claim to individuality, defined outside of Kemalist norms.

The mere presence of women with their headscarves covering their hair and shoulders in public institutions particularly universities was an implicit challenge to republican attempts to confine religion to the public sphere. The different groups of Islamist women united in their insistence to wear their headscarves, which they declared was a predicated state of Islam. The rise of Islam, or more specifically, increasing public visibility and influence of Islamist teachings, groups, religious schools, sects and the Refah (Welfare) Party influenced women to cover their heads (Arat, 2005b:24).

One argument made by secularists is that the head covering restricted women’s freedom. The state officials explicitly argued that head covering was opposed to women’s liberation. Among secularists the headscarf has long been associated with

limiting women's freedom. Also it is interpreted as a symbol of opposition to the Republic. What is disappointing to see is that the seculars who believe in western values such as democracy and human rights do not even consider the possibility of female agency. They should have considered the liberating and empowering effects of Islam (or religiosity and piety) and take into account that many women might feel liberated this way.

Ataturk supported women's rights in the public sphere but not in the private sphere. In the 1926 Civil Code, men were still the leaders of the household and there were no laws protecting women from violence such as domestic violence and honor killings (Ahmad, 1993). This private/public distinction has remained intact until today.

In addition to this, they were expected to be sexually modest and virgins at the time they got married. Ataturk's revolution had its own limits, which were set by himself (Kandiyoti, 1991). State feminism was conditional on the extent to which served ideological and nationalist prerogatives women were granted support.

There are reasons to argue that Ataturk wanted women to be empowered, only to the extent that it was in line with his strategic vision. First, Ataturk did not grant women the right to vote at the time the issue was first brought up in the parliament. In 1924, Recep Peker, a Republican People's party MP, suggested that women should gain the right to be elected into parliament since the law stated that "Every Turkish citizen who is 30 years of age could be elected to the parliament" (Ahmad, 1993: 90).

As a result of this, the parliament immediately turned into a battlefield (Tekeli, 1981). Later on, the law was changed to say "Every male Turkish citizen that is 30 years of age can be elected into parliament". (Pope and Pope, 2004: 64). This debate that occurred in the public sphere, the assembly, could have been seen as giving legitimacy to the issue and woman's equality in general. The debate was perhaps too

soon for the Turkish society or maybe Ataturk preferred to leave the issue unresolved until the 1930s when he started to be compared to European dictators.

Another reason to believe Ataturk set the parameters of Turkish state feminism is his attitude towards women's political activities. For instance, in 1923 women wanted to establish their own political party called the Women's People's Party. Ataturk thought it was "divisive" (Kandiyoti, 1991) and told women to organize their political activism under the Republican People's Party. Women could have had genuine reasons for wanting to have their own political organization. In fact, women's demand for a political party was the first time in Turkish history that women wanted to start their own party.

Ataturk's discouragement, if not rejection, has damaged Turkish feminism, not only because it was not in line with his strategic interests and that he preferred that women's issues to be handled within the Republican People's Party. Even today, this party takes pride in their dedication to gender equality. The incidence following women wanting to start their own political party was another reason to believe Ataturk was not a feminist but rather a very wise and competent strategic leader.

A third reason to believe that Ataturk set the parameters of Turkish feminism can be seen when he dismantled the Turkish women's congress that joined Turkish women with European women and women around the world. The Union discussed women's rights in national and international contexts and had encouraged women's active participation in the political issues of the time. It was created in 1924 and it was disbanded in 1934, a fortnight after it had hosted the 12th Congress of the International Federation of Women (Kandiyoti, 1991). Within the federation, Turkey had unwittingly been made a tool of allied propaganda. According to Kandiyoti, "On the eve of a major conflagration in Europe and at a time when defense spending was increasing its share

of the national budget, Turkish feminists' stand on disarmament was inopportune" (Kandiyoti, 1991: 42).

This is a typical example of how Ataturk thought that every political activism, including women's political activism, should be in line with his own strategic and ideological interests. The women's union was applauded by Ataturk, when it was first formed but it was dismantled due to the insecure environment prior to WWII. It is important to note that parties were shut down and MPs were banned from politics during the Ataturk era in Republican history (1923-1938) (Ahmad, 1993).

The question is yet to be answered: did Ataturk believe in women's rights? Or was he just a strategic leader who used the women issue for his own interest? Ataturk wanted to see Turkey as a modern western state. As Pope and Pope state, commenting on women's rights "with a few pen strokes this conservative and rural country was ordered to become a modern state" (2004: 62). Even for the above cited author, women's rights are a matter to be understood within the East and West dichotomy as if Eastern nations just could not believe in gender equality or as if women's rights were primarily western.

It is still debated among feminists and historians whether Ataturk was fully committed to women's rights. One way to answer this question is to look at his relationship with his own wife Latife who was 22 years younger than him. The myth about this marriage stated that Ataturk did not really love Latife in fact he loved an illiterate, rural woman his own age. According to the myth, Ataturk married Latife because she was a good role model for Turkish women. Latife grew up in Paris, France. She was educated in Europe, and she spoke a number of European languages. Two years and four months after they were married, he decided to divorce her. "Women's rights did not impede his decision, without even consulting Latife, he drew up a divorce

decree, signed it and had it approved by the parliament” (Pope and Pope, 2004: 64).

Clearly, his marriage and divorce were seen as a national concern.

This divorce created much speculation; if he believed in women’s rights, he would not have just abandoned his wife without even discussing the matter with his wife. This led to many commentators stating that he was not a sincere believer in women’s rights but rather used her public visibility. They believed that she was used as a symbol for eliminating Islamic beliefs in social life and to manufacture a western identity.

According to Pope and Pope, “He was never western in his understanding of women... He was extremely jealous; his inclination was towards the harem. But intellectually, he believed that women should be free and equal with men” (2004: 63). This is highly debatable. Whether he was divided into two sides as Oriental and Occidental or whether he just used women on matters of secularism, westernization and modernity remains a debate among Turkish historians and feminists.

From the evidence above, it is clear that as a military commander Ataturk did not approach many women in his life and he did not work with or study with them. This might have led to a belief that women are inferior to men. I argue that he had a contradiction within him. To start with, his adopted children were female; he could have been patriarchal and adopted male children. He advised all three of his daughters to take leading public roles; for instance one became a historian, another became the first military pilot and the third became a judge.

It is still questioned why he believed women should take prominent roles in the public sphere. This chapter claims that Ataturk believed in gender inequality as long as it served his own interests, and this understanding became a model for future governments that perceived women’s rights a matter of concern that had to complement

nationalist policies. It is apparent that Atatürk's wife did not suit his lifestyle because she often criticized him for working and drinking too much. It can be said that he was a dictator like Hitler and Stalin (who were in power at roughly the same time) and similar to them, he did not have good relationships with women.

As a military commander he was charismatic enough for the nation but he was not charismatic enough for women. Therefore, his view of women was very limited and he set the parameters of gender equality and state feminism in Turkey with that understanding.

State feminism was primarily concerned with women's public emancipation and their public visibility. The Turkish woman was seen as a symbol of modernity and when at times she was not, her concerns did not matter. State feminism was encouraging "but little concerned with their private lives as women" (White, 2003: 147). Many feared that westernization would lead to individualism, which would make women feel distanced from their domestic duties as wives and mothers. It was feared that Westernization would lead to "a moral breakdown of society" (ibid).

This concern has also been addressed by Kadioglu, who argues that women were trapped between notions of modesty and modernity (Kadioglu, 1996). Since women are expected to balance the technical aspects of the west with the spiritual aspects of the east, they found themselves marginalized and pushing borders. "Those women who are unable to achieve such a delicate balance by either being too modern as to warrant promiscuity or being too traditional for not keeping up with novel fashions are usually pushed to the margins of the society" (Kadioglu, 1996). The ideal women, even today, are women that serve Turkish nationalism which aims to balance the material aspects of the west and spiritual aspects of the east.

The concern of balancing the east and the west and its effect on women is best observed on issues pertaining to sexuality. Virginity is a matter of cultural authenticity and being different to Europe. The ability to abolish this norm is seen as a failure of attaining “a desirable degree of modernity” (Parla, 2001: 66). When the Minister of Women’s Affairs strongly defended virginity examinations she stated “there is no such requirement that we should westernize in all aspects. All people have their own culture. Furthermore, the whole world admires Turkish people’s manners, customs and traditions” (Parla, 2001: 67).

Further evidence is suggested by Arat, “even though there are no legal grounds for it, high school principals and dormitory superintendents have been known to send girls suspected of intercourse to virginity examinations” (Arat, 2005: 108). Women have symbolically been used to draw the lines between tradition and modernity, authenticity and cosmopolitanism as well as to highlight the differences between east and the west. Women’s sexuality is seen as a public matter, an issue that we should all agree on, whereas male sexuality is a private matter.

This is evidence that women’s citizenship does not include rights and privileges but only responsibilities and duties. One indication that women have limited entitlements is with regards to previous codes on adultery. In 1926, the articles on adultery (and rape) are contained in an expanded chapter entitled “Crimes against Public Morality and the Constitution of Family”, in which a women’s infidelity was considered a public offense against the family (Miller, 2007: 369). To this extent, with regards to sexuality, men represented themselves and women represent the morality of the nation. A woman was neither a citizen in her own right nor an individual entity but rather she was a matter of public concern and collective identity whose existence was exploited on political, legal, social and moral grounds by multiple agents.

Some articles in the Turkish Civil Code have been amended many times to change the relationship that exists between a husband and his wife and women's status within the family. For instance Article 153, which required husbands to grant permission for their wives to work outside the home, was annulled (Arat, 2005) in 1992. Some changes had minor effects such as changes pertaining to the last names of women. Article 153, which required that wives assume their husbands last names, was revised so that women could keep their maiden names before their husbands' last names. Some articles tried to make changes for women whose sexuality was not in line with traditional norms. Article 438 of the criminal code, which granted a reduction in punishment to a rapist when his victim was a prostitute, was annulled.

Despite the changes made in the Turkish Civil Code, some laws and their implementations still curtail women rights. For instance Article 153 states that the wife is essential, as the assistant and counselor of the husband, to the extent of her capabilities, in order to establish shared happiness (Arat, 2005). The same article also defines women's role as follows "The wife takes care of the household" (Kogacioglu, 2005: 146). Article 21 of the Civil Code states that, in marriage the residence of the wife and children are to be the husband's residence (ibid). These laws automatically limit women's actions to the private sphere and still assume male supremacy in the household.

In addition to this in Turkish law, honor killings are *almost* encouraged. In case of honor killings, the clause of provocation is applied. The punishments can be reduced with the understanding that the killing was carried out to "re-establish family honor". For instance if the victim is understood to be sexually active or not a virgin the judge would "reduce the punishment to one-eighth of the normal punishment" for manslaughter, due to unjust provocation (Kogacioglu, 2005:147). Therefore the

Turkish State actively punishes women who are not virgins and therefore reinforces cultural norms on virginity at the expense of women's lives and security.

Women's role in politics and their mentioning in party programs make it clear that women's issues are only relevant to greater political gains. One indication of this understanding is that women are categorically sidelined as they are mentioned in party documents. Women are often given the role to lead the women sections of their political parties but they are often excluded from matters concerning the rule of national politics. In addition to this, whenever women are mentioned, it is usually within the context of family or with reference to the headscarf controversy. The stance of Islamist politicians with regards to the issue of women is always conservative and problematic.

According to Landes and Landes (2001), the issue of gender equality is mostly problematic for Muslim majority nations. They state that "The oppression of women may not only help explain why Islamic societies have fallen behind the west, it may also help explain why they find the west so culturally threatening" (Landes and Landes, 2001: 20). Although the author tries to explain the behavior of Islamic fundamentalists it is also rather true for the secularists and moderate Islamists of Turkey.

Although, Erdogan stated whilst being the prime minister, "The discrimination against women is as dangerous and wrong as racism" (Cavdar, 2010:34) he does not seem to be sincere and he fails to convince anyone else. He actively discourages abortion and he maintains that every married couple should have three children. He appears to have a greater national project of enlarging Turkey in population and therefore he discourages women from working outside the home. For instance, the Prime Minister has decreased the entitlements for maternity leave so women are encouraged to leave their jobs or have their jobs terminated at times of pregnancy. One

indication of this is efforts to reduce maternity leave to one-third. Therefore AKP's concern for women is only instrumental to further reinforce an Islamic lifestyle.

The AKP discerns itself with its attitude toward domestic violence. Although the Family Protection Act was passed in 1998, the implementation of the law is an impediment to its goal (Arat, 2005). In Turkey today, women who file a complaint against their husband are confronted by the police. The police actively discourage them from filing a complaint and encourage them to return home. The cases that make it to courts represent serious problems (ibid). The court might claim that the woman actually willingly participated in the act of violence and might even say that she deserved it. There are extenuating circumstances to domestic violence and thus the courts legitimize the prevailing patriarchal violence of women.

Therefore, although laws that protect women have been passed in the parliament in practice state institutions support the subordination of women. This leads us to conclude that laws that have passed result from a motivation to manufacture a western identity and convince a western audience that the Turkish state implements gender equality. There are serious issues with regards to Turkey's commitment to gender equality.

In addition to the headscarf controversy, women's employment is one of the many issues that divide the seculars and the Islamists. However, both the Islamists and the secularists believe that women should be used instrumentally. Laws concerning domestic violence claim to protect women from violent husbands and fathers, however the police and the judiciary continue to restrain women's right for protection.

These laws are enacted to create the a European image seen as that convincing to a European audience. That said, there is little evidence to suggest that the AKP government wants to implement laws that reinforce gender equality. Therefore, women

are not citizens with entitlements but rather citizens with duties. Most definitely her sexuality is a problematic issue and it must remain a public concern for the authenticity of the Turkish culture. Women's rights remain a serious issue given that women lack the right to be themselves and raise feminist concerns in politics.

Conclusion

In the first section of this chapter, the literature surrounding the state-citizen relations has been reviewed. Following this, a discussion about Kemalism took place and evidence was shown as to how it reproduces the 'others' of the regime. Subsequently, I discussed the role of the military as a state institution above the elected officials and civilian will. Finally, I discussed women's relationship with the state, mainly Kemalism. I argued that Atatürk was not a feminist but just a strategic leader. This chapter has shown how citizens in Turkey are subordinated by the state. It has also briefly discussed that how men are to the state what women are to men. It is evident that Turkish citizens are obedient but at the same time mature enough to be politically active and take responsibility of their choices. This chapter has demonstrated the characteristics of Turkish citizenry and its relationship with the State.

CHAPTER V: THE HOUSEHOLD

Ruler-Subject Binary: The Household

I moved to London in 2008 and remember it clearly. That year, large corporations such as Lehman Brothers went out of business and the global economy was in decline. Throughout that year, I worked in minimum wage paying jobs whilst preparing my applications for postgraduate study in London. One day, while wandering around Kensington, where I lived, I heard a woman shouting and crying as well as noises of someone “punching” someone or something. I looked at the people around me in the street; everybody was looking at that flat, wondering what was going on. I called the police immediately.

I introduced myself and said that there was a case of domestic violence and gave them the address. After 15 minutes of waiting, a police car and a van appeared in front of the house. Five police officers, four male and one female, got out of the car. They were not armed. They did not have batons either. The other people waiting and I discussed how police in our hometowns would refrain from interfering and would do almost nothing. We waited outside for a while, the woman was still crying out loud. After 30 to 45 minutes the police had arrested the man and were leaving the building. I immediately crossed the street to talk to the British police and told them I had phoned them. They said, “Yes, he was punching, but the wall not his wife”. I asked one officer how they were so sure and he said, “Because a lot of blood was coming out of his hand. If he hit someone's body and bled like that, the person who was hit would be in serious condition. Also, there was blood on the wall”. I asked, “Why did he get arrested at the end?” The officer replied, “Because he was making noise and disturbing his neighbors.

He was too loud”. I remember, at the time, I was really impressed by how the British police handled the situation.

For me the significance of the above mentioned incident stems from the reaction the society gives to such occurrences. It is also school teachers, friends and relatives who let the abuse take place, in the name of protecting my father from prosecution. Now I am aware that, at the time, there were no legal restrictions against domestic abuse and the law enforcement officials would have sent me home. What matters is not the abuse taking place, but the society’s response, ability, capacity and will, to eliminate it that allows such abuse to take place. In the above mentioned incident, my phone call represents the society’s will to eliminate it. I was “the society” for her, and the negligent agents, in my case was the society for me.

In this research, I discuss how the society responds and manages such situations. It is indeed, the reaction of agents surrounding the victim which allows oppression to be manifested. This research, for this reason, enables the reader and fellow researchers to understand how circumstance, the people surrounding the oppressor and the oppressed that enables abuse as a common practice shaping people’s lives.

At times, law enforcement officials prioritize the protection of the rights of abusive people. At times, in developing countries like Turkey, protecting vulnerable people can be seen at the expense of an oppressor’s rights. Therefore, ensuring the safety of vulnerable people in domestic settings is contradictory, implying that oppressors’ conditions are justifiable and assault survivors’ rights of indivisibility are disposable. In other words, when women ask for protection, the reaction received clearly indicates that the issue is not seen in relation to security, vulnerability, marginalization, equality and protection but rather as a zero-sum game amongst women and men.

For this reason, understanding patriarchal violence is often very complex. To begin with, our ability to know the exact truth underlining these incidents is often limited. For example, statistics are problematic. Initially, it is important to highlight that, in the case of Turkey; most women are persuaded not to file a report against their husbands by the officers themselves⁷. Secondly, there are women who choose not to file a complaint regardless of the reaction of authorities, observed across the globe. Additionally, Turkish officials, similar to Bolsheviks in the early 1930s in Russia, who manufactured inaccurate statistics representing economic development for the purpose of propaganda (Rosefielde: 2007), are known to have reduced statistical percentages that reveal evidence of gender inequality⁸.

It is often difficult to approach an authority and state; “My husband/ father is beating me”. It is more difficult to admit, report and confess that you have been raped and it is extremely difficult if the rapist is your husband⁹. The stigma associated with being a victim might lead to a certain (unknown) percentage of women remaining silent and not reporting the incident. For this particular reason, if nothing else, we are aware that numbers are misleading. This is one of the many challenges a researcher faces whilst investigating violence¹⁰.

The other challenge is the culture itself, which normalizes and tolerates these incidents; such as the bias and sexist perspective of authorities in Turkey, the Middle East and, possibly, various locations in the global south. However, if one asks, after four years of PhD study, including four months of ethnographic research, ‘what is the

⁷ This information was provided through an interview with the Women’s Solidarity Foundation in addition to lawyers and other activists.

⁸ Interview with lawyer Vildan Yirmibesoglu, Ankara, Turkey, 30, November 2013

⁹ Marital rape is not officially recognized in Turkey however, it is considered mistreatment of the wife which is considered unlawful.

¹⁰

main problem faced in tackling intimate partner violence?’ I would say, in the context of Turkey, the main problem was realizing that it was not just women who were oppressed but everybody was oppressed and, for that particular reason, when women attempt and campaign in order to obtain rights, men say ‘what about my rights?’

This should be interpreted in two ways; first, men are threatened as women gain rights, in a manner in which men will be held accountable. Secondly (and I believe more importantly), men are trying to say; “what about my rights, I am oppressed too”. So, when women get too much attention, others (and for some reason these are mainly men, rather than gay men or disabled people) feel excluded.

It does not end there though. When I visited an English philosophy professor, an atheist with a Christian upbringing, who was a lecturer at an Istanbul university, he told me about his intimate partner who was Alevi (which is a sect of Islam and a religious minority group in Turkey). As he was telling me how the government did not respect their right to worship and treat them equally, I immediately reminded him that women were oppressed in the same manner by the authorities in Turkey. He said instantly, “Alevi's first, then after that women”. This is also true about gay rights, disability rights and Kurdish rights.

In Turkey, almost no measures are taken to protect vulnerable people because the primary concern of decision makers and people who manipulate the political agenda is to protect the interests and wellbeing of the national subject. One indication of this position is the frame and context in which domestic violence is discussed. For example, as one participant indicated,

“The state has no standing, positioning or policies towards violence against women; instead they try to eliminate violence within the family. There is a law numbered 6284 and the name of it is ‘The elimination of violence within the family’, that’s the title, eliminating assaults against the wellbeing of the family.

The family unity is more important than women. The wellbeing of women does not concern authorities”

(Huriye Karabacak-Danaci, Lawyer, NGO activist, Ankara)

This policy, I argue, refers to the male political subjects’ fear of abandonment. The primary concern is to ensure men have infinite access to female sexuality, control the primary caregiver and ensure that Turkish citizens do not have consensual, casual sex outside of marriage. The sanctity of marriage stems from the regulation of sexuality and protecting men from being abandoned.

Another impediment against tackling domestic violence stems from the fact that a larger segment of the society, in the context of Turkey, is being oppressed as well. For this reason, one of the most invisible problems of human rights (as well as gender) research is, who comes first? It is as if there is a certain hierarchy or an invisible ladder waiting to be climbed and as people climb higher the person below tries to trip the one above in order to be first. It might seem that men are at the top of the ladder but they are not because they are, like everybody else, disposable.

Subjects who are powerful enough to oppress men are other men who are more privileged than others. To this end, it is important to notice that a certain class is used extensively to create its own others in the system. For example, the word ‘aydin’ is often used to describe the intelligentsia of Turkey. The term refers to the most distinctive professors, novelists, filmmakers and journalists in the country. However, the term is used to distinguish whose opinion matters more; it is a form of ‘othering’. Therefore, as academics are often invited on to national television programs to inform the general public using jargon and/ or academic terminology that is only understood by a minority, and therefore, knowledge and information becomes a privilege on their own.

The point needed to be made is that the masses in Turkey, known to be conservative, religious and patriarchal are also the least educated and most excluded. The key argument here is that despite the greater proportion of the conservative classes within the state (as these are the voters of the conservative AKP regime for over a decade), it is these masses that are marginalized by the secular classes who are less in population but greater in power, influence, education and class.

Socio-economically, the conservative masses are fully able to generate wealth. However, they are unable to generate wealth through intelligent means, such as owning stock in a mobile network company like Turkcell or buying and selling government stocks and/ or producing an intelligent services or product requiring specialized knowledge and/or competitive expertise. The reason underlining the different ways that difference is manifested in the Turkish politics is to stress that men who oppress women are mostly those men who are oppressed by the pro-western, modernized, secular classes.

To this extent, masculinity studies specializing in the Middle East (Sinclair-Webb, 2000 and Kandiyoti, 1994) tend to analyze the oppression of men with reference to subordinate and hegemonic masculinities and, at times, in relationship with structures. Therefore, research is needed to link the subordination of men to the subordination of women and see the similarities in the patterns of oppression that the oppressed faces by different yet similar oppressors.

I believe that men, who openly state that they want their female kin to be seen and examined by female doctors, represent the vast majority in Turkey that is known to be greater than 50%. Secular men are represented by 20%, who are more powerful in their ability to generate wealth, access knowledge and integrate into the European

Union as well as the industrialized world¹¹. The remaining proportion is highly volatile in their voting behavior and their opinions are shaped by exclusion and inclusion, as they are oppressed and accepted with reference to circumstance.

This context of difference, division and confrontation, leads to certain marginalization that is exclusive and inclusive. The socio-economic differences between the labor intensive majority and the relatively skilled minority could never be reduced to the Marxist interpretation of class. On the contrary, this is a cultural form of segregation influenced by political marginalization leading to economic vulnerability, difference in education and western models of development. This defines the norms shaping political difference as a form of difference between Ataturk's Turkey and Erdogan's Turkey. The ladder metaphor, therefore, should be seen as the sense of dominance men have over certain power dynamics result in their own oppressor subordination.

The conservative masses, often marginalized by the pro-western authorities in Turkey that leads them to feel a sense of inferiority towards development, both western and Turkish models; having profound implications for women, reflected as a form of existential, diplomatic, geopolitical overcompensation. I would argue that the pro-western secular minority also feels insulted by western notions of modernity including individualism (Kadioglu, 1996). Therefore, the ladder in the United States might be a domestic/ national concern, yet in the Middle East, issues regarding international politics and the performative formation of orientalist cultures (American cartoon

¹¹ Statistics given on basis of electoral votes of both Islamist and secular parties. In 2011, the conservative Nationalist Action Party and Justice and Development Part obtained 63% of national votes whereas the secular Republican People's Party includes 25.9%.

caricatures depicting Turkey as a bird on the eve of the Iraq war, etc.) contribute to the subject formation of the male political subject.

I would argue, despite having similar concerns over a common and mutual ‘other’ associated with the west, the two different male subjects can conflate as a subjugated yet dominating political class that is patriarchal in nature (both vertical and horizontal dimensions). As I return to the ladder metaphor, the male political subject who endeavors to trip women as they proceed is defined through his disabling endeavors towards women. As one participant of my research has indicated,

“The state is always male. First they represent the state and second they represent the husband. Every husband is a state. When we talk about women’s rights, men automatically ask, what about men’s rights. Men’s fear of losing their power and their sense of exclusion is one impediment against women’s rights in Turkey”.

(Eren Keskin, Human Rights Lawyer, Istanbul)

Another research participant supports Eren Keskin and demonstrates how the law makes preferential treatment towards the defendant rather than the oppressed.

“Unless you have solid, undeniable and strong evidence that person [the offender] would not be prosecuted. Instead of prosecuting him it is most likely that he would not be penalized. Such incidences usually have no witnesses. Women need time to recover from the trauma and find the strength to report the incident to authorities. It is far more common amongst battered women, to not approach law enforcement officials at all. And when you approach authorities so late, then this works against you, as they [the police] say why did you apply so late?”

(Human Rights Activist, Ankara)

Another participant states that,

“All violence is protected by the state. The state violates women to destroy her integrity and indivisibility. Violence against women (including sexual violence)

occurs to deter women from being politically active or to demand their human rights as a woman.”

(Human Rights Association, Istanbul)

The ladder is not legal; on the contrary, it is a race to be seen as the most vulnerable trying to make political claims. It is sociological, anthropological and political. Adam Smith’s ‘invisible hand’ is probably the most suitable metaphor for this context. A cultural hierarchy that operates as a social force on its own merit disables vulnerable groups at times where their mobilization has a faster pace than the national subject. For example, evidently women’s rights to peaceful assembly, has been interrupted far more than men’s rights to conscientious objection¹² because men were intimidated about mobilizing against the military elite. It is known that men have not organized for the elimination of compulsory military service¹³ for the last five years, yet they have written articles and represented themselves in debates in the public sphere, assuming national broadcasting media represents civil society.

Conversely, women have organized eight times in 2014 against oppression varying from violence (both police and intimate partner) as well as sexist statements addressed by the Islamist regime¹⁴. People are not arguing freedom for everyone, they

¹² Conscientious objection was chosen as a fundamental violation of the rights of men across liberal societies. It refers to the male political subject’s ability to stand against the Turkish political elite for their right to choose not to join the compulsory military duty. Research needed to divide protests into male protests and female protests in order to measure which group is mobilized would require extended periods of time dedicated to data gathering in Turkey in addition to theoretical research in London. For this reason, such analysis is excluded from this thesis.

¹³ Interview with lawyer (anonymous) Istanbul, 8, January, 2015

¹⁴ Further information on feminist protests in Turkey in the year 2014 can be accessed via;http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/kadinlardan_arinca_kahkahali_protesto-1204354 and <http://www.aljazeera.com.tr/haber/aile-ici-siddet-yasasina-protesto> and http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/kadinlar_plajinda_kadinli_erkekli_protesto-1208700 and http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/kadikoyde_kirmizili_kadinin_protesto_dansi-1247801 accessed 11 Jan 2014

argue as a secluded community who aim to obtain rights at the expense of the rights of the people. Citizenship, as previously discussed, is also constructed according to a member's status regarding other members. The most common misunderstanding amongst Turkish citizenry is the assumption that citizenship is a right bestowed to the public, that gave them power over the state apparatus (both appointed and elected officials). However, our relationship with one another and the state's contribution to this power dynamic defines who is a citizen and who is not.

It is noteworthy that the invisible hand interferes with the mobilization of women aiming to transform gender inequality into substantive equality due to men's inability (or lack of motivation) to mobilize.

For this reason, the ladder, in the context of Turkey, is a gender studies topic that is neglected. In other words, the relationship amongst subordinate subjects (and therefore, competing subjectivities, aiming to obstruct one another) appears to be neglected in the literature. One of this chapter's aims, as well as the preceding sections of this research, is to fill the void described above whilst examining competing subjects and subjectivities with reference to their relationship with the state.

This chapter suggests that values, norms and cultures that accommodate and construct the reproduction of gender equality is manifested and revealed through statements made on domestic violence in Turkey.

This chapter is about women, men and subjecthood; how they interact and how hierarchy, oppression, privilege and vulnerability are produced with reference to domestic violence; in the household.

Male to Female Violence

Whilst conducting interviews in Turkey, I found that there was a strong emphasis but on the word family. The majority of feminists are concerned with the lack of an understanding of protecting women instead of the family. As one participant states,

“There is a patriarchal mentality. By naming the law as the family protection law, they are stating that the family comes first and women come second. They are sending a message to authorities that if you have to choose between women’s welfare and the unity of the family, choose the latter in the expense of the former.”

(Eray Karinca, male, Former Family Judge, Ankara)

Another participant attracts attention to compensation and prioritization of needs.

“A man know that if he states that his partner is cheating on him he would benefit from unjust provocation and he obtains a reduction of penalty, immediately. It is perceived that if a woman says I love someone else, the man is in unjust position. But in reality infidelity is only a reason for divorce. But the courts perceive men as victims and for this reason men have encouragement to kill their wives.”

(NGO activist, female, Ankara)

In this statement we see that a man’s insecurity at times of rejection and exclusion is seen as a detrimental force that he cannot contain or suppress and for that reason it seems a legitimate reason to oppress the female subject. We can clearly see that there is a hierarchy of needs in which his needs of acceptance and fear of exclusion is seen more urgent and vital compared to her needs of security and safety. This is an example of numerous cases where men’s less urgent needs are seen more vital and essential than her right to life and right to safety.

The legal system has numerous shortcomings and limitations. For example, a family judge I interviewed has clearly stated sexist opinions as a concern for the wellbeing of the male political subject on issues pertaining domestic abuse.

“We have extreme pressure on us. On the law of 6284 [family protection act], the judge, without any investigation, has to give a restraining order from one to six months. One Member of Parliament received an order that he cannot join his household for eight months. If the judge decides accordingly, a woman could be allocated to a pension. “

(Family Judge, Judicial Palace, Ankara)

In this statement it is very clear that the judge is resentful of the fact that he does not conduct any research or investigation against the allegations and accusation against the male political subject and that he has to order a restraining order, often restricting the abusive man. He was resentful about how easy it is for women to obtain restraining orders against their partners. It is clear that the law enforcement officials are more concerned about the well being of the male political subject than instead of the abused women.

Another problematic aspect of protecting women in the household stems from the shortcomings of the 6284 law. For example, as stated by a research participant,

“Sometimes law enforcement officials assume that if they, the man was prosecuted and sent to jail he would be even more in a rage and he would be released from prison and murder his wife. No matter how harsh the laws are we will not be able to protect women against violence. For example, a man killed his wife in front of a prison, in front of her child, because he was in love, the man can define love as homicide.”

(Human Rights Lawyer, female, Istanbul)

From this statement it can be understood that oppression and love operate together. Men who cannot manage their feelings of affection and loss reflect violent behavior due to their intense feelings of helplessness. This helplessness gives him a man privilege to

restrict and obstruct the primary needs of safety and right to life of others. This implies that there are needs that have different rankings of urgency and they are compensated in an unjust matter. Furthermore, the above statement also demonstrates that oppression is nurture. Love can lead to homicide. Love and nurture have a unique relationship in the Turkish context that will be elaborated in further sections of this research.

According to the research conducted by Women's Status General Directorate which is associated with the Prime Ministry of the Turkish Republic, 64 men and women have been interviewed in Ankara, Samsun and Mersin in Turkey. These interviews reveal information on how women, at times, condemn violence and at times, learn to live with it. Interviews with men reveal how they see violence as unavoidable. To analyze in depth, I will quote references from research published in 2009, by the Turkish Prime Ministry.

“[...] look for example, she had a widow friend, to be honest, for the sake of being precautions, I told her to not see her... She [the widow] was beautiful. She almost always spent time outside, like in cafes. OK, let's not think badly, but when I think nicely I find contradictions. But I do not want my wife to spend time with this person. That is what I want from my wife [...] Do not be friends with this person. If she wants she can come to our house. [...] But [you should] not go out and spend time together, in fact delete her phone number from your phone [...] She had a few friends like that. She would secretly talk to them on the phone. I would say, do not do it, once, twice, three times... but at the fifth time I would react radically. You can imagine what could happen then, to a man... You would get angry and raise your voice and if the other person is also raising their voice, then you will experience the reflex your brain gives to your hands and arms, you would also break the furniture, as I often did” (p.129)

(34 year old married, father of one, graduated from elementary school)

With this participant, it is clear that verbal assaults are aimed to ensure conformity and physical assaults stem from the same notion. To ensure a certain outcome he (the oppressor) needs to control the external factor, as he has no subject formation allowing

him to compete with the alternative subjective outcome he deems undesirable. It is also important to notice what he considers to be provocative (as he claims to be provoked into violent action) is reciprocity, as his wife raising her voice was deemed unacceptable.

Reciprocity could be defensive on her side and it implies equality. The assault stems from problems occurring in implementing dominance, therefore, resistance. The assault is, as a result, concerned with creating a subject formation that accommodates the needs of an oppressor who does not retaliate but simply conforms to the inequality imposed on her.

Another characteristic of this male political subject, which influences the power dynamic, is a sense of responsibility/irresponsibility towards his subjecthood. He expresses his behavior by addressing his feelings as something done to him; anger is something that *happens* to a man. There is no indication of an individual who is aware that his feelings result from his own thoughts and the way he is reacting to the situation but rather emotions are intrapersonal forces that take over the situation and the other person influenced by it. The stimuli, is the person who is responsible for his feelings as well as his reaction to them.

I cannot see a sense of responsibility or appreciation of his input into the outcome being questioned, by him or anyone else. He is entitled to a subjecthood that can act on impulse whereas his wife, who is responsible for the cause and effect of the undesired outcome, is expected to be the engineer who steers him and herself to the status quo that serves him, the society and the state.

As highlighted in the chapter on patriarchal theory, we also see a deep concern over a women's sexuality. This sexuality is not only monitored through virginity tests but also through restrictions on behavior and socializing. The main issue here is to

prevent what a man fears might happen. It is noteworthy that his wife is not being unfaithful in any way. Rather, the husband assumes that this other women might be willing to flirt with men and, therefore, his wife might end up being influenced in a certain way. This is sufficient for a man to feel insecure about his manhood.

Therefore, the concept of honor, as discussed earlier, is about taking precautionary measures to eliminate the possibility of something “unacceptable”. This often includes a man's fear of feeling threatened, betrayed or simply rejected. Honor is not just about what is deemed moral or immoral but it is more about what serves the man's being his self-esteem, pride and sense of dominance, that is extended over other people, justified by culture, the judiciary and policy makers alike.

As seen in the case above, men not only have the written and unwritten right to tell women to shape their entire lives according to taken measures, that should be taken to avoid the possibility of a sexual threat to his wellbeing; but they are allowed to enforce these measures by force if necessary. This is supported by the elite within the Turkish government and gives men a greater sense of confirmation of masculinity.

A man's rights as a husband (and to an extent as a father) are extended rights. Defenders of the rights of vulnerable people aim to protect the weaker party; the term human rights (from a gendered perspective) could either mean a man's rights as a person or women's rights as the marginalized group. However, I suggest we consider the term **Extended Rights**. These rights usually contradict the norms of international law, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the European Court of Human Rights. These rights are claimed by those who believe that their personal imagery, goals and aspirations are essential rights for them, to the extent that, they should be defended and claimed against the primary, fundamental human rights of others.

These rights also suggest that a subject is entitled to shape another subject's subjecthood and every thought and value needed in every social and material form of existence. An extended right is a right that is existential and it aims to destroy the power within and enable a woman's to the 'power over' that should, would and could be subjected by patriarchal peers as well as kinship.

The rights of the privileged are a reflection of a greater sense of entitlement. This sense of entitlement is often evident from their acts of overcompensation. This overcompensation is observed whilst analyzing the loss the oppressor claims and the damage he causes amongst the oppressed and the disproportion between them. The greater sense of entitlement leads to the overcompensation in which the oppressor is often justified.

The acceptance of this justification amongst government officials, the general public as well as women, transforms the hegemonic subjectivity. This subjectivity becomes the basis of a man's extended rights over a woman. These extended rights are produced within the household; however, they spread across the public sphere and become part of the structure, producing **structural patriarchy**.

Another man interviewed by the same researchers discussed how the society loses when women are empowered, not just men. Similar to the participant above, many men believe that violence against women happens because women provoke and/ or seduce (tahrik) men. For example;

"In general, it is really women who provoke men but if men come home after drinking, or as drunk, women would nag in the morning. If there is unemployment or financial difficulty... it would still be women who would provoke men, but she would provoke him for those reasons. I do not think she would provoke a man for no reason." (p.121)

(Age 60 to 65, male, married for at least 15 years, high school graduate)

It is noteworthy that this participant almost always blames the woman for heating the conversation. Even in times of economic hardship and stress, violence against women is still her fault. However, as discussed in the chapter on patriarchal theory, there is a direct relationship between a man's socio economic status and his violent behavior which leads us to conclude that he, who feels emasculated and less of a man for not being able to fulfill his role as a breadwinner, is more likely to assault his wife when he loses his job.

Yet, in the imagination of Turkish men, that loss of power and the sense of being emasculated are not being overcompensated through violence but rather women are being put in their place when they start nagging. Therefore, in this quote, similar to previous ones, women are seen as a reflection of personal insecurity, the ultimate source of provocation (if not reduced to external stimuli) that brings mistreatment on their own.

Another participant believes that violence is not a male to female or female to male act but rather a feeling inflicted on a person through violating personal belongings. For example;

“He would burn my clothes. I could not wear the skirt I liked to wear. He would burn everything. He would not want me to wear anything [nice]. You would have to wear old clothes, bad clothes.” (p.122)

(34 year old, married, mother of four children, graduate of elementary school)

Through this participant we see that violence is not just about oppressing someone physically but rather eliminating any possibility in which women could be a challenge for a man.

This is significant in shaping women's status as citizens. I always believed that, at times, clothing could be a means of expression for women¹⁵. Therefore, women would be positioned amongst other women as well as men through their attire.

His assault, as a result, intends to shape her social positioning and how she stands in the group amongst her peers and other men, implying that he wanted to sustain her second-class status as his wife, so he could feel safe.

I can provide a personal example that is relevant to this case. My mother's mother was considerably younger than her husband. They dated at a time in Turkey when the majority of marriages happened through arrangements between parents. The dating period was considerably long. They were often invited to receptions as a couple due to my grandfather's position as a high-ranking military officer. My mother told me the story that one day my grandfather told his mother how attractive his wife looked and how he was disturbed by the attention she received. His mother told him to give her a child every year so she became damaged goods. My grandmother gave birth ten times and five of the children died. I was told that my grandfather would force his wife into having sexual intercourse against her wishes, which was well known amongst their female children.

Her beauty and the insecurity it inflicted on her partner was something that needed to be destroyed as if the man had no means to overcome his insecurity. A woman's soul had to be destroyed, body had to be abused and children had to be born for the sake of something the man felt. This is the existential element of gender inequality in which there are often no limits to what a man would destroy, dispose or destruct in the name of an unjustified sense of insecurity. It is the limitation in the

¹⁵ This thesis does not intend to explain women's attire and their self-esteem, citizenship and wellbeing. However, my argument is based on the assumption that clothing would mean something more than it does for men.

motive (how insignificant the feeling is) and the lack of limitations in the destruction (how far he would go) that define the roots of domestic violence. Therefore, superficial, if not cosmetic, understandings should be discouraged and rather the subject formation, reflected in a series of a zero-sum game, should be explored.

In this case, we see a man ensuring that his wife is not attractive and that no one thinks she looks attractive. He felt threatened by his wife's beauty and the possible problems it might cause. But what are these problems? Maybe she would get more attention from other people and maybe she might enjoy that attention. At that point, people might start spreading rumors about what kind of a husband he is, in which she is more appealing than him, and that it was a reflection on his manly skills of restriction. So, he would probably claim that he would do this for his honor, it is possible that he is just afraid that his wife's beauty was a liability, if not a burden; or possibly, he might think that he looked insignificant when they were seen together in public.

Therefore, the concept takes its shape, not only from the restrictions on sexuality, but anything which causes a man to feel insecure regarding his female dependents. This insecurity is felt, at any time, when he feels he is not entirely in control or when people around him accuse him of not being entirely in control. This sense of control is established through extended rights. The right of a man to find excuses, justification and a realm to realize he can establish a sense of security, by dominating/ governing the stimuli rather than relying on power within or self-empowerment, is an extended right that shapes subjecthood for the oppressor and the oppressed. He is not only governing a relationship with a spouse but also a nation. His enacted subjecthood is based on an invisible right (substantive nature) permitting restrictions of circumstantial reproduction of actual and potential threats.

According to the research conducted by the Turkish Prime Ministry, violence is about establishing status quo. The report was funded by the Turkish Prime Ministry and was conducted by Hacettepe University academics. Although funding was provided by the state, it is clear that the university has structured and conducted the research. It might appear as if the state is aiming to criminalize abuse by taking the necessary measures to understand it. However, I believe when it comes to criminalizing the abuser, women's safety would be perceived in contrast to men's conviction. Often the man obtains reduced sentences due to unjust provocation causes such as "she insulted my masculinity" or "she was not a virgin".

Therefore, measures introduced to protect women and efforts to understand their subordination should be seen with reference to the shortcomings of introducing legal adjustments and impediments on men to protect women.

A case in the report states that,

"Violence is about the use of force and men who have power in the society (or at times feel that this power is under threat), establish control over women through the use of violence from time to time."(p.130)

According to this statement violence is about control. As I see the truth in that claim, I personally think that violence stems from a sense of entitlement (Kimmel, 2002), which is, largely, a very effective way of convincing the subject that such acts are necessary. This sense of entitlement is recognized amongst female participants. For example,

"When a man beats a woman, he thinks, *I can take her. My power is enough to handle her. All men have it [the mentality]. My father had it too. My power is enough to take you. There is such a thought. You know how you say ego, I do not believe in that, it is only a matter of power. You know they say, men are satisfying their egos, or themselves, there is no such thing. To be honest, this is not about an ego.* In reality, if a man's power is good enough to take a woman, then he will always beat his wife. That is how it is." (p.130)

(26 year old, in the process of getting a divorce, mother of one, did not graduate from secondary school)

It is interesting to see that, for this woman, if a man has the power, he will definitely be violent. However, she also refers to deterrence. She does not even consider the possibility that some men will be personally and politically mature enough to express themselves without violence. Interestingly, she argues how it is a matter of a man's capability rather than the culture he was raised in. But it is also important to notice that she addresses a certain sense of entitlement, driven by relative power associated with being a man. Also the lack of deterrence on a woman's part is, to an extent, what the system could provide for her. Interestingly, there has been no reference to the state as a means to provide deterrence or a sense of retaliation and the inability of authorities to provide women such security.

It is this relativity that reinforces the sense of entitlement needed to overcompensate his loss of even the smallest concern he might have at the expense of the fundamental rights of women. These small concerns are not just basic needs a "subject" would have, as suggested by Maslow, whilst mutually coexisting with one another based on equality and freedom. On the contrary, these concerns emerge from a strong sense of entitlement regarding a man's quest for seniority and dominance in which great loss felt in other subjects is justified.

The understanding of extended rights, which involves a man increasing his sphere of influence and treating his every single desire and concern as a primary matter against someone's fundamental rights, is a psychological construct which shapes the worth of a man and a woman. His need to be the one who is respected the most and is often above everyone else's right to exist freely. The phrase 'respect' should not be understood within a liberal context in which two people mutually reinforce an imagery

of equality and freedom. On the contrary, it should be understood with relevance to vertical patriarchy, as explained in the chapter on patriarchy.

As discussed in the chapter on patriarchy, with relevance to Sharabi's work (1988), there are often vertical relations between the husband and his wife, the father and the child, as well as the state and the citizen. Therefore respect, in the context of Turkey, refers to an understanding where the one claiming it also claims a sense of superiority over the other party. This sense of entitlement is linked to identifying respect as obedience and the other knowing 'their place'. One participant gives an example of this;

“I am not defending wife battering, but a woman should be reluctant to approach her husband. She should be intimidated by him. I do not accept if she asks why things are happening that way. A woman should know her womanhood¹⁶, she should speak less. Do not get me wrong, if she needs to defend something she should. But when her husband is present she should not speak on and on. If she should do anything that is demeaning for her husband, even I would also beat her. Even if her husband does not beat her, he should give her, her training.”
(p.132)

(Age 58, widowed, mother of four, elementary school graduate, mother and mother-in-law)

In this context, it is important to observe a mother-in-law's point of view in which marriage should be based on an understanding that privileges the male kin and oppresses the female kin. It is also noteworthy that she uses the phrases “...demeaning for her husband”, which makes it clear that his need of being respected (in the vertical

16 The phrase of womanhood should not be confused with femininity. Instead it should be seen as, a women's place of being in secondary importance.

sense of the term) is more crucial than her right of indivisibility as well as her right to life.

Through this participant we see evidence of women supporting oppression against women. Often in the Middle East, women not only *internalize* oppression they have experienced but also *identify* with the oppressor and decide to *enact* that personality. As psychologist Paolo Freire explains the dynamics between the oppressor and the oppressed, he states that “he imposes his own contours on the vanquished, who internalizes this shape and become ambiguous beings ‘housing’ another...”¹⁷. His statement clearly defines self-othering as widespread within the Middle East; however, there is ample evidence suggesting the need for further research.

Vectors Within

Research on the exclusive conditions of oppression and how it is manifested in a unique form of subjecthood has been elaborated through the concept of intersectionality. As discussed in the chapter on patriarchy, intersectionality and subjecthood are constructed through vectors that identity, manifests itself as race, class, sexual orientation, religion, ability and many more constructed forms that define the unique conditions of patriarchal oppression with a subject. Could one argue for an existential vector, affecting a subject’s perception of oppression and motives for enactment? I believe, building on the psychologist quoted above who aims to explain working class oppression in the US, one could also explain how Muslim women in Turkey are oppressed looking at the same framework. To exemplify, I will give

¹⁷ <http://4strugglemag.org/2010/07/23/examining-the-internalized-oppressor-complex/> last accessed 11 January, 2015

evidence from research conducted by United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) in 2013, in addition to a personal experience I had in my immediate family.

According to UNFPA's research in 2013 a case has been given to research participants to see how they reacted to the situation,

"A 12 year girl comes home from school to see her mother and siblings crying and her father angry. She learns that her mother went to have a cup of tea with her neighbour and neglected her domestic duties of cleaning and cooking. As her father told her mother, "Didn't I tell you not to go to the neighbour's?" Her mother tried to explain why she was late, her father said, "Don't you talk back to me!" and assaulted her more than once".

Participants from the city of Aydin were high school students. Female participants objected to the man's right to batter his wife whereas male participants have insisted that there must be a just cause to battering, at all times and, therefore, the act is never unjustifiable. Female participants from the city of Erzurum, on the other hand, suggested that the father was right to act in that way and it was women who lead to the violent reaction. Interpreting the situation, I assume the female students would feel vulnerable, hurt and resent the situation due to a romantic partner who would batter women, as women feel responsible for the aggressive behavior simultaneously. The 'vector within' is reflected through contradictory positioning towards stimuli that might appear to affect her judgment that is located within the subject.

Another case, seemingly relevant to this discussion, is based on an experience I had with my mother. As a 14 year old girl I bought a box of tampons and put it in my drawer, and my mother found it. Her reaction had nothing to do with matters related to health and hygiene. Somehow, in her mind, tampons for a 14 year old translated as 'sexual intercourse'. She shouted angrily, "who did you have sex with?" My father was not speaking, yet he was standing right next to her as if he was being diplomatic on the

surface but patriarchal in nature. As I did not defend myself or make a statement either way, I remember asking about the relationship between sex and the use of tampons. She said that when a virgin uses a tampon it does not work because of the hymen. What I thought the most surprising issue was her inability to acknowledge how some girls did not live or plan their lives around their hymens. Additionally, like many other women, my mother had marital problems in which she questioned her husband's ability to express his feelings, provide for her emotional wellbeing and make her feel appreciated. The contradiction she could not see is how patriarchy has constructed masculinity that leads to a detachment towards emotional awareness, preventing the possibility of healthy relationships with others. Therefore, my mother (as my biological and social/emotional parent) identified with men to the extent that the only message she was able to deliver was a patriarchal message despite being a victim of patriarchy herself. This is one incident that suggests how patriarchal oppression is seen as nurturing, literally. As a mother she was doing what she knew best, since the anger suggested that she was educating a girl who had misbehaved. However, her struggle with her husband and insistence of her entitlement to sexual expression suggests that the system she rejects was what she was trying to teach her own daughter.

Indeed, it is unreasonable to accuse someone for not being a social/ political scientist; however, as a woman who has been a victim of the system, her attempt to victimize the younger generation is interesting. Therefore, existentially the subjecthood understood as intersecting vectors, should also include this contradiction, of being located between being a victim and an enacting agent, as a form of plural existence. Being the oppressor and the oppressed at the same time, can manifest itself within the same subject. Alternatively, we can discern whether a subject identifies with the

oppressor or whether she submits to oppression. An individual's position towards oppression is a neglected vector that could potentially understand the magnifier effect.

According to transactional analysis, we consist of three inner beings. The inner parent, child and adult represent different forms of knowledge, need and being¹⁸. The inner parent represents recordings from our childhood (such as 'boys don't cry'), upbringing and internalized societal values and the inner child represent our need to play, feel, connect and belong. Our inner adult represents an independent way of looking at the world, our voice that recognizes the other two and seeks means to manage all subjectivities. Given that, in the above example, a woman would cry despite her patriarchal beliefs of violence being deserved, we can see an existence of two subjectivities. The self (inner parent) that is constructed amongst patriarchal values would imply compliance. On the other hand, her tears give evidence of a being that is hurt and vulnerable. Therefore, she is torn between self-oppression (internalization and identification) and self-consciousness.

The inner parent that serves the interests of the abusive partner rather than the subjective and emotional existence that makes her cry is a torn identity that has not reached the existence described by Freire. Therefore, the existential vector I aim to describe, with reference to the submission of women in the Middle East, attracts attention to the multiple identities within the subject that also defines her positioning compared to others. It is extremely difficult to detect whether it is repetitive and profound oppression or rather a person's own tendency of internalizing oppression (as opposed to resistance) that leads to the subject's modalities. However, it is clear that some subjects believe in oppressive structures as a beneficiary whilst suffering as a

¹⁸ <http://www.12accede.org/transactional-analysis.html> last accessed 11 January 2015.

victim simultaneously. For this reason, we should consider intrapersonal analysis whilst discussing subjecthood and, therefore, intersectional analysis, should bring existential perspectives to the debate.

Another important part worth mentioning is how she said that the wife needed her training. By being trained by her husband she would learn to live with less, insubordinate and oppressed. This training, as I understood it, involves teaching what is important in their marriage and what is not. Needless to say, it is about a man's extended rights over his wife. I assume it does not even cross her wildest dreams to discuss a type of training that challenges this status quo in the first place which shows how ingrained patriarchal values are amongst different groups within the society.

A participant makes a fair point regarding the social aspects of violence.

“... The woman who says, I am being beaten at home, is ashamed of it.

But the man who says, I beat my wife, is not ashamed of it when he says it in the street or in the cafe...If the society condemns him, if his education was given in that way and if the man was shamed, he would not be able to do it...There is a great role for women in this case” (p.138).

(60-65 years, married for 15 years, studied after high school, male)

In this regard, it is important to notice the role of structural patriarchy in Turkish society. As noted by the participant, the values of the society lead to the normalization and acceptance of violence. As men reinforce their power by beating women, other men as well as female relatives, like their mothers and sisters, continue to oppress women. As Kandiyoti (1988) discussed in the chapter on patriarchy, women oppress other women primarily because that is the only way they can escape their own oppression and claim a privileged role for themselves. This is known as bargaining with patriarchy and it is common in the Middle East and North Africa. Women's role in the reproduction of patriarchy is often undermined. This reproduction stems from women's limited, scattered resistance in addition to active participation in acts of oppression. It also stems

from the lack of faith, on part of Turkish women, in their ability to change the system eventually .

Women role as oppressors can be observed amongst women who raise a son.

According to one participant,

“Even if you penalize him and try every method, still nothing changes.

It is inside of a man. It is related to a man's self. Because he was raised like that from the very beginning. [...] We are also mothers. Maybe I also raise my child that way. I do not want him to do it like that but I give him that freedom. I look at him and say, he is a man. That is the problem, from the beginning. Men are given this privilege.” (p.155)

(41 years old, divorced, mother of one, graduated from elementary school)

The relationship between the mother and the son, apart from Kandiyoti's research, has not been sufficiently studied in detail, in the context of the MENA region. Throughout human rights campaigning and advocacy efforts that operate in Turkey, there is almost no mention of the way boys are raised. However, it is suspected that men learn that they are privileged and explore the various ways they can be a man from an early age. As a social worker from a women's shelter in Turkey, she has observed a five year old child being capable and motivated to oppress women, despite the age gap, simply because he is male.

“...The child does exactly what his father does and this is a five year old who does this. We accepted him to our shelter and his mother was relieved. Of course the shelter is very crowded; there are children and women who make noise. In the blink of an eye, the boy went to the kitchen and grabbed a knife. “I am telling all of you to shut up.” he said.

“I am also crazy like my dad, I can stab all of you.” and he continued

“You have to shut up”. We sent the boy to therapy for a long time.

This is very painful but since violence is experienced in front of the children, they are affected by it.” (p.143)

(Worker at women's shelter)

This was probably one of the many incidents in which boys learn that they are superior for being a man at a young age. Feminist organizations like Purple Shelter and Women's Solidarity Foundation in Ankara have no training programs for mothers who intend to raise their sons in egalitarian ways. Ideas concerning new ways of tackling domestic violence, discussed in the public sphere, do not acknowledge the impact women might make by raising their sons differently. Perhaps, this is the greatest problem amongst women who have lived through patriarchal structures, criticized it but not yet challenged it. This is also a matter of citizenship, which involves the construction of the self, in relationship to the community and other citizens. It is almost as if intimate partner violence is a matter of bad luck or a freedom that has gone too far.

I wonder why women do not raise their sons to be how they would like their husbands to be. Firstly, in the Turkish culture and, to an extent, the Middle East, there is an expectation that children should grow up and look after their parents by giving them money, taking them to the hospital if necessary and doing their weekly grocery shopping. In this regard, the mother might consider raising her son in a way that privileges his masculinity for the sake of bonding with the child. This bond, the women hopes, will reward her eventually, as the child grows older. Therefore, she would tell him that he is better. Also, for a mother it is probably difficult to tell a boy not to do something, as the child would rarely acknowledge her authority since she is a woman.

More importantly, I would argue, this is a matter of citizenship. The idea that a single person would matter and that he/ she can make a difference by questioning authority or simply just questioning stems from a democratic understanding of ideas pertaining to evolution, social change, progress and the worth of a human being. In other words, women do not raise their sons to believe in equality because they simply

do not believe they can make a difference in the first place. The difference mentioned here refers to an ability to shape structures, norms, values and procedures. This has very little to do with a mother being a woman and is more likely related to the social structure and democratization of Turkish society.

If respect meant being superior and worthy of obedience and behaving in other ways that might lead to prosecution, what is the likelihood of a random individual, educated to elementary school level, lower class with a religious upbringing, taking a stand and saying, 'I will do it differently'? I would contend that if women try to raise their sons (and daughters) differently, they would be challenged by their husbands. Additionally, their sons would socialize with other boys, watch TV and go to school. Therefore, the pattern introduced by the mother would be challenged by the boy who is exposed to patriarchal values in every segment of society. As a result of this, the effectiveness of the method would be highly controversial.

Indeed, little effort is better than no effort. Probably, if the majority of women decided to make a change, something would be moved from its place. However, in this research, I argue that, the reproduction of patriarchy is structural. It is reproduced at metaphorical levels through abstract concepts. It is reproduced through structures, which reward and discard men and women accordingly.

Another case provides evidence for children, in addition to their mother, learning the basic practical implications of living with an oppressor.

"My children and I, take it easy with him because he is always angry.
The children got used to it; they try to behave in an easy-going manner.
[...] We leave [him alone in] the room or the area he is in. Because
I am not [physically] powerful enough to go against him."
(48 years old, single/ living with parents, graduated from university)

It is important to notice children's compliance, which has inevitable consequences for citizenship. If the mother was given the opportunity to file for a divorce (legal aid, social workers, psychologists, etc.) rather than learning how to live with less security, the children would have learnt to challenge authority and ask for a greater structure allowing them freedom for their rights to flourish in the public sphere. Therefore, citizenship and the 'ruler subject binary' is, in my opinion, situated and constructed at the private sphere and later reproduced at the public, national and international levels, which will be elaborated in further sections.

Conclusion

Gender inequality is constructed within the dynamics of intimate partners in the private sphere. However, these dynamics also shape citizenship, subjecthood, interpersonal and intrapersonal relationships. The intrapersonal might be seen as an existential vector of subjecthood, addressing contradictory identities that are inhibited within a subject.

Subject formation, as an agent of political enactment should be seen in relation to 'power within' and 'power to', and not only 'power-over'. The main aim of power over, in this context, is to sustain stability and maintain circumstances needed for satisfying needs of self-actualization that are far from urgent but socially constructed instead. The severity of gender inequality is the man's ability to overcompensate needs and inconveniences that are not essential to a healthy existence but enables him to build a system of rewards and ramifications based on a definition of subjecthood and, therefore, manhood which deems a woman's primary needs of safety and security extravagant. I believe this power dynamic, and the relationship between the ruler and

the subject, manifests itself across the public sphere throughout Turkish political structures.

CHAPTER VI: STATE REPRODUCTION OF PATRIARCHY

The Ideology of National Assembly

First, I would like to give one more example from the research conducted by the Turkish Prime Ministry in order to give an illustration of a state institution which is meant to protect women.

“Yes, I stayed there for three months. I stayed at the women's shelter, which was opened by the state. There are a lot of women there.

Not all of them were subject to violence. Some were hiding from someone, some were just divorced. Some women were pregnant.

Some were healthy and some were unhealthy. There were people whose mental health was not so good, and some had schizophrenia¹⁹.

The fact that they put these ill people in the same place as pregnant women makes healthy people lose their health as well. [...] Indeed, we were all staying together. There were two rooms, which had six beds each. They were giving us a meal to eat three times a day. The food was not edible. [...] And I could not eat anything until I gave birth. I fed myself with water and milk. [...] You are being subjected to psychological violence there. Imagine that they [shelter staff] would shout at women with children. They would say: “your husband threw you out because you are like this”. That was the mentality of the shelter staff. And whatever we did we could not erase that thought from our minds. I had the right to take a shower once a day. Only 15 minutes. Not more [...] it was a shelter. Which is not exactly a nice environment but instead of being beaten by a man, as a pregnant woman, or being beaten in front of your child, the shelter is like heaven.” (p.147)

¹⁹ I am not entirely sure whether the participant is fully able to identify a mentally ill person when she sees one. The term schizophrenia can might as well as be a -figure of speech- also.

(26 years old, trying to get divorced, mother of one, educated to secondary school)

The institution, which is supposed to be a refuge for battered women, as indicated above, had no feminist notion. This notion is only expected since it is a women's shelter for battered women and domestic violence is a serious case of gender based violence. They did not see women as victims of male violence or patriarchal values. They did not see them as women whose basic human rights were curtailed, but rather as trouble makers or women who just did not fit in. They were seen as women who were unwanted for a variety of reasons and came to this shelter because they had nowhere else to go to.

This shelter, amongst others, was regulated by the state. The shelters were found to be a measure to tackle domestic violence. Those who represent the state were not representing women. At that point, it was clear to see that, just like men who did not see women as individuals, the state did not see the women as citizens. Women, who have experienced exclusion in the private sphere, had once again experienced it in the public sphere. This was a clear example of how vertical patriarchy transformed itself into structural patriarchy across the state apparatus. Different concepts, different metaphors as well as different methods of violence caused the essence to stay the same; oppression, exclusion, hierarchy and patriarchy were prevalent.

Another report that is relevant to this discussion was issued by the Ministry of Justice on the 20th of February, 2015. One important feature of this document is how the family is discussed in relationship to the collectivity. For example, the document states that:

“The family is the most important and essential part of a societies' foundation. The family, which is incredibly important for the society and the state, is the oldest living arrangement ever existed. The importance of the family to the state

and the society, has led the family institution to be documented and regulated by international treaties. The protection of the family not only affects the family and its members but also the society as a whole. In the last few years, mostly women but also other family members have been subject to violence at escalating rates. [...] The European Union Committee has recommended the prosecution of offenders and the protection of victims of violence.”

(Ministry of Justice, Ankara, 2015)

In the above mentioned document, it is important to notice that the wellbeing of women is almost never mentioned (except on one occasion). The elimination of violence is somehow connected to the wellbeing of the society. I argue that the main concern authorities have is the alienation of the male political subject. By passing laws that protect the family, authorities aim to send a message to men that they are responsible for the wellbeing of the family, but in no way? is way women's wellbeing more important than his. If the law states that this is a measure taken to ensure the safety of women, at that point, men will oppose and ask for measures to protect them. To this extent, men are, as I argue, threatened by legal measures that protect women but not men.

Commented [KM1]: Doesn't make sense – sorry!

Another characteristic of this document is the authorities determination to make necessary legal adjustments adhere to the norms of the EU. It is clear that if the EU has not enforced its vision, values and norms on Turkey, progress would have been much slower and time consuming. It is almost as if Turkish officials feel that it is their responsibility to adhere to European norms, possibly for accession. However, there is very little evidence to suggest that the measures taken to eliminate violence against women are actually deployed to protect women from violence.

According to one research participant, women's rights actually threaten men in tangible means as there are no measures taken to ensure their full citizenship:

“The state does not have any position towards violence against women; on the contrary, it has a position towards the unity of the family. That is the phrase used in all documents ‘elimination violence in the family’. The family is more important than women. This is a conscious effort. We need new regulations. We do not see women as equal citizens to men. [...] In several meetings we hear the same argument. ‘You constantly say women’s rights, where are my rights?’ This is due to men’s fear of losing his power over women.”

(Huriye Karabacak, Lawyer, female, Ankara)

Similar to the document above, it is clear that human rights lawyers are concerned about the negligence of the state towards the wellbeing of women. They are also afraid that women’s rights are above men’s rights, whether it is citizenship, military service, employment law or any other legal concern that affect men. Men do not mobilize as much as women do and for this reason, the more women shout and demand women’s rights, the more it is deemed threatening to men.

In the document issued by the Ministry of Justice, it is clear to see that the unity of the family is protected by the state. Another participant argues that the state could not be undermined:

“We have to understand violence against women has to be understood whilst being situated within the system. This [violence] has been a tradition. It is a societal issue. The state has a tremendous responsibility. However, all forms of violence are protected by the state.”

(Human Rights Lawyer, 2014, Istanbul)

From the participant’s opinion stated above, it is clear that the state might take measures to eliminate violence, however the state somehow gains from this violence and protects the offender. As I will argue in the next chapter, the state gains from the power men exercise over women.

Another research participant drew attention to the tension between men and women at times when human rights are being discussed:

“Women say women’s rights, men often say, ‘what about my rights?’ The reason because of this is that men want to exercise power and control over women. This (legal-political) system gives privileges to men. The state has an incredible effect on this outcome. The law also gives privileges to men as well. Yes, men have rights too but from being a human being”

(Human rights lawyer, female, Istanbul)

From the above statement we can clearly see that there is a zero-sum game amongst men and women and women who fight against domestic violence are doing this in opposition to what some people call, men’s rights. The state is a tight-rope walker between alienating EU officials and the male political subject. The fear of alienating the male political subject is a clear concern, if not encouragement for men to oppress women.

Another participant, a retired family judge, provided a different perspective.

“In order to refrain from sending men to prison, naturally, tolerance towards men will increase. The judge will think what I can do to prevent him from going to jail.”

(Retired Judge, 2014, Ankara)

This statement clearly indicates that there are opinions upheld by law enforcement officials, including the judiciary that exercises preferential treatment towards men. It could be suspected that, in Turkey, the majority of judges are males, and for this reason, it is easy to implement or exercise excessive tolerance towards male offenders.

Another participant drew attention to restraining orders that fail to protect victims of violence:

“The majority of women murdered already had a restraining order. These orders are not effective at all. The police do not know how to implement the restraining orders. As soon as the order expires men assault women and often kill them”

(Lawyer, female, 2013, Istanbul)

Another participant indicates how women internalize patriarchal values:

“Sometimes women can say I deserved it. Men can kill a woman with a knife because she did not cook the dinner. Women can help preserve the patriarchal order. Men obtain penalty reduction on the basis of unjust provocation. He is always seen as a victim [by officials] who had no other choice but to attack his partner.”

(NGO worker, female, Istanbul)

In the above statement, it is clear that partially the problem stems from women’s inability to understand their entitlements and rights. However, I would like to stress the importance of the unjust provocation cause by which men are deemed helpless and that they had no other choice but to assault their victims. As I argue in the next chapter, helplessness is often a privilege and a man’s not so urgent needs are always deemed more vital and significant than the victims right to life and right to safety. This indicates that overcompensation is a practice endorsed and/or encouraged by the authorities.

Another participant drew attention to the patriarchal mentality of authorities:

“The state’s position on violence is insufficient; at times they [the state] allow it to happen since everyday 4 or 5 women are murdered. We can see that the state does not do anything significant because the penalties are not deterrent. The state cannot implement any of the laws they issue. Women are used for population control. [...] Women do not need to do anything to be murdered because they are murdered for being a woman. Men do so many bad things but nothing happens to them. Women are murdered simply because they want to enjoy their freedom, such as using a mobile phone.”

(Lawyer, female, 2013, Istanbul)

This statement also indicates how the unjust treatment of authorities over penalties of misconduct, are insufficient. The freedom women exercise is seen as an unjust treatment for men and for this reason, differences in prosecution and penalties are observed. The state, through judiciary, enables men to hold a privileged position through the adaptation of the unjust provocation cause.

Furthermore, we must look at additional documents to see how the state presents itself and how the state is perceived by other actors, such as feminists. The Human Rights Inspection Commission of the Turkish Grand National Assembly published a report titled: “Violence Against Women and Family Members Report” in 2011. The report is published by seven Members of the Parliament. Interestingly, out of the seven MPs, only two of them are female and the other five are male. So the report that is meant to defend the interests of women was not written by women. Therefore, it is not a reflection of the problem but rather how the problem is seen and suggested to be resolved by men. So, the rights of women were discussed, evaluated and, to an extent, granted by men as if it was only possible if they allow it to happen. Often, feminist students and female citizens would hear some government official saying: 'We gave women their rights in 1934'. The word 'gave' is striking, as if women did not fight for it or deserved or were neither entitled to it, but rather it was men who allowed it (in the manner of doing a favor to someone) to happen. Looking at this report, we can see how the state looks at violence against women. In addition to this, as a PhD researcher undertaking research in the field, I have conducted interviews with NGO activists, judges, lawyers and professors regarding, among others, the state's attitude towards domestic violence in Turkey. Through these three documents, I have gathered data to analyze the role of the AKP government in preventing and/or reproducing violence against women, the state and the political culture in Turkey.

The document starts with stating the topic and aim of the report. One paragraph in particular was peculiar. It not only made little sense, it was almost as if the authors blamed the advancement in technology and science with regards for the emergence of problematic issues on human rights.

“In today's world, the fast advancement of science, technology, industry, transportation and communication mediums led to the globalization of the world

and enabled people to communicate effectively across borders. This world order triggered generations to learn from a very young age how to think and perceive, and this has created instability in the realm of rights and law.” (p.2)

I have found this paragraph informative in understanding the Turkish state's mentality towards human rights and progress. The more children learn how to think, the more there is instability in law and rights because they start to question the established order and demand more. This is clearly strong evidence that the Turkish government considered thinking individuals as a challenge to the concept of 'order'. This probably reveals information about why some are intimidated by the idea of free women. This also shows why the state curtails rights with regards to peaceful protests and freedom of speech.

In the subsequent chapter, my primary focus is showing how the state perceives its role on women's rights being curtailed. The reality is, however, that the state is little concerned with the rights of women as human beings, but rather what women mean for the society in general, or simply the state. As stated in the document:

“The main philosophy of our work is to preserve the unity, reputation and continuity of the family. Reaching this goal involves introducing new legislation. [Our goal is to maintain] a mentality that develops the importance of the family institution, the education of husband and wife (man and women²⁰), and should focus on developing a culture of respect, love, compassion and humanity. This should be the goal.” (p.2)

As can be seen, the primary focus for the state is to ensure that men and women 'figure out' a way to coexist but never live separately, live together or have consensual sex without being married. If the primary goal is to maintain the unity of the family and

20 Unfortunately, it is clear from this statement that marriage is a union only observed amongst a man and a woman. Same sex marriages, in addition to LGBTI individuals did not catch the attention of Turkish policy makers in the year 2014. Perhaps, decades and decades later, other marriages will be recognised.

if the family institution is problematic in the first place, in which men are the primary breadwinners and women are the primary care givers, this should be deemed problematic. When taking feminist protests, lobbying and advocacy into account, we now know the traditional family union is where the problem begins in the first place. This is perhaps what Walby (1990) meant when she suggested there are two different forms of patriarchy – private and public. She stated that private patriarchy was observed in the household and within interpersonal relationships, whereas public patriarchy refers to patriarchy observed in the market, the state and the public sphere.

Indeed, the private and the public are not two different realms with clear-cut divisions amongst them, since the boundary between the two, as suggested by Joseph (1997), are often subject to negotiation and contestation between and within the state and their subjects. Therefore, as Joseph argues, boundaries between the private and the public is fluid. This fluidity, I argue, leads to the replication of vertical relations that are observed in the private, into vertical relations ingrained in the structure. Therefore structural patriarchy, as seen in the statements made by government officials above, is a reinforced version of private patriarchy which now attempts to control the male political subject and place two sexes within a grand design, that not only reinforces patriarchal relations between men and women, but also the state and its subjects.

Further to our discussion on how the state governs gender, based on the report published by the Turkish Grand National Assembly, it is important to notice how the state has its own vision of what male and female roles in the society should be. This vision is the basis of the structure they build. For example:

“Besides it should not be forgotten that women are mothers and they raise future generations. These generations will form the nation. If the smallest unit of that nation, the family, has a strong structure and foundation, the generations which are the future of the nation will be raised better.” (P.3)

This statement is followed by the following affirmation:

“As violence against women and discriminatory laws are observed in our society, it is necessary that this social problem is considered within a 'woman's human rights' framework.” (P.3)

To begin with, in the first statement, the MPs who wrote this report start by stating how the family should be based on a culture of love and compassion, but continue by saying 'Besides...!'. The word 'besides' is controversial to begin with. It suggests that the idea underlining love and compassion was not enough to convince the male MPs who wrote the report and male citizens for whom this report was written, and that the need for a cooperative culture was not considered necessary within the family. More importantly, the phrase 'women are mothers and raise future generations' should be discussed in detail.

To begin with, do all women need to give birth in order to be a woman? If women are not mothers, does that mean they deserve less? Or does it simply explain the fundamental role women play in the Turkish society? As if they were suggesting, as representatives of the Turkish government, we define women as mothers and primary care takers, not employees, tax payers, voters, traders. In fact, they do not even see women as nurses, teachers or midwives, which are jobs that are mostly associated with women. Instead Turkish women are seen as mothers, suggesting that their labor is worthless, their vote does not count either because they are most likely to vote for the party their husbands want them to. Needless to say, they are not citizens with any entitlements to be free. For this reason, the first quote above underlines the impact of domestic violence for future generations. Therefore, it is clear that the state is not concerned with the trauma women go through, their psychology and their human rights

of indivisibility and right to life. The reason I included the second quote is to draw attention to the irony between the two.

On the one hand, the state officials would like to appear as if women's human rights are a priority for the Turkish State; yet they make it quite clear that their primary incentive is to ensure the continuity of the family for the sake of future generations that are raised for the nation. Indeed, this is not exclusive to the Turkish state. Germany under Hitler's rule, as discussed in my chapter on Turkey, believed that women's place was in the kitchen, church and (with) children. As Yuval Davis suggested (1990), the nation-state mostly saw women as reproducers of the nation; therefore, women were never seen as citizens who were entitled to empowerment, freedom and self-determination. It is the latter that creates tension within the nation State.

What if women decided not to get married and have children? What if they decided to live with their sexual partners without being officially married? The problem with all of this is how women's role in the society is decided, based on what is best for the nation-state rather than her. Therefore, the second quote above, which states the importance of women's human rights that mobilizes the state officials to take action, is a far-reaching goal. From an optimistic point of view, they might be totally unaware of how widespread and ingrained gender discrimination is. They might, in their own view, sincerely be defending women's rights. However, what they are proving is, first, women are important because they want to protect the unity of the family and second, women are important for the nation. As a result, family and the nation, similar to Walby's analysis of the private and public, are once more two sites of oppression for women in which they are subordinated, first and foremost, by the state.

Interestingly, government officials have made statements similar to those of feminists. Do they actually see what women see? Looking at the quote below we can see evidence of a progressive vision.

“In summary, the reasons underlying domestic violence²¹ against women should be sought within a certain mentality. This patriarchal mentality does not see women as independent individual, it sees women as being under men's guardianship and think that women should be the subjects of men” (p.25).

It is indeed true that women are seen within the jurisdiction of men, by the public and the state. It is also true that domestic violence is a matter of a sense of entitlement and superiority. However, what do state's officials try to achieve? On the one hand, they discuss the unity of the family and then they criticize a patriarchal mentality that subordinates women. Is it not clear whether the family is being seen as sacred or whether the family is the very cause of women's oppression? I suspect that the problem is not only the presence of a patriarchal mentality but rather a Turkish desire to maintain its traditional outlook and be modern at the same time, which is often endemic in Eastern European nationalisms.

On the one hand, the Turkish government signs treaties which demonstrate commitment to certain values, such as the Istanbul Agreement, prepared by the United Nations in 1999 which condemns inhuman treatment, torture and cruelty. Yet, when it comes to implementing these treaties, Turkey falls short of what they promise. I not only believe that international treaties are there to show the world (mostly the west) how modern, advanced and liberal the Turkish government is. In reality however, there is a strong resistance amongst every layer of the society as well as the state apparatus towards any change attempted to the traditional values of the society.

Another quote that must be discussed is:

²¹ The main reason the term domestic violence is chosen because in the original document, the phrase used to discuss such violence is, 'violence against women which take place within the family'. The term domestic violence is probably the closest to that.

“If women earn more money than their husbands, their chances of being subject to violence multiply by two. This is evidence that men cannot tolerate the changes in their subjugating relationship with women.” (p.28)

Through this quote it is evident that women’s empowerment is deemed threatening and rarely encouraged. Additionally, this is an important quote, which suggests that violence against women stems from men's need to be superior and that the imbalance in that status quo motivates men to oppress women. However, there is a contradiction in this situation. Since, the law allows women to work without the permission of their husbands, it seems feasible; but in reality women cannot work without the permission of their husbands. Those who work manage to do so since their husbands come from an educated background whilst working in a middle class or upper middle class job. Those who are in lower classes, as shown through a research participant's statement I gathered through field work in Turkey, manage to work because their husbands are not working and they do not see anything wrong with their wife earning the sole income. In this case, the husband drops her off in the morning and picks her up in the evening. Therefore, the statement made by the report is important in seeing the issue of a man claiming relative and absolute power over his wife; however the discussion between employment and violence is complex and in the case of Turkey, the issue of honor (Onal: 2008), as reflected in the form of jealousy, needs to be taken into account.

The contradictions between the statements made by MPs, as seen in the report, shows clear evidence of the state favoring the unity and maintenance of local, traditional and conservative values.

For instance: –

“Within those couples who meet their partners, get along and get married with the approval of their parents, violence against women is at around 28 percent. Those women who get married through arranged marriages experience violence

by 37 percent. For those who meet their partners and get along but do not have the approval of their parents, they experience violence by 49 percent.” (p.28)

This is a clear message to the Turkish youth. Whoever gets married without the consent of their parents is likely to be beaten by their husbands. As a PhD researcher, I cannot even empathize and identify the relationship between family approval and violence. Perhaps there is no relationship to begin with. But the message is clear: The Turkish Prime Ministry, as the representative of the Turkish government, might appear to support your job that pays you more than your husband earns, however, your first and foremost duty is to act in accordance with your parents’ wishes. Again this is clear evidence that shows how Turkey aims to adopt principles on human rights but without giving up on cultural authenticity and patriarchal values.

This is not a new discovery amongst scholars who specialize in gender and the Middle East; Kandiyoti (1991) and Joseph (1996) have explained how dangerous, western notions of individualism threaten the state. However, I argue that, it is not just the threat perceived through importing western concepts that are threatening but also how the state has driven a motive that ensures the sustenance of the state. As the state reproduces gender through regulations that control women and the family, it is also the family, men and women who reproduce the state. The sustenance of the state, not the nation, the people or the citizens, is the core motive in the imagery of Turkish officials. It is the state that needs a certain type of individual to think about authority in a certain way in order to maintain its supremacy within the polity. As discussed in the chapter on Turkey, the state is at the core and the people are at the periphery. It is the state that has extended rights, in which every single concern, which may or may not be significant, is protected and preserved at the expense of the fundamental rights of its citizens²².

22 The analysis of state behaviour, with regards to its sustenance, will be discussed at a later stage.

Therefore, the youth is advised and encouraged to act in accordance with the wishes of their family. The person who is submissive to their parents is also submissive to their state. The person who equates respect with obedience will tolerate the use of force by government agencies, such as the police. Therefore, the quote stated above has little to do with giving people information about how domestic violence has escalated, but rather is a government statement that aims to lead the citizen towards a direction that suits the state's interest, rather than anyone else.

“Even the judges with the most good will, can be sexist in their decisions, as they make decisions that assume the man was provoked and had no other choice than to behave the way he did²³. We can now see that women are aware of this. It is true that educating the police, the judge, and the public prosecutor is difficult due to their resistance to change.” (P.29)

This is ironic, a joke, if not a curse. I am not entirely sure whether this is a matter of gender equality or not. In a way, this is about gender equality. Government officials, despite the commitments the Turkish government makes in accordance with the values of human rights propagated by the international community have no real motive to implement equality. First, sexist decisions and verdicts that emerge in courts are not penalized. A judge can decide that a woman who was raped actually deserved it.²⁴ For example, as I conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews in Turkey, I spoke to a judge from the family courts in Turkey who stated that: “A man is often provoked”. This is clear evidence that the Turkish judiciary sees men as the victim who had to commit a crime because he had no other choice. This is a common understanding amongst the judiciary in Turkey with regards to issues of rape and domestic violence.

23 In legal terms, this is known as unjust provocation. In which, the defendant is assumed to be helpless due to the harsh conditions he faced

24 This will be discussed when I start analysing the interviews I personally conducted with feminists in 2014.

A recent example of rape is a 13-year-old girl who was raped by 26 men²⁵. The court decided that she consented to it. The woman, who was raped, in this case, cango to the Constitutional Court. The court may or may not decide in her favor; however it is important to note that the Constitutional Court is not entirely independent. Further to this, a woman can apply to the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) and that can lead to condemning Turkey and making the government pay compensation. This might offer a sense of relief for the woman who has been victimized by first a Turkish man and second the Turkish government. However, this probably does not mean anything for the Turkish State.

During the interviews performed in Turkey with human rights lawyers, NGO activists, feminists and judges, I found that the state does not see it as a problem paying the amount the ECHR decides Turkey should pay. The government officials who cause that particular human rights violation are not prosecuted in any way. In fact, the only concern the Turkish government has with regards to the verdicts made by ECHR is how Turkey is perceived in the western world. A verdict that condemns Turkey, in no way, mobilizes Turkey to implement policies that protect the sanctity and indivisibility of its female citizens.

Another reason why I believe it is tragic that the government officers make the statement above is that those who author this report are MPs. In other words, they are members of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, discussing and voting new laws. They are, above all, government officers and members of the judiciary. This should be understood in two ways. First, the Turkish judiciary is never independent. As one participant of my research, a retired judge, Mr Eray Karınca stated,

25 A participant I interviewed, who is a lawyer, whilst I was in Turkey in 2014 as I was undertaking ethnographic research, informed me about the rape of the 13-year-old girl.

“Judges and public prosecutors favor the sanctity, indivisibility and sustenance of the state over the rights of its citizens”.

Second, it is the laws that are voted in the Turkish Parliament that are meant to be implemented in the court. Therefore, if the Assembly decides that the Turkish Penal Code should reflect equality over a man's right not to be provoked, then the court has to implement it. The same applies to the police. During an interview with a professor from Bogazici University in Turkey, Mr. Caglar Keyder said:

“The police cannot act on their own. They do not have the right to have a voice independent from the state”.

In fact, my research indicates that the police are the 'security force' of the state; they protect the sustenance of the state from the individual. Further to our discussion about the above quote, it is a matter of controversy to think about whether the MPs are actually helpless in breaking the resistance of government officials. Is it the members of the Assembly who wish to implement gender equality but cannot because there is too much resistance amongst its staff? Or is it the Assembly itself that allow such officials, including judges, prosecutors and the police, to make such verdicts and preserve order within the society, with the clear intention of giving men extended rights? I argue that if the MPs of the ruling party decide to develop the rights of citizens in a way that allows the indivisibility of women being protected rather than defending the man who was (so-called) provoked, then there is a way to make this possible. Therefore, through the above quote, it looks as if the Turkish Grand National Assembly, the highest authority in the country, is somewhat helpless with regards to the sexist attitudes of its staff. However, in practice, it would be almost impossible for the Assembly not to be able to control its own apparatus if they wanted to do so. As a result

of this, it is an important step for the MPs to realize that government officers were sexist and more importantly reluctant to change however their helplessness is worth noticing. Another statement made in this report is concerned with how domestic violence is defined: “Domestic violence is not the name of a crime. It is the combination of eight different crimes and it refers to the violence a person is subjected to because that person is a member of a particular family.” (p.40)

The report continues by stating that:

“There is no such crime in the Turkish Penal Code [regards to domestic violence]; instead crimes like cruelty (eziyet), causing injury (yaralama) and ill treatment (kotu muamele) that are committed against a person because they are a member of a family or committed against a woman because of her gender, are named domestic violence....” (P.40)

Interestingly, the report does not identify the eight crimes that constitute domestic violence; nor does it explain the appropriate penalties for these crimes. The report does not state the reasons against defining domestic violence as a crime either. Although it is true that violence against women stems from her female’s identity, the other statement, in which domestic violence is defined, is highly problematic.

Is it true that a person is subject to domestic violence because they are a member of a family? As previously discussed through the interviews conducted by Hacettepe University with women who have experienced violence, apparently when a man takes a woman as a wife he is entitled to be violent towards that woman. Another participant mentioned that violence would not occur if a woman was aware of her power. To an extent, I argue, that the aggressor is violent if and only if, he feels like he can get away with it.

In addition to this, as discussed by Joseph (1993), in the context of the Middle East, people define themselves through their relationship with others,; mostly through other family members, and this is a concept known as patriarchal connectivity. Therefore, domestic violence is a way a man would define himself and his masculinity in relationship to the women he oppresses.

It could be argued that women are most vulnerable amongst relatives. Indeed, a man who assaults a woman on the street would get a greater penalty than a man who assaults his sister, since Turkish mentality upheld by conservative groups, they would suggest that a brother is entitled to a role that involves disciplining his sister, often using force when necessary.

In addition to this, women are seen as a man's honor and therefore, in the name of sexual purity, every move of the female family member is monitored and constrained against a cause that can lead to another cause and might lead to a difficult position for a man. As I argued before, the extended rights of a man are mostly realized in the household, in which he is seen as the man of the house. Although the Turkish state, which accepts a woman's declaration as sufficient whilst giving protection orders, requires a form of proof from the woman who states that she was a victim of violence when she files for divorce. Therefore, the state is willing (or at least aims to appear that way) to support her security, as long as it does not threaten the unity of the family.

It is true and discussed with participants of my own research that a lot of women are murdered despite their protection orders. These men are well aware that the court will decide that they were provoked. They are also aware that they could obtain a reduction in their penalty, in a manner exclusive to Turkish law. In Turkish it is called, 'iyi hal indirimi', the literal translation of the term would be: 'a reduction in penalty made due to decency in condition' [of the defendant]. This issue was brought to my

attention by almost all the feminist participants of my research. That particular condition refers to a man who goes to court to testify. When he wears a suit so that he looks presentable and decent, says that he is in pain, is respectful to the judge and the prosecutor and if he states that he regrets what he has done, the Court that is often ruled by men, would decide he should have a reduction in penalty because he is “decent” in court.

As a result, we must ask, is domestic violence a matter of being a family member in an aggressive household? As the report published by MPs suggests or Joseph exemplifies? Or is it because the state allows men to say: “I am sorry” and receive a reduction in their penalty? This is a theoretical debate rather than empirical. As empirical evidence gathered supports the theoretical constructs, we need to ensure that theories argue various aspects of the evidence to provide an explanation that is valid and reliable. Therefore, this debate on whether private patriarchy leads to public patriarchy should be suspended until all evidence pertaining to the Turkish state and its relationship and governance towards citizens are explored, as discussed in the next chapter.

I would argue that the state is at the center and that the male political subject is produced through the actions of the state. Therefore, it is not only gender discrimination as well as the governance of gender in which the state takes a leading role. I would argue that whilst the state produces itself, it also produces the male political subject. The reproductive mechanisms of the state that shape male behavior have often been neglected amongst scholars of gender and the Middle East or only understood within the construction of masculinity (Sinclair-Webb, 2006). However, the state's reproductive mechanisms and their effect on the male political subject are crucial in understanding the various ways gender inequality is produced.

Indeed, my argument with regards to the state reproduction of patriarchy is rather theoretical and most likely to be academic in nature. As a result, research conducted by government officials look at the surface by analyzing the day to day implementation of given laws. It is important to analyze the following statement seen in the report as published by the members of the Assembly.

“...In developed countries, it is observed that security forces and the judiciary perform their duties with zero tolerance. In our country the problem is a matter of civilian and social policies as well as the lack of infrastructure. For example; when a woman makes an application at 3:00 am, she would be needed to be taken to a place in accordance to her honor²⁶ and a man should be taken to a temporary address where he will be hosted for a while. However there are no such facilities or infrastructure to enable this.” (p.41)

To begin with, the term honor or 'onur' as it was used in the original document is very controversial. They have not used the term 'namus' which refers to honor in terms of sexual purity. Do different women have different honors? Do rich women deserve something different to then poor women? Do women in full time employment deserve less than women who are housewives?: Are these two different in terms of honor? Is a woman who is veiled (wearing the headscarf) more honorable than women who are not veiled? Additionally, a woman who lives with her romantic partner together, without being married, is deemed less honorable than a woman who is living together as a married couple.

I argue that the phrase 'in accordance to her honor' is informing us citizens and researchers that the government believes that discrimination based on factors discussed

26 It is important to note that the word honour is commonly used to translate 'namus' which refers to sexual purity in most cases. However, in this statement, the word used was 'onur' which can mean anything and therefore is very vague. It might refer to social class, it might refer to level of education, it might refer to being veiled or not etc.

above is in fact necessary. Indeed, as discussed in the chapter on citizenship, equality is a relative concept, in which everyone should receive in accordance to their needs. But that is not what the Turkish government is suggesting. It is not their needs that will determine how much help they will receive but rather their 'worth'. This understanding of 'worth' is a concept introduced by the Turkish government officials who share a lot in common with the conservative classes of Turkey. This concept of worth suggests that a woman's entitlement to human rights is subject to an assessment, if not qualification, led by the conservative imagery of Turkey, which rationalizes discrimination against women and men alike. Therefore, we not only see women's rights being curtailed, but also the rights of citizens being a subjective and relative matter, far from its applications in liberal societies, in accordance with feudal, rural, religiously conservative and (neo) patriarchal values (Sharabi, 1988). When I interviewed Prof Dr. Metin Heper from Bilkent University in Ankara, Turkey, he stated that conservative people look at our religiously conservative president; Recep Tayyip Erdogan and think that he is one of them. The professor states:

“...Conservative people know the [Turkish] society better. They feel closer to the society/community. Conservative people emerged²⁷ or originated from the society. They are keen to help and they do not see themselves as superior to the people.”

(January 2014, Ankara, Bilkent University)

This is an important statement that helps us understand the conservative approach of the Erdogan government. The conservatives in Turkey believe that they represent Turkey's true identity. They know how Turkey should be governed and what the people need. The progressive minority which adheres to Kemalist principles of

²⁷ The original word used in the interview was 'cikmis' which means -to come out of-.

secularism and westernization are not seen as the 'true' citizens of Turkey. For example, according to Prof. Dr. Sule Aytac from Istanbul University;

“If the Republican People's Party (CHP) which was founded by Ataturk in 1924, was the ruling party today, couples who were living together in the same house without being married, would not have be a problem [...] When we are talking about patriarchy it does not matter which government is holding office because the world is being ruled through patriarchy for 2600 years...”

(January 2013, Istanbul, Istanbul University)

To begin with, Kemalists are not exactly liberal politicians. They have and will continue to oppress the people when national security and/or order are at stake, as seen from the military interventions in the 60s, 70s and 80s. In addition to this, the rise of political Islam and sectarianism in Turkey is a direct result of the failure of Kemalists²⁸ to either liberalize the society or convince the people that Westernization is needed for modernization²⁹. Within the given circumstances, as seen from Erdogan holding office since 2002 until today, the conservatives have established control over the country, marginalizing the Kemalists who, to an extent, believe in western values of, among others, equality, human rights and feminism.

It is interesting to observe that Prof Heper underlines that the conservatives are the true citizens and representatives of Turkey and Kemalists are somewhat foreign as if they were imported. Westernization has never been welcomed amongst the greater masses of Turkey. So, returning to the statement made in the report, people will be classified in accordance with their vision of conservative people. Whilst it is acceptable for Kemalists forthat a man and woman to live together before marriage, the

28 The rise of political Islam in Turkey is far more complicated than it was explained in this chapter. It is out of the scope of this thesis to explain the complexity of the issue.

29 I am not defending an argument that suggests that in order modernise, a country must westernise. Modernisation is not entirely a Western concept nor is it universal.

conservative government which never challenges conservative views, claim that they represent the true Turkish identity and choose to reinforce inequality based on class, education, religious sect, gender and marital status to empower those who are deemed honorable (namus) and honorable (onur).

Once again, further to the discussion made with regards to equality in the chapter on citizenship, this entails one's right to hold an existence different from the norms associated with the public sphere, hegemonic subjectivity and the national subject. However, the difference is different than the other types of difference. The conservative Turkish government makes it clear that the difference seen amongst the underprivileged will remain intact, unquestioned and often reinforced amongst the ranks of the state in accordance to the wishes of the masses. It is important to note that, unlike Kemalists in the 1920s and 1930s, there are no state initiatives taken to rectify such inequality or transform public opinion towards a more progressive vision. In fact, the Turkish government has discerned clearly that the safety of a woman is secondary in its agenda. For example, in the conclusion section of the report published by the Assembly;

“The dissolution of the **FAMILY INSTITUTION**³⁰, which consists of the foundation of the society, would lead to the dissolution of our society. Although the issue of violence against women and other family members; this is something that needs to be resolved, the most important issue that needs to be considered; should be the 'Preservation of the Family Institution'”. (p.53)

It is clear that women would be told in various ways that they should avoid conflict with their husbands, so the state can reach its goal of having lower divorce rates in the country, which is currently as high as 50%. Some interviewees I met in Turkey

30 Emphasis is made in accordance with the original document.

suggested that the government is focusing on preserving the family for the sake of providing cheap labor to the Turkish economy. Others argued differently. For example, according to Prof. Dr. Sule Aytac:

“The state [Devlet] wants obedient, homogenous citizens that do as they are told. A woman is a mother and wife. If a woman is married and associated with a family, she would have an owner. Men are a woman's owner and women are within a man's jurisdiction. [...]

She continues:.

[According to the State] Men [are deemed to] know the best of everything. A woman who can think for herself is not acceptable. It is a state tradition.”

Therefore, it is clear that one of the reasons the Turkish government promotes marriage amongst the ranks of the state apparatus, as well as the society, is to ensure that the nation's women; are were controlled by someone firsthand. It is the state that needs women to be subordinated for two possible reasons: Turkey's assertion from the west and its claim for authenticity, the construction of the male political subject and therefore, the sustenance of the state. Indeed, the relationship between the male subject and the sustenance of the state needs to be understood. This understanding will also inform researchers as to how the state governs gender and place women in the society. At times, the Turkish government appears in a manner suggestive of a similar lifestyle for male and female citizens. For instance, according to one statement, the MPs discerned loneliness as a condition needed to be avoided at all cost.

“For the future of our nation, the family members who are responsible for transferring our cultural norms and values to future generations should not be alienated from each other. The family union should not be disturbed and as a result, the programs the state implements; should not drive family members into loneliness. Therefore, we see good use in this.” (p.53)

It is clear that the main concern of the Erdogan government is to reproduce the nation. The question is: what kind of nation? As we will discuss whilst I analyze the interviews I conducted, the type of nation produced will evidently be very conservative in terms of gender and sexual rights. In this regard and as seen from the quote above, loneliness is a concern for the government, not for psychological reasons but probably for sexual reasons. The state tries to fight against modernity and the freedoms and challenges that come with it. Dating (and therefore consensual sex) is not only a concern with regards to the sexuality of women (also known as concerns over honor), but also the sexuality of men. As stated by a female lawyer in Turkey –

“Sexuality is a very key concern. The person who lives his/her sexual freedom is a free person who also has a free mind. They see this free mind as a serious threat.”

(Lawyer, female, Istanbul, January 2014)

This threat perception includes limiting both male and female lives. However, it is needless to say that the pressure is mostly on women and their sexuality and therefore; their possession of free minds. As the lawyer continued,

“A few years ago Prime Minister Erdogan spoke about a woman who had joined protests. After medical examinations it was found that she was pregnant but not married. The Prime Minister, in his public speeches, spoke about her in a very condescending and insulting tone. Everything about a woman's personality is seen as a problem.”

“Insulting a woman” is government policy to discourage single women and to educate the general public on matters of sexual morality and honor. As a result, the state does not approve of its citizens being lonely (which could be read as single) and having sex outside of marriage. If a man challenges the norms, he is encouraged to get married through government incentives. For instance, as one participant explained, the government introduced incentives for university students to get married at early ages.

If they do, the wedding will be free, as the Erdogan government promises to pay for it. However, if a woman is to challenge the norms as regards sexual freedom, nobody discusses incentives but rather how immoral she is.

I would argue that, first; if a man gets married he will be financially responsible for his wife. Additionally, the national subject is imagined to be as conservative as the government. So, I argue, the government will assume the husband will force his wife to leave her job and become a housewife from that point. This will reduce female employment radically and make more jobs available for men. The state would be partially relieved in its efforts to reduce unemployment in the country, which is particularly high.

Second, when a man marries a woman, she becomes his honor and he becomes her owner and governor. Her family by birth, as often stated by the general public in Turkey, will say: 'you left your home in a wedding gown you can only come back in a shroud'³¹. The family disowns her from the moment she gets married. It is not only the husband who believes he owns her, but also her family, friends and indeed the government. I recall watching a Turkish movie whilst I was growing up in Turkey in which, Sadri Alisik, a famous Turkish actor plays a father. On his daughter's wedding day, his daughter he responds to his daughter who asked his opinion about what she should do to which he. He replies: 'You are now the property of your husband, do not ask me'.

Once women are owned, it is not only the reproduction of the nation that is under control, but also men. Men, who are oppressed by the government and forced to follow the programs introduced by Erdogan, the military and the economy, start to

³¹ The phrase shroud is meant to refer to a burial garment, a cloth worn after death.

become somebody. As he oppresses women, he becomes somebody. This somebody believes in hierarchy, inequality, obedience (as respect) and most importantly certain cultural norms and values³². The national subject who believes in vertical relations for the sake of upholding traditional values is a subject who would see, as Sharabi (1988) explains in his book on Neopatriarchy, the state as a father. In the Middle East, as explained by Joseph (1993; 1996), politicians are seen in terms of kinship. As a result, the state needs men to oppress women in order for that the state can oppress men and argue that this is a natural outcome due to our customs and traditions.

The male political subject would not only be empowered but also have a sense of gratitude towards the government. It is not only the government that legitimizes and justifies a man's superiority over his wife (and his female kin) but also encourages and enables it. The great majority of Turkey has limited access to education; in fact, the average education in Turkey does not exceed the 6th grade³³. It is easy to see that this majority also works in low-paid jobs, and are likely to be discriminated against in accordance to their social class on a daily basis. His power as a man, which is felt through power expressed over women in the Weberian sense (in relative terms) is the only power the government enables him to possess.

Furthermore, the government needs men to be oppressive not only because they could act like 'micro government agents' in the private sphere, implementing the patriarchal vision of the state, but also because a man who exercises crude power would also be afraid of it. He would pay his taxes because he would feel that he owes it to the

32 The meaning of the Turkish words used in the report published by the Assembly might not translate into English very well. The original words used were, 'orf' and 'adet'. They both mean tradition, but somehow they are different.

33 Based on an interview conducted with the Minister of Education, Ms Nimes Cubukcu by the Milliyet Newspaper. Last accessed 29 August 2014, <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/turkiye-nin-ortalama-egitim-duzeyi-6-nci-sinif-cikti/siyaset/sondakika/13.01.2011/1338703/1537>

state, instead of seeing it as something that empowers him against the state. In addition to this, as discussed in the previous chapter on patriarchal theory, the vertical patriarchal relations produced in the private sphere are the foundation of structural patriarchy. As Kandiyoti (2000) argues, gender primarily shapes the society rather than the society constructing gendered subjects. These are the metaphors we use in comprehending the world around us, such as the nation as family, in which the government is like the parents and the children are like the citizens, through which we learn to be citizens (Lakoff, 2002). Therefore, the direct similarities of the private and public spheres are evident, and together they form structural patriarchy.

The transformation of vertical patriarchy into structural patriarchy is partially metaphorical and functional. The metaphorical reproduction of patriarchy is evident from Lakoff's work in which the nation is seen as the family. However the functional reproduction is evident in this way; relationships between brothers and sisters and how they transform their social existence in terms of the gendered roles people play. As Joseph (1994) argues: the relationship between brothers and sisters, at times, can become the basis of how people learn to be male and female. As the brother limits the behavior of his sister, he learns that a man who limits a woman is a man who loves her.

The reproduction of the norm, oppression as nurture, is endemic across the society. This exemplifies metaphorical and functional reproduction of patriarchy. Because the brother's role played as an oppressor justified in the name of protection, it is also sustained amongst intimate partners. There are two different binaries that are relevant to this discussion. The binary opposition between the ruler and its subjects is replicated in the private sphere. The private sphere provides a metaphorical model for the public sphere. The gendered binary that is rooted within the private sphere manifests itself through its relationships between the state and its citizens. Indeed, the

construction of the private and public sphere is not exclusive. The boundaries between the two are fluid. Both 'the state' and 'the citizen' appear to be abstract constructs at first glance. However, they are both gendered.

I argue, in the context of Turkey if not the Middle East, what women are for men is what citizens are for the state. They are similar because they exist within the same binary as their whose pattern of behaviors serve the same purpose, giving them a functional similarity. This binary has been partially examined above as the relationship between men and women was analyzed and the state's governance of gender has been exposed.

Below, a discussion of the Family Protection Act in Turkey, with reference to the 6284-coded law, is has been made from the through interviews I conducted in Turkey with NGO activists, human rights lawyers, professors and members of the judiciary. These interviews will allow us to see, first and foremost, how the family protection act continues to reproduce a patriarchal culture (in terms of values and norms) and structure (in terms of a distribution of power that spreads across different units and segments of the society, processes and procedures). In this context, I argue, patriarchal cultures are the manifestation of structure. Similarities amongst various oppressors are no coincidence because theyit indicates that structures have spread and reproduced themselves. Prior to engaging with this discussion, which will be further analyzed towards the end of this chapter, different perspectives ofn the family protection act should be discussed to see how the state governs gender and whether or how patriarchy is reproduced by the state.

Intimate Concerns of a Former Family Judge

A resource I found relevant for content analysis is a book entitled “Erkegin Itibarsizlastirilmasi ve Feminist Duzen” by a former family judge, Onder Kanyilmaz published in 2013, in which the translation is given below. The book was recommended by one of my research participants who worked for the Turkish Gendarme in a role given to implement legislation and procedures regarding gender equality. She recommended this book not because she saw evidence of patriarchal assumptions common amongst the rankings of the judiciary, if not the state. On the contrary, the book that had deep concerns withabout the rights of men was written in order to challenge laws that govern family affairs and protect women such as including restriction orders, equal share of property purchased during marriage and custody of children given to mothers, policies and understandings that privileged women. She suggested that the arguments introduced in this book were viable oppositions to feminism. Given her position of law enforcement in the realm of gender equality, the patriarchal mentality endemic amongst the ranking of the State becomes evident.

Commented [KM2]: This paragraph is incomplete – or this sentence is incorrect. Surely you want to join the paragraphs together to explain why she explained the book?

The title of the book should be translated carefully. The second half of the title is called “And the Feminist Order”; however, the first section of the title is “Erkegin Itibarsizlastirilmasi” which involves a process that happens to a man. ‘Itibar’ means respect. ‘–Siz’, refers to the negativity of respect. ‘–lastirilmasi’, refers to the process of a man losing respect through someone else. Therefore the feminist order was deemed responsible for it.

The book discusses divorce extensively and how men are deprived from basic rights through the process. The idea of the provoked male political subject was not only established by the family judges I interviewed in Ankara, but also common amongst the rankings of the judiciary. As the author explains further;

“They [women] impose their desires and wishes on their husbands and make them feel inadequate to the extent that women are subject to violence because

of making him feel that way. They make their husbands feel inadequate by comparing them with their friends' husbands." [p.27]

By this stage, he uses this premise to give advice to his colleagues in the judiciary by stating:

"At this point, it is important that the judge makes the accurate assessment. He [the judge] should see that the woman is using her rights given by law and to justify her vulnerability in family courts and divorce settlements by provoking men to be violent against a woman' [p.27]

It is clear that provocation is seen as an important part of the Turkish legal system. As we have seen in the previous chapter, on Gezi Park protests in 2013, both the state and the male political subjects perceive men as helpless and driven by instantaneous emotion. To this extent, the author introduces a concept to explain the depth of provocation:

"Controlled provocation is a woman's ability to instrumentally use and calculate the legal procedures that privilege her, as well as her physical weakness, against a man, in order to make him inflict violence on her" [p.25]

He argues that a woman who has been subject to violence should be evicted from the house, instead of the oppressor because it was her fault that she was beaten from the very beginning (p.28).

The author gives further evidence of this understanding by stating that –

"The man who falls for this trap will not only be the unjust side of the divorce but he would also have to pay alimony. In this process he will also lose custody of his own children and he will not be able give care to his own aging parents." [p.25]

It is clear that the discussion on alimony after divorce is used to describe a man's victimhood. In contrast, it could have been argued that a sense of igniting an understanding of responsibility and independence on their wives would possibly reduce her dependence on alimony. Second and most importantly, a man is said to inflict violence because he was intentionally trapped into hitting his wife. There is a subject,

described in accordance with hypothetical situations, in which men are deeply weak and unable to control how they react to stimuli that contradicted their personal beliefs. Therefore, similar to sexual harassment, in addition to some rape cases, women are often consulted on how they were dressed at the time, suggesting their possible provocation. As indicated by the female officer from the Gendarmerie who participated in my research (interview conducted in January 2014), it is perceived that women were doing something wrong that led to the violence as well as men's inability to control their own urges. In addition, to another participant from the family court claimed, 'men are under a lot of provocation' which underlines underlining the helplessness of the male political subject.

The effort to find research that explains how men's inability to sustain their negative feelings, as the primary frame of looking at crime, divorce and gender equality has been proven to be fruitless. The system, legal and political, is designed to either enact laws that allow men to exercise power over women or the members of the judicial body can claim a man's victimhood by exaggerating the role of stimuli on offensive behavior.

As the author exemplifies;

"Let's say you decided to get divorced, what will happen to your children or what will happen to your mother and father, can you marry a more understanding woman the next day? [...] Imagine you get divorced and deal with the trauma, you will look after your parents and you will also be employed and look after your family!" [p.25]

The author Onder Kanyilmaz, describes divorce by referring to the implications on the male political subject. The ironic part of this story is that he is describing the situation of several lower class and middle class women in Turkey. They have full time jobs, they look after their family, including extended family (in-laws, own parents, grandparents) and deal with the traumas of life. Indeed, this cannot be generalized, as

financial security might allow women to hire caretakers. However, the responsibility of caretaking is assumed to be female across race, gender and class. Therefore, a hypothetical scenario of a man who had to be employed and act as a caregiver at the same time cannot be seen inas a victimizing scenario. Indeed the equality of harsh conditions and competing responsibilities should be expected, whilst approaching female empowerment and egalitarian societies. Interestingly, as discussed in the previous chapter where a woman who raises her voice when her husband did, equality is often deemed unacceptable, provocative and unjust.

However, it is very clear that the judge is not interested in developing democratic consolidation and egalitarian laws but rather he suggests that violence is a means to sustain supremacy. As he further explains:

“The feeling of helplessness [or entrapment], [...] gives men a feeling of losing control and [as an] attempt to restore his control, in a sense that allows him to affirm his supremacy over his wife, might lead him to inflict physical violence.”
[p.32]

This is clear as the former judge, and author of this statement, argues that men be tolerated as they take drastic measures to restore their loss of supremacy. Not only is supremacy seen as a birth right for men and linked to masculinity, but is also discussed in a manner of wherebywhich it is the only form of co-existence with an opponent or partner. Therefore, women’s rights to safety and indivisibility, and as a result her primary needs of feeling safe and loved, should at all times be secondary if a man’s order preserving measures needs to be implemented. This is a point where the male political subject and the state aligns as similar forces as they have the same culture (values, norms and beliefs) in addition to having similar structures (processes, reproductive mechanisms and means of enactment).

Another important point of discussion in this book concerns how the state sees women and their ability to provide economic and social security for themselves.

The author states that:

“The state that provides financial security to a woman whose husband died would not consider doing the same thing for a man in a similar position. For this reason, the state provides benefits for women until they get married” [p.20]

He continues:

“The state sees the solution of women’s financial security by making men pay alimony after divorce as well as the sharing of property.” [p.20]

It is true that the system should provide financial security to both parties. However, the fact that the state provides financial security to women until they get married makes it clear that the state has no intention of perceiving women as capable of providing for themselves and for that reason women are put under the jurisdiction and responsibility of men instead of their own. Therefore, women are seen as inadequate and incapable of initiative, responsibility and to an extent, agency. The author, as a result, draws attention to how men are seen as primary providers for women. However, instead of accusing the state of discrimination, an analysis of social values and state structures that promote the co-dependence of women, would have been a long-term solution. In addition to this, his constant criticism of alimony makes it clear that he does not see women’s domestic and care-giving responsibilities as essential contributions to the household.

As a result, a lack of understanding of why men pay alimony is evident. In fact, given that most legislation regarding women and family affairs are undertaken through feminist lobbying and international pressure (the European Court of Human Rights as well as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch to name a few), the issue stimulates a debate. If the law-making procedures were not adopted from different

countries like it has been since the early years of the republic, I argue that a debate in the public sphere would allow ideas to compete and may lead to the emergence of a certain consciousness towards issues pertaining to family and gender equality. I believe that the author, as a family judge, is clearly lacking an understanding of why women should be victimized and financially abused through the process of divorce notr about a woman's entitlement to all wealth accumulated through marriage.

Another point that the author makes is not only relevant for understanding the cultural dynamics in Turkish society, in accordance to a retired family judge, but allows us to see how the relationship between the child and the parent is similar to that of the state and the citizen.

“Children, for mothers and fathers, are capital for the family. When we get older we can find shelter in their shadows. They can be our hands and feet. We can trust them the most and they are always the closest to us.” [p.51]

As discussed earlier, parents seek security through children as they become older. In this quote we can see how a child is not seen as having an independent mind but rather as a means of self-interest. The idea of children looking after their parents is familiar in some countries in the Middle East including Lebanon and Egypt. Therefore, the child that exists in order to provide for the parents also learns submission as a form of respect. This provides, to a certain extent, a foundation for citizenship that praises obedience in the name of a state that is almost always sacred.

Last but not least, another concept worth discussing in this book is the concept of motherhood. The book itself starts with an acknowledgement:

“First and foremost to the the womaen who lovesd me unconditionally and who is without concerns, in my opinion is are the best women in the world, my mother and then secondly my wife”. [p.1]

Commented [KM3]: Is this what you mean? Your translation doesn't make sense.

It is not a coincidence that a man believes his mother comes first and his wife second. First of all, the mother is expected to and mostly enacts as a parenting that is built on self-sacrifice. Secondly, she is probably patriarchal not because she believes in oppressing women but rather in the name of being a good mother, she teaches her son how to perform/enact male supremacy. This is an investment similar to the above quote. The son will return this love and self-sacrifice by looking after his mother. The concept of motherhood and its patriarchal nature is available as additional quotes discussed below.

“Whilst working at the East and South Eastern provinces of Turkey, I found that, although it was men who committed honor killings, it was women who were the perpetrators of them. These women were sometimes the mother of a man who killed his daughter or the mother who allowed her son to kill his sister or at times, the mother-in-law who tells his son to kill his wife. Those murders were committed out of loyalty to their mothers.” [p.50]

Another quote shows how men feel intimidated by, but also respect, the power women possess over their children, in modern yet rural families.

“Understanding the power women possess as mothers is very important for us men. After understanding this we learn about our own position in the family and our limits. We get to know who the real bosses, patrons and leaders are. This is a type of leadership men will never stand up against and never be able to compete. In fact, our children love us because their mother loves us.” [p.50]

It is in these two quotes that we see a culture being described by a patriarchal man who believes in the patriarchal power of a mother. In this regard, it is important to notice that a woman’s position in the patriarchal society, at times and under certain circumstances, is a perpetrator of crimes and oppression. Her privileged position as a mother, whose children become the hands and feet in which she can seek asylum in their shadow, is her greatest source of security. Therefore, a mother has every reason to

support a system that makes someone else's daughter (and at times her own) disposable as long as her own sons and/or male kin's power is sustained. With reference to honor killings, it is evident that women gain from the homicide of their female kin. Again, it is important to notice how the system is never discussed as something to be eliminated or challenged, but instead what is important is what could be done within the given dynamics.

The author quoted above never challenged the status quo in a way that allows women to gain economic empowerment and therefore reduce dependence onto a romantic partner. But rather, the man as the husband is seen as a victim of an order that perceives women as vulnerable. Indeed, at times, a woman who contributes to household work and domestic responsibilities and has no financial security should be protected at a time of divorce. Yet for this understanding we need a legal system that recognizes her contribution as an essential contribution, similar to a man's role as a breadwinner.

It is clear from this book, in addition to other judges I have interviewed, that the legal system is not dedicated to gender equality. For example, I recall interviewing a former family judge who is now a private attorney (Interview conducted in February 2014). On one occasion he stated that there was a man who had a restraining order so that he was not allowed to get near his wife. At one point he calls his wife and abuses her over the phone. By law, he was supposed to be penalized by getting six months of imprisonment, yet the judge (my participant), decides that six months is too much to give so he just gave him a warning. Not only are the laws problematic in the way they are formed but also the implementation is not sufficient and highly problematic. The fact that the former judge believed the penalty was excessive indicates that it is often the case that the male political subject's prerogative is essential when it comes to accessing security, indivisibility and rights for women.

The Role of Pressure Groups

The prerogative is also reflected amongst the ranking of the state, and feminizes the male political subject. A document worth discussing in the context of the state reproduction of patriarchy in Turkey has been circulated by the Turkish Grand National Assembly. The 200-page report was prepared in June 2012 during AKP rule by a sub-committee within the Prime Ministry. The Female-Male Equal Opportunity Commission³⁴ Report includes recommendations from leading academics in Turkey who often work as consultants to MPs and/or hold particular privileges with the Grand National Assembly.

The content not only includes recommendations but it they also attempts to define the problem, the state's role in rectifying the situation and how equality has been or should have been seen in the country. The discourse of these recommendations and the manner these opposing views are situated gives evidence on the depth and context of equality with regards to on issues pertaining to gender, sex and sexuality.

A male professor from Turgut Ozal University made a statement that reinforces the idea that women's rights are at the expense of the unity of the family and therefore, the nation.

“As we say, ‘Let's equalize women to men and for this reason, protect women’ we should not discard the family, or damage the family and not engage in any extreme measure that would threaten the unity of the family. Nobody should interpret positive discrimination to disintegrate the family and encourage divorce.

The main reason people [law enforcement mechanisms] should protect women is because they are human and they [vulnerable family members] are not just

³⁴ The name of the commission in the text above reflects the exact translation from ‘Kadin-Erkek Esitligi Komisyonu’. It is important to note that it is not considered a matter of gender equality.

women, but also men and children. Children should be destined to live in one-parent households but rather live and raised in unhealthy families” (p.13)

It is clear that a woman’s rights end when the nation’s reproductive mechanisms struggle to survive. There is a clear clash between individual interest and collective manifestations of identity and nationhood. Since the family reproduces the nation, both biologically and socially, its disintegration would be the end of hegemonic constructions of nationhood. Therefore, as often seen in the context of the Middle East, especially with reference to honor being situated above a woman’s individualism, dignity and indivisibility, it is clear that plural identities subsume her interests, happiness and fundamental rights.

Therefore, men who control pluralism and collective constructions, situate a woman’s rights in a core-periphery relationship in which her rights, safety and indivisibility will be accessed if and only if they align with the goals of nationhood. Additionally, as the family unity is deemed to be protected at all costs, nationhood and unity should be sustained against her rights. Therefore, gender and patriarchy, as a construction, is not limited to the manifestations of a zero-sum game, but rather constructions that are formulated at macro structures. In this case, patriarchy and male domination is sustained through the imposition of collective notions such as nationalism over individual rights. Therefore, patriarchy as a system includes male hegemony substantiated against a female subject and situates her in a manner compatible to patriarchal structures. Women, even in debates on violence against women, are seen in relation to collective goals or with regards to the potential threats her rights might pose.

Another indication of the perception of a threatening nature for women’s rights is the way in which it/he emphasized how ‘she’ was human. My first impulse was to

Commented [KM4]: Not clear what you are talking about here

ask, 'what else would she be?' but I suspect the differentiation between women and human has been made to suggest that being a woman can never be seen as a privilege situated above male subjects. If we exclude the word female from human then I believe, in a patriarchal platform, the remainder would be male. So, what **it** actually stated is that women were protected only because they are human (equal to men) but not a woman (potentially perceived above men). Clearly, women's rights and their possible threats are seen against men's political existence. Even in an executive report, women are situated beneath men, in multiple contexts.

Commented [KM5]: What does 'it' refer to

Another male professor from the same university demonstrates the construction of Turkish-ness and nationhood in opposition to the west by stating,.

"Gender equality that has spread from the west is not in opposition to us. However, they do not believe in 'sanctity of the family' or 'family being the foundation of society'. Today they do not value these sentiments, which is evident from their [Western countries] TV shows. In Turkey, through our media, there is a similar tendency in believing that the family is not sacred and celebrities living together, without being married, have been a model for many which undermines the significance of the family. However, this is not true. If legal equality is important, if gender equality is important, then the unity of the family should be even more important." (p.14)

It is clear to see how law enforcement officials, such as the police and the judiciary, initially neglected the protection of women who lived outside marriage. Her protection, and therefore right to obtain a restraining order, would be an encouragement of women living together without being married. Celebrities and artists were chosen because of their visibility as they are a liberal community in Turkey, similar to their western counterparts. Academics, students, journalists and many others in large cities like Istanbul, Izmir and Ankara would feel free to live together without being married however, very few academics and government officials have access to that information.

Another reason, artists were targeted was because of their ability to influence others. For this reason, “governmentality” as a concept Foucault suggested should be visited. Foucault suggested that the government would interfere with the means of one’s self-governance. Additionally, we see the national subject or the citizenry seen as helpless and unable to sustain itself, whilst being stimulated. In other words, the citizenry is seen as being helpless, the same way the male political subject is thus and the national subject is male. However, as we will discuss in the next chapter, the male political subject will be perceived as being female in accordance to the context. Therefore, when the national subject is not confronted with the state, he is male however, but once his interest is at the expense of the state’s vision, he is female. The male political subject is male and therefore entitled to helplessness (entitled to overcompensate) as, he defines his gender in the Turkish political culture.

Another interesting element of the above quote is how gender equality is western, which would naturally imply that patriarchy is eastern. Although the above consultant states that gender equality was not in opposition to Turkish culture and values, it is important to note how equality was seen as an adopted concept rather than a value that grew from within. First, this undermines, feminist advocacy, campaigning and political activists that have existed since the late 19th century, early 20th century and post 1980 coup and our current context. Therefore, it is highly problematic to argue women’s rights in Turkey, without reference to other countries, often within an east/west or modern/traditional dichotomy. Clearly women’s rights are still to be discussed for their own sake rather than the above-mentioned discourses.

In addition to the evidence given above and throughout this chapter, the unity of the family, therefore, is the main issue at stake. As I wonder whether the issue is children, I suspect mostly the issue is female freedom. Unmarried women having sex

independently and as free agents, is deemed intimidating for the masses. Not only would they have to tolerate women who do not mind their loss of virginity, but also they would have to cope with the fact that a woman could leave her partner when she felt unhappy. I believe the fear of divorce stems from the fear of sexual freedom and abandonment. Marriage ties the woman to the man legally and she is therefore a subject in her own household. I believe partners who are committed to each other without being married could live separately more easily. It is mostly patriarchal men who fear women's freedom being above the unity of the family suggesting that regardless of the conditions she is facing, she should never abandon the family.

Therefore, women's rights are not only a threat to the nation and a man's dominance but they also imply that men would have to act in an improved manner to keep her interested. Free sex is very threatening to Turkish men, not because they are loyal to their wives but because it would grant the women the same rights of freedom, and as discussed with reference to interviews as one participant stated, a sexually free person is also politically free.

Another professor from Turgut Ozal University recommends the recognition of a different side of gender equality.

"When legal precautions are taken [we] should refrain from making extreme approaches, on one side there is feminism and on the other side there is patriarchy [...] a midpoint between the two should be found. Whilst finding that point we should all be reasonable and stay away from extreme approaches, especially those that damage the unity of the family." (p.20)

In the eyes of government consultants, feminism is seen as an extreme understanding similar to patriarchy. As both concepts were seen as oppositional, and to an extent it could be argued to be in that way, feminism is seen as a threat to social order. Feminism is not seen as a discourse to equalize men and women and de-construct

the gender binary, stereotypes and limiting constructions. I suspect, through this quote, feminism is recognized as the quest of a world dominated by women and succeeding in marginalizing men. However, this should also be contested. Making this highly problematic assumption that women strive for supremacy suggests that men fear women's quest for equality because the only way to reverse patriarchy would be matriarchy, suggesting that a different medium could never be reached.

If women's leadership involved the employment of resources to achieve supremacy, given that men have been politically superior since (at least) ancient Greece, it would only be a matter of reciprocity, to live in a society that situates women in a manner that once situated men. For this reason, responses to gender equality amongst government consultants are not only seen as representative of a great fear of marginalization, they also demonstrate a lack of appreciation and understanding towards women's leadership, initiative and empowerment.

Another reference that needs needed to be made about amongst this quote, similar to some of the above quotes made from both authors, is how protecting women is understood in opposition to the unity of the family. This should also be recognized with relevance to literature on patriarchal theory. If we see how women are sacrificed and murdered in the name of family honor which is that is represented over women in order to represent the merits of the seniors (including women) and men of the family, we can see the supremacy of seniors over individual integrity. Therefore, even though existentially deprived, this quote situates the female subject beneath collective constructs. Additionally, men use this plurality to manipulate the subject into conformity and self-sacrifice.

It could be argued that, if women's safety is secondary when it comes to the unity of the family, marriage that represents a collectivity is deemed sacred. Given that

the partner being marginalized is female, then it is clear that the interests that are protected are in fact representative of the male partner. Therefore, the collectivity is represented through the male partner. It could be argued that, the theoretical construction of structural patriarchy, as suggested in the chapter on patriarchal theory, is not just concerned with analyzing public and private forms of patriarchy nor does it suggest the recognition of patriarchy as a system.

As family is deemed as the fundamental element of Turkish society, in accordance to the 41st Article of the Turkish constitution, it is clear that marriage is seen as a matter of national identity and most certainly an integral part of nation building. In this regard, the above analysis could be linked to a woman's right to abandon an abusive partner, violating social norms on nation building, cultural authenticity (discerning a Turkish identity different to that of the so-called west) and sexual morality. As women's safety is seen secondary, the nation's identity becomes the justification of her sacrifice similar to understandings pertaining to honor in rural areas. Therefore, the collective exploitation of women and making her the representatives of larger, collective and subsuming constructs, gives the concept of structural patriarchy a different meaning and context from Walby's understanding of private and public patriarchy (1990). It might seem as if the above situation exemplifies public patriarchy. However, the matter of domestic violence and its connection to the unity of family is ultimately integrated into discourses of nation-building, authenticity and identity. These constructs are based on restricted sexual freedom that conflates and transcends the so-called private and public spheres and turns individual exploitation into a collective goal.

The Muslim feminist subjects' collective exploitation, to an extent, differentiates her from her western counterparts. Additionally **collective and structural patriarchy** should be differentiated from Walby's concepts of public and

private patriarchy because the subject is integrated and exploited within patriarchal structures at multiple levels at exact the same time, therefore her existence is linked to a multi levelmulti-level structure that operates to reflect the interests of the privileged. Additionally, the difference stems from the recognition of an existential dimension to exploitation. Since her existence is an extension of a collective identity, collective and/or structural patriarchy should be seen as a reflection of a patriarchal connectivity (Joseph, 2006), in which a subject would see another as a reflection of itself. In this regard, Joseph's analysis is primarily interpersonal whereas I believe the connectivity she recognizes is also endemic across abstract structures that reproduce themselves through metaphors.

For this reason, collective patriarchy and structural patriarchy stems from its ability to exploit the singular by the beneficiaries of the collective in the name of the family, nation, religion or varied different identities that subordinate and marginalize a group by an elite that has always been allowed to construct the collectivity. The difference between the collective and structural components stems from our ability to discern one's identity constructed, expressed and sustained over another's right to life. Therefore, the former is existential and the latter is a systematic mechanism of reproduction, in which dynamics between masculine and feminine agents and structures observed in multiple levels, reinforcing each other through per-formative negotiations and contestations of power.

Analyzing state officials and consultants has allowed us to introduce new understandings and frameworks in patriarchal theory. However, often gender inequality stems from the clash between the universal and the particular and therefore, to an extent, the modern and the traditional.

For example, the same consultant has made another comment worth mentioning whilst advising to the AKP administration:.

“In Germany there is a certain demographic trap which leads to the reduction of the young population and therefore the population is consisted of senior citizens. This has serious implications for the social security system [benefits and pensions] and if it continues like this, the social security system will collapse by 2050. For this reason, men and women should not see each other as rivals. The idea of an individual who is focused on sustaining his/her life is called ‘commercialized and egocentric’ individualism, which have resisted in constitutional debates. Instead of ego-centric individualism, they [the people] should choose social individualism. They [Germans] have stated that people can be egoistic in their personal lives however the constitution has no obligation to accommodate such individuality. In this egocentric individualism family life and children are seen as a threat to individual desire and ambition and for that reason birth rates are decreasing and the population is shrinking. (p.21)

It is important to see that individualism is seen as a threat as often -mentioned elsewhere. As will be discussed in the next chapter, Turkish authorities fear sexual freedom and the individual who puts herself/himself above collective interests. This is not a discussion on Capitalism where the interests of the entrepreneur, at times, would imply sacrificing the interests of working classes. This is not a discussion on tax regimes where equality might lead to inequality. Nor is this is a debate on national security where defense expenses are often supported against budget allocations on education and health care.

This is a discussion on gender equality which is intended to supplement a democracy and strengthen the foundation of the democratic regime by forcing its subjects to exist without oppressing one another or grant individual indivisibility as a core principle of the constitution as guaranteed by the rule of law.

It is important to see that, in the above quote, there is no reference to German and/or Turkish political, economic and social structures that have failed to

accommodate women's needs without having her to sacrifice motherhood. If the system allowed her to embrace motherhood without having to make sacrifices from her career then birth rates would not have decreased so dramatically. Saddam, in the aftermath of the oil crises in the late 1970s, has introduced policies to integrate women into the national economy at the time the economy was blooming (Al-Ali, 2007). He opened day care centers that were free and highly subsidized by the state and this that allowed women to reach a high employment rate.

Indeed he was not a feminist, as he acted on national interest rather than feminist initiative. However, he created it was a model that was aligned to many Middle Eastern, and to an extent, western economic and social models. He represented, to an extent, the role of state incentive on an increased, female employment rates. This exemplifies the obstacles women confront whilst striving for employment due to limited childrearing options. If all of women's needs women were accommodated for all of their needs, they would not need to choose between the two options, which do not substitute each other but rather, essentially complement each other despite conflicting time schedules and difficult financial constraints. Capitalist patriarchy subordinates women withby its inability to allow her to integrate like hertheir male counterparts. They are not paid equal wages; additionally they often work in pink-collar jobs. Furthermore, and most importantly, the subject is male in which labor laws are deemed to protect and define. Women are not the subject of the economic structure. Subsequently, issues pertaining women's economic rights in the labor force, often constitutes an appendix within the relevant judicial constraints. Therefore, she is included through measures of extension rather than full integration. At this point, it is relevant to recall that equality could not be understood as 'being the same', since, at times, it refers to an entitlement to difference. For this reason, it is clear that the economic and legal system in Turkey is

far from accommodating women's needs as individualism is deemed the obstacle rather than urgency of meeting the unmet needs of the working women.

Following the assessments and suggestions made by numerous government consultants, the 145-page document includes a section titled 'Overall Assessment'. In this section, it is stated that;

“With an amendment made in 2014, international agreements' legal status has been situated above the law and it is perceived as detrimental to our constitution. Therefore, the National Assembly and the Judiciary and administrative bodies would use their authority in accordance to the international agreements Turkey is a party of.” (p.129)

The recognition of international treaties as determinants of national legislation is mostly an ideal that only resides in Turkish imagination rather than being a reality. For example, it is known that many legal cases support male aggression through mitigating circumstances and this has never been seen as a violation of legal principles regarding gender equality and therefore international agreements and treaties. For this reason, the implementation of a law often includes an understanding that, as an interview participant (retired judge) has stated, “The conscious always favors the defendant”³⁵. Therefore the conceptual and philosophical connections between the incidental and empirical manifestations of equality and its connection to broad principles (equality, democracy, rule of law etc.) and international treaties (UDHR) are often neglected in the implementation of family law. In addition to this, the same participant has made it clear that, at times, the judge would reduce the penalty because he or she might see the written code and relevant punishment as being too harsh on the defendant. In other words, laws that favor men are further reduced based on the prerogative of judges. For this reason, it is clear to see that the defendant's protection

³⁵ Interviewed participant in December 2014, Ankara, Turkey

is seen as an implementation of legal procedures that are needed to be just. The sense of justice mentioned and the other that described in the quote often contradicted one another.

As a result, there is a limited will amongst the Assembly and law making officers to recognize international law being situated above national law. Consequently, there is very little will, if any, amongst law making officials to ensure and implement measures sustaining gender equality that is often against the interests of the defendant.

All in all, this document is important for the following reasons. First, the state apparatus and its ability to implement changes have been excluded from the debate. It is assumed that changes initiated by the Assembly would trigger change throughout the state apparatus and somehow that would restructure the state. However, the judiciaries' lack of insight into day-to-day executions and reproduction of patriarchy has been excluded from the report. Second, there is evidently a lack of will to tolerate dissenting views and non-hegemonic ideals. For example, marriage is seen as an all-inclusive entity in which citizens should pledge regardless of individual circumstances. In addition to this, it is clear that citizens who chose to de-sanctify the union are deemed as a threat to the nation.

The inability to tolerate mutually co-existing subjectivities remains a weakness of the Turkish state as well as the overall political culture, bringing the debate into other arenas, situated beyond and above gender equality. Therefore, it is clear that a homogenous citizenry is targeted amongst the intellectuals who strive to influence the government. For this reason, the state lacks appropriate guidance amongst the members of its intelligentsia. Third, feminist efforts which aim to protect women from patriarchal values, processes and procedures are undermined as gender equality is seen to be western.

It is assumed that women in Turkey are just following their western counterparts with almost no agency or intellectual and political independence that allow them to recognize oppression and take a stand against it. The description, identification and narration of the problem, therefore, have contributed to the problem itself. It is clear from the above quotes, analysis and summary, that the appointed officials of the Turkish government lack the will to appreciate gender equality on its own merit. This stems from their incompetence and inability of implementing it on a day-to-day basis but also indicates difficulty to appreciate the demand for freedom within and amongst its own citizenry. The hegemonic identity, as it is represented in the imagery of Turkish officials, is patriarchal and by being so, represents the interests of the collective interest.

Conclusion

This chapter involves the utilization of content analysis and thorough analysis of government documents on domestic violence and the Family Protection Act in addition to a book that is written by a retired judge as well as a document produced by government officials who worked in family courts. The book is not a legal text nor is it scientific. However, the book has been authored by an appointed government official who is ultimately sincere in his authorship. This provides profound information as to how patriarchal mentalities are common amongst members of the judiciary. All in all, the key term that governs law-making officials is “provoke”. Men are provoked to be oppressive and this should be taken into consideration whilst issuing protection orders. It is the assumed helplessness that the society and members of the judiciary needs to take into account whilst looking at relationships between men and women.

We will proceed to the next chapter in our understanding of the provoked subject and state, the implications of provocation and seduction and the assumed

helplessness of subjects who had no other choice but to overcompensate. Evidence will be provided to demonstrate the determinants of power dynamics between the state and the citizen. The former will be conceptualized as masculine and the latter would be conceptualized as feminine, which leads us to argue that the male political subject is feminized by the state.

CHAPTER VII: BETWEEN WOMEN AND THE STATE: MALE POLITICAL SUBJECT

The relationship between men and women has been explored in the chapter that elaborated the household. In the chapter on the state, I have elaborated the state's reproduction of patriarchy, through the implementation of laws and documents that represented the views of consultants who are appointed to explore and rectify such issues. A comparison between two different manifestations (of the ruler subject binary and the masculine and feminine) needs to be made to identify how cultures and structures reproduce themselves metaphorically. The notion as the family metaphor implies that the state is like a parent. However, the study elaborates the parent-child relationship, nevertheless however the male-female relationships in the household, also has metaphorical significance. The restraining and controlling behavior can be

perceived as nurture and reflects itself through the relationship between men and women, within a vertical context, necessitating an outcome of structural patriarchy.

Horizontal patriarchy, elaborated amongst legally similar but substantively unequal conditions, are observed during Gezi Park protests in 2013. Although, historically, sexual torture (or gender based violence) has been inflicted on both male and female subjects and, recently it became endemic amongst female citizens of Turkey. The most gendered form of oppression took place when, as it is often said by participants in 2013, police officers who would place a woman in a car and state “what were you doing in the streets at this time of night?”³⁶ It is clear that the public domain was reserved for men, which implied that women were expected to remain in the household. Therefore, although women were equal citizens in legal terms, culturally they were excluded from citizenship whilst suffering from various types of discrimination based on gender. This chapter, however, intends to shed light on vertical patriarchy and how the household shapes the state and vice versa. The reproductive mechanisms that create two spheres which operate through similar dynamics and procedures require an analysis empowered by political sociology, philosophy and political science. This chapter is written through semi-structured and unstructured interviews with related to relevant theoretical frameworks discussed in detail in previous chapters.

Commented [KM6]: The introduction to this chapter is quite difficult to follow – could be revised

Dissenting Views and Gender

³⁶ Interview conducted with NGO activist, Ankara, November 2013.

It is important to discuss the criticisms concerning the law of 6284³⁷, Family Protection Act, to see how the state has created a society that is divided on women's rights and has no attempt to rectify the situation.

As I spoke to an activist from a leading NGO in Ankara, she stated;

“There are serious difficulties with regards to the implementation of the law. They see extenuating circumstances necessary whilst prosecuting the offender. They perpetuate the trauma women go through. When we look at statistics we see women are murdered despite having a restraining orders against the oppressor. Women often get injured and raped. There is no protection. [...] What matters is the protection of the family. When a woman goes to the police, the police try to reconcile the two so she would return to her home. We know this from the women who come to our support center. They do not take the testimony of the woman or the man. They do not process the application. They do not invite the husband to make his testimony; they rather invite him to pick his wife up. Women are forced to go back to the site of violence.”

The police refrain from initiating processes to implement action in a manner appropriate to the law. It is clear that there is a problem within the 'rule of law' in Turkey. Laws are often bent and discarded to implement certain strategies of power.

As indicated by a human rights lawyer, protection orders are not implemented properly;

“When women are subjected to violence when she files a complaint at the police station and the family court issues a restraining order against the husband. However, they are, at times, murdered by their husbands, because the state cannot protect them despite the protection order. It is due to a feudal system that dominates the way we see things.

We are still discussing whether secondary school institutions should have both girls and boys studying together. These affect the way the society see things.”

³⁷ The term Law of 6284 has been chosen instead of law 6284 due to the reference made in original language. The law is not labeled within a legal name or a similar frame but rather in a manner to attract attention that it is numbered in a certain way.

Ayşe Pasalı was a woman who got divorced and applied for a protection order against her former husband who was eventually murdered by her former husband. A lawyer says;

“It is difficult to show you are under threat since violence occurs in private places and courts are not easy to convince. Additionally, if you are living together without being married and if your parents do not know about it, you will not be able to obtain justice.”

It is important to note that the relevant law is concerned with eliminating violence within the family, instead of protecting women. In my opinion, it is because (as pointed out by many participants of my research), the state is primarily concerned with protecting families against obstacles that might threaten their unity. However, another reason accounting for the state's reluctance for implementing gender equality, is a concern for alienating male voters by making them feel that women's rights are more important than men's (unjust) rights. As seen before, at times, men feel that battering women is their right, in the form of an entitlement, if needed to rectify issues by imposing one's point of view by force. Therefore, if the law was called 'protecting women from domestic violence' or 'the law of women's rights in the household' then it is likely that men would say; “what about my rights?” The very phrase of women's rights is threatening for men. Below, through the statements of a former judge who worked at the family courts in Turkey, we first see how the state never sees women's rights as a priority even in issues pertaining to domestic violence. Secondly, the former judge will give an example of how women's rights often threaten men and lead them to do something just to get even with their (former or current) intimate partner. He states that,

“There is a patriarchal mentality. By calling the law 'family', by calling the ministry 'family', they are saying; in cases of doubt between what is best for the family and what is best for women, choose what is best for the family. In real terms the state does not see men and women as equal. They do not see women as individuals.”

As the same participant provides an example of a court case in which a woman obtained a restraining order against her partner, he states,

“A man can obtain a restraining order against his wife. It happens very often. When a woman obtained a restraining order against her husband due to violence, then the man filed for a complaint to retaliate and obtained a restraining order against his wife. It is obvious that this is done for revenge but the judge accepted it anyway. Those restraining orders taken against women, by their partners, were not removed despite the lack of any supporting evidence.”

It is clear from the above statement that it is a matter of pride, for a man, to either retaliate or just oppose laws, practices, norms as well as speeches and people who defend women, in order to compensate the feeling of 'emasculating' on women's rights were deemed to cause.

Another lawyer draws attention to a separate issue;

“The methods that prosecute or judge men are insufficient. Electronic cuffs are not used widely, except in a few pilot cases. We always tell the women to run and save themselves. But no one tells the man to stop. He is free. We tell the one who is threatened and abused to protect herself. We call the police; they listen to his testimony and let him go. Then he goes back and continues to be violent.”

This is a very significant statement that demonstrates how inequality has various different forms. It is clear how the state refrains from telling men how to be and how not to be. The fact that men are allowed to conduct and enact how they please and how it is expected that the women will would adjust and position themselves herself accordingly demonstrates a pattern in the relationship between the ruler and the subject. This is an indication of a core-periphery relationships amongst men and women. As we see from the paragraph above, the freedom to oppress, which men have against women's rights to indivisibility, is indicated. The different ranks between 'rights' or 'freedoms' that are enjoyed between male and female subjects are relative and they manifest inequality, hierarchy and vertical relationships.

By saying 'rank' I refer to an assumed hierarchy of needs a human being might have. As argued by a famous psychologist, Maslow³⁸ (1956), there is a certain hierarchy of needs. According to his theory, there are eight different needs. FAs Maslow argues, first, we have our biological needs, such as air, food, drink, sleep and sex. Secondly, we have our safety needs; protection from elements, security, order, law, stability. Thirdly, there are social needs, like belongingness and love. Fourth, there are esteem needs; self-esteem, achievement, mastery, independence, status, dominance. Fifth, we have cognitive needs, such as knowledge and meaning. Sixth, there are aesthetic needs such as appreciation of beauty, balance and form. Seventh, self-actualization needs; namely reaching ones' potential, self-fulfillment, seeking personal growth and peak experience. Eighth, there are needs of transcendence, which involve helping others to achieve self-actualization.

38 Information on Maslow's theory was gathered through a website.
<http://www.businessballs.com/maslow.htm> Last accessed 25th of September, 2014

I do not argue that this hierarchy of needs is applicable to today's circumstances. Neither do I say that it would be observed in every country, as if it was universal. I do not even believe that people fulfill their needs in this particular order. In fact, I find it very easy to believe that, some 'very privileged' people, who reach the self - actualization phase, might never reach the transcendence stage, in which they would help the underprivileged. However; the acceptance of a certain hierarchy of needs has serious implications for this research.

Another indication of privilege could be observed by the reaction men give to restraining orders. For example,

“In a restraining order a man is told to stay away from his wife due to his violent behavior. However, the majority of women are murdered by their husbands who have not followed do not follow their restraining order. A woman who is afraid of being murdered has no real protection”

(Lawyer, female, Istanbul, 2013)

What attracts draws my attention the most is the over-compensation a man would inflict on a women. For example, there is clearly a lack of understanding amongst men who have been secluded from their his household that it was their his violent behavior that led to this. Furthermore, their his retaliation is excessive. Murdering a woman due to a restraining order is a typical case of overcompensation, which has been explained below.

What I would like to emphasize by using Maslow's model is the way our needs have a certain rank regardless of what this model implies. To apply this understanding to patriarchal theory, state-society relations manifesting the ruler and the subject metaphor, do not need to follow a particular model. It is evident that social and psychological needs are secondary to biological needs. It is also evident that the need of flattering oneself and one's self-esteem is secondary to the need of feeling safe and preserving order. As a result of this, applying this to the quotes above, we can say that

first, men (due to their need to feel safe and preserve order) batter their wives and violate their needs of safety and order. Therefore, the way the same need is protected over violating another person's 'respective' need, which holds the identical rank and/or urgency, signifies how hierarchy is produced over by a **prioritization** that is defended amongst men in court and supported by the apparatus of the state. However, an alternative approach to interpreting this model involves understanding how different needs are protected through violating others' needs, which are different in rank and possibly urgency.

An understanding of urgency and ranking of needs is required to appreciate overcompensation, which is the primary motive and cause underlining violence. Women's behavior provides the rationale for men to exercise their power over women. Their self-proclaimed and officially recognized and endorsed helplessness encourages them to oppress women at times of insecurity. The lack of 'power-within' leads the male political subject to overcompensate his less urgent needs in expense of her urgent and primary needs.

For example, I interviewed a female member of the Gendarmerie in Ankara who was also employed at the Gender Equality Commission who stated,

"I am against feminism. Feminism says that women are superior and puts women at the forefront in the community [...]. A lot of people in Turkey are criticizing this law [Law of 6284]. Due to the law numbered 6284, divorce rates have increased.

[WhenAs I asked her why that should divorce should not be expected when there is violence, she just remained silent.] [She continued] They complain about how women are not required to provide evidence in court, since all a woman needs to do is to declare that she is subjected to violence. They say that the reason women who are murdered by their husbands is probably due to a mistake they were and not supposed to have made."

The last two statements, in my opinion, are crucial. First, people with patriarchal understandings think that declaring violence is not enough; but rather, evidence is needed. This clearly indicates how the society wants to make it harder for the women to prove it; thus so men are would rarely be prosecuted. This is also about the different ranks of needs. Her safety, which is a primary need, is deemed secondary to his need to establish his self-esteem, dominance and prestige (ranking fourth according to Maslow's model). I argue that this relativity is the key to understanding patriarchy; vertical, horizontal and structural. Therefore, discourses on equality, as being the same or different, may not always shed light on our understanding of what equality is or is not.

Equality is rather a concept we should understand with a notion of relativity. For example, we all exist, in one way or another, within and without the public sphere. All members of a collectivity unite to form the collective good. I would argue, whilst discussing whether people are equal or not, whether we should first look at what they need to give up as a member of that polity. What precise sacrifices are they expected to make in order to exist with the state as well as their peers? Second, despite the sacrifice, how much of that collective good was shaped due to their effort, power and entitlement? For this reason, men, whilst enjoying extended rights that are not recognized by any international governing, body but only patriarchal states, obtain the privilege to shape the society they live in. This indicates a clear superiority on the part of men, especially because most women do not have their primary needs met as well as being violated very frequently.

Therefore, equality could either be seen as within a comparison of how needs are compensated (whether an unmet need led to an out of proportion response, with severe implications) or by looking at the relativity of the two different needs. A need

met by a subject whilst the other being violated, because a high ranking (therefore less urgent) need is attained through violating other people's primary needs (often urgent if not detrimental) or alternatively, it could be seen as another form of relativity observed within the entitlements one has (as discussed above) and their 'ability' to shape the collective good. As a result of this, I argue that equality can be measured through the question "what do you need to give up in order to coexist with your peers?" and how urgent and/or detrimental is was that need? Indeed, the relativity amongst the needs with different rankings should demonstrate how people are expected to coexist under vertical patriarchy.

Returning to the female government officer's statement, her second claim also makes a similar point in which we see asserts relativity. As she explains the criticisms concerning the law on domestic violence, she mentions the murdering of women being deliberately associated with women's behavior. The word 'mistake', rather than a more neutral term such as 'act', is crucial here because it assumes that there is an established way of doing things, a universality or an objectivity, that constitutes the hegemonic subjectivity within Turkey. The victims' deed was to diverge from that established order that is manifested in the ruler-subject binary where there is a vertical relationship between the former and the latter. This also indicates how his needs were above hers. It was his need of 'dominance' and the means of sustaining that power balance that was deemed far more important than her right to life, which is such a primary need that Maslow could not even include it in his model; maybe because it was too detrimental or perhaps because he assumed it was already well established.

The obligation of the state to pass a law in the parliament to protect women was evident in the cases that were diverted to the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR). Nahide Opuz was the first women in Turkey and in Europe to apply to the ECHR about

Commented [KM7]: Do you means 'asserts'?

a matter pertaining to women's rights. When the Court made Turkey pay a fine of 36,500 Euros in 2002, it was the first time the court ruled against a government for not being able to protect the rights of their female subjects.

Indeed, Turkey had very little concern to protect women from men, as it would often involve penalizing or prosecuting them. For example, Opuz applied to ECHR because of due to her husband's physical assaults, causing major injuries and attempted murder. However, the court dropped charges due to the 'lack of sufficient evidence'. The husband tried to run over his wife with a vehicle. He was given a prison sentence of three months that was later turned into a fine. On 29 October 2001 the husband, who stabbed his wife seven times was exempted from prosecution and eventually payed paying a modest fine and informeding the police that, "Her mother interferes with our lives; that is why we argue a lot". The interference of her mother, obviously, created a problem of control and dominance. Therefore, he used violence as a means to subjugate and establish order, in which he is the ruler and/or they, mother and daughter, were the subjects. The relationship between the ruler and the subject is replicated within the family through relationships between the parent and the child in addition to the employer and the employee and the State and the citizen.

Certainly, gender is shaped by culture, political economy, geopolitics, ideology and religion, among others. However, it is in fact gender that shapes culture, the collective good, the public sphere and the state, by as one of a variety of ways, through providing a model for coexistence amongst opposing binaries. Therefore, violence and the traumatization of the subject, are evident across a variety of different 'rulers' who approach their subjects, whilst enjoying extended rights. For that particular reason, the State is not only unwilling, but also incompetent in its approach towards violence against women.

To begin with, I argue that the state faces a dilemma in this issue, which I can identify by saying, “It is evident that women are assaulted and that we (as the state) are expected to do something about it, however how can you protect women without prosecuting men?” If the choice between men and women were made regarding taxes, voting, municipal representation, health care (the percentage of women seems to be higher compared to representation of the national assembly) it would not imply a conflict of interest or a zero sum game. However, violence is different. It is seen as necessary to preserve and drive the opponent into submission. Therefore, for a decade, the Turkish government could not do anything about it, simply because they could not decide on whether officials wanted to eliminate violence. To give an example; a lawyer stated:.

“On March 8, 2012, the law of 6284 was issued as a present for women on international women’s day. This law deals with combating violence against women with its sociological and psychological dimensions. During the same government period [AKP government] there was a law that issued before this one: law numbered 4320 and was called the law on violence against women. That was not issued for 10 years. For a decade, the state apparatus did not know how to implement the law. For example, when women went to the police, the officer did not know what to do. No one knew how to implement the decisions made by the courts. There was a ten-year period of uncertainty with trial and error. Women during that period were afraid of going to the police or the courts because each verdict was different from one another. Then they introduced the new law and there was not enough infrastructure or superstructure to implement them. The quantity of psychologists is not sufficient. The law was inflated, in the sense that it [the state] makes promises it cannot keep. At the same time, they [the state officials] say that violence against women stems from unequal power relations with men. But then they discuss mixed sex education [boys and girls enrolling in the same school] in a way that they are critical. Also they say the police will control whether male and female students live in the same house without being married. Instead of focusing on how women can go to university

and become independent, they are giving the wrong impression to the conservative, lower class people who would think that allowing their daughters to access education would make them promiscuous.”

In this statement, we see evidence of an intention that is not supported by structure and resources. This might indicate that gender equality is far from being a priority in the government agenda. Second, there is a lack of commitment that is needed to enforce and implement laws that are produced which raises concerns over sincerity: it is as if we ask; “Do you actually mean it?” The government would probably change rhetoric depending on its audience. For example, for Europe, Turkey would like to appear committed to human rights values and gender equality. However, within its own jurisdiction, Turkey would, in accordance with an ideology that is propagated by the state, reinforce male power in every single way.

Another point that is required is how the government is like a doctor dealing with a patient’s symptoms rather than tackling the illness. Let’s assume that the government is sincere and that they do want to fight against domestic violence; then how do we explain a decade long uncertainty about the implementation of the law? I argue that the state could have introduced protective and preventative measures needed to implement certain principles of human rights if deemed necessary. The problem that the Turkish government (similar to some non-western governments) is concerned with is the ideological, structural, traditional and religiously influenced cultures that may not always support the values of human rights. So the question is: would we have to stop being Turkish in order gain our rights?

Turkey is no exemption amongst nations who struggle to accommodate the universal and the particular. In this specific context, the universal requires elevating the status of women and penalizing and restricting men to this degreeend. It also implies a

feminization on part of the Turkish male political subject as the universal is represented in the global sphere and men who uphold the local settings are subjugated by foreign influence.

The tension between the universal and the particular is also a tension between objectivity and subjectivity. The subjectivity of the liberal world and its universalization causes crisis of cultural identity and masculinity. Since subjectivities of the subordinate masculinities are far from being incorporated in the global public sphere, unable to attain multiculturalism without culture, subjectivity without universalism becomes a vague reality. Collective patriarchy, in this context, is represented through the subjectivities' conquest of the female subject and her instrumental value of patriarchal connectivity.

Possibly, the inclusion of the subjective reality and the particular, in the making of the universal, through debates and contestations manifested in the global public sphere, might lead to multiculturalism without culture. However, the construction of objectivity seems unavoidable since it is evident that almost certainly, collectivities, local and global, would need a system to take for granted. However, an objectivity, is a subjectivity that became hegemonic. This hegemonisation represents the emasculation, if not the feminization, of the male political subject across multiple settings, including Turkey. Therefore, self-proclaimed commitment to women's rights stems from the accepted feminization, however the limitations observed in their implementations, stem from their resistance to feminization and their form of anti-imperialist resistance.

Beyond the emasculation of those who uphold subjectivity, compensated through the existential exploitation and subordination of the female subject, there is also very little understanding and consensus ofn the relationship between gender equality and modernity as well as democracy. It is common amongst the male political

subject to assume that wealth, democracy, development and modernity could be sustained with a male figure stronger than his female partner whilst being protective, giving and ensuring. The supremacy of men is often perceived as a matter of preference, choice or taste rather than a concern for civil rights and therefore democracy. This perception of preference and taste, in addition to concerns over cultural authenticity, creates the tension between the written law and its daily implications. The difficulties in implementing laws represent the resistance of men and their inability to universalize their subjectivity, both within Turkey and the global public sphere.

The debate on culture versus human rights has been dealt with by leading NGOs like Save The Children, Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International as well as academics across the globe. However, I have never witnessed a scholar and an activist, taking a wider view on the issue that does not deal with the occurrence of the event but rather the illnesses of the society that creates that outcome in the first place. However, aiming to detect the reasons underlining the ‘illnesses of the society’, might lead to racism, cultural imperialism and an international form of oppression because it provides western institutions, such as NGOs and Intergovernmental organizations, the encouragement that not only interferes but shapes the sociological structures, functions and metaphors to potentially embrace a culture of human rights.

This upholds the closest the west (ranging from academic institutions to governments and NGOs) can get to a new form of imperialism. It is now well known that the influential Harvard professor, Samuel Huntington, (2003) firmly believes that human rights are western and that they cannot be duplicated by non-western societies. There is an undeniable truth that needs to be acknowledged within that. For example, given that the law of 4320 only protected women who were married and particularly excluded divorced women who were abused by their former husbands as well as

unmarried women. We can clearly see that the state, at first, tried to do the absolute minimum they had to, in order to respond to criticism raised by domestic as well as mostly foreign officials.

As a result, pressures raised by western sources, with reference to the Turkish case, appear to make a difference. Yet, once we investigate the mentality of the law (as discussed regarding the report published by the assembly), the implementation including the judiciary and the police and analyzing the general discontent in the society as offenders are restrained; we can see how oppression is endemic in the structure and culture at every societal level. As a result, the influence of the west, will not fully counter-balance patriarchal practices. The west will be equally incompetent as the Turkish government would be in introducing a culture of human rights. For instance, Europe (or Amnesty International) might put pressure on the Prime Minister to respect the citizens' right to peaceful protest. The Turks may decide to adhere to that. In all levels of the society, across different micro and macro structures there will be resistances to it. For instance, there will always be a loophole; an extenuating circumstance or the use of the unjust provocation cause.

On one hand, there will be a man who would say, 'I slap my wife one day. What does that have to do with democratization?' and therefore, he will not be able to abide by the law because first, he was not made part of the discussions about introducing the law and second, he is simply not able to see the direct relationship between oppressing a woman and its relationship between how poor he is, the roads and electricity infrastructure in his village, the insufficient minimum wage or in summary: development. Indeed, when men do not oppress their partners because it is a backward thing to do, it also indicates certain ignorance on the issue of her right to be safe. As a result, human rights have to be dealt with at the grassroots level by

empowering those who are oppressed the most. This is a choice that only people can make. In this regard, local activists who are at times empowered by global actors are those who could make a difference.

The contribution that Amnesty and ECHR makes is to shame Turkey as a means of compliance. In certain cases it was useful, especially regarding the Gezi Park protests, which I will discuss after analyzing gender. However, similar to the man who does not understand the relationship between slapping his partner and development, the state, or the judiciary, does not understand the relationship between limiting state power and human rights. Therefore, despite being successful in the short run, the influence of the west is actually quite limited.

Therefore, we go back to the question on whether Turkey can adhere to human principles in a profound, sincere and substantial way. I would say it is possible. It must come from 'within'. Mostly, it must capture the core metaphors that produce and duplicate through similarities in function and distribution of power.

What I aspire to emphasize is that the governance of 'sexual modesty' observed in cases reflected on honor, and similar sexual restrictions, is a model of relationships that is formed as a binary. The binary serves the basis of the relationship between the ruler and the subject that have conflicting and often competing interests. Women might favor wearing their hair down rather than use a veil, yet they are told to consider whether they are tempting anyone or not.

Therefore, men are allowed to dominate women's lives, not because they will give something in return, but rather because that is the only way to avoid conflict, manage to concentrate on daily tasks and therefore, simply exist in the society as a law abiding citizen. This leads to an understanding that men can only feel safe if they restrain someone and women can only exist in the society if they accept being restricted.

In a way, this reminds me of Rousseau's social contract that defines the relationship between the state and the citizen (or society) in which they both accept to abide by the same rules and each party knows where they stand and, together, that governs their relationship.

As I previously discussed in the chapter on the household, whilst explaining extended rights with regards to men in Turkey, the same reasoning can be observed elsewhere. Indeed, as Leila Ahmed (1992) has emphasized, Islam is not responsible for the subjugation of women in the Middle East but rather, the interpretation of Islam is. We can see that Islam emerged in the 7th century, 1400 years ago. The failure of interpreting the text, to allow freedom to flourish, in accordance with the expectations of our times, especially with regards to progressive forms of coexistence is the result of a corrupted, elitist, conservative (in terms of preserving the status quo as envisioned by Edmund Burke and Machiavelli) approach to Islam and social affairs (including knowledge production in the fields of sociology, politics, international relations and anthropology) that ultimately reinforced those who were already in power. So, it is not Islam but rather the power relationships in Muslim majority countries that have developed oppressive structures and cultures.

It is impossible to detect the exact influence of Islamic teachings whilst analyzing political oppression in the Middle East. As stated above, this thesis has no intention of propagating Orientalist messages across academia and the informed public. However, it would also be naïve to assume that Islam had no role in the reproduction of oppressive structures and cultures. Therefore, based on the (benign) assumption that Islam might have influenced the political affairs of the believers, we must continue our analysis.

In the above quote, there is evidence to an extent that might suggest that 'oppression' is needed to peacefully coexist regardless of the presence of an internal and external threat. In fact, the sexual, tempting image of women is perceived as the threat. Without a doubt, the discussion of this topic requires extensive analysis. Instead, I would like to draw attention on how 'restraining' (the term 'oppression' might be an Orientalist conclusion) the source that is placed in an opposing, conflicting position, has been seen as a viable form of overcoming threats. This would ultimately influence, one way or another, to a small or large extent, first, the way believers would cope with threats, and second, how people who are on the side of conflicting and competitive binaries would coexist.

One the one side of the binary, there would be the one who is excused, the same way a man's sexual desire is accounted for in the quote. The excused one, who inflicts restrictions on his opponent for his sustenance is the one who shapes the terms and conditions that define the relationships within the binary. This allows him to develop a personal being that claims and justifies the extended rights he enjoys in the private and public sphere. As he has been drawn to leadership, both within the household and in the public, the binary reproduces itself in other binaries, since the essence of the metaphor duplicates itself within, amongst others, men and wife, the parents and their children, the brother and the sister, the government and the citizen (as well as civil society), the employer and the employee, the teacher (or professor) and the student.

I am certain that the binaries I have introduced are only a small portion of a large sample group. These binaries exist within different structures such as the private or public sphere, the financial market or the bureaucracy. These structures and the cultural norms are managed and proliferated through the performance of the male political subject. The man who integrates into and proliferates within the public sphere

(including the state) shapes the way the collective good is attained. This collective good could be exemplified by Rousseau's social contract that defines the terms of the relationship between the state and the citizen.

As a result, it is evident that the relationships between women and men provide the model for the relationship between the citizen and the state. Therefore, Islam, through its particular forms of governing gender, presents a viable model that feminizes the male political subject. The male political subject is indeed, biologically male and he is used to 'enjoying' a certain privilege in the society. He is also a subject, in the sense that he has to abide by the law and recognize the supremacy of the state apparatus. Mostly he is political, in the sense he claims an identity based on his view of governance, authority, distributive justice, rights, etc. Therefore, the term 'male political subject' refers to the 'class' that is at the intersection of two different power relationships. He is a ruler in the domestic sphere; he is a subject in his relationships with the state.

In contrast to the intersectional analysis presented whilst discussing patriarchy that assumed that a number of vectors would intersect in order to define the different contexts in which a subject is 'subjugated', I believe, with regards to the transformation of vertical patriarchy into structural patriarchy, we should consider an image of intersecting circles. Each circle would define a reproductive mechanism of power that intersects with another circle of power. They are mainly different in structural terms such as the household would be a different domain than the workforce, the classroom and the state. Yet, they would still intersect because the dominant party would spread this particular balance of power, onto another sphere within the society.

Patriarchy, in this context, would appear as a grand structure that is formed by small structures in which the same characteristics defining the distribution of power, means of establishing authority, and preserving order, are established. The main

emphasis should be made on how and what is deemed challenging (such as a Muslim man's effort in containing his sexual desire) is coped with through, firstly, restraining the subject whilst a viable threat is absent due to a preventative measure, which is the main evidence I can suggest for the term 'extended rights'.

Secondly, the ruling power, both in the household and in the state, would simply attack the subject that poses a threat to those who hold power. The existence of preventative measures leads to the construction of selves that reproduce and subsume oppression as a way of being. Initially, the preventative measures that are imposed on women (or civil society) becomes, to a large extent, their mentality, frame of mind and mode of conduct. Indeed, an important point to see about these subjects is the skepticism of this particular distribution of power and have, one way or another, been punished for their dissent. Furthermore, and most importantly, the ruler (both in the household and social sphere) learns how to sustain the minimum requirements of his peaceful coexistence (referring to how oppression is needed for him to fulfill his low ranking, therefore, urgent and primary needs, that allow him to function like a regular citizen) due to his ability to disempower his opponent. That is indeed, a clear indication of a co-dependent personality. It also contradicts the fundamental principles of both modern economics and democratic theory.

Modern economics require the 'homo economicus' or the economic subject to exist within a structure of perfect competition in which you are expected to be driven by the 'power within' (as discussed in previous chapters). Democratic theory, including Habermas' (1962) notion of the public sphere, would strongly support the competition of ideas in an effort to pursue the public good and ensure progression is attained. However, as Cinar (2008) argues within the context of Turkey and gender, the public sphere can also be a site of subjugation, authority and marginalization.

Evidently, what provides western societies with a platform for emancipation, recognition and claiming an entitlement to difference turns into a site of hierarchy and subjugation since; what appears as a space for equals, turns into a space of a paradox. The paradox of democracy entails the equality of unequal people and observing how that leads to the privileged classes taking the lead over those who are less privileged. Therefore, the so-called emancipating public sphere turns into a site of vertical relations.

As a result, within an understanding of the public sphere, through the effort of reaching the collective good, we see how this vague space transforms into a site of vertical patriarchy in which women (among other underprivileged groups) are subjugated, as their voice, in debates within the public sphere is dominated by the state (Cinar, 2008). Therefore, vertical patriarchy is not produced within two opposing, competitive parties as we look at the ruler and the subject, but rather through spaces (or sites) without any specific structure. The vague space turns into a segregated space in which vertical relationships precede simply because that has been the dominant form of co-existence, which is mostly familiar and convenient more than anything else and, as a result, it is duplicated across different vectors.

The patriarchal structure, evident in the Habermasian public sphere, could also be seen as a site for horizontal patriarchy. For instance, everybody is equal in status and citizenship. As a result, their competition is on equal terms; therefore, the inequality that becomes evident within equal terms might be present in a horizontal patriarchy. In that case, it is important to observe that, at times, horizontal patriarchy can be an earlier phase evident within a structure, prior to its transformation into vertical patriarchy.

In this regard, Cinar's arguments should be revisited. She explains how the headscarf issue (or the veil) is seen within a discourse of westernization or adherence to Kemalism. or alternatively, as a matter of cultural authenticity. Two values were

clashing due to two different visions on what Turkey's future and identity should uphold. Neither the secularists nor the Islamists were interested in focusing on what women wanted to do with their lives, simply because they were symbols of concepts much larger than themselves. Therefore, the public sphere is far from being unstructured and emancipatory as Habermas argued.

As a result of this, I argue, the discourse in which women were discussed was never individualism, equality or human rights, but rather what women allowed men to say to themselves about who they are and other people in the world. As a result of this, although it might seem that women were equal participants in to the debates taking place in the public sphere, they were actually subjugated within that debate, both as a citizen taking part in of a debate side by side with men, as well as with regards to the content of the ideas they presented within that debate. Additionally, horizontal patriarchy can easily transform into vertical patriarchy through the content of men's participation and their political opinion regardless of women's participation in the debate. It is often known, in Middle Eastern countries that women are mostly more patriarchal and dedicated to male and superiority based on seniority compared to men, a concept known as self-othering.

As intersectionality was discussed with its limitations in the chapter on patriarchy, it was noted that the concept fails to explain how a person can be oppressed by one party/ person/ entity and be the oppressor of another. I argue that this chapter might shed light on that particular issue raised by feminists who look at how oppression is experienced as a result of the intersection between class, race and gender.

We should discuss intersectionality outside of the vectors of race-class-gender and look at it whilst analyzing the relationship between the ruler and the subject. As discussed above, intersecting circles, each holding a different color, instead of lines

representing class, race and gender, might be able to explain the reproduction of patriarchy. If the subjecthood of a man within the ruler-subject binary was blue then the oppression he makes others face, would be red and the intersection of different subjecthoods would be purple. The main difference between scholars of Black Feminist Thought (Collins, 2008), who examined the subject amongst intersecting vectors of race, gender and class, introduced whilst discussing intersectionality and my approach, is that the former focuses on explaining the oppression of the individual; however, my main aim is to draw attention to how patriarchy is reproduced as a structure. Therefore, the context of which an individual's oppression is analyzed might shift from socio-economic indicators (as seen by western scholars) to the structures that subsume a metaphorical significance; such as the ruler and the subject.

Yet, the question raised by authors of Black Feminist Thought needs to be adapted to our analysis. How do we explain how a person can be a 'ruler' who oppresses and a 'subject' that is oppressed at the same time? In order to discuss the oppressor that is also oppressed, we must continue to analyze the state. The 'ruler/ subject' binary becomes evident whilst analyzing Gezi Park protests and police violence. Therefore, the clash between the state and the citizen must be explored. Through this analysis I aim to find similarities between the state approaching its people and men ruling women. The similarities between the two will lead us to the feminization of the male political subject, as I intend to argue that what women are for men is what the people are for the state. I hope, one day, the understanding that men are feminine in their political identity whilst confronting the state would give the male political subject a reason to believe in gender equality, not. Not because it is primarily a women's issue but rather a democratic issue.

Beneath 'The State'

Gezi Park protests started on 28 May 2013 in central Istanbul, as an opposition against the Prime Minister who wanted to destroy a park and turn it into a shopping mall. Soon, the protests turned into an anti-government protest criticizing Erdogan's oppressive practices, mostly his tendency of criminalizing dissent. The protesters were soon subject to police violence as they used water cannons, tear gas and arbitrary beatings. According to Amnesty International, six people died due to direct assaults by the police and over 8,000 were injured (Amnesty International, 2014). Evidence gathered through my field research in Turkey suggests the state is very similar to a man who feels entitled to dominating its 'other'.

As I spoke to a lawyer about state violence, she said;

“...we should approach the issue this way. The state does not term the violence it inflicts as 'torture'. That is why the state does not even have a reason why it inflicts this violence at the first place. The state sees this as, an act justified within its authority, as an entitlement. [...] To define its jurisdiction and draw the lines of its own sphere and command.”

(Laywer, NGO activist, male, Istanbul)

It is clear that the state's violent behavior inflicted by the police has one aim in particular: preserve the sustenance³⁹ of the state by intimidating citizens. Fear of violence as well as causing injuries through direct assaults towards civilians is seen as a measure needed to re-establish state power over its subjects. Please note that power is always 'over' the subjects in the Weberian sense. Therefore, the primary aim is to maintain a hierarchical structure within the public sphere.

³⁹ The word sustenance is chosen to attract attention to a system of maintenance and preservation through structures; procedures and processes that enable a continuum and wellbeing.

Another lawyer, a woman who works with the Human Rights Foundation in Ankara, indicates that,

“It [state violence] is something it [the state] does to ensure its own continuity. It is a policy of punishment and suppression. Even at a press meeting of 10 people, the police sprayed tear gas. How dare you go against me [the state]? And perhaps they are successful at it. After Gezi Park protests, I do not go anywhere where if there is a police toma [a vehicle used by the police that partially resembles a military tank]. Torture had always been used, even before the establishment of the Republic.”

Violence is seen as a way to intimidate the public by taking ownership of social issues and discouraging them from taking action against the state. It is clear from how the lawyer above speaks, that she changes her actions if she can see the police. Therefore, to an extent, it is evident that violence is a successful tool to pacify people against authority.

Another lawyer discusses discontent against the Prime Minister, in the leading education institution of Turkey, Middle Eastern Technical University (METU) in Ankara, by stating that,

“The police are selected in accordance to their political views as it is assumed that they would do their job better that way. If you see the police, as a force whose mission is to provide security for the state, then they [the police] would put the concept of the state above everything else. For instance, there was a case about METU students. They were accused of throwing stones at the police as well as gathering for an illegal protest. One of the accused suspects, a student from METU said, 'This is a university and the Prime Minister is an enemy of science. That is why we did not want him to come to our university'. A high-ranking police officer who was injured by a protester said, 'I condemn the students. How come the tremendous [koskoca] Prime Minister of this country cannot enter a university? Who do you think you are to not allow the Prime Minister to enter the university?' [The lawyer continues] It has been a year since

the incident and they [police] are still angry. If they get their way around it, they will beat that student. It is important how he [the police officer] did not say, how come you threw a stone to a police officer; but rather he said, how dare you! By not allowing the Prime Minister to enter a university... This is a fascist order that claims that no one can criticize or go against the Prime Minister.”

First we see how the Prime Minister ensures his supremacy through suppressing opponents. This is very similar to the mentality that suggests that women should wear the veil simply because it is easier for men to restrain their feelings of sexuality, enabling men to focus on daily tasks. Both In both cases we see as suppressing the 'other' being a means to establish authority, power and hierarchy. As the police officer in the METU students exemplify, the major crime a citizen can commit is not violent behavior towards the police but rather limiting his (Erdogan) sphere of influence, jurisdiction and refusing to be his subject. Disobedience was the act of the dishonorable citizen.

Disobedience becomes endemic in Turkish culture after systematic methods and mediums of suppression were used and implemented by the state apparatus. The police are one medium, which is part of the state apparatus that ensures conformity and suppression.

The judiciary, which is responsible for being an impartial investigators, is indeed another medium in which state supremacy over the citizen is established. A similar position can also be seen amongst prison guards who punish criminals who have already been prosecuted by the state. It is not the police, the judiciary and the prison guards that are deemed sacred but rather the unity of the state, its sustenance, supremacy and authority that is protected against the indivisibility of the citizen.

One method the state adopts, in order to ensure its supremacy, is to sue citizens or file law suits against citizens who have stood up against their authority. I asked a

human rights lawyer about how the 'state' opens a law-suit⁴⁰ against citizens. He gave the following example:

“They do it like this. They [the public prosecutors and the police] say this amount of glass was broken, x amount of police cars were damaged. They accuse the protestors who were put in custody on that day, for the listed damages. That is how the system⁴¹ is. They sue for damages to obtain compensation. With regards to the Gezi Park protests, the main accusation was this: let me read the official statement in the document. 'Since you have joined the protest, events that are violent and provocative [tahrik] in intent, which started on 31st of May 2013 that is still on-going; being a member of an underground [or illegal] organization throughout the events , committing crime on behalf of that organization, making propaganda on behalf of that underground organization...' Now; we ask them. Which organization? If they say Hezbollah, I will defend [my client] accordingly or if it is a membership to a left-wing organization then I will defend accordingly, and I will prove that he/ she is not a member of that group. They [prosecutors and police] say that they cannot give the name of the organization. They say it is still not certain which organization it is. I continue [reading from the document] 'Provoking [tahrik] the people to commit crimes against public order, as a member of a terrorist organization; throwing explosive, hurtful matter, insulting and cursing at state seniors and the Prime Minister’”

First I would like to draw attention to the word 'tahrik', which (I have included the original word, right next to the English translation of provocation). This word is the exact word used in law suits on rape and sexual harassment. It is often the defense of the suspect to say, 'I raped her but she aroused me'. The word 'arousal' (in the sexual

40 It is important to note that there is no such word or phrase in the English language that explains this situation. The exact phrase used by the lawyer is 'karsi dava', the word 'karsi' means 'opposite' and the word 'dava' means 'law suit'. So it either means 'counter legal case' or 'retaliating legal case'. That is the closest translation I have reached.

41 Many other participants of my field research in Turkey, especially lawyers, wanted to emphasize how the police would first arrest a suspect and then, afterwards, try to obtain evidence from the person in custody. This is against many legal systems in the west and elsewhere in which evidence is collected prior to arresting a suspect and putting them in custody.

context) is also known as tahrik in the Turkish language. Therefore, tahrik is used for sexual arousal and political provocation interchangeably. Either way it looks at a reactive subject that is coping or adjusting to circumstance, stimuli and structure. Tahrik aims to attract attention to the helplessness of a subject on the one hand and driving people outside of an established order, on the other. In political purposes, tahrik is a crime, as stated in documents, because it is assumed that the majority of Turkish public is subservient and only a provocateur could be blamed for any organized, peaceful protest. Tahrik is often used for sexual arousal as well and indeed it is addressed to attract attention to the man who had no other choice but to sexually harass or even rape a woman, because simply he had no other choice since he was provoked. Tahrik is an important element of one of the patterns of oppression I introduce, namely; helplessness as a privilege.

The male judge I interviewed regarding domestic law, who worked in family courts, used the same word tahrik to explain the frustration men feel and the judiciary (as well as the public) should take into account. I recall his statement, as he said 'men are under constant provocation' and this was used in the defence of men, against a female researcher who was investigating domestic violence, with a clear intention of defending what was best for Turkish women.

It is also important to note that in Turkish law, with reference to sexual assaults, gender based violence and the governance of gender, in many cases the 'unjust provocation' cause is invoked to reduce the sentence of an offender who either raped, assaulted or killed a woman. For example, according to a feminist lawyer and NGO activist;

“A person murders another person. If that person has to commit that crime due to a defect or fault that the person has, then, that is unjust provocation. It is at the judge’s discretion. Often, there is a reduction in sentence or punishment in

honor killings, due to unjust provocation. The judge decides on the provision of provocation (tahrík) based on his own world view.”

Therefore, tahrík (either as arousal or provocation) is a problematic concept, which ultimately is linked to the quote made from the Holy Qur'an about Muslim women's attire. Men are aroused/ provoked, therefore, homicide or rape is not entirely their fault. He is only human, he has no self-control and the stimuli are always responsible for stimulating the subject that reacted in an offensive manner.

Looking at the statement made by the human rights lawyer above, we see that those protestors in custody were accused of tahrík. In the private sphere tahrík is used to suggest that male to female violence was unavoidable. In the public sphere however, tahrík is controlled through police violence, often being a public offence on its own merit. At this point it is clear that the word tahrík is used in a multi-dimensional way, for supporting those who hold power.

As the statement often observed in court cases on women, the external source is responsible for its effects on people. In this case, the protestor is accused of arousing other protestors, as if the state was justifying the spread of protest, civil unrest or simply disobedience amongst its citizenry. People were just aroused, it was not entirely their fault. In this case it is important to notice that citizens are not allowed to react to being provoked (tahrík by the state) but rather the state feels provoked by the citizen, therefore its violence is deemed justified.

Nevertheless, the most important thing to consider is that arousing/ provoking is accepted as a form of crime. What does that say about the male political subject/ the citizen? By nature, they are weak, they will do as they are told and often they need to be excused for their behavior by the members of the judiciary, police and the state. Also, it shows that leadership is a crime. For some reason, the state is never held responsible for tahrík. The AKP governments' oppressive behavior is never seen as a provocation

against the Turkish public. Therefore, it appears that, leaders (within the state and family) are allowed to abuse their powers and make people subject to arbitrary rule. It is in the nature of leadership to do so. Nevertheless going against order makes the disobedient a terrorist (in the public) and an immoral woman (with reference to honor in the household).

First, labeling is a necessary tactic needed to be adopted in order to exclude and isolate the threat. If those who hold dissenting views are not labeled, that would make them appear as neutral which is often deemed normal. Therefore, they must be seen as abnormal. Secondly, please note with reference to my previous discussion on protection orders, many men obtain a restraining order against their wives, simply, for revenge. This would suggest a parallel method of preserving superiority over others. There is very little difference between a man who obtains a restraining order for retaliation and the state who charges a citizen with a crime against public order.

In both cases, we see the lack of responsibility within the superior party. The man who battered his partner refuses to see that she needed that order to be issued against his aggression, yet the state has no intention to take responsibility of its arbitrary rule. Therefore, as I explained above, those who stand against established norms are the ones held responsible for crime. This is another similarity, which makes male violence and state violence similar.

Thirdly, in the quote above,; the term 'state seniors' is mentioned and it is a problematic term. As I translate the original text as seniors, it is important to look at the original word, 'buyuk'. If you refer to any dictionary, it would state that it means big. This understanding reflects a patriarchal order within the collectivity in which both male and female subjects are situated. Seniority, as also indicated by Kate Millet, in previous sections, attracts attention to a hierarchical order, in which all subjects are

subjugated as the other of state officials. This implies a core periphery relationship between the state and the citizen and indeed, the male political subject is the other of state officials and their subjugation, and as I argue, this relationship is similar to the subjugation of female subjects by men in the household.

Additionally, *buyuk* means grand, large, great and senior. It means that the state, often referred to as the father, even by Ministers such as Ms Isilay Saygin who was the Minister of Women and Family Affairs, infamous for her statements advocating virginity controls in the late 90s, referred to MPs as a senior (Joseph, 2000). It is big, grand and great.

To this extent, seniority is a concept and status at the same time. As we can see the father metaphor is also associated with parents, grandparents, uncles and aunts. If kinship associated within the family is mostly seen as senior, it is evident that children are associated with inferiority. As discussed, through the document issued by the Turkish Grand National Assembly has indicated, citizens are told that those who marry someone without the consent of their parents are were more likely to get divorced. We can clearly see how disobedience for those who are deemed *buyuk* (big, grand and senior) would find themselves in chaos and misery.

Nobody questions the merit of those who are associated with being grand. My mother would often say, “I might make mistakes but I am 'a' mother, you have to respect me”. It is important how she did not say, ‘your’ mother but instead 'a' mother, which indicates that the respect she claims, is due to her status as a mother, rather than the bond she built with her daughter. I found it profoundly interesting, how my father, as a professor in Turkey, has never claimed respect due to his status as a father. Rather he would inflict respect with the things he did and said. Therefore, for some, respect comes with merit. However, for the vast majority, respect comes with status.

It is important to note that, often, honor killings are a decision made by family seniors, which are often committed by the youngest male of the family. The majority of the population get s married through arranged marriages, which take place as an agreement between the two groups of seniors amongst two different families. Also, there is no doubt that so-called child marriages are a matter initiated by family seniors. The state, through the reports it initiates, openly discourages people to have their own opinion, even on whom to marry, and go against their parents' wishes.

Finally, a female friend of mine⁴², who obtained her master's degree from the London School of Economics and relocated to Turkey to work for the United Nations, was having problems within her marriage. WhenAs I asked her, 'why did you not choose to live with him in the same house whilst you were still dating?' She said her parents would not have approved it. Then I asked, 'why did you not go against your family's wishes and do it anyway?' She immediately accused me of being an Orientalist. She said in Turkey, you just cannot go against your parents' wishes, not because you are afraid but rather because it is inappropriate. There are other things that could be discussed about this conversation⁴³. However, it is important to continue to discuss seniority in the household. From this case, I assume that parents, as seniors, have the effect of placing a feeling of guilt on the child. Because they raised the child, fed her and supported her education, therefore, she feels she owes them something. Respect is never intended to be both ways, but only one way.

⁴² The consent of the female acquaintance has been obtained over a phone conversation

⁴³ As she stated that resisting the parents is an Orientalist way of looking at living, it suggests a dichotomy which obedience is authentic and Middle Eastern and independence and resistance to pressure is foreign and western. This is very problematic; however, this discussion needs to be excluded in order to discuss the main theme.

In addition to this, it should be noticed that, the text known as 'The Vow' that is vocalized by every elementary school student, every week before they start their first class, begins with;

“I am a Turk, I am honest, I am hard working.

My principle is to protect the small, to respect the big, to love my country and my people more than myself.⁴⁴”

Clearly, the self-sacrificing citizen is equally as sacred as the self-sacrificing wife and mother. This notion of sacrifice, as explained in the previous chapter on the state, is an engendering force in Turkish political culture. Selflessness or self-sacrifice is deemed feminine. A woman who has been loyal to her husband and parents is always considered the woman worth praising, this is similar to what Onder Kanyilmaz, discussed above.

Therefore, the binary is reflected in a relationship with one side having limitless and extended entitlements, whereas the other is glorified for upholding submissive individualities, self-sacrifice that is justified with the common good. The common good, which seems neutral, is highly problematic as it is aligned and structured to produce the interests of the ruling elite, either the state in the public sphere or the male political subject in the private sphere. Citizenry, as a result, is constructed with the values, norms and beliefs that enabled the existence of procedures and processes that naturally created its' own rulers and subjects that are positioned vertically and reinforced structurally.

The reproduction of Turkish citizenry is evident from the first two lines. First, it is evident that the national subject is a Turk, not Kurd, nor Laz (another minority group in Turkey). Second, it states that people are divided into a binary of big and small. Who is the small? Needless to say, they are those who are not big. They are 'otherized'

44 The English translation of the Vow can be found here.
http://www.turkishclass.com/forumTitle_29075

by the big. Therefore, those who are big are also those who are never held accountable and always claim respect (measured in obedience) and marginalize those who do not. Consequently, the ones who are otherized are the ones who are subject to arbitrary rule and yet, sued by the government, subjected to violence when they resist pressure and often satisfy only their minimal needs whilst the oppressor holds the right to satisfy his/ its higher ranking needs.

One last comment I would like to make about the quote above, stated by a human rights lawyer, is with regards to the quote taken from the official legal document. The phrase, 'Provoking [tahrik] the people to commit crimes against public order' is very interesting and indeed problematic.

Who consists of 'the people' and who is the 'public' who compose 'the public order'? What is the difference between people and public? As I used online dictionaries⁴⁵ that explain certain Turkish words, phrases and idioms, the various meanings for the words, people, public and public order have become clear. I first investigated the word; 'halk' which means 'the people' in the English language. According to the dictionary, first, the word 'people' means, among others, the collective people who live in the same country. Additionally, it also means, the collectivity that remains outside of the enlightened classes (such as the intelligentsia of the society).

Therefore, aside from the obvious meaning of a collective group, people are considered to be those who are not well informed, educated or enlightened. They are beneath those who are well educated and supposedly lead the society to progress. It is evident that 'people' is something inferior, ordinary and random. The inferiority of the

45 I used a Turkish to Turkish dictionary to analyse the words, people, public and public order to shed light on accepted ways of looking at such political concepts. The links is; <http://www.nedirnedemek.com/kamu-duzeni-nedir-kamu-duzeni-nedemek> Last accessed 23 September, 2014.

people is often discussed with reference to a newspaper headline in the 1970s which said: saying, “the people rushed to the beaches, the citizen could not swim” which referred to one of the wealthy parts of Istanbul. Today, it is common knowledge to use that phrase. The idea beneath that statement was, those who represent the people were the ones who were belittled and the wealthy classes who were seen as the privileged, full citizens.

Second, I investigated the word 'kamu' which means 'public' in the English language. There were two explanations that require attention. The first meaning of the term suggests that 'public' is a synonym for 'people', in the sense that two words are often used interchangeably. Yet, the other description said, all state organs (or bodies) that provide a service to the people. In this regard, and again according to the translating website, it is important to note that, the term 'public sector' (kamu sektoru) refers to economic affairs conducted by the state. Therefore, the word 'kamu' refers to the role the state plays with regards to their subjects.

In other words, the difference between 'the people' and 'the public' is the difference between an arbitrary existence seen on one side and a state-to-citizen involvement on the other side, which is interesting because it could have also meant mobilized citizens or something that describes citizen's involvement.

We should also discover what 'kamu duzeni' or 'public order' means. There were, in particular, three different definitions that I found informative. Firstly, it states that it is the lining up of abstract and concrete objects in accordance with an order, goal and aim. Secondly, it states that it is the entire rules and regulations that allow all public services (or functioning) to be conducted within a country, in the best possible way; a state's security and order both inside and outside that also enable peaceful relationships amongst individuals. Thirdly, it states that within a given societal structure, it is the

relationships between components (or units) to the whole (the entire body) and the relationship of the whole, with the components as well as relationships that different components have with each other.

The first definition clearly emphasizes one important aspect of public order as having a 'goal and aim'. This suggests that 'some' might be privileged over 'the many'. The second definition states the importance of effective administration as well as harmony, yet the state's 'security and order' has been introduced as an element that is equally as crucial as others. The third states that it is a relationship between an entity that holds a higher power and those who are subject to it.

These three, in my opinion, complement each other. What we call 'the whole' might appear as a neutral term that subsumes all particularities, yet often what is deemed neutral is representative of ruling classes. Therefore, in the third definition, it is possible to argue that the definition is talking about the relationship between the ruler and the subject, through a different metaphor, namely, the component and the whole. Another way of approaching the issue is through recognizing a certain hierarchy in that definition.

As the mutual relationship between the whole and the component is highlighted, so is the relationship between different components. This can implicate a system of political ranking for power, entitlement and clout. Therefore, it could be argued that in the Turkish political imagination, public order, to some extent, means hierarchy or a system of ranking that describes the clout subjects have within the country.

Another point that needs to be made is how the state's security and order, detached from the people who legitimizes and justifies its rule, is seen as irrelevant discussing the state's security order. However, it could be argued that the security that needs to be preserved both inside and outside, refers to its subjects. Clearly, the threat

seen outside would be the Syrians who still claim the southern city of Hatay as a part of their political map.

The elected officials play the 'state' card, in times of questioning and scrutiny, which is a form of immunity given to the elite, which culturally and legally gives them the right to prosecute their opponents, due to a perception of the state that is deemed sacred. Therefore, public order, in the Turkish imagination, entails the feeling of safety the 'state officials' have when opponents are silenced. The elected politician works within a party.

American understandings would suggest that they are an 'administration'. In Turkey, the term government is utilized for leaders appointed after election. Yet, after they start holding office, they define themselves, in relationship to their subjects, as the state. The state is glorified, considered sacred and, above all, holds asymmetric power and rules arbitrarily. So, as a result, returning to the first definition, the aim and goal mentioned is, what the second definition states, the state's ability to silence opposition. This takes us to a synthesis of all three definitions: we (the public) are united for the same goal, which is to strengthen the sustenance of the state through oppressive measures in order to silence internal threats; we are most likely to engage in a relationship with the state, as well as our peers, that would suit the vision of the State and complement its sustenance through the management of particular units.

As Walby discusses public and private patriarchy in the UK, it is possible to see that certain aspects of patriarchal oppression, she identified, are also applicable to Turkey. She draws attention to the relationship between private and public patriarchy when she states that, "the private and public forms of patriarchy constitute a continuum rather than a rigid dichotomy" (Walby, 1990; 180). I prefer to read this quote as both structures: private and public, being designed to reinforce one another and also having

the same reproductive mechanisms that are ultimately empowering each other. They enable and support each other.

Public order was defined with a goal of being united for a hierarchical, state-centric society. As a result, patriarchy was deemed as public order that was attained at times of peace, similar to a man who needs to restrain women to feel safe in the absence of a visible threat. Suppression is needed at times of security (not only insecurity) to ensure the sustenance of that feeling of security, safety and reassurance, approached through restraining the opponent. The similarities are evident, however highly under-theorized and often deemed provocative [tahrik].

Sexual Torture

At this point, the state's relationship with its subjects who oppose particular administration is mobilized and brutalized. This should be further examined.

As I spoke to a human rights lawyer in Ankara on state violence, he stated,

“...as long as the state sees me as an enemy; the police who see its primary mission to protect the state, [the police] will continue to inflict violence in order to make the subjects subservient⁴⁶ to the father state. The violence that is inflicted on the citizen, so a police officer can impress and gain credit in the eyes of his seniors, manifests itself as torture. The public prosecutor would do the same through giving dismissal [regards to legal cases]. The courts will do the same by giving 'cezasizlik' [impunity]. For instance, amongst lower ranking officers, it is done by saying 'Ali Ismail Korkmaz was murdered by his friends'. This is also a means of violence that is inflicted on the citizenry, so officers could adhere to the state and look good to their seniors. Why? Because the mayor does not protect those officers that are lower in ranking than him but rather protects the Prime Minister instead. Once the Prime Minister said, our

46 The word, he used implied that the police would inflict violence to look good for his seniors; to get the approval of his seniors, to be recognised and possibly rewarded.

police is writing an epic story; how can the mayor say that ‘Ali Ismail Korkmaz died because the police beat him?’ The mayor is not trying to look good and impress the police. On the contrary he is also, like others, trying to impress his own seniors. Violence caused by those who impress happens at different levels of the state apparatus. Today, I do not think that torture has changed its definition but rather its method. If that child [Ali Ismail Kormaz, 17] lived today, we would be looking at a torture case. He died and now we look at a murder case. Dilsat Aktas is an example of a torture case. Fifty two police officers lynched her at the city center in Ankara. Eylem Karadag⁴⁷ is another case of torture. For forty minutes, police officers touched her sexual organ in a police car.”

Torture for men and women have similarities as discussed in the above statement and further explanations are provided below. Men are tortured by utilizing gendered tactics. For example, as stated below, they tortured by threats of harming his female kin, therefore his honor. Women on the other hand, are assaulted due to the concept of honor. During Gezi Park protests, both male and female prisoners were forced to get naked and they were interrogated as naked individuals to shame and embarrass them. Furthermore, women were would assaulted verbally by stating that ‘nobody would marry them’. During the 1980s coup d’état where torture was widespread across the young civilians, police officers would bring in his female kin into the interrogation room and threaten the prisoner to rape her. The male subject would be tortured by threats of harming his family members for this his honor. It is important to notice that honor is a key concept for both male and female prisoners as well as the police officers. Since the Turkish society has a strict moral code of what is considered acceptable and unacceptable behavior, the police force would use that strict

⁴⁷ Eylem Karadag was one of the few sexual torture cases reported to journalists and NGOs. She was a bystander during Gezi Park protests and she was abused inside the police car as they asked her ‘should we ****you here, or at the police station?’ The incident was reported by journalist Ayse Arman, published at the Turkish daily on July 2013.

moral order to in their benefit. For this reason, the reproduction of patriarchy by officials could be not be limited to actual public policies but rather through the implementation of policies and the reasoning and justification of the policies they implement. To this extent, I argue, that even though there are differences in circumstances between sexual torture against men and women, I strongly argue that, honor is as an undeniable moral code in Turkish culture, which transforms differences between two subjects into similarities in which both subjects are subjugated.

WhenAs I ask the same human rights lawyer about men being sexually tortured, he said,

“Men are threatened by the police by sticking [penetrating] the police baton into their anus. The other day, the police force s arrested a sixteen year old boy and told him to lie down, as his face was facing the ground. Both of his arms were broken, after being beaten by the police. They tried to stick something in his bottom, without taking his clothes off. The child was thinking, “I hope they just beat me up and let me go”. He was wondering what would happen to him if he was taken to the police station.”

From this first statement, it is clear that within the state's organizational structure, violence is endemic in its ability to marginalize the national subject. Ali Ismail Korkmaz was a male, university student of nineteen years of age. He was not a Kurd, an Alevi (religious sect within Islam), he was not exceptionally poor, nor did he have any other vulnerability. For that reason, he should be seen as the national subject, the kind of citizen that the state conjures up in its imagination whilst developing a certain mode of governance, excluding those that consistently marginalize vulnerable people.

Therefore, Gezi Park protests were about rights, entitlements and power divided amongst the national subject and its opponent, the state. It was the 'ruler and the subject' that were fighting over the distribution of power. The ruler and the subject, as explained in the longer quote, is a relationship that is sustained by defeating the subject at every

level of the state apparatus. The state makes it clear that their indivisible rights are disposable when the state's security, meaning its relative superiority and, therefore, the vertical nature of the political structure, is at stake. Additionally, the police, court, public prosecutor and the Prime Minister work hand in hand to maintain their superiority. Not only because the Prime Minister has stated that the police force were heroes, regarding their infliction of violence during the protests, but rather because even doctors were afraid of being prosecuted for insulting the state, in cases which they issue a medical report stating that a person has been tortured. They are mostly afraid of being appointed to a different (meaning rural, poor) city. They are afraid that if they do not comply, they will lose their jobs and be dismissed or prosecuted.

As a result, I believe the hierarchical structure is sustained through fear as well as (equally important) an adherence to state patriarchy. Torture may not be about making people suffer, but rather because they have no other way of doing this. In this context, I think, since domestic violence is used as a method to preserve order by making sure the women sees the abusers' means of things to be the most reasonable, I argue that state violence is just deemed necessary out of a collective imagination that sees violence endemic to sustaining order. However, regardless of intention, the outcome necessitates a statement on how the opponents of the state are always feminine, regardless of their gender.

Another important aspect that requires recognition is concerned with how victims react to torture after the incident. Clearly it has an impact on its precedents.

“We hear about such incidences [sexual torture] very often. Usually the women do not report the incident to authorities because they cannot tell their stories. The fear being prosecuted or seen guilty for something they did that somehow provoked that behavior”

(Lawyer, male, Mersin, 2013)

Nevertheless, more evidence is needed to understand violence, torture and sexual torture of both men and women as a state policy. A human rights lawyer who specialized in sexual torture of women in Turkey has told me about an experience she had when she willingly got arrested by the police, following the 1st of May⁴⁸ protests. She stated that,

“[In custody] there was a guardian who was coming to our prison cell systematically. That was his only job. He would come and open the window. He would say all the slang [curse] words about the human anatomy with extreme detail in order to insult your sexuality. His insults were towards the sexuality of women and their sexual organs. In a systematic way, they would say 'you are very ugly and men will not like you'. Even female officers would do it. It was systematic not arbitrary [or random].”

It is clear to see methods of torture vary between men and women. However, I would argue that, by simply identifying a certain strategy applied to women, there is a common understanding that torture is often conducted by both men and women alike.

As a lawyer and author, Ms Meryam Erdal (1997), she gives an example of the sexual torture of men,

“As a man was in custody being interrogated, he was told to sit on a bottle. As he sat on it, the bottle started to fill with blood.”

Ms Meryem Erdal and Ms Eren Keskin (2006) both lawyers, state that the definition of rape is not adequate. As Erdal states, “Rape is very difficult to define. It needs to be discussed in a broad way.” Keskin (2006) indicates that:

“Rape has been defined as a man's penis to penetrate into a women's vagina, by yielding sperm.” (p. 89).

48 The lawyer did not give an exact year which the protests and her arrest took place.

Without doubt, this is very problematic. First, it does not recognize rape through oral and anal zones, as suggested in the evidence given in the above quote. Second, the victim is defined as female, although it is evident that both men and LGBTI peoples are often subject to sexual violence or rape.

According to another lawyer I interviewed, men in police custody are often feminized. For example;

“Nude search is widespread. They search for external substances in a suspect’s body. That is why they make them take their clothes off. Essentially, in societies like Turkey, nudity is something to be ashamed of. That is why they use nudity to embarrass the suspect. Then they tell a political convict, who is male, to wear a skirt. They tell him to walk around like this. I think that the nudity that makes all men and women feel uncomfortable being used that way by the state is related to feminization.”

My research on sexual torture indicates that there is a certain trend within and difference between sexual torture of men and women. Women, as the lawyer indicated, would be dirty. That filth would indicate a loss of purity which means that she would be rejected and deemed immoral by the society. Therefore, regarding sexual torture of women, the emphasis is to make her an ‘unacceptable’ woman within the norms of the Turkish society.

However, as Erdal exemplifies in her book, a senior security officer who was trying to convince a lower ranking officer to rape a woman who might be affiliated with a guerrilla warrior; “my son; this women's husband killed your friends. This is the best punishment you can give him.” (Erdal, 1997:91). This indicates that another reason why women are subject to sexual torture is because they are trying to punish their husbands (ibid).

For men, sexual torture is done through three different ways. First,; by bringing or threatening him that the officer will bring his wife, sisters, and children to custody

and rape them in front of him. Second, and most commonly, they threaten to rape him, by inserting an object into his private parts and saying that he is not a man anymore and telling him, from that moment onwards that he is a homosexual. The third is by electrically shocking his genitals in order to attack his fertility.

Commented [KM8]: Who does 'they' refer to?

The feminization of the male political subject, as a result, can be seen in two different ways. First, it is the literal meaning in which men are feminine in the ways the police treat them in custody. Second, it has metaphorical meaning in which men are feminine with reference to their position vis-à-vis the state, in the way women are to men, in the household. As this thesis uses the data gathered on the first meaning in order to draw conclusions about the second meaning, it is important to notice how patriarchal values are the real torture device rather than the actual instruments used.

Women who are seen as the property of men, defined within the jurisdiction of men, cause the soldiers to rape their wives to punish the husband as their existence is a proxy matter. It is again patriarchal values, in the middle eastern Middle Eastern context that would consider a woman who is not a virgin or simply being a woman who is raped who would be rejected and excluded from the society. It is patriarchal values that despise homosexual people and see them as less than men. Indeed, these assaults would still take place even if Turkey did not have a virginity-based understanding of honor or prefer to despise homosexuals, often seeing them as less than men.

Commented [KM9]: Confusing – unclear

Therefore, we cannot say that these assaults happened because Turkey is patriarchal. But what we could say is that patriarchy, as a system that glorifies self-sacrificing children for their parents and their state, within a specific sexual morality, has been deemed sacred by state officials at multiple occasions. These sacred values are protected, preserved and reinforced by the state at all levels of its organization.

In the cases of police violence and gender based violence inflicted by the state, as discussed above, it is clear to see the sanctity of the state as a value that gave the state (police and military officers) the upper hand. Rape, as an act of violating someone's body and threatening their physical and emotional integrity was not a threat for being a degrading form of physical violation. According to Dr Inge Genefke, the founder of the International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims in Denmark, the main reason for sexual torture is not related to the sexual desires and pleasures of the offenders, but, rather, the primary aim is to destroy one's personality and soul (Erdal, 1997), which is worse than killing them. Therefore, rape is not a threat because it assaults the indivisibility of the body, but rather rape is a threat because she needed to get married one day and that being raped would make that impossible and again in accordance with patriarchal values: a woman who does not get married does not have a life worth living. She is simply a nobody, a person who lives a very low life. Therefore, sexual torture in Turkey, to an extent, stems from the judgmental and excluding values of patriarchy. Since it is not the individuality of the person that is at stake but rather his/ her role played within the system that is threatened. It is a person's rank and clout, within the system, that is being assaulted but not their personality. I argue that this might be due to the state not being aware that a person would have a certain integrity and indivisibility which they value more than how they rank within the patriarchal hierarchy.

Another case we can look at to see how people are ranked within the system is given below. According to a lawyer who works at the Bar Association in Ankara, the state would not only violate the law but also destroy or hide evidence to appear innocent:

“We make a claim saying that he was beaten at the police station. But they have no camera footage. No recordings. When he was inside the police car they did

all sorts of things that were offensive and threatening. After that they sue you for disobeying the police. The punishment of that starts from 2 years in prison and it is a serious crime. Now its name has changed and it has become an act of 'disabling an officer whilst he is in duty'. He is beaten by the police and the police who tear a part of his clothing' saying he assaulted me as I tried to put him into custody.”

She continues:

“Only a small portion of the legal cases in which the citizen sues the government results with a state officer being convicted, suspended or punished in anyway. Yet, all of the legal cases filed by the state against a citizen have resulted in with a penalty being inflicted on the citizen. There has not been a single case where the charges against the citizen have been dropped.”

Another indication that demonstrates state violence, either physical or legal has been stated by one lawyer in Ankara.

“Unless you tell the doctor [working for the state] that you have an illness or an injury they would not examine you. You have to tell the doctor. Additionally, the police would enter the doctor’s office with you and the doctor would be intimidated to write a report that is against the state. The patient has a right to ask the police officer to leave the room, but they do not, due to their fear of authority. Most people do not know their rights.”

Another element that has attracted attention by a participant is with regards to the state’s perception on violence.

“The state does not perceive its own violence as torture. The state perceives the situation as utilizing its own privileges and authority. The reason it inflicts violence is because the state wants to draw the line of its own jurisdiction, its own sphere of influence.”

(Lawyer, Ankara 2014)

It is clear that, in cultural and political terms violence is a common practice needed to coerce and subjugate one another. This is clearly an act to oppress the stimuli utilizing power over, instead of power within.

As a result of this, we see that it is common practice for the police and, therefore, the state, to accuse a citizen of with disobedience whilst he was the one being victimized by the state in the first place. These two quotes exemplify the clash between the state's invasive sphere and *his* limited rights to indivisibility that he holds *against* the state. It is important to show why we are talking about the male political subject instead of the female.

Indeed, women have also joined the Gezi Park protests and they were subject to violence, including sexual torture. However, we must recognize that, women were never identified as full citizens, by any state official, at multiple levels. Often women who that were arrested and put in a police car or taken, would be asked told by the officer that 'what were you doing on the streets at this late hour?' suggesting that female protestors were meant to be at home instead. Certainly, this is very similar to the judge in the court room who asks the female rape victim what she was doing outside so late and why she was in an environment where people were taking alcohol. In both cases, she asked for 'it', whether it is male to female violence or state violence. Blaming the victim, for creating the circumstances that caused, it is also a common understanding that is replicated by state to citizen and male to female violence.

The Male Political Subject

As one human rights lawyer indicated, Gezi Park protests were much needed for the Turkish political culture.

“During the protests people were reacting to the oppressive practices of the state. It was an energy that needed to be discharged.”

(Human Rights Lawyer, female, Mersin, 2013)

Returning to my original concern, why is the national subject male? And why are we discussing the feminization of the male political subject extensively? As I discussed

above, women have an 'exclusive' treatment. They are treated as the 'other' of men. Similarly, this theme would be evident in affairs concerning Kurds and other racial, ethnic and religious minorities⁴⁹, as well as those who originate from extremely poor, uneducated, religiously conservative and marginalized backgrounds. Many are the 'other' once compared to the national subject. Second, the male political subject is the group within the Turkish citizenry that enjoys the most extensive rights. Those who are deemed to be the 'other' have other concerns that the male political subject does not identify. The marginalized groups aim to catch-up with the male political subject, if not trying to align and level with them. Therefore, the participation and initiative of this particular group could only be possible through the male political subject that is enabled to threaten the state.

Additionally, the male political subject is capable of expanding the boundaries of acceptable behavior for the Turkish citizenry. Similarly, he could contest the long-established social contract that has been accepted between the ruler and the subject in Turkey, for decades, if not centuries.

Furthermore, as a lawyer indicated, the officials' reaction to Gezi Park protests was out of proportion.

"First, officials retain a suspect, in the middle of the protesting field. You have no choice to leave that area. That park, where the protests took place, is our place to exercise and enjoy our rights. There is a right to hold meetings and enjoy our right to peaceful protest but we were deprived of our rights due to officials. The police used tear gas, fake bullets and in the case of Ethem

49 It is very important to note that the issue of minorities is very different in London and New York than in Istanbul. Minorities in London; might be recognisable for being black, Asian or Brown. However in Turkey; we all look the same. Kurds and Turks as well as other minorities look like each other. They are recognised by origin; such as Diyarbakir being the most prominent Kurdish city. As we ask people; 'where are you from?' we get an insight into their ethnic origin; if they are willing to share.

Sarisuluk, they used actual medal bullets. They do this to inflict pain and punish you. They want to make sure you never attend any other protest or join Gezi Park protests against the state. Violence is meant to be a deterrent.”

(Lawyer, female, Istanbul, 2013)

Clearly state violence aims to at deterring people from having their own views and challenging the state. The state clearly favors obedient citizens and this form of violence aims to penetrate into peoples’ minds and subjecthoodsubject hood.

Another participant attracts attention to the patriarchal nature of the state by saying,

“If they, the state wanted to eliminate the patriarchal order of the society they would have implemented measures for it. However they, the state benefits from the patriarchal order. You can notcannot punish the patriarch, not only legally but also socially because the society tolerates and enables it”

(Lawyer, Istanbul, 2014)

Another lawyer draws attention to a female protestor who was tortured on the street for her daring and brave behavior whichthat was deemed invasive.

“That day, Dilsat Aktas, actually climbed on top of the police tank (toma) with a flag in her hand as if she was enacting a conquest by invading the police officers vehicle. The police, as they were beating protestors, exercised exceptional amounts of anger towards her. They all squeezed onto a side street, on the corner of a wall. From the cameras we can count 52 police helmets; potentially it could have been even more. She was sexually harassed, her bones were broken and one leg is now 4cm shorter than the other. They did not take her into custody because they aimed to kill at killing her, on the street”

(Human Rights Lawyer, male, Ankara, 2013)

Female protestors are often sexually harassed partially because they are were not seen as being entitled to political mobilization and activism. Second, the vulnerability of a female protestor whilst being confronted by a police officer allows the authorities to abuse their privileges and not being prosecuted. Another indication of this event is that the state overcompensates its damage. For example, in the UK, if I

Commented [KM10]: Is this the right word

stand on top of a police car, I would expect a punishment in some measure, by expecting to pay a fine and possibly spend a night or two in police custody. However, I think it is unlikely to witness something similar to what Dilsat Aktas had to experience. The police, that represent the state's law enforcement officers, were overcompensating their damage with the interference and abuse of 52 officers.

“We saw such incidences many times before. They insult his manhood. And say, ‘Once I am done with you will become sexually impotent, you will not be able to have sex with another woman again.’”

(Human Rights Lawyer, male, Istanbul, 2013)

This is similar with women, as the interview with Meryem Erdal suggested that guardians in the police establishments would often say, ‘I will deflower you and then no one will marry you’. In the female and male case, the norms and values associated with patriarchy are a weapon on their own. Since there are strict moral codes in which no tolerance is given towards those who do not conform to patriarchal values, the police authorities use this as a measure of coercion.

In addition, with reference to sexual torture against male subjects, feminization is seen as a distinct form of threat. The fact that the baton was used as a threat suggests that sexual violence aims at making the suspect passive and subservient, since the fear of sexual violence is strong enough to coerce them. The fact that the baton was used for penetration whilst he still had his jeans on means that rape was never intended, yet the fear of rape and therefore, the culture of fear, is essential for state officials' behavior towards their subjects.

The male political subject, however, is privileged with having respect and extended rights over his 'others', which is especially evident in the way they are allowed to violate them and get away with it. So, a Gezi Park protester, in a particularly defined way, was *his* battle. Particularly because he would be the first and main beneficiary of

Commented [KM11]: unclear

the rights that could have been (re)established and renegotiated between the ruler and the subject. Therefore, if they had succeeded, men would have to redraw the contours between the ruler and the subject on behalf of all, although 'others' (such as women and queer individuals) would still have difficulty accessing those rights that were newly established in addition to older ones that were never substantiated.

The male political subject was feminized so the state could enjoy extended rights over him and the rest of the society. The male political subject who is an ally of the state in its ability to reproduce and sustain patriarchy in the household, job market, military and the state apparatus is yet feminine. It is he who has power over everyone else, in such a manner that multiple government agencies recognize and reinforce his power through written but more often unwritten laws.

An example of the feminization of the male political subject, with regards to the Gezi Park protests, attracts draws our attention whilst analyzing the infamous Ali Ismail Korkmaz case as he, who was murdered by the police. As the human rights lawyer indicates,

“He [Korkmaz] was running from the police, four men go into a small side street, civilian officers with gas masks on their faces appear from behind the car, they start running from the police immediately. The officer captures Korkmaz and he gets beaten to the extent that he hasd brain damage. He goes to the doctor immediately, the doctor says he is fine and he goes home and dies from amy brain trauma.”

(Human Rights Lawyer, male, Istanbul, 2013)

It is clear from the statement that violence was in fact random. In other words, they had beaten someone running from the police without an actual threat to the wellbeing of others, as often the case in arresting people for criminal acts. This random act indicates how the state officials perceive themselves with the authority to exercise violence

against the male and female political subject, and female, to sustain their its supremacy, higher rank in the society and indeed, patriarchal authority.

Nevertheless, he could not define the what role the state plays when they do not exercise control, authority and violent acts against the male political subject. It is the state which needs to fulfill its highest ranking (less urgent) needs, such as self-actualization at, in the expense of the subjects' most primary needs. His power as a subject, as recognized by the state, terminates where the sustenance of the state begins.

Evidently, similar to the particular Muslim man who needs to restrain his sexual opponent to feel safe enough to function at times of peace (or in the absence of a threat), the state needs to ensure public order, which basically means its sense of security, by restraining the rights of those who might distract it, at times of peace. The primary focus of the Turkish security perception is neither the oil in the Aegean Sea nor the Islands that they Turks fight over, but rather those with independent minds, questioning the hegemonic subjectivity that the subjects take for granted as our national heritage or local culture.

The defeat of the male political subject could have been through debates and countless encounters in which AKP policies and state mentality was discussed in the public sphere in the pursuit of the public good. Rather, it turned into an event where the political incompetence of the state, coping with dissenting views, found its solution to establishin establishing vertical patriarchy in the public sphere that was also institutionalized as structural patriarchy.

As a result, I argue that the male political subject is in fact very much feminine. In his economic, social, marital, military and civil experience he might be male. Powerful, privileged and situated above all of his 'others'. The male political subject is male for being privileged over women but feminine in another aspect, since he is

defined in the ruler subject binary in the exact manner women are within the household. Since sex is biological, sexuality is personal and gender is social, the construction of a gendered identity can often stem from one's interaction with others. Since gender is performative (Butler, 1990), we can argue that the relationship between the male political subject and the state, transforms the gender of the male political subject into feminine. For this reason, I emphasize once more, that women are to men what the citizen is for the state and for this reason, the male political subject is feminine and masculine at the same time depending on the context.

As discussed above, suggested by Joseph (1994), in the context of Lebanon, brothers and sisters learn intimacy and security from one other, constructed in relation to one another. Additionally, regarding Joseph's analysis in a different text, patriarchal connectivity (1993) stems from one's ability to define themselves through others' behavior. Therefore, the state needs to feminize the male political subject in order to claim its own sustenance which that almost certainly manifests into a masculine identity. The ruler and the subject, masculine and feminine, are defined in contrast to and comparison with one another.

Additionally, the state actively perceives the acts, protests, resistance and other political engagements of the male political subject as a reflection of itself. Even when the male political subject is fighting for himself (and behalf of others who would potentially align and elevate in future decades), the state would perceive state perceives such circumstance as an assault against itself. First this indicates an existential exploitation, which turns the subject into a proxy identity. Second, there is truth in the state officials' claim. The motive of the protests was to stand against arbitrary rule and poor governance. However, ultimately it is a zero sum game (similar to men and women in the household) in which the male political subject is eventually, slowly but surely,

discovering that he is entitled to more than what the state permits him to possess and that he might be able to restrict the State sphere and their extended sense of entitlement.

Regarding the oppressive structures analyzed in this chapter, a few questions need to be raised and answered: 'Why does the state allow men to subordinate women? What does the state gain out of it?' And 'What does that say about the male political subject?' Some aspects of the answers to these questions have already been raised in the literature concerning gender and the middle eastMiddle East. For example, as Yuval-Davis (1997) indicates, women are often bearers of cultural authenticity and seen as a means to reproduce for the nation. Therefore, they need to be controlled by the government and men adhering to it, to ensure that, to an extent, Turkish women resemble the image of a sexually pure woman enjoying far less rights than their western counterparts.

Also, as indicated through interviews conducted in Ankara, women's sexuality and her fertility is seen as a national issue that needs to be governed by the state. Women's bodies are seen as a means for population control driven by strategic priorities of prominence within the Muslim middle eastMiddle East. This also, clearly demonstrates that the boundaries between the so-called private and public spheres are often 'negotiable' and 'fluid' and they are simply drawn in accordance with the priorities of the ruling elite. Therefore, the state would interfere, and at times choose not to interfere, in accordance with the regime to ensure that even the private lives of women is a matter of state decision which results in reinforcing the powers of men in the household. This allows us to recognize another reason behind the state's preference for gender inequality in the household.

The state needs agents of the state to deliver its 'service' to remote locations. In the public sphere, evidently, the state is reproduced through the limiting and violent

Commented [KM12]: unclear

actions of the police and impunity led by the judiciary. Men are not only similar to the state, in that they dominate within the household, but also the police, who do all 'the dirty work'. Men are agents of the state, who would not only subordinate women because of their belief but also because the state encourages them to do so which is almost like a pat on one's backshoulder when they do something right, in addition to inspiration given by the Holy Qur'an. Issues pertaining her sexuality, freedom and interactions, need to be monitored and become the subject of scrutiny.

As discussed above, women are not seen as individuals outside of a family due to the monitoring role of her male kin. The recognition, respect and acknowledgement he receives from government bodies, especially regarding his 'right to react to stimuli (tahrik)' which is an extremely high ranking need (that is far from being urgent, in fact it would not even exist in progressive democracies⁵⁰) that is exclusive to patriarchal structures observed across the Middle East.

Despite the reasons discussed above, there might be other reasons worth noting. Men are allowed and encouraged to oppress women by the state because a certain 'subordinate mentality' needs to be produced among the citizenry, both male and female. SubjecthoodSubject hood is a multi-layered construct of relationships that involves a subject's contentment with his or herself and with their positioning towards others including the state. Therefore, citizenship is ultimately linked with one's own perception of self-worth and its their contentment with the rank of their role in the society; including the state.

50 The term 'progressive democracies' might indicate that I am flattering, if not promoting, the supremacy of western democracies. I have no intention to promote dichotomy amongst western and eastern nations. Yet, I take the liberty to assume that some democracies are more liberal than others.

This perception can unfold in multiple directions. As a result, if necessary, the citizen can overcompensate for his/ her needs against the state, if a higher sense of self-worth is attained. To prevent Preventing this situation from happening it is necessary to subordinate people within the vertical binary of the ruler and the subject as well as masculine and feminine.

Given that political opposition, as well as criticism of any kind, is seen as a threat to the so-called public order, the subordinate mentality becomes necessary for the sustenance of the system and the state. Therefore, the subordination of women is needed to prepare the citizenry for subordination of for both male and female subjects. They would learn how to live with low self-esteem from each other. She will teach her children that they can never challenge the system but rather they should accept the way things are maintained. Mostly, they must learn to live without being detected (as a threat) by the mechanisms of surveillance of the state. A man would oppress his subject, which not only teaches him how to preserve order but also how authority should be constructed. As a result, men learn from women how to be rulers and subjects whilst simultaneously becoming the subject the state needs them to be.

Discussing the reasons underlining a man's 'entitlement to female subordination' we have to see the frustration of the male political subject. The moment a son is conceived in a woman's womb, it is a matter of joy within the family, often very different to than how it would be if it was a girl. The mother to be, often gains a higher status within the family, as she that will eventually be promoted her to become an oppressor instead of someone who is oppressed (Kandiyoti: 1988). Soon after his birth, several naked pictures would be taken of him to be shown to friends and relatives, needless to say his nudity and display of his penis is the most important part of this tradition. The day he gets circumcised, in accordance with Muslim faith, he would be

Commented [KM13]: You have written 'would' in this whole paragraph – is it still happening now? Shouldn't it be present simple e.g. he wears a special costume, etc of if it is in the past use past simple – would sounds a little strange

wearing a special costume and a party would be organized, in which he would be in a bed located at a wedding venue in a hotel, whilst guests are drinking and eating as the doctor performs the circumcision. The party is considered so grand, so important that it is not even called a party but rather, 'a circumcision wedding', (translation from in Turkish). Every guest will attend the wedding with presents and the 6 or 7 year old boy would get gold and cash from the guests and his parents. At times, Ministers and celebrities attend the circumcision weddings of privileged groups to honor the occasion.

The reason for this narration is that, far before a male child reaches the age of 10, he would, by a virtue, know that being a man is something more rewarding and beneficial than being a girl. Therefore, he enjoys a much higher self-esteem, sense of entitlement and power than his 'others'. This will eventually become very problematic for the state. The man who is told he is superior since infancy would learn how to live with restrictions to that power at a later stage. The male political subject might threaten the system, if not openly trying to shape it. As a result, the state would need to contain him through brainwashing from the start of since secondary school textbooks (as discussed in chapter on Turkey), compulsory military service, and day to day interactions with the state and police violence when needed. In this context; evidently, the state is not only concerned with maintaining the subordinate mentality of women, by preserving the unity of the family despite on-going violence, but also the state needs the male political subject to feel empowered within a given 'acceptable range'. Accordingly,; this range has women on one side and the state on the other.

Consequently, the male political subject has a different 'social contract' which makes him masculine against those who come lower in rank than him and feminine through his relationships with the state. I argue that, the subordination of women in the context of Turkey, in addition to other reasons listed above, stems from 'the deal' he

gets with his cooperation with the state andbut involves accepting its state supremacy. It is a bribe, if not a compensation, for being emasculated by the state. The state needs men to oppress women, so men can bear being oppressed by the state. Because, if a man does not have women or LGBTI people to oppress, then he has nothing else to call him a man as defined within the parameters of the ruler and the subject metaphor, evident across various structures of the state.

Additionally, we should discuss whether the state reproduces the man or the man reproduces the state. In other words, does the private sphere determine the public sphere, assuming the question can ever be answered. In the Turkish context, after people cast their votes during national elections, elected parties would form the government (or administration) that instantly defines itself as the state.

The state is situated at the center, superior to its subjects, yet inferior to the west, in which they see the origins of individualism, feminism and democracy. For example, following the Iraq war in 2003, The Ministry of External Affairs, Abdullah Gul (who eventually became president), had a meeting with the former US Secretary of state, Condoleezza Rice. He complained about the negative image of Turkish people and the current political situation of the time. His instant call was to ask his counterpart to do something to suppress the image of Turkey promoted by some Hollywood films and series. Since suppressing stimuli or threats, in short, censorship, was the main coping mechanism and strategy to sustain a secure position, even at times of peace, this was the only suggestion he could introduce to his American counterparts.

Indeed, suppression sing was the first option to consider, since suppressing the source is what he has learned since his early years of socialization through his relationship with women. Rice immediately stated that they were not powerful enough

Commented [KM14]: Who is 'they' here?

to do something about it⁵¹. The threat Hollywood poses on the Turkish image is a result of freedom of speech and, in America, it is not subject to negotiation.

Therefore, the Turkish State was challenged with creating new ways of coping with challenges. I believe the self-help system of the international arena and the inability to suppress opposing voices coming from the west is promising and has the potential to transform the state. The international arena would shame the Turkish state to find new procedures and processes to cope, manage and handle threats. In Turkey, the Erdogan government donates food to areas of extreme poverty during religious holidays. This is a result of a successful public relations campaign. Yet, on a global scale, it is not effective. Therefore, the state could transform through the non-conflicting (in terms of the military) forces of globalization and, potentially, break the cycle. The state can evolve and start tolerating the transformations observed in the binary.

Synthesis

The realization of how oppression can be presented as nurture, love and protection is evident in the texts presented above. Another example, worth illustrating, involves analyzing a visit to a gynecologist, as a site of confrontation and contestation. I remember being examined by a female doctor when I was 16 and ever since, I have been intimidated by female gynecologists. Occasionally, the female doctor would act as if she was a representative of Turkish culture who favored a female existence that adhered to norms and values expressed by the misogynist paradigm. She asked me, 'have you had sexual intercourse before?' I remember saying 'Yes' immediately. Then she said, 'let me decide'. After examination she said 'yes I can see you have had sexual

51 For further information see: <http://admin.hurriyetdailynews.com/rice-we-can-not-control-hollywood.aspx?pageID=438&n=rice-we-can-not-control-hollywood-2005-02-07>, Last accessed 25 September, 2014

intercourse before'. I had already told her already, but yet she needed to 'search' for the answer herself.

Then it occurred to me that my opinions did not matter, the only thing that mattered was the condition of the hymen. If it was intact, regardless of my testament and personal experience, I was still a virgin. I realized she was trying to protect me from patriarchal cultures by giving me the benefit of the doubt and exploring the possibility of deceiving people based on medical evidence. However it made me furious for political reasons because her understanding of protection was within patriarchal values. She never considered the possibility of inspiring her patients to stand against the culture and encourage them to say 'I can be active too and it should not concern anyone'.

The difference between being the confrontational subject and the one who manipulates within the system is the difference between two separate subject formations and how political culture and order is reproduced in the system. I remember my mother would often criticize my clothing and say 'you cannot wear this in Turkey, they will not allow you, and they will harass you'. I also remember her calling me an exhibitionist. This not only suggests that the culture is patriarchal and I should know my womanhood within it, but also she believed that a woman should dress up in a certain way that complied to general rules. Focusing on her first statement, suggesting compliance is introduced as protection. The only way you can escape the order is to live according to it. Therefore, protection reaches a different form of reproductive mechanism, which involved eliminating risk-taking behavior.

A female acquaintance of mine, who held a PhD in engineering, introduced her fiancé to her parents living in a small city in Turkey. Her parents told her that she should not hold hands with him in public places. My friend said, 'why can't others change for

a change?’ and her father responded, ‘your reasoning is also justifiable’. He was saying that she was right to feel that way and she could possibly live according to an understanding that aimed to be enacted against established structures. Two examples highlights the different reactions people are recommended to give to similar stimuli. The difference in reactions is difference in two separate political cultures.

The individual and structure interact in a manner that conflate, collide, reinforce and indeed contradict each other. In the context of Turkey, the subject is defined through the interpersonal encounters within the so-called private and public spheres, as they are both regulated by the state⁵². As argued by Melander, the individuals that are defined through their relationships with between men and women are fundamentally shaped and constructed in comparison to other social relationships (2005: 154).

As authors argued whilst elaborating what is deemed primitive societies, they explained how the private and the public, the particular and the universal, strive for overwhelming powers and are contradictory in nature (Chmielewski, 1991:271). However, the so-called private provides a metaphorical existence for the citizenry in Turkey.

Commented [KM15]: Unclear – who you mean?

Since the relationship between the male political subject and female subject of exclusion represents a gendered binary which is the foundationfundamental of social organizations across multiple levels (Ridgeway, 2009:151), they reinforce and reproduce oppression in the public sphere where the national subject is oppressed by the state. In other words, not only the binary between the ruler and subject is produced within the dynamics of the household but also inequality, namely, political,

⁵² The private and public spheres in the Middle East are highly fluid. The state (government, police, and judiciary) is an active agent and decides which parts of the sphere should be deemed private and which parts should be deemed public. Both spheres represent and define ruling class privileges and new definitions of being privileged and underprivileged.

sociological, psychological, are reproduced metaphorically through binary: the masculine and the feminine.

This has implications on the intersectional theory. As discussed in previous chapters, a subject can be an oppressor and oppressed at the same time and this needs to be further explored. However, the subject in mind is female, often white-middle class American. However, a scholar must question the concepts' applicability to the male political subject and explore circumstance, which uphold a masculine and feminine existence within the same subject. How would a scholar examine the oppression of a subject that is masculine in the private sphere and feminine in the public sphere? I would argue that compound patriarchy would create the subjects' dual positioning since one identity enables the other. The cause- effect relationship amongst intersecting vectors deserves extended attention amongst researchers of the intersectional theory.

Additionally, this thesis describes political culture in the manifestations of power and similarities between the male political subject and the state. As defined by Murrin, the understanding of political cultures includes analyzing modes of expression, habits, thoughts and beliefs that underline visible elements of manifestations (1989: 411). However, the expression of needs is a manifestation of worth and that produces hierarchy. Political culture not only analyses how power is reproduced, but also has to examine how power defines the subject. I argued that the male political subject is defined through his ability to enact on what is deemed provocative. Therefore, helplessness affiliated with the male political subject and the state has defined the boundaries of difference and privilege.

In this regard, another approach towards political culture argues that 'actual behavior' can expose 'deep structures' (Adams, 1986: 549). For this reason, his entitlement to helplessness and law enforcement officials' effort to support a subject

that is deemed weak towards stimuli is, in fact, endemic in Turkish political culture, across multiple sites of confrontation. The subject that is excused is the subject with the privilege that extends his rights and political space, invading his opponent and depriving him/her of her own primary needs. Therefore, in a way, he has been allowed to act on impulse to sustain survival, which is the maintenance of a vertical structure and his supremacy over his wife.

Ironically scholars believed that the private and public spheres were exclusive spheres. According to Somers (1995), the concepts of political culture "...were made to depend on its critical job of adjudicating and guarding the boundaries between public and private" (p. 116). However, it is clear that not only does the interference of the state eliminate the boundaries, but the ability of the private and public spheres to reproduce and reinforce each other, is a metaphor of power that is a means and an end in itself.

Therefore, the private and the public sphere are metaphors of each other defining the male and the female through enactments and performances (Butler, 1990). As a result, the lack of alternative structures and limited means of peaceful negotiation and contestation shows how, violence (physical, emotional, etc.) is endemic not just as a value but also as a process that regulates political behavior.

Culture has presented the necessary norms needed for processes to be accommodated. For example, oppression as nurture, such as a former boyfriend limiting my freedom to choose my own clothes was suggested to be a sign of being intimate and serious, is indeed a by-product of this system. Mothers and children, as explained above, also bond by their mutual faith or love, be it restraining or protectingon, involved a limitation of freedom. As argued by Almond (1980), political culture involves "the creation and maintenance of a society's fundamental political order (Almond, 1980: 6). Therefore, Turkish political culture has enabled the values needed, including enactment

Commented [KM16]:

Commented [KM17]: Unclear

of love, protection and security, in a manner that is consistent with private and public spheres creating a metaphorical alignment in relation to each other. As Walby (1990), argues, there is a continuum between private and public patriarchy that not only enables and reinforces each other but rather defines the subject that is needed to be compatible within a given ruler subject binary.

The state is probably an independent variable which has to sustain its existence and survival in the international realm of anarchy and self-help in the global sphere. As Ataturk and Inonu, the second President of Turkey, both used international insecurities to justify an order of constraint and repression, the public had to be shaped in accordance to those demands. Additionally, today, EU accession and negotiation periods have been used to justify laws to protect women from domestic violence. Indeed, it could be argued that the demand for EU as well as national security is endemic in grassroots organizations and political mobilization of the citizenry; the core-periphery relationship of the state and the society suggests that the state has to construct a feminine sphere to justify its supremacy.

To this extent, Habermas (1989) describes the public sphere as being apart from the state. I believe the state defines the public sphere not through rules and regulations that govern freedom of speech and association, but also through being the main threat to the liberation of the national subject and the construction of the public domain. The main issue of the protestors was focused on being counter-culture and therefore represented an oppressed group of people re-negotiating its position with the state. Dissenting views, as seen in the Gezi Park protests, did not intend to define a subject in its position with reference to each other but rather the subject in relation to its ruler. For this reason, the public sphere, as a site of liberation, would only reach its potential if the femininity affiliated with a particular type of oppression would be eliminated.

Although Gezi Park protests openly intended to change legislation and policies enacted in the country, in cultural terms, it was against the core-periphery dynamic and the ruler-subject binary that would ultimately have a profound impact on gender.

Therefore, as the structure creates its own subjects, the subject creates its own structure. In addition, it is argued that “resources can only constitute structures, only when they mutually imply and sustain each other over time” (Sewell, 1980:131). What is neglected in research on political cultures is how the method of analyzing aligning metaphorical existences reproduces each other through cognitive processes such as memory. Empirical evidence, gathered fromby interviews and extensive content analyses, the norms and values that are manifested through processes which neutralize oppression through enactments of love and nurture. As a result, culture, as an independent variable, shapes subjecthoodsubject hood that creates and tolerates oppressive political structures.

The Turkish state often seessaw women under the jurisdiction of men and encouraged men to oppress women. The causes for this are diverse and complex. Initially, the reproduction of the nation, both physically and socially, is the first to be accounted for to understand this intent. However, I believe the male political subject who is oppressed by the state, needs to overcompensate for his oppression. His subjecthoodsubject hood needs to be constructed within the private domain, as the ruler. According to Baker (1990), “...actors convert their immediate private experiences into political interpretations and ‘interest’ is itself inherently a political symbol and political construction, not a pre-existing reality” (p.5). Interest in this case, could be perceived as supremacy and rank in the vertical ruler-subject construction.

However, if the word ‘interest’ was substituted with ‘entitlement’, then I believe the helplessness of the state, as well as the male political subject, would be a political

construction that provides the social stability and the core in which the periphery situates itself accordingly. Therefore, the male political subject who enacts the culture of the state, within the dynamics of the household is maintaining the structure. Therefore, containing the deviant is needed to establish an order of surveillance and mechanisms to reach the equilibrium needed for social order that is in the case of Turkey, mostly vertical and hierarchical patriarchy (ibid).

In this regard, memory, along with the subjects' mind that operates through metaphors, becomes an intervening variable that defines the subject and its ability to submit to power. As suggested by Phillips (2006) "...tactics that rely on the memory of past events to seek the right moment to act quickly in order to manifest greater effect. [...] The central component of the tactic is the transformation of memory of past events into rapid action at the right moment" (p.320).

The citizen who believes in sustaining subjugation and hierarchy is most likely to tolerate it. Therefore, the ruler-subject binary is initially learned through gendered interactions in the household, making its most profound effect in macro structures. This enables him to identify with values and structures that would make him willing to submit the order since his memory would allow him to recall that dynamic in which he would enact instantly. As men oppress women to compensate for the oppression they suffer in the hands of the state, the state relies on the patriarchal subject to sustain its own supremacy.

As the state represents a father figure (Joseph, 1996 and Lakoff, 2000) and senior officials are organized by kinship structures, they also structure the state as a masculine actor that would sustain its supremacy and vertical positioning towards the public through similar processes of the male political subject enacting to female

resistance. The parent-child relationship that is considered vertical (Sharabi, 1988) has a different dynamic whilst being represented amongst two genders.

As explained in the chapter on patriarchal theory, substantive inequality is manifested through relationships, power dynamics and structures that are supposedly equal, such as the male and female citizen who can vote and be voted legally. The formal equality of those who have equal rights rarely produce equal outcomes, since the substantive conditions of the market, societal cultures and structures, at times and certain circumstances, reinforce men's privilege. Therefore, privilege and being underprivileged is culturally constructed, enacted in the private domain of interpersonal encounters, and are reinforced by the state through government regulations⁵³ and reproduced by the state that oppresses national subjects with dissenting views, in the name of restoring the vertical order, endemic in vertical patriarchy.

According to this point of view, the state creates a feminized citizenry that can/would be defined in accordance to its/their position as the other, defined and negotiated through expressions of dissenting views, such as protests, cartoon caricatures, public speeches, etc. This contestation and negotiation aims to redefine the subject, initially defined by structure but ultimately by the agents of that structure, as the state. Primarily, this description implies an understanding of the overcompensation of un-urgent needs. As Maslow's hierarchy of needs suggest self-actualization as a high ranking, privileged need, any possibility of threat is pre-emptively punished, for establishing the mentality of an oppressed subject, living in accordance to the needs of an oppressor. At times of negotiation, such as the Gezi Park protests, reinforcements of status-quo manifest the use of similar means and reasoning of over-compensation as

⁵³ Discussed previously regarding judges who believe men are provoked in the same manner as men who batter women and make the same argument.

observed in the household. Therefore, the relativity amongst the gains and losses expressed through the ruler and the subject is deemed as a threat of an (often unjustifiable) urgent need that is overcompensated through violating primary needs of the other. The immediate implication of this is that there is a lack of structure that resolve conflict through peaceful and egalitarian procedures.

The lack of structures as observed in processes and procedures is the evidence of patriarchal reproductive mechanisms that govern the society, in favor of **patriarchal relativity**, a relative measurement of loss and gain observed within power dynamics in structures of vertical patriarchy. This concept often describes compound patriarchy in which one form of patriarchy (vertical) becomes the basis of another form of patriarchal oppression (patriarchal relativity). Therefore, oppression should be perceived as a compound form of multiple forms of vulnerabilities constructed in relation to different subjects, agents and contexts.

This concept could also be utilized to explain state-society relationships as well. The state, or the administration, which is threatened by organized citizens, would at times, inflict torture on citizens and cause severe damage on the citizenry in order to sustain its own supremacy. The state could reproduce its regime through campaigning and efforts of advocacy yet suppressing views, against one's right to indivisibility, is a relative loss and gain observed amongst the gendered ruler subject binary and therefore the system of vertical patriarchy. Therefore, the State and the male political subject, leaders of two spheres, align in their procedures and processes to reproduce structural patriarchy to define and constrain the deviants in the name of the common good, or simply nurture.

The Male Political Subject and the Binary

The concept of citizenship, whilst being seen as membership to a community, often highlights the difference between a subject with legal entitlements on the one hand and the one with restrictions on the other. For countries like the UK and USA this differentiation would highlight a social stratification that defines the subject beyond legal implications but also a difference in a sense of entitlement and a capability of self-actualization. In the context of Turkey, it is possible to discuss a difference between racial, ethnic and religious minorities in a manner, in conclusion with stratification and hierarchy; however the difference that is studied in this thesis is more inclusive than the ones mentioned above.

This thesis focuses on the metaphorical reproduction of the masculine and feminine and the ruler and the subject through its manifestation in state/male violence and its legal procedures. Ridgeway (2009) states that, the construction of the self and the other, involves a shared principle of social difference. However, it could also be a shared principle of hierarchy and a power dynamic in which people are situated by default. The author indicates that the state acts in a masculine manner whilst governing the binary of masculine and feminine. However, the state also creates its own female, on a national level as it governs its subjects.

For this reason, a two-layer reproduction of patriarchal structures can be observed amongst the state that reinforce male supremacy in the household but reinforces the power of the masculine state against its subjects in the same manner a male would express 'power over' its female kin. These two layers represent the intersection of two patriarchs with two separate subject groups. For this reason, understandings on patriarchy should only analyze the subject of patriarchal oppression but also the agent of oppression whether by seniors, males or states. It is through the intersection of these two layers reflected on the governance of the same agent that

patriarchal relativity becomes a matter of gain and loss in which one's non urgent needs are often overcompensated through the sacrificing of a subjects primary, urgent and detrimental needs. Patterns define the ruler and its ability to manifest itself across different metaphors. In this regard, political meaning should not only be seen through the manifestations of votes, demonstrations and actual consent but rather through "cultural and intersubjective symbols in collective meanings" inscribed in collective memory (Formisano, 2001:549). Therefore cultural reproduction of the ruler and the subject is inscribed in an unconscious process reflected through other unconscious processes.

Political culture as a concept is an inclusive term; however, in this thesis it involves the analysis of making political order and stability (Almond, 1980:26). This order stems from tolerance and a mutual expectation of what is deemed acceptable behavior whilst being an agent/party in a binary. This order is enabled by mental schemas and resources that constitute structures that sustain each other (Sewell, 1980). These schemas accommodate the subordinate and the dominant. The relationship between the ruler and the subject not only manifest itself in the realm of politics but also in political asymmetries where an uneven distribution of power reflect a social hierarchy, not always defined by law, but rather accommodated by various different implementations of law.

Agents tend to reproduce the given structures because they have been produced and habituated by those very structures (Bourdieu, 1992:6). In this case it is important to notice that Bourdieu's understanding of structure also includes cognitive structures. However, the relationship between the cognitive and the social structure is often less examined than needed. In other words, the mental conditioning of what the ruler and

the subject entail would have its impact on the actual social structure. However, the transformation between the two remains unclear.

Bourdieu also informs us that, “all external stimuli and conditioning experiences are, at every moment perceived through categories already constructed by prior experiences” (Wacquant and Bourdieu, 1992:133). To this extent, prior experiences could refer to the mental adoption of a gendered binary within the household. In fact, the authors also refer to children (boys and girls) younger than earlier than age of 3 years of age that where girls and boys learn at nursery in nurseries what is male and female (ibid). The authors also reflect on how binaries reflect and reproduce one another.

“In effect, the dominated, that is, women, apply to every object of the natural and social world and in particular to the relation of domination in which they are engendered, as well as to the persons through which this relation realizes itself, ‘unthought schemata’ of thought are the product of the embodiment of this relation of power in the form of pair couples (high/low), (large/small), (inside/outside) which lead them to construct this relation from the standpoint of the dominant.”

(Wacquant and Bourdieu, 1992: 171)

It is important to notice that binaries reproduce through a mental process which reflects how masculine and feminine automatically reflect on another. However, what is missing in the above quote is how roles conflate and contradict one another. For example, it is expected that, according to Bourdieu, if the citizenry is ruled, then it would reflect the characteristics of the ruled subjects within the household.

One must ask, given that the male political subject that is masculine in domestic spheres adopt a female role with regards to its relationship with the state, how does the transformation from dominant to subordinate take place? In other words, how can one subject be both the ruler and the ruled, as one binary is constructed through another?

Since, patriarchy is a system, structure and cultural artifact, the manifestations of multiple binaries should reflect a similarity amongst them. Yet, this similarity needs to be understood of accommodating contradictory subject formations within itself.

This main clash or contradiction is indeed the limitation of this research and the limitation of the current point in literature. Neither, Bourdieu nor other scholars have explained the transformation between two binaries at times when the subject swaps from being privileged to being underprivileged.

In addition to this, another point worth making, to stress the limitations of my thesis and the overall political sociology and social philosophy literature, is that, the process of reproducing binaries is often neglected amongst researchers. For example, as one binary reproduces the other, similar to this thesis' emphasis on male to female dynamics, as reflected within the state and the citizen binary, how does the transformation and/or reproduction actually occur? In other words, how does the citizenry adopt a female role? How does the gendered construction, adopted since their time in nurseries, pass on to the ruler-subject binary in the public sphere? For this reason, this thesis is unable to explain *how* one metaphor is reflected through multiple binaries that transform into one another. The current literature has yet to analyze Bourdieu's work to fill in the gaps in his philosophy.

The main premise of this thesis was to demonstrate the similarities between male to female violence and state to citizen violence. Through the legal procedures it was clear that women were to men what the citizen was to the state. It was crucial to demonstrate helplessness as a privilege, in addition to related overcompensation and evident patriarchal relativity. This thesis mostly intended to make a contribution to research on gender and the Middle East and Turkish political culture. Filling the gaps

listed above would require a new research question and, in particular, extended time allocated on such projects, which is beyond the scope of this thesis.

Conclusion

Evidence provided and discussed above, demonstrates that oppression, in our minds, is reproduced in accordance with metaphorical boundaries, such as the ruler and the subject or the component and the whole. Given the information presented above, men oppress women whilst enjoying extended rights that are recognized, acknowledged and reinforced by the state. The state, obviously, promotes the vertical patriarchy produced in the household.

Nevertheless, the state actively subordinates women in collusion with men. However, as seen in relation to Gezi Park protests, the state oppresses men and women alike, with a different set of reasons and strategy. This violence stems from a very similar mentality than that of men in the household. Therefore, I argued that women are to men, what the public (led by men) is for the state. Although many marginalized groups joined the protests to fight against the oppressive state side by side with the male political subject, it was clearly an attempt that led to the feminization of the male political subject.

This leads to the conclusion that male power is not infinitive and it is not unrivalled. It is clear that the rival of the male political subject is, yet again, another man as we see from the behavior of the state. His 'others' are not seen serious enough to threaten his supremacy. The state, however, has killed a few and injured thousands to ensure its supremacy. Given the structure, the male political subject exists within 'a range' of power and in a sphere of influence and entitlement. This range defines his rank, as detrimental in the definition of public order in accordance to a Turkish source.

Therefore, I argue that the system that defined men within a range placed him above women. As a result, the freedom to subordinate women (including impunity) was offered as a bribe, reward or present or simply, compensation, to be enjoyed as a means of experiencing political clout in exchange for his loyalty to the State.

CHAPTER VIII: CONCLUSION

In this research I have analyzed patriarchy as a system of oppression, not only as a matter, issue or value that oppresses women, but rather affecting all segments of society. There is an urgent need of further research that elaborates patriarchy as a system that could be discerned through deploying a multi levelmulti-level analysis, which is endemic across different segments of the society. Patriarchy, as a system, needed to be analyzed to understand how the male political subject is oppressed by other masculine agents. Furthermore, patriarchy as a system, needed to be addressed as a system of subordination in which one subjects' oppression is linked to the oppression of another subject. In addition, the system of patriarchy had to be analyzed and elaborated as a social circumstance in which the everyday practices of subjects are traced through the means of which their loss is overly compensated. Research was needed to understand the relationship between oppression and nurture.

My original contribution to knowledge stems from my ability to address all the above-mentionedabove mentioned issues which are significantly different to those of my peers and fellow researchers. I have noticed, at an early stage, that compensation of loss indicates privilege. My contribution stems from my ability and creativity whichthat led me to draw attention to patterns and similarities observed in oppressive practices conducted by various different agents. To this extent, I have compared male to female violence and state to citizen violence. This implied the necessity of a metaphorical approach that was rarely utilized in feminist research.

My research is also unique and insightful in its ability to deliver messages to male political subjects and their oppression as a primary reason to account for, whilst understanding the oppression women face as a matter of routine in some societies. My

research has successfully addressed the concerns of men, as an oppressed subject, and has linked their oppression to the oppression of women. Without a doubt this is an original contribution to knowledge and further research could easily built on my metaphorical approach comparing different levels of the society, whilst examining the ruler-subject binary.

Furthermore, I have included autobiographical elements in this research for multiple reasons. First, as I analyze oppression, I take pride in not otherizingotherizing oppressed women by clearly stating that I am indeed one of them. Second, future researchers might choose to analyze my being (in the existential sense of the term) with the research I have conducted and the arguments I have produced. Without a doubt, the relationship between knowing and being is a dynamic that needs to be understood, interrogated and clarified.

In summary, this research has several chapters that provide the context to the research findings gathered from ethnographic research. First, the chapter on patriarchy informs us that patriarchy is an extremely problematic concept and that this elaboration allows me to situate myself (as a scholar) within the current debates concerning the concept. As argued above, I refuse to adhere to previous researchers' insight by situating patriarchy in the household and follow the rarely observed scholars (such as Sharabi) who draw attention to how patriarchy could be perceived as a system at both macro and micro levels.

Second, I have written a chapter on Turkey that provides a rich context for my research. I have introduced the major dynamics of which the male political subject is situated and often discerning their forces of restriction and oppression. The aim of this chapter is to describe circumstance and context to the following empirical chapters where the dynamics and patterns of oppression are explored and revealed.

Commented [KM18]: Is this the correct word?

Third, in the chapter on methodology I aimed to describe the difficulties I faced whilst conducting research, giving the reader the opportunity to read the subtext of the text I analyze. From the family judge who smoked cigarettes at the judicial palace despite being forbidden, to the lawyer who felt offended by my critical positioning towards the Turkish state as well as the male political subject, it is clear that human rights are below certain values, including the sanctity of the state. I argue that the experiences I describe in that chapter provides evidence to my peers and fellow researchers about the difficulties to question power dynamics in an oppressive, patriarchal system due to many subjects' preference to live in accordance to it.

In the chapter on the household, I aimed to describe the dynamics between male to female violence and the state's position towards oppressive practices within the household. The main aim of this chapter is to trace the logic, underlining assumptions and patterns within and amongst male to female violence. This was an essential analysis that provides a link to proceeding chapters and to other forms of oppressive practices that were elaborated in further chapters.

In the chapter on state reproduction of patriarchy, I was limited in my options to explore state behavior since officials were often incredibly defensive, skeptical and intimidated by researchers conducting research on human rights in Turkey. For this reason, I have utilized content analysis, analyzing documents, to read the text but also the sub-text, often tracing hidden messages that could be detected in such documents. This chapter was essential to my research since it was my only means to introduce the intention of state officials to researchers.

Whilst writing my chapter concerning the analysis of the male political subject, my primary motive was to connect the insight I gathered whilst analyzing male to female violence in the household, the patterns and similarities, with the insight I

gathered by analyzing state to citizen violence. For this reason, this chapter is an essential section of my research in which I connect and conflate oppression that takes place at different levels in of the society. It is this chapter that explains introduces that oppression has a pattern and eventually argues that the male political subject is indeed feminine.

This research aimed to understand the dynamics of oppression in Turkey by discerning patterns of oppression. For this reason, this research focused on the analysis of oppression within the household to understand male to female violence, its underlining assumptions, assertions, norms and values. Male to female violence within the patriarchal household was examined to detect the hierarchy and/or urgency of needs that were compensated atin the expense of another subjects' primary needs of right to life and right to security.

This research is **outstanding** due to its approach of utilizing metaphorical analysis whichthat is rarely employed by others. Different levels of the society are rarely compared to discern patterns of behavior. Additionally, several feminist researchers fail to address the oppression men face as an intervening variable needed to be taken account whilst analyzing the oppression women face. This research is also unique since it introduces the urgency of needs and their compensation as a measure to tackle the world of human beings and the hierarchy of different subjects within a given community.

In this research I conclude that the male political subject is feminine. This implies a complex argument. First I argue that gender is not assigned by birth and that it is not biological. Second, I argue that gender is enacted; it is a political standing, positioning and situation. By arguing that the male political subject is feminine, I firmly indicate that men are oppressed by the state in the same manner women are oppressed

Commented [KM19]: Quite a strong adjective to use – you sound like you're blowing your own trumpet! Would change...

by men. Given that our minds operate in metaphors, it is common to assume that the nation is a family. For this reason, the dynamics within the nation operate in the same way they do within a household. For this reason, men who aim to escape oppression would have to eliminate, tackle and release the oppression women face in the household.

This research utilizes a rarely deployed method of analyzing a binary and its manifestation across different levels of the society. As I conflated and compared the ruler-subject binary in the household (that is also endemic of masculine feminine subjects), I also compared this with the ruler-subject binary in the public sphere. Utilizing this analysis enables the researcher to detect patterns of oppression and common manifestations of privilege. For this reason, this research has contributed to the field of political sociology, politics and gender studies far more differently than my peers.

This research was carried out through the use of content analysis and semi-structured and unstructured interviews. Additionally, I have used the research findings of other scholars who have conducted research on similar areas, due to the extreme sensitivity of the topic of domestic violence. Nevertheless, I have successfully gained insight into the mentality, logic and understanding underneath oppression and marginalization within the household. As I argued before, the ruler-subject binary, reflected amongst the relationship between male and female, significantly contributes towards the relationships between other rulers and subjects that operate in multiple levels of the society. For this reason, my depiction of the binary within the household, as I argue, often consists of the blueprint of other binaries across the collectivity.

As a result of this, I firmly argue that the relationship between the ruler-subject or masculine-feminine consists of the model of other similar binaries across a collectivity. Therefore, masculine feminine dynamics, in addition to the ruler-subject

binary has to be understood as a blueprint of other types of oppression that takes place within the nation. To conclude, I argue, that women are to men, what the citizen is for the state, and for this reason, the male political subject is indeed feminine. This is an argument that has never been stated before and it encompasses comprises my original contribution to knowledge.

My original contribution to knowledge stems from two major contributions to the literature. First, as I discussed above, the male political subject is oppressed in the same manner women are oppressed. Second, there are similarities and patterns that could be observed between the oppression that take places within these boundaries. For examples, one of the arguments I introduced was that helplessness is a privilege. This statement is made to draw attention to a pattern, similarity, if not tradition, of oppressing one another. For this reason, the three patterns I introduced whilst analyzing patterns of oppression need to be perceived as an artifact that defines more than one subject that who is situated within the ruler subject binary.

Employing a multilevel analysis within a given collectivity, based on the utilization of masculine-feminine binary or ruler-subject binary is quite uncommon. As I undertook this novel approach I was expecting a contribution that was often far more distinctive than my peers. I argue that employing a multilevel analysis is extremely insightful and for this reason, my peers and fellow researchers should further deploy similar analysis to trace patterns within oppression and many other phenomena.

The ruler-subject binary has been interrogated since Ancient Greece, if we include Aristotle and Plato, for example. However, those analyses analysis's were male-centric and particularly focused on how men gain and lose from these power dynamics. That said, However this binary needs to be explored from a feminist point of view to further discuss how subjugation, oppression and similarly how privilege is produced.

The originality of my research stems from my ability to show that the male political subject is oppressed in the same manner women are. This is indeed a type of research that the literature lacks. To this extent, this research deserves appreciation and credit for analyzing gender-based violence whilst delivering messages to men and how they need to re-adjust their behavior in order to ensure they do not oppress to compensate for their own oppression.

The word 'compensation' is also crucial for this research. I argue that the subjects who are privileged are also the subjects who over-compensate their damage. The concept of overcompensation is indeed controversial and to an extent, in the eye of the beholder. For this reason the theory of compensation I introduced should be taken seriously, by fellow researchers, since the manner and ways people over-compensate their damage reveals the circumstance of which privilege and oppression is manifested.

For this reason, this research utilizes a rarely used metaphorical analysis to depict patterns of subjugation and oppression at multiple levels of the society. Indeed this is a rarely utilized approach and it displays comprises my original contribution to knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abela, A and Vetere, A and Scarri, C (2012) "Ethical Dilemmas of a Researcher/Clinician Interviewing women who have grown up in a family where there was domestic violence" *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* Vol. 11 No 2

Abu-Lughod, L (2002), "Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving?" *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 104, No 3

Adams, W (1986), "Politics and the Archaeology of Meaning a Review Essay", XXXIX Ahmed, L (1992), *Women and Islam: Historical Roots of a Modern Debate*, Connecticut: Yale University Press

Ahiska, M (2003). "Occidentalism: The Historical Fantasy of the Modern", *South Atlantic Quarterly*, Vol. 102 No 2/3

Ahmad, F (1993), *The Making of Modern Turkey*, London: Routledge.

Ahmed, L (1992), *Women and Gender in Islam*, New Haven: Yale University Press

Al-Ali, N (2005), "Reconstructing Gender: Iraqi Women between dictatorships, war, sanctions and occupation" *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 26 No 5

Allen, J (2003), *Lost Geographies of Power*, Oxford: Blackwell

Altinay, A (2004), *The Myth Of the Military Nation*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Amnesty International (2014), Adding Injustice to Injury, *Amnesty International*, International Secretariat

Antony, D and Al-Hamidani, Z (2010), Deciding on a Mixed Methods Design in a Doctoral Study, *Issues in Research*, Vol. 18 No 1

Arat, Y (2005), "Women's Challenge To Citizenship" in (ed) Birtek, F and Dragonas, T, *Citizenship and the Nation-State*, NY: Routledge

Arat, Y (1996), "On Gender and Citizenship in Turkey", *Middle East Report*, No 198

- Atkins, M (1984), "Practitioner as a Researcher, Some Techniques for analysing semi-structured data in small scale research", *British Journal of Education Studies*, Vol. 32 No 3
- Aydinli, E (2009), "A Paradigmatic Shift for the Turkish Generals and the End of The Coup Era in Turkey", *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 63 No 4
- Baker, Keith Micheal (1982), "On the problem of the Ideological Origins of the French Revolution" in *Modern Intellectual History: Reappraisals and New Perspectives* edited by Dominic LaCapra and Kaplan, Steven, Ithaca: Cornell University
- Barrett, M (1980), *Women's Oppression Today: Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis*, London: Verso
- Barton, M (2012), "Wrestling with Imperial Patriarchy", *Feminist Theology*, Vol. 21, No 7
- Beamer, G (2002), "Elite Interviews and State Politics Research" *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*, Vol. 12 No 1
- Beechey, V (1979) "On Patriarchy", *Feminist Review*, Vol. 3
- Brown, I and Misra, J (2003) "The Intersection of Gender and Race in the Labour Market", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Issue 29
- Bland, D (2001) "Patterns of Liberal Democratic Civil-Military Relations", *Armed Forces and Society*, Vol. 27, No 4
- Bloomer, M and Moss, C (2012) "Qualitative Observation in a Clinical Setting: Challenges at the End of Life", *Nursing and Health Sciences*, Issue 14
- Bonner, A and Tolhurst, G (2008), "Insider-Outsider Perspectives of Participant Observation" *Nurse Research*, Issue 18
- Brannen, J (2005), *Mixed Methods Research: A discussion paper*, www.ncrm.ac.uk

- Brock-Utre(1996), “Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research with Education in Africa”, *International Review of Education*, Vol. 42 No 6
- Burger, T (transl. 1991) *Jurgen Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Cambridge: MIT Press
- Bryson, V. (2003) *Feminist Political Theory*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Bryson, V (1999) “Patriarchy: A concept too useful to lose”, *Contemporary Politics*, Vol. 5 No 4
- Brockett, G (2011) (ed), *Towards a Social History of Modern Turkey*, London: Routledge
- Buchanan, N, Sosulski, M and Donnell C (2010), “Life History and Narrative Analysis: Feminist Methodologies Contextualising Black Women’s Experiences, *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*”, Vol. 36 No 3
- Butler, J (1990), *Gender Trouble*, London: Routledge,
- Callinicos, Alex (1999), *Social Theory*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Campbell. R and Adams, A (2009), “Why Do Rape Survivors Volunteer for Face to Face Interviews? A meta-study of victims’ reasons for and concerns about research participation” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 24 No 3
- Charrad, M (2001), *States and Women’s Rights*, University of California Press: Los Angeles
- Charmaz, K (2006), *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*, London: Sage
- Chmielewski, P (1991) “The Public and the Private in Primitive Societies”, *International Political Science Review* Vol.. 12 No. 4

- Chrisler, J and Levy, K (2008), "The Media Construct a Menstrual Monster : A Content Analysis of PMS Articles in to Popular Press", *Women and Health*, Vol. 16 Issue 2
- Cinar, A (2008), "Subversion and Subjugation in the Public Sphere: Secularism and The Islamic Headscarf" *Signs*, Vol. 33 No 4
- Cizre, U (2011), "Disentangling the Threads of Civil-Military Relations in Turkey: Promises and Perils" *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No 2
- Collins, P (1990), *Black Feminist Thought*, London: Routledge
- Connell, R (1995), *Masculinities*, Los Angeles: University of California Press
- Creswell, J, Shope, R, Clark, V and Green, D (2006), "How Interpretive Qualitative Research Extends Mixed Methods Research" *Research in Schools*, Vol. 13, No 1
- Curry, G (1996), *The Affirmative Action Debate*, New York: Perseus Books
- Davison, R (1960), Where is the Middle East, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 38 No 4
- Deardon, A (1975), (ed), *Arab Women*, London: Minority Rights Group Report no 27
- Denzin, N (1978), *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*, New York: Mc Graw Hill
- Demirel, T (2004) "Soldiers and Civilians: The Dilemmas of Turkish Politics", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 40, No 1
- Dobash, R and Dobash, E (2004), "Women's Violence to Men in Intimate Relationships working on a puzzle", *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 44
- Donmez, R (2011), "Beyond State-Led Nationalism, Ideal Citizenship for Turkey", in Donmez, R and Enneli, P (eds) *Societal Peace and Ideal Citizenship for Turkey*, Plymouth: Lexington
- Donovan, J (2000) *Feminist Theory*, London: Continuum International Publishing

- Dootson, S (1995), An In debth Study of Triangulation, *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 22
- Dornyei, Z (2007), *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Ebert, T. (1991), “The Difference of Post Modern Feminism”, *College English*, Vol. 53, No 8
- Evans, M (1994), *The Women Question*, London: Sage
- Eisenstein, Z (ed) (1979) *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*, New York: Monthly Review Press
- Eisenstein, Z (1993), *The Radical Future of Liberal Feminism*, Boston: Northeastern University Press
- Elmire R, Schmied V, Jackson, D and Wilkes L (2011), “Interviewing people about potentially sensitive topics”, *Nurse Researcher*, Vol. 19 No 1
- Enloe, C (1990), *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*, Berkeley: University of California Press
- Erdal, M (1997), *Rape whilst under Police Custody, (Gozaltinda Tecavuz)* Istanbul: Civi Publishers
- Evans, M (1994) (ed) *The Women Question*, London: Sage
- Farrelly, C (2011) “Patriarchy and Historical Materialism”, *Hypatia*, Vol. 26 No 1
- Ferguson, K (1999) “Patriarchy”, *Women’s Studies Encyclopedia*, Vol. 2
- Firestone, S (1970), *The Dialectic of Sex*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Girouse
- Gause, G (1999), “Systematic Approaches to Middle East International Relations” *International Studies Review*, Vol. 1 No 1
- Geetha, V (2007), *Patriarchy*, Calcutta: Stree Press

- Ghoussaub, M and Sinclair-Webb, E (2000), *Imagined Masculinities: Male Identities and Culture in the Middle East*, London: Saqi
- Goldberg, S (1979), *Male Dominance*, London: Sphere Books
- Groenhout, R (2002), "Essentialist challenges to Liberal Feminism", *Social Theory and Practice*, Vol. 28, No 1
- Hartmann, H (1981), "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union" in McCann, S and Kim, S (ed) *Feminist Theory Reader*, London: Routledge
- Haynes, J (2010) "Politics, Identity and Religious nationalism in Turkey: From Ataturk to the AKP", *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 64 No 3
- Hennessy, R (2003), "Class", in (ed) Eagleton, M, *Feminist Theory*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing
- Habermas, J (1989), *The Structural Transformation of the Political Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, translated by Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge MA: MIT Press
- Hennik, M and Hutter, I and Bailey, A (2011), *Qualitative Research Methods*, London: Sage Publications
- Heper, M (1985), *The State Tradition in Turkey*, Hull: The Eothen Press
- Heper, M (2005), "Civil Military Relations in Turkey: Toward a Liberal Model?" *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 12, No 2
- Heper, M (2005), "The Justice and Development Party Government and the Military in Turkey", *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 6, No 2
- Hirschmann, N (1996) "Domestic Violence and the Theoretical Discourse of Freedom", *Frontiers : A journal of Women Studies*, Vol. 16, No 1

- Holland, J and Ramazanoglu, C (2002) *Feminist Methodology*, London: Sage Publications
- Holvino, E (2010), "Intersections: The simultaneity of Race, Gender and Class in Organization Studies", *Gender, Work and Organisation*, Vol. 117, No 3
- Hooks, B (1978), "Ain't I a women" in Wallace, M , *Black Macho and the Myth of the Super Women*, New York: Dial
- Hooks, B (2010), "Feminism: A movement to end sexist oppression" in (ed) McCann, S and Kim, S *Feminist Theory Reader*, London: Routledge
- Hooks, B (1981), *Ain't I a Woman*, London: Pluto
- Hughes, C, (2002) *Key Concepts in Feminist Theory and Research*, London: Sage
- Hunnicutt, G (2009), "Varieties of Patriarchy and Violence Against Women", *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 15, No 9
- Humm, M (1989), *The Dictionary of Feminist Theory*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Ince, B (2012), *Citizenship and Identity in Turkey*, London: I.B Tauris
- Ince, B (2012), "Citizenship Education: Inclusive and Exclusive", *Oxford Review of Education*, Vol. 38 No 12
- Ismael, S and Ismael J (2000), Gender and State in Iraq, (ed) Joseph, S, *Gender and Citizenship in the Middle East*, New York: Syracuse University Press
- Kadina Yonelik Aile Ici Siddet Konusunda Ilkogretim Ikinci Kademe ve Lise Ogrencilerinin Tutumlari, (Domestic Violence Against Women, Attitudes of Elementary and High School Students)* United Nations Population Fund, 2013
- Kadioglu, A (2005), "Can we Envision Turkish Citizenship as non membership?" in (eds) Keyman, F and Icduygu, A, *Citizenship in a Global World*, New York: Routledge

- Kadioglu, A (1996), The Paradox of Turkish Nationalism and the Construction of Official Identity, *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 32, No 2
- Kain, P (1992), "Modern Feminism and Marx", *Studies in Soviet Thought*, Issue 44
- Karaosmanoglu, A (2011) "Transformation of Turkey's Civil Military Relations Culture and International Environment" *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 12 No 2
- Kardam, F and Cengiz, K (2011), "Republican Citizenship in Turkey: Historical development, perceptions and practices", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 47 No 1
- Kahraman, H (2005), "The Cultural and Historical Foundation of the Turkish Citizenship" in (eds) Keyman, F and Icduygu, A *Citizenship in a Global World*, New York: Routledge
- Kandiyoti, D (1991), *Women, Islam and the State*, London: Macmillan
- Kandiyoti, D (1987), "Emancipated but Unliberated? Reflections on the Turkish Case", *Feminist Studies*, Vol. 13, No 2
- Kandiyoti, D (1991), "Identity and its Discontents", *Millennium*, Vol. 20, No 3
- Kandiyoti, D (2000), "The awkward relationship: Gender and Nationalism," *Millennium*, Vol. 6
- Kandiyoti, D (1988), "Bargaining With Patriarchy", *Gender and Society*, Vol. 9, No 3
- Kandiyoti, D (2000), "Foreword", in (ed) Joseph, S, *Gender and Citizenship in the Middle East*, New York: Syracuse University Press
- Kandiyoti (2007), "Old Dilemmas or New Challenges? The Politics of Gender and Reconstruction in Afghanistan", *Development and Change*, Vol. 38 No 2
- Kaygusuz, O and Icduygyu, A (2010), "The Politics of Citizenship By Drawing Borders: Foreign Policy and the Construction of National Citizenship", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 40 No 6
- Keddie, N (2007), *Women in the Middle East*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press

- Keskin-Kozat, B (2003), "Entangles in Secular Nationalism, Feminism and Islamism", *Cultural Dynamics*, Vol. 15
- Jeffreys, S (1977), "The Need for Revolutionary Feminism", *Scarlett Women* No 5
- Joseph, S and Slyomovics (2001), *Woman and Power in the Middle East*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania
- Jenkins, G (2007), "Continuity and Change: Prospects for Civil Military Relations In Turkey", *International Affairs*, Vol. 83, No 2
- Joseph, S (1994), "Brother / Sister Relationships: Connectivity, Love and Power in the Reproduction of Patriarchy in Lebanon", *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 21, No 1
- Joseph, S (1993), "Connectivity and Patriarchy among Urban Working Class Arab Families in Lebanon, *Ethos*, Vol. 21, No 4
- Joseph, S (1997), "The public/private imagined boundary in the imagined nation/State/community", *Feminist Review*, Issue 57
- Joseph, S, ed. (2000). *Gender and Citizenship in the Middle East*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Joseph, S (1996), "Gender and Citizenship in Middle Eastern States", *MERIP*, Vol. 26
- Keskin, E and Yurtsever, L (2006), *It is all real, Sexual Violence Caused by the State*, (Hepsi Gercek, Devlet Kaynakli Cinsel Siddet), Istanbul: Punto publishers
- Keyman, F and Icduygu, A (2003), "Globalisation, Civil Society and Citizenship in Turkey: Actord, Boundaries and Discourses", *Citizenship Studies*, Vol. 7 No 2
- Kogacioglu (2005), "Citizenship in Context, Rethinking Women's Relationship to the Law" in (ed) Birtek, F and Dragonas, T, *Citizenship and the Nation-State in Greece and Turkey*, NY: Routledge

- Kawulich, C (2005) Participant Observation as a Data Collection Method, *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, Vol. 6 No 2
- Kreps, B (2010), "Radical Feminism" in McCann, S and Kim, S (ed) *Feminist Theory Reader*, London: Routledge
- Kellough, E (2006) *Understanding Affirmative Action*, Washington: Georgetown University Press
- Kimmel, M (2002), "Gender Symmetry in Domestic Violence" in *Domestic Violence*, Vol. 18, No 11
- Lakoff, G (1996) *Moral Politics*, Chicago: Chicago University Press
- Lafta, R, Al-Saffar, A, Elisa, S and Al-Nuaimi, M (2008) "Gender Based Violence: A Study of Iraqi Woman" *Interpersonal Social Science Journal*, Vol. 192
- Landes, D and Landes, R (2001), "Girl Power: Do Fundamentalists Fear Our Women?" *New Republic*
- Lan, P (2000), "Bargaining With Patriarchy: Taiwanese Women Hiring Migrant Domestic Workers", *Anthropology of Work Review*, Vol. 21, Issue 3
- Lerner, G (1986), *The Creation of Patriarchy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Lewis, G (2009), "Celebrating Intersectionality? Debates on a multi-faceted concept in Gender Studies: Themes from a conference" , *European Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 16 Issue 3
- Lewis, S, Zamith, R and Hermida, A (2013), "Content Analysis in an Era of Big Data: A Hybrid Approach to Computation and Manual Methods" *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, Vol. 157 No 1
- Lewis, B (1989), "The Map of the Middle East: A Guide For the Perplexed" *American Scholar*, Vol. 58, Issue 1

- Lindsay, J and Perlesz, A (2003) "Methodological Triangulation Data in Research Families: Making Sense of Dissonance", *Social Research Methodology*, Vol. 6, No 1
- Locke, J (1939) "An essay concerning the true original, extent and end of civil government" in Burt E, *English Philosophers from Bacon to Mill*, New York: Random House
- Martinez, A and Beitler, R (2010), *Women's Role in the Middle East and North Africa*, California: Greenwood
- Mahmood, S and Hirschkind C (2002), Feminism, The Taliban and Politics of Counter-Insurgency, *Anthropological Quarterly*, Vol. 75, No 2
- Mahmood, S (2001), "Feminist Theory, Embodiment and the Docile Agent: Some Reflections on the Egyptian Islamic Revival", *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 16 No 2
- Mardin, S (1990), "European Culture and the Development of Modern Turkey" in (ed) Evin, A and Denton, G, *Turkey and The European Community*, Budrich: Opladen
- Marshall and Rossman (1995) *Designing Qualitative Research*, Los Angeles: Sage
- Mays, N and Pope, C (1995), "Rigour and Qualitative Research", *Qualitative Research*, Vol. 311
- Melander, Enk (2005), Political Gender Equality and State Human Rights Abuse, *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol.. 42, No.2
- Miller, R (2007), "Reproduction, Sexuality and Citizenship in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey", *Signs*, Vol. 32, No 2
- Michaelsen, J (2012), "Emotional Distance to So-Called Difficult Patients" *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Studies*, Vol. 26
- Mitchell, J (1974), *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*, New York: Pantheon
- Millet, K (1977), *Sexual Politics*, London: Virago Press

- Mohanty, C and Russo, A and Torres, L, (1982) (eds) *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press
- Moghadam, V (2004), "Patriarchy in Transition", *Journal of Comparative Studies*, Vol. 35 Issue 2
- Morrisey, S (2003), "Patriarchy on Trial: Suicide, Discipline and Governance in Imperial Russia", *The Journal of Modern History*, March, No 75
- Murrin, J, (1989) "Political Development" in Jack, P and Pole, R (eds), *Colonial British Americans Essays on the New History of the Early Modern Era*, Baltimore
- Nash, J (2008), "Rethinking Intersectionality", *Feminist Review*, Issue 89
- Oberst, M (1993), "Possibilities and Pitfalls in Triangulation", *Research in Nursing and Health*, Vol. 16 No 6
- Onal, A (2008), *Honor Killing*, London: Saqi
- Opdenakker, R (2006) "Advantages and Disadvantages of Four Interview Techniques", *Qualitative Research Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, Vol. 7 No 4
- Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ortner, S B (1974), "Is female to male as nature is to culture?" in, M. Z. Ronaldo and L. Lamphey in eds *Women, Culture, Society* (eds) Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp 68-87
- Phillips, K (2006), 'Rhetorical Manoeuvres: Subjectivity, Power and Resistance', *Philosophy & Rhetoric*. Vol.39 No.4
- Parla, A (2001) "Honor of the State: Virginity Examinations in Turkey", *Feminist Studies* Vol. 27 No 1
- Pateman, Carole (1988), *The Sexual Contract*, Cambridge: Polity Press

- Phillips, A (2010), "What's wrong with essentialism?", *Dinstinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 11, No 1
- Phillips, A (1991), *Engendering Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Plumwood, V (1993) *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*, London: Routledge
- Pope, N and Pope, H, (2004) *Turkey Unveiled*, New York: Overlook Press
- Reinharz, S (1992), *Feminist Methods in Social Research*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Redfern, S and Norman, J (1994), "Validity Through Triangulation", *Nurse Researcher*, Vol. 2 No 2
- Rice, G (2010), Reflections on Interviewing Elites, *Area*, Vol. 42, No 1
- Ridgeway, C (2009), "Framed Before We know it: How Gender Shapes Social Relations", *Gender and Society*, Vol. 23, No. 2
- Roded , R (ed) (1999), *Women in Islam and the Middle East*, London: IB Tauris
- Rosaldo. R (1993), "Notes towards a critique of Patriarchy from a male position", *Anthropological Quarterly*, Vol. 66, No 2
- Rossi, A (1970) *Essays on Sex Equality*, Chicago: Chicago University Press
- Salman, M, Kazi, M, Yuval-Davis, N, Al-Hamdeni, C, Batman, S and Lerman, D (1987), *Women in the Middle East*, London: Zed Books
- Said, E (1978), *Orientalism*, London: Vintage Books
- Salyers, M, Bosworth, H, Swanson, J, Lamb-Pagone, J and Osher, F (2000), "Reliability and Validity of the SF-12 Health Survey among people with severe mental illness", *Medical Care*, Vol. 38 No 11
- Silverman, D (2011) *Interpreting Qualitative Data*, London: Sage
- Sinha, M (2010) "Gender and Nation", in (ed) McCann, S and Kim, S *Feminist Theory Reader*, London: Routledge

Shorideh, F, Ashktorab, T and Yaghmaei, F (2012) "Iranian Intensive Core Unit: Nurses More Distress: A Content Analysis" *Nursing Ethics*, Vol. 19 No 4

Swift, A and Draper, A (2010), Qualitative Research in Nutrition and Dietetics: Data Collection Issues, *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*, Issue 24

Stone, N (2012), *Turkey A Short History*, London: Thames & Hudson

Sturges J and Hanrahank K (2004), Comparing telephone and face to face qualitative interviewing: A Research Note" *Qualitative Research* Vol. 4 No 1

Sharabi, Hisham (1988), *Neopatriarchy: A Theory of Distorted Change in Arab Society*, New York: Oxford University Press

Somer, M (2007), Moderate Islam and Secularist Opposition in Turkey: Implications for the World, Muslim and Secular Democracy, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 128, No 7

Spivak, G (1988), "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in Nelson, C and Lawrence G, *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press

Tekeli, S (1981) "Women in Turkish Politics", in (ed) Abadan-Unat, N, *Women in Turkish Society*, Leiden: E.J Brill

Türkiye'de Kadına Yönelik Sıddet (Violence Against Women in Turkey), *Prime Ministry of Turkish Republic*, Ankara, 2009

Umberson, D, Anderson, K, Glick, J and Shapiro, A (1998), "Domestic violence, Personal Growth and Gender", *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 60, No 2

Walby, Sylvia (1990), *Theorising Patriarchy*, London: Blackwell

Windle and Kulczycki (2011), Honor Killings in Middle East and North Africa: A Systematic Review of the Literature, *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 17, no 11

Whelehan, I (1995), *Modern Feminist Thought*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

- White, J (2005), "The Paradox of New Islamic Women in Turkey" in (eds) Okkenhaug, I and Flaskerud, I, *Gender and Religion and Change in the Middle East*, Oxford: Berg
- White, J (2003) "State Feminism, Modernisation and The Turkish Republican Women", *NWSA Journal*, Vol. 15, No 3
- Weinhardt, L, Forsyth, A, Carey, M, Jaworsk, B and Durant, L (1998), "Reliability and validity of Self-Report Measure of HIV related Sexual Behavior : Progress since 1990 and Recommendations for Research and Practice", *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, Vol. 27 No 2
- Williams, J (2000), *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What To Do About It*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Wind, G (2008), "Negotiated interactive observation: Doing Fieldwork in Hospital Settings", *Anthropology & Medicine*, Vol. 15 No 2
- Wollstonecraft, M (1975), *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*, Baltimore: Penguin
- Vali, F (1971), *Bridge Across the Bosphorous: The Foreign Policy of Turkey*, London: John Hopkins University Press
- Vardar, D (2005), "European Union-Turkey Relations and the Question of Citizenship" in (eds), Keyman, F and Icduygu (2004), *A Citizenship in a Global World*, New York: Routledge
- Yuval-Davis (1997), *Gender and Nation*, London: Sage
- Zahedi, A (2011), "Muslim American Women in the Post 11-September era", *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 3 No 2
- Zuhrer, E (2004), *Turkey: A Modern History*, London: I.B Tauris