

21554

SEXUAL DIMENSIONS OF THE POWER RELATIONS  
WHICH MANIFEST VIOLENCE

Zeynep Dilek Hattatoglu

B.A. in Journalism and Public Relations,  
University of Istanbul, 1982.

Submitted to the Institute for Graduate Studies in  
Social Sciences in partial fulfillment of  
the Requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts  
in  
Sociology

Y. O.  
Yükseköğretim Kurulu  
Merkezi  
Dokümantasyon  
Bogaziçi University

1992

SEXUAL DIMENSIONS OF THE POWER RELATIONS  
WHICH MANIFEST VIOLENCE

APPROVED BY

Doç. Dr. Nilüfer Göle.....  
(Thesis Advisor)

Prof. Dr. Faruk Airtok.....

Yard. Doç. Nükhet Sirman.....

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The starting point of this thesis is my need to understand the violence we are subject to in our daily lives. The strength of this need made my ties with the thesis strengthen. On the other hand, it led to some difficulties; to adjust the analytic distance which is necessary for formulating and teorising a thesis was quite difficult for me.

Nilüfer Göle, my thesis advisor, was a person made it possible that I could design my concern as a sociological subject. Also, thanks to her guidance, I was not lost in the dispersion of my thoughts. And she gave me freedom for clarifying and organizing my thoughts- if she preferred to determine my mind, it would be very easy for her. I owe special thanks to her for both this freedom she gave me and her guidance which is far from an imposition and ambiguity, and her intellectual enthusiasm.

Faruk Birtek and Nükhet Sirman, who both read my drafts, contributed also to clarify and to organize my thoughts with their stimulating criticisms, and enthusiastic intellectual support. I thank them.

Müserref Hattatoğlu, allowing me to reach the case files which are the materials for the research of this thesis, saved me from bureaucracy.

Erol Özbek's presence is very special to me for he did not leave me alone for these thesis-years, and supported me with faith, and he gave me his time for discussing my thesis subjects whenever I need, and he was very patient for solving my problems with computers.

Tülin Altan, when even the thoughts about this thesis did not exist, was a person shared the thoughts which were stimulated by the violences she subjected to, with me. Also, she gave me her many days for improving my thesis-language. I owe special debt to her.

And the last but not the least, I want to thank 18 persons for their approval in answering my questions about their private lives, they had courage and self-confidence to such extent that they allowed me, a stranger to them- make some aspects of their private lives the material of a research.

Istanbul, Mart 1992

SEXUAL DIMENSIONS OF THE POWER RELATIONS  
WHICH MANIFEST VIOLENCE

This study is an attempt to understand the existence ground of violence which is experienced in the power relations in daily lives of the ordinary persons who are not classified as beyond the normal according to any standards, with focusing on the sexual dimensions. The research this thesis based on was completed in 1988, in Istanbul.

ŞİDDETE YOL AÇAN İKTİDAR İLİŞKİLERİNİN  
CİNSİYET BOYUTLARI

Bu çalışma, herhangi bir şekilde normaldişi olarak nitelenemeyecek sıradan insanların gündelik hayatlarındaki iktidar ilişkilerinde yaşadıkları şiddetlerin varoluş temellerini, cinsiyetlere ilişkin boyutlarında odaklaşarak anlamayı amaçlıyor. Tezin dayandığı araştırma, 1988 yılında İstanbul'da yapıldı.

## CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	PART ONE: CONCEPTUAL APPROACH.....	6
	Discussion on the basic concepts of this thesis	
	A) Violence.....	6
	B) Power and Power Relations.....	16
	C) Sexuality.....	18
III.	PART TWO: PRESENTATION OF THE STUDY.....	21
	A) Hypotheses.....	21
	B) Design of The Study.....	21
	C) The Cases.....	27
IV.	PART THREE: GENERAL INTERPRETATION OF THE CASES...122	
	A. Connections between social structure and violence.....122	
	1. The ideal and the real	
	a. The ideal family relations, male and female stereotypes	
	b. Denial of violence in ideal relations	
	c. Meaning of denial of violence in ideal relations	
	2. Manifestations of violence	
	a. Violence between inequals: the beating	
	b. Violence between equals: the quarrel and the fight	
	c. Justification of violence	
	3. Violence as a communication tool	
	B. Sexuality and violence.....140	
	1. Tension between male and female	
	2. Relations through social roles	
	C. Suitability of violence.....148	
V.	CONCLUSION.....	152
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	155
	REFERENCES NOT CITED.....	158

## I. INTRODUCTION

I started this thesis by asking why people quarrel for most trivial reasons, for instance in the city bus? Or why stepping on one's feet causes, at least, a fierce discussion? In other words, what are you violating by stepping on one's feet?

Arguments about our society or speaking more generally, some societies "having a tendency towards violence" did not seem to me as a proper basis in search of these answers. While similar reasons for violence seemed strange to me, others in different societies may be irritated by situations in which they would not perform violence, but where actual violence emerges and, even if one accepts the concept of tendency towards violence, it has to be found out why and in which conditions a society becomes more tended towards violence. That is one aspect.

On the other hand there is a certain social machine behind any behavior of knocking at the door of a known or friendly person and expecting him/her to let one in. And, laughing about "women gags", "from man to man" or "chat on men" among women, corresponding, in fact, to a very serious ideological attitude. That is, we are expected to act by learnt behaviours, thus taking position on a prevailing (presently dominating) balance of powers at a cultural

level. Although in other circumstances these limits may also be applied by me, this hurts me.

It was this feeling of being hurt that caused me to work out this thesis. Aiming at an understanding of the causes of this being offended and beyond that, an understanding of the attitudes upon which our lives are built on and that social machine that feeds these attitudes, produces and reproduces them.

Still, the theme of my thesis is more limited. The precise theme of my work is the sexual dimensions of power relations which manifest violence. That is, the sexual dimensions of those micro power relations that lead to events that are called in Turkish language as *siddet* (violence). Therefore the first necessity was to determine the Turkish concept of *siddet* (violence), that is to outline what is called as violence in Turkish language and, by starting out of the vocabulary meaning of the term and my own observations and deductions, to build a conceptual frame and provide a theoretical tool that would enable the evaluation of the concepts of violence held by the persons interviewed.

A difficulty I had to face in conceptualizing violence was that although I was thinking in Turkish language and working out a Turkish concept, my sources were in English. This in turn proved in another aspect to be useful and enabled me to make comparison.



The almost total lack of remarkable studies in Turkish was only a complicating element. I tried to draw the limits of the concept violence by discussing its components and on the other hand the terms violence is frequently connoted with.

Secondly, the concept of power had to be elaborated. What I needed was a discussion of power relations far beyond the political one, which emerge in every field of society, in this or that relationship and which are more than just a miniature of political power. I borrowed this concept from Michel Foucault, but there is almost no discussion about Foucault in this text, because my aim was to interpret my own research data based on the conceptual ground provided by Foucault.

That violence emerges out of a power relation and that violence is only possible where there is power, is a basic assumption.\* The other one is that the manifestation of the immanent violence in every power relations depends on a threat against that power itself or the owners of it. This threat is not to be necessarily a concrete, visible or physical one. Rather, is an "imaginary violation". As for sexuality, it's seen that in our society -I mean all communities within Turkey's territory- the female status is a low one relative to male status.\* In questioning the emergence of violence within micro power

---

\*It is stated that the comprehension of violence of a component of social order is a Weberian interpretation. (See: Copet-Rouger, and see: Parkin.)

relations, the relations dealt with were personal -private and close environment relations as experienced by everyone in their own specific situation. I tried to find out if we may speak of "subordinated" in power relations as "female" and of "superior" as "male".

Since I want to examine the violence in everyday power relations, I had to exclude violence of a specific group, i.e. "criminals", or violence that could be interpreted as a result of a special psychological situation, i.e. "pathological feelings" or "madness". With this objective, I choose the interviewed persons who had to provide the data on which my study is based, out of people who had quarrelled but in no way transgressed the limits of socially accepted as legitimate. All of the 18 interviewed persons were from "lower culture group", with an education lower than university and within the ages of 18-65. 13 of them had not use any weapon, the remaining five were never in court because of a quarrel or fight or of any other cause.

In the interviews with these 18 persons I let each of them tell a quarrel (*kavga*).<sup>\*</sup> This could be any event

---

\*The lower status of women is proven by various women studies. But if those who bear qualities attributed to female may be regarded as "female", despite biologically being not female, that is, if they might put on the same status as women and if they are subordinated in power relations because of this, is, in my opinion, another matter.

they were involved themselves, they witnessed or just imagined. They further answered my questions on their private lives and private relations. All these provided me their conceptions of the world. By analyzing these conceptions I examined whether the world they live in is a common one, and if it is, interpreted their power relations in that world and the identities of "female" and "male" within these power relations and finally the role of these elements in the emergence of violence.

---

\*The English equivalent of the Turkish word *kavga* is a problem. The concept of *kavga* includes the allusion of physical force, but it is not necessary to use of it. In *kavga*, the use of physical force is a decision of actors which depends on the balance of power relations. So I prefer to use the word quarrel for concept of *kavga*. Other possible word was fight, but it has too strong meaning (necessity of using physical force) for *kavga*, it is rather synonym of *dövüş*.

## II. PART 1: CONCEPTUAL APPROACH

### Discussion On The Basic Concepts In This Thesis

This thesis aims at examining the sexual dimensions of violence that emerges in power relations. Thus the basic concepts in the development of the hypotheses of this work, in the interpretation of the research and finally in proving the hypotheses, are violence, power/power relations, and sexuality. First the implications and the limits of these terms will be discussed and then conceptual framework of this research will be formed.

#### A. VIOLENCE

Because of the diversity and confusingness in most everyday speaking, violence is a term that is conceptualized with quite different contents and limits, and is especially hard to define. Since the research of this thesis is made among Turks in Turkey, the concept of violence to be used had also to be the concept in the Turkish language. But Turkish studies on the meaning covered by the Turkish term for violence, *siddet*, on what violence is and on violence at all, are very scarce. Besides, there was no source available on the term violence in Turkish language other than my own observations and

reflections.<sup>1</sup> For this reason I will first refer to Turkish studies on violence and discuss their concepts. Then, I will put forward a comparison of the violence concepts in English and in French, in order to develop a proper and practical conceptual framework in Turkish for this research.

Turkish studies on violence concentrate mainly either on political violence/terror or murder, homicide and blood feud. The studies on political violence, perhaps because of their objective to enlighten the relations from which political violence emerges and upsurges, perhaps because of the almost total lack of reference sources in this field of violence, did not attempt to work out a concept of violence "indigenous" to Turkish.<sup>2</sup>

There are two studies (known to me) on murder and blood feud as a special division of murder. One of them Mahmut Tezcan's *Kan Gütme Olayları Sosyolojisi*, was not available to me. The other is Serap Özgür's master thesis, titled *Social Psychological Patterns in Homicide of Male and Female Inmates*. Unfortunately, perhaps because examined a very specific type of violence, Özgür did not

---

<sup>1</sup> Reflecting on violence makes my "natural knowledge" that springs from belong to and living in this society become confused.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Keleş, Ruşen and Unsal, Artun; *Kent ve Siyasal Sıddet*, 1982. And also Ergil, Doğu; *Türkiye'de Terör ve Sıddet*, 1980.

attempt an elaborated conceptualization of violence and contented with using Palmer's social psychological concept instead.

Common to all of these studies mentioned above, they see violence as a social phenomenon that has to be eliminated, and the way, the place and the factors of its emergence have to be determined with this objective. Consequentially, Keleş and Ünsal (referred in footnote 2) concern that which approaches can be applied to socio-economical structure for the policies aimed to prevent violence can be put into effect,<sup>3</sup> while Özgür directly elaborates on possible short and long term measures to prevent homicide.<sup>4</sup> Apart from their internal consistence and the validity of their results, I have to state that, at least for this thesis, I do not find this attitude of "problem solving" to be efficient.

It might be said that despite this objection, these studies would, in their quality of being studies referring to Turkey, provide information on the immanent qualities of the phenomenon violence in Turkish/Turkey. But this involved the risk of transferring the concepts about violence they lean upon and through them their connotations as well.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Keleş and Ünsal, *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Özgür, *ibid.*

The explanation of the word *siddet* (violence) in Turkish might provide some clues. According to the Turkish Dictionary of the "Türk Dil Kurumu", violence means:<sup>5</sup>

- "1. The grade of a action or force, intensity, hardness.
2. Speed: Violence of the wind.
3. Fig.: (About emotions or behaviour) Extremeness.(...)
4. Use of brute force against opposite thinking persons, instead of persuading or settling. Show violence: behaving rough, rude. Event of violence: an event created or action performed in order to humiliate/frustrate the environment. Make use of violence:use brute force. With violence: in a strong way/manner."

The same dictionary defines brute force as: "a way chosen in order to achieve an intention/purpose by unlawful actions".<sup>6</sup>

The dictionary "Hayat Büyük Türk Sözlüğü" states about this term:<sup>7</sup>

- "1. Enhancedness/tihgtness/firmness, excessiveness, exaggeration.

---

<sup>5</sup> See, Türk Dil Kurumu, *Türkçe Sözlük*, Vol.2.,p.1120.

" 1. Bir devininin, bir gücün derecesi, yeğinlik, sertlik.  
 2. Hız:Rüzgarın şiddeti.  
 3. Mecazi (duygu ve davranış için): aşırılık.(...)  
 4. Karşıt görüşte olanlara, inandırma ya da uzlaştırma yerine kaba kuvvet kullanma. Şiddet göstermek: kaba, sert davranmak. Şiddet olayı: çevreyi sindirmek için yaratılan eylem ya da girilen eylem. Şiddete, başvurmak: kaba kuvvet kullanmak.Şiddetle: güçlü bir biçimde."

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. "Yasadışı eylemlerle bir amaca ulaşmak için tutulan yol."

<sup>7</sup> *Hayat Büyük Sözlüğü*.

"1. Peklik, fazlalık, mübalaga.  
 2. Sertlik, sert muamele, cezada aşırılık:şiddet göstermek.  
 3. Müsaadesizlik, sıkılık."

2. Hardness/roughness, rough treatment, excessive/overdone punishment: showing violence.
3. Unpermissiveness, rigidness/strictness."

The Ottomanic-Turkish dictionary of Özön:<sup>8</sup>

- "1. Enhancedness/tightness/firmness, being much/excessive.
2. Hardness/roughness...."

The word *sedid*<sup>9</sup> (violent) that derived from the same vocabular root is defined as

- "1. Hard/rough, rigid/bold.
2. Tight.."

and *sedide* as "mischief/calamity, big pain."

Before defining the common points of these vocabular definitions we have to state the viewpoint of these definitions. The first two definitions are clearly made from the viewpoint of government. It is evident that these definitions have a serious defect of justifying "violence" of state power. While the third definition consists of rather neutral expressions, the word "sedide" that originates from the same verbal root is connoted directly by the viewpoint of those afflicted by violence.

Another common theme is hardness/strength and rigidness/ boldness, excessiveness. Although these terms

---

<sup>8</sup> Özön, Mustafa Nihat; *Büyük Osmanlıca-Türkçe Sözlük*, "1. Peklik, çokluk. 2. sertlik..."

<sup>9</sup> "Sedit: 1. Sert, katı. 2. Sıkı..."  
 "Sedide: Bela, büyük sıkıntı."



physical implications, there is no word about use of physical force.

### 1. Anglo-Saxon and French Notions of Violence

The term violence in English means mainly physical aggression, mostly having connoted unjustified use of physical force.<sup>10</sup> Social scientists who worked on this field agree that the term violence in English strongly includes the meaning of physical force.<sup>11</sup>

Stating that the Anglo-Saxon meaning of violence includes not only causing "physical hurt but also that it is illegitimate", David Riches considers violence in his article "*The phenomenon of violence*"<sup>12</sup> an intentional resource at theoretical level, and analyses "why, from among other alternatives, people specifically choose violence to strive for their goals."<sup>13</sup>

According to this analysis there are four basic properties, that "reveal violence to be unique among social acts" and that "have cross-cultural validity":

- "1. The performance of violence is inherently liable to be contested on the question of legitimacy.
2. The discrepancy in basic understandings amongst those implicated in the performance of a

---

<sup>10</sup> See: *The New Grolier Webster International Dictionary of the English Language*. Vol 2, 1971.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Riches, Parkin, Moeran, Copet-Rougier.

<sup>12</sup> Riches, David; "The Phenomenon of Violence", in *The Anthropology of Violence*. pp 1-27.

<sup>13</sup>. Ibid. p.5.

violent act, or in experiencing a violent image, is likely to be minimal: in its key sense, as the 'contestable giving of physical hurt', violence is unlikely to be mistaken as such.

3. The practice of violence is highly visible to the senses.
4. The performance of violence to a moderate degree of effectiveness requires little by way of specialized equipment or esoteric knowledge. The manipulative and strength resources of the human body, and knowledge that these resources are capable of destroying physical objects, are sufficient to enable a minimally successful act of hurt against another human being."<sup>14</sup>

"The potency of violence stems from the way in which its four key properties make it highly appropriate both for practical (instrumental) and for symbolic (expressive) purposes...."<sup>15</sup>

In his analysis he reminds that even if in some cultures there are invisible phenomena of violence, like witchcraft and sorcery, its potency is still enabled by the assumption that they cause a visible result.

David Parkin finds that the term violence in English "has a primary sense of a) determination or destruction through physical force, which is regarded as b) beyond the law." And he emphasizes that, "This sense of violence clearly presupposes questions of institutionalized legitimacy...."<sup>16</sup>

In his article that deals with "the analytic potential in the relationship between the two notions of violence... between violence as physical destruction and

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid. p.11.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. p.11.

<sup>16</sup> Parkin, David; "Violence and Will", *ibid.* p.205.

'violence' as metaphysical desecration", he explains that,

"The former may seem to overlay the latter in many Western societies, possibly because in these societies the value given to the inviolability of private property for its own sake supersedes in importance notions of metaphysical and, so to speak, spiritual perfection or wholeness -breaking into a man's car is a more criminal offence than rudely disturbing him at prayer or while contemplating a work of art."<sup>17</sup>

In explaining the French notion of violence, Elisabeth Copet-Rougier elaborates: "In French there are two basic meanings. One relates to the English, and the other has the idea of 'exerting pressure on someone in order to make them comply'."<sup>18</sup> Starting from this second meaning, she comes to the concept of "constraint, or indirect violence."

Reflecting on the fact that in a given society, norms and rules of violence are well determined, Copet-Rougier emphasizes the strong relationship between violence and power: "Who or what says one instance is illegal, and another, if not legal, is at least part of the social order? The answer is: none other than that through which they are defined, namely power."<sup>19</sup>

In Copet-Rougier's approach, "the violence that perpetuates the social order contains within itself

<sup>17</sup> Ibid. p. 205.

<sup>18</sup> Copet-Rougier, Elisabeth; "'Le Mal Court': Visible and Invisible Violence in an Ancephalous Society- M̀kako of Cameroon". *ibid.* p.50. David Parkin reminds that this second meaning stressed by Copet-Rougier is covered in English by the term *violate*, that has *desecrate* as one of its major connotations. (Cf. Parkin, D.)

<sup>19</sup> Ibid. p.53.

barbarous forces of destruction. The power, all the power, that it reproduces has this wild and destructive element. For this reason power does not exist by itself, and in its capacity to reproduce also carries the capacity to destroy. As Michel Foucault suggested, 'Murder is the point at which history and crime meet...Killing sets up an ambiguity in the relationship between legitimation and illegality'.<sup>20</sup>

Another conception of violence that is not limited to the application of physical force is that of Bourdieu.<sup>21</sup> According to him, in opposition to direct violence that includes application of physical force, indirect violence has two types: "open violence" and "symbolic violence". While "open" violence functions through economic obligations, "symbolic" violence makes use of the manipulation of moral and affective-based obligations.

In another attitude, reminding that he accepts the symbolistic concept like Douglas and Leach, and develops a concept to examine the Andalusian society, John Corbin splits violence in two major groups:

"Physically it involves the application of force to distort, damage or destroy objects; mentally it involves violation of identities.  
Violation occurs whenever a term in the map is

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid. p.54. Cited by Copet-Rougier. Foucault, Michel: *Moi, Pierre Riviere, avant egorge ma mere, ma soeur et mon frere.* p.217.

<sup>21</sup> Bourdieu, Pierre: *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Cambridge. Cited by both Copet-Rougier and Riches. In *The Anthropology of Violence,* pp. 22 and 52.

threatened, the intensity of violation depending both on the strength of the threat and the importance of the term in the map."<sup>22</sup>

According to Corbin, conceptual experiences of violence provide for the comprehension of violence and for the mediation of knowledge of violence. These experiences not only includes physical force, but also the conceptual structures that justify and necessitate the use of physical force. And in every society all these are specific to that society.

Finally, I must say that I do not find the approaches useful that see the phenomenon of violence found in different forms in different societies as a manifestation, a surfacing of the archaic/primitive state of human. The fact that violence appears in different societies with different meanings and forms, shows that it is a phenomenon belongs to culture. And if there existed violence wherever man was present,<sup>23</sup> this does not mean anything more than the existence of situations, factors and dynamics that require violence to emerge. "Cruelty" as a measure of the emerging "violence" cannot be a practical criterion, as it does not include any common idea about even synchronic (I preferred this term instead of contemporary, because the latter seems excessively

---

<sup>22</sup> Corbin, John; "Insurrections in Spain: Casas Viejas 1933 and Madrid 1981". *ibid.* pp.29.

<sup>23</sup> See Ferrarotti, Franco; *Social Research, Violence Special Issue.*

ideological) societies.

As we focus on the "legitimacy and illegitimacy" aspect of violence in its definitions in various languages, it is seen that it is regarded as an immanent quality of violence. I find that it would not be wrong to take it as a basic/profound element of power relations. Doing this, we arrive at the second basic concept of this thesis: power and power relations.

## B. POWER AND POWER RELATIONS

Approaches that limit the concept of power to political power and to the level of politics would obviously be insufficient for the purpose of this thesis. If violence appears everywhere human beings live in, while its various manifestations differ according to time, place and environment, then the precondition of examining violence in combination with power relations would make us able to speak about a concept of an "omnipresent" power, as it is the case with violence.

An approach to power that can be present on every level and of social structure and also any spot, and external to other relations - "economic processes, informational and sexual relations" - can be found in Foucault's work.

If we accept that all human practices are possible only in a given time and place and within relations that

can be changed only within limits and limited conditions then we may accept, too, that on every place these relations are present, power can also be practiced.<sup>24</sup> But this should not be understood as the presence of miniature political powers in a given society, since Foucault emphasizes that power should be understood preeminently as "the plurality of the balances of power immanent to the field they are applied and making up their organizedness."<sup>25</sup>

According to Foucault, power is not an institution, a structure or a force owned by certain persons, but "it is the name given to a complex strategic relation in a given society."<sup>26</sup> And:

"Power, in the substantive sense, does not exist... in reality, power means relations, a more-or-less organised, hierarchical, co-ordinated cluster of relations."<sup>27</sup>

Consequently, to analyse power means directly the analysis of these micropower relations. From now on, the word power in this text will refer to micropower relations.

---

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Gordon, Colin, in *Power&Knowledge*, "Afterwords"

<sup>25</sup> Foucault, Michel: *Cinselligin Tarihi*. Vol.1. p.98. An English version of this book was not available to me, so I had to translate my citation from the Turkish translation mentioned above.

<sup>26</sup> Cited and translated into English by Gordon Colin. In *Power&Knowledge*.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

### C. SEXUALITY

In rough outlines, sexuality may be described as knowledge of having a sex, that is the knowledge related to how the sexes have to perceive themselves and each other and that takes shapes according to their own specific conditions of each society.

This knowledge does not realize the ways of relationship between the sexes only by banning, suppressing, ignoring or denying, on the contrary by paving the way, identifying, creating norms through sexual mechanisms.<sup>28</sup>

If we recognize sexuality as social knowledge with historical quality forming the way of knowing the human body and making it legitimate, then we have also to accept that the human body is subject to power, as well as it has the control over it. A highly clear example in this regard in our society is the notion of *namus* (honour). *Namus* or *haysiyet* (dignity) is the evaluation of the person as viewed by him/herself but also through the eye of the others.<sup>29</sup> For the female sex, *namus* also implies the idea of the woman's body owned by her family/community prior to herself and that the female person holds this knowledge.

---

<sup>28</sup> See Foucault, M.: *Cinselligin Tarihi*, Vol. 1. pp. 189-190.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Julian Pitt Rivers, "Honour and Social Status". In *Honour and Shame*.



Thus, sexuality is not only the knowledge of having a sex, but includes norms and rules about the way this knowledge will be experienced, and their ways of being practiced.

A last question is why sexuality has great significance regarding power relations. On this question various approaches may be developed, but personally I find Foucault's approach valid. As he formulates, "sexuality is rather relative to power relations... an intensive transition point. In power relations sexuality is... one of the most instrumental elements."<sup>30</sup>

In its sense of being a knowledge of having a sex, a significant aspect of sexuality consists of the roles of female and male in a society, as well as the ideologies about these roles.

If Turkish society is examined in this regard, it may be seen that women are shaped and exist at home and men in public places. Further, women appear as subordinated, ruled and decided upon while men appear superior, ruling, deciding.<sup>31</sup>

Meanwhile, the domains in which the sexes exist, whether public or private, are not separated from each other by strict, rigid, lasting limits. This state of being not strictly separated is "known" by those who live

---

<sup>30</sup> Foucault, M.; *Cinselligin Tarihi*. English translation of cited passages by me.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç.; Kandiyoti, Deniz; Başaran, Fatma.

in it, even if they are not much aware of it. Therefore the everyday relations in fact immanently require to be formed and reproduced at every moment.

In other words, women, like men, experience the roles assigned to them within power relations that are reproduced at every moment. Does this mean that situations of the man failing (being unable or not willing to) to fulfill the role of masculinity or not fulfilling expectations, would result in a "loss of masculinity", in a "femalization"? And if this assumption is valid, then at which point it would become a "crisis"? What is the understanding of the actors in this regard?<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> It is assumed that there happens no break from the norm, so the evaluation relates to the norm.

### III. PART 2: PRESENTATION OF THE STUDY

#### A) THE HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses of this study may be formulated in the following way. Violence is present in everyday power relations and immanent to them, while its manifestation depends on a threat to power. The threatening of power closely relates to a change in the ways the knowledge of having a sex is realized, as well as a change in the components of these ways. Thus it stands in a close relation to any excursion out of the positions that are determined within the domains in which the sexes are established, and to any attempt of changing these positions.

#### B) THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The material of this thesis was collected through face to face interviews, instead of the use of questionnaires. The "raw material" consists, therefore, of the full texts of these interviews. The interviewees were chosen from lower culture<sup>1</sup> groups, who supposedly experience violence more

---

<sup>1</sup>Not to be confused with "subculture" groups. (Cf. Stirling Paul: 1965; Rothschild, 1969; Tezcan, Mahmut: 1972; Unsal, Artun: 1973. Cited by Özgür, Serap.)

frequently. All of the persons are at least 18, -which is although often for practical reasons, frequently accepted as the limit of the socialization period-, but also far below the old age.

As another common feature is that, their schooling level was below higher education. In another country, this level might be regarded as too high for a lower culture group, but my suggestion was that, even if they enjoy a notable financial support from their family or are 'clever kösedönücüleri (pushers) who have found out how the system works', the only possibility to break with their social milieu (or strata) they come from, is through accomplishing a university education.

Finally, in selecting the 13 persons - who we can name as the main group- out of legal cases of Fatih Sulh Ceza Mahkemesi, I considered following criteria: Even if they are involved in acts of physically injuring against other persons, they had to use no kind of weapon, but any object of everyday use -a bread-knife, a stick, a pocket-knife etc. As for a second criterion, they had to have no criminal record, for I wanted to minimize the variables. Because my aim was not only to analyze the violence and its sexual dimensions but to analyze it among people who are lasting a life without conflicting with the judicial and penal bodies of the state. Not among "persons and milieus with an inclination toward criminality", which can be

characterized in terms of "psychology of criminals".<sup>2</sup> Another criterion I applied, was that their quarreling counterparts had to be the same sex.

The group including the other five persons, can be considered as a control group. Those are in no way involving in any legal offense. Therefore, it can be assumed that they are not involved in even minor legal cases, neither as offenders nor as victims or witnesses. As in the first group the women were overwhelmingly outnumbered by men, the second group includes more women. More importantly, all of five were relatives of my friends. This ensured a relatively greater trust in me, which although not eliminated completely the element of lying.

---

<sup>2</sup>Although, during the interviews I had to learn that distinguishing the persons without criminal records is not as easy as it seemed. The persons had lied to the court, because in this case they were involved in a minor offense, and thought in such an unimportant case, the court would not investigate to learn about their criminal record. There are two persons, who, I found out during the interview, have criminal records, and there is another one whom I strongly suspect also to have one. Despite this, I excluded one of formers -because of his drug addiction treatment and presently being an alcoholic- from my data. A main reason for this elimination was that their conception of the world which they told and which emerged from information they gave about their lives was in accordance with other people whom I was sure to have no criminal record -for, their words during my interview and in court, were not conflicting. Still it may be considered as unclear, if this common understanding of the world was rather the world of 'common people' who live inside the limits of law, or the world of those who made delicts or criminality an element of everyday life. My suggestion was that this understanding of the world of the majority that emerged from this study was the world of the majority, that means common people without criminal record. Still, I admit that this approach made it much easier to continue this study.

but for the most part it was replaced by quiet, withholding, bypassing of facts. The all interviews consist also of two parts: telling a quarrel (or fight) and information on their lives. Further there were discussion on the understanding of the world, which emerged from these two sources.

In the end, all persons, informed me on the power relation(s) in their private lives, the limits beyond which violence is generated -the formation of the family relationship-, as well as telling a fight they witnessed or were involved into, or they imagined. By doing this, they gave me also information on the place and function of violence in the world they are living in.

My reasoning was that the quarrels they would tell would be based on their conception of the world. It seemed not very likely that the ideology they openly or apparently defend would be absorbed in a degree that it would perfectly and closely fit into a lie they were just telling down in my presence. You had to take it for granted that they would lie. But they would not be able to tell down this lie, without falling in contradiction with the fictive or real relationships they would speak about. This suggestion proved valid, as the arguments they defended or seemed to defend were not confirmed neither in the fight they told, nor in other talk about their lives, or proved to have no effect on their behaviours. In short, my conclusion is that we can use the conception about the


world that emerges from the fight they told as a valid data -giving us the clues.

Secondly, I asked all the informants about their lives. And these questions unveiled the conception of the world that was the 'hinterland' of their lives. Consequently, the research would reveal two different conceptions of the world, perhaps two different power relationships, the roles of woman and man within these two relationships, the living spaces and domination fields coincided to woman and man, the limits of these fields of domination, the relationships between their determination and violence or directly the capacity of violence. Do the power relations, the attributed importance given to woman and man within these relationships and the panorama about the roles of violence in these power relationships, which were sorted out of these two data, coincide?

If the pictures which arise by comparing these two different conceptions of the world show a consistence or continuity, the first part of this study would have been accomplished. Then, leaning upon this data, we could speak of a general phenomenon that was obtained from individual cases. Discussion, whether it is a limited phenomenon or not, goes beyond the limits of this work. On this issue, I can only say that this phenomenon is valid among the groups with the characteristics which I studied. Also if we can prove that in a certain society, in a certain group the manifestation of violence depends on the power relations, in the same society but in another groups it depends on

power relations, too. But when we speak a different group, the threshold and the form of violence is to different. What peculiar to groups is not that violence emerges out of power relations, it is the threshold and the form of violence.

At this point, we can speak about a type of power relations is common among a certain section of Turkish society, and the characteristics of the relationship between the roles attributed to woman and man within this power relations and the performance or existence of violence. And this is the frame of this study.





## C) THE CASES

### 1.

M.Ç. 35. Female. Secretary. Mother of one child. Graduate from Ortaokul. Since more than ten years she has been living with a man who is married to another woman. This man is also the father of her child. In the judicial case which she is involved in she is the beaten party, the aggressor being the wife of the man she lives with.

MÇ portrays herself as a woman who underlines her conservativeness and her opposition to flirting, who is very nervous, but directs this nervousness inwards. This nervousness is carefully differentiated from a catty (*şirret*) and aggressive type of it. So, the wife of the man she has been living with is pictured as the latter kind. Though the resistance of the wife to divorce, despite the fact that her husband is living with another woman since more than ten years is explained by MÇ in terms of her character being evil, her marriage being a source of income; still there are some thoughts which leak through MÇ's explanation. These are that the wife cannot accept being left by her husband, tries to stress her quality as a desirable woman and for these reasons resists to divorce.

MÇ, for rationalizing her cohabitation, comments "so, one is changed by the life"; living together is in no way any desirable state and only a situation she accepts.

A state that is experienced when it is the only alternative to a civil marriage. So she declares their relationship to be actually under way since 15 years, but they decided to live together in the 7th year when both became convinced that the man could not manage to divorce and withstand the burdens of living alone. Further, birth of their son, now 6, was presented as an act upon the advise of a doctor, a friend of the couple. All these guarantee, in the eyes of MC, the purity of her relationship.

Thus MC as a mother and woman of a man tries to underline her respectability. And quarrel is not an element of her daily life. Quarrel is some kind of deviation which, although there are some "normal" ways, some people use for their own personal defects. As a matter of fact, MC is a person who does not quarrel except with "other woman".

The sole incident she specified as a quarrel and was unrelated to "this issue" happens in a city bus. In a speedy traffic she travels with her son and cautions the busdriver not to chat with the passengers nearby. She thinks, the driver being busy by a chat with two young woman, is not able to concentrate on traffic, and goes to him and she says, "Mr driver please be careful. You are not allowed to talk." The driver reacts by answering her, "you sit down, woman" , yet he stops his his talk. MC pointed clearly out she would not have engaged into this "quarrel" if her son was not with her.

However, it is commented that she experiences some

violence manifestations. And these manifestations even if in daily relations which to be idealized by MC cannot be explained by the performer's personal features. First example of this is the reactions of her family members to her relation. Although MC did not describe her family members as catty or aggressive, almost all members of her family performed violence to MC, according to her narration. Violence of her family can be classified as threatening -I'll break your legs-, using brute force -beating- and putting some restrictions -you'll not go to work, you'll sit at home. (They also discredit and humiliate her lover). Further, for MC, the violence which the members of her family performed to her is not a deviation, is not bad. She does not blame them. On the contrary, she considers that they must be expected to perform violence. Here the positiveness belongs not to violence, but to its reasons, i.e. living with a married man is socially badness and putting some reactions against this is an indicator of her family's honour. Here it can be said that MC makes an idealization and exaggerates her family members' reactions the desire of stressing her honour, but it is significant that this idealization and/or exaggeration has the elements of violence.

Other example is her "other" quarrel. The quarrel in question is to warn the driver. By this example, MC stated that she worried that her son would be afflicted, if a traffic accident would occur and for this reason she took

a sharp attitude. And here, performing violence or quarreling can not be explained by the performer's personal defects or features. For MC, what the reactions which are expected from persons are also changed in relation to their sexes: females to behave passively, males to behave actively as expected socially. And the persons who are presented by MC behave accordingly. For MC's presentation, her brothers take an active attitude and try to change MC's mind while her sisters content to worry about. But it is only what MC presents. Because at the narration, MC says that her sisters and her brothers came her office and caused a scandal: i.e. her sisters are not the persons who consent their fate. But from MC's presentation, we can conclude there is, at least in the eyes of MC, a social expectation that females behave passively and males actively. But existence of this kind of expectation does not ever mean that females do not perform violence when they decide it to be necessary, even if at MC's ideal presentation. When they face a situation that afflicts their status or their respectabilities, females, like males, may perform violence against the person who afflicts them.

Now, let me try to analyse two incidents of violence in MC's life, in detail. First one is the violence her family members perform against her. Other is the violence the wife of the man whom MC living with, performs. One of the most significant aspects of the violence which is performed by her family members seems

that it aims an end. However, their aim seems not to protect a social value, rather to achieve certain situation -to prevent her living with a married man, if this aim could not be achieved, to force her for marrying to the man in question. This result can be concluded from that they perform violence against her, for changing MC's mind when her relation was new. But MC does not give up her decision to live with the man who married another woman, the relation gains establishedness, and after a grandchild to the family was born this establishedness becomes legitimacy in the eyes of her family. Namely, the family recognizes her relation.

As for other example, it is difficult to explain that why the wife of the man prefers to disturb MC, instead of a divorce, for the information about this is very scarce. But it can be concluded (from MC's narration) that the wife of the man sees the leaving of her husband as the humiliation of her femininity and tries to imply that the woman her husband has preferred has lower status than hers when respectability in question. But whatever her cause is, this woman performs violence only against "other" woman. Not against her husband. It is meaningful that for showing violence to MC the wife of the man prefers especially the public places in which MC is with her friends. The wife also becomes aggressive to her husband but this aggressiveness is related with the "other" woman. She humiliates MC on her husband. Or MC presents the events

in this form. But, at least, the reason for the judicial case was of her being the beaten party. Briefly, at the relations MC presented, violence does not depend on the actors's personal features, but whatever the performers' personal tempers are, violence emerges as a tool which actors can use when their respectabilities or their status are afflicted.



2.

HK. Male. In his 40's. Director of a beerhouse in Topkapı. Studied at Egitim Enstitüsü. Because of his political past he did not allow me to record his voice on tape. Instead, he wrote about a quarrel that is not the one to be registered in the court archives from where I picked up his name.

His narration of the quarrel begins with meeting all the family members together in the garden of his father-in-law in a hot summer evening for dinner. During dinner alcohol is also consumed. Meanwhile, some noises from outside are heard by them. His father-in-law wants to look at what happens, but HK prevents him saying "don't disturb our peace". But as the father-in-law suggests some of the voices to be familiar to him, HK decides to go out and look. After putting his pijamas off, he dresses up and goes out. The scene is that two drunken men fight, two children (are about 8 and 10 years old) and a pregnant woman try to separate them, and the neighbours content with watching. The first point HK underlined is that the ones who to settle the fight are the two children and a pregnant woman. It should not be their task to separate a fight, as the some men watch. It is to be blamed to be contented with watching. And, he expresses his anger against this situation by rebuking the crowd, "You have fun, watching, eh?" Consequently -in consistence to his anger against the watching- he tries to separate the fighters. But one of the

men tells his wife -the pregnant woman- to give him his revolver from the handbag. The woman refuses to put it out, he slaps two times in her face -slapping a pregnant woman-, and as the slaps make her fell down, the man takes his gun and fires aiming at HK.

As the bullet zips near his feet, all the thought in his mind is to avoid it, and he immediately engages close fight. Soon, he knocks down the man and manages to get the gun from him. After he sends his brother-in-law to the police station to deliver the revolver he returns to dinner.

Meanwhile, during the fight, before directing his revolver to HK, the man has declares that he is a policeman and HK has answers him that "to be a policeman does not give you the right of shooting at me."

While still at the table "two carloads of policemen" -far too many regarding the importance of the incident- appear at home and take him in a rough manner to the police station. There, he is beaten and insulted. But despite everything, the normal procedure is followed: his interrogation officially completed and he is released from custody. According to what he learned later that policeman was fired from his job because other incidents of such kind.

This is a text underscores the fight on a highly justified ground. This justification is proved at two different levels. At the "citizen rights" level, and at the level of conditions and rules of quarrel and/or fight.



It is interesting that, for HK, to be right in a fight is not related with its cause(s), at least, directly. As a matter of fact, he does not concern with the questions of why these men fight, which one's cause is right, etc. He concerns only what the conditions in which the fight is continued are. So, he establishes his own justification on the ground which is proved these conditions. His interference with the fight is based on the rules of fight.

His rightness begins even before his interference with the fight. Because he considers that one of the fighting parties can be a familiar person to him, he leaves to dine with his family. His intention is to interfere with not any quarrel, but with a familiar person's case. But he "is forced" to interfere with a fight despite nobody familiar is involved in, because amidst of the event there are two little children and a pregnant woman. Further there is a crowd that does not intervene despite the necessity to and he dislikes the attitude of this crowd in moral terms. So, for illustrating them the right attitude, he enters the quarrel to separate the parties.

The second fighter is merely a detail. His presence in the fight has a function but HK tells us nothing about him. But the policeman is a person who slashes a pregnant woman, fires a revolver to a person who comes just to settle the quarrel, and misuses his duty. The policemen at the station back their colleague in a kind of "solidarity to a colleague". This backing begins with sending out

several patrol cars to bring HK from his home into the custody and continues with the beating and insulting of HK at the police station. But still there are the law of the state and the law has to be followed. So even if he spends a night in custody for nothing, the routine procedure is followed and HK is sent home. And thanks to the memory of the state -criminal records archive-, the incident results at the cost of that policeman.

Thus, HK presents himself as a man who has moral values, practicizes them within his own domination sphere -the family environment-.

Why do people quarrel? According to HK "they cannot stand it anymore and explode." But the explosion point of any person is different. This difference depends on one's own personal experiences. Everybody expresses these experiences in this or that point, that means they quarrel.

HK describes his temper as nervous but not aggressive, and adds that he does not quarrel because of his patriarchal gender. In a "*babaerkil*" (he means "*ataerkil*", i.e. patriarchal) family, the explosion is not or is not allowed to form quarrel. How does the patriarchal family structure prevent a person from entering quarrels? According to HK, in patriarchal family structure, the domination fields and status are strictly outlined. This certainty prevents, in its ideal form, the quarrel. In this ideal form, the quarrel may be, either a means which is used in the situations the boundaries of

domination has been trespassed or an action of the trespassing itself. HK claims that, in a patriarchal structure, the violence whose form is a quarrel is not necessary and because of this, it does not be manifested. This claim implies a supposed situation, not an existing one. In other words, it is merely the presentation of HK.

But, in the network of relations the punishment form of violence is accepted as a right of dominant. "Because it contradicted with my social opinion, I am against beating my wife.....I cannot think my wife committing a guilt that requires to be punished by beating. If I am convinced she did, then I try the legal ways. My relations of obedience with my wife are at a normal level."

He supposes there can be no wrongdoings but only guilts. Here are two things emphasized: He cannot even to think about anything requires beating and if it would occur it can only be a guilt that requires legal sanctions. Probably it would be related to sexuality, honour, or adultery. So it is regarded for certain that woman would not commit any "guilt" within the frame of her fulfillment, the home and family relationship. Or if his wife fails to fulfill her duties as a mother and as a housewife, he does not classify her failure as "a guilt requiresto be punished by beating." The "violation of honour", however, is seen directly as a breaking out of this sphere.

Also he states he lives in a patriarchal family structure, and in it obedient one does not equal to

dominant. And saying "his relation of obedience with his wife is at a normal level" he means "my wife obeys me". But for he did not give enough information about his private life, we do not know how this obedience is established and what its limits are.



## 3.

S.E. Female. 52. Housewife. Mother of four children. Graduated from ilkokul. Living in Istanbul for 22 years. Her husband works as a street peddler.

SE portrays herself as a person who wants all the problems are solved peacefully, is calm and favors tolerance but cannot stand if "evil" behaviour is done to her. Her children are in their thirties. One of her sons is lawyer, the other is pharmacist. Both of her daughters are sent to Kız Meslek Okulu, but she said that "if we knew from the beginning they would be succesful, we had sent them to normal highschool." They send their daughters to Kız Meslek Lisesi in order to "have them know the work of their home, at least."

SE lives in a world where girls are brought up to become "woman". To "become woman" means to take care of the children and husband, to be responsible for their food, clothing etc.. Going working is only possible if there is time left from childcare and housework. But contributing to the budget in terms of economy, cleverness and being industrious is her usual responsibility.

SE insisted very much she does not quarrel with her husband. But such insistance leads to suspicion. Finally, as I switched off the tape and just was going to leave, she felt the need to state: "of course, we have quarrels too,

like every couple, but these are insignificant, there is no fighting." And she told the cause of their quarrel was mostly "money". So it can be said that she regards quarreling as an evidence of disorder in marriage life. Her insistence on that these conflicts which their cause is money, or lack of money, do not turn into fighting and are normal things happening at every home, and that may be understood as in her marriage life everybody knows his/her place and nobody challenges these borders and order.

Her conception of quarrel begins at the point that she cannot convince the other. Namely, she consider the quarrel as a tool which is used for convincing another person, but at the same time as a tool which she dislikes and does not prefer. If she cannot make the others listen to her, says that she puts a distance between her and these persons for avoiding quarrel. Although she dislikes the quarrel, she cannot avoid it. One of the reason of this fact is related with conditions of her daily relations, namely lack of money. Other reason is the presence of the persons whose temper are aggressive. The example to the latter is a man in her neighbourhood. She explained his quarrelsome character by his habit of suggesting to know everybody's matter better than themselves and of interfering with everybody's affairs. Of course many people do not like him to mix-up into everything. But even if he would say the "truth" , the man is considered as wrong from the beginning, because he has interfered

"without having the right".

The second incident she told that is a big brawl also caused by wrong behaviour. The party that she regarded as being wrong get a beating in the end. The quarrel is between fellow groups of Ordu and of Isparta. The party she regarded as wrong comes from a village of Ordu, to where you have to ride on horseback and thereafter still have to walk a distance; ignorant people. The fellows from Isparta province are from a place near to Konya-Aksehir. They are "almost natives" to SE. Despite her 22 years in Istanbul, the traces of 'regionalism' can be seen here.

SE told about herself being a good mother, who is seen even by the children of others as lovely, and who is shown to their own mothers as an example. In her relations to her children she stresses the importance of "tolerance" and softness, very much. This is illustrated in her comparison of her brother's wife in Aksehir waking up the children with saying "awake" and her saying "please children, your breakfast is ready, so please stand". And the children showing her as an example to their own mother by saying: "See, how nice is the kind of my aunt's telling."

A good mother contributes to the household by her cleverness but still she is in the second place. S.E. told she was beaten by her husband only one time in her almost 40 years of marriage. And this happens in the first years of their marriage. Her husband longs for *pekmez* and called

upon her to taste it to find out if *pekmez* is sour or is eatable. As SE refuses to taste *pekmez* she gets a heavy slap on her face. The reason for her refusal is her being pregnant and having nausea. Otherwise she would accept that she has to taste whether the food is eatable or not - thus her husband has the right to punish her in this act of disobedience. But she sulks her husband because she has a strong reason to reject tasting the food: she is pregnant. Although her husband has the right to demand his wife to taste a food, in this case he is not the just party, to her. The example of a quarrel she experienced herself, happens in the train to Akşehir. In this case, she travels with her children and without her husband. Her children have tickets, as well. As they wait at their places for departure time to come, a man with a woman comes and demands in a rough manner that the children should stand up so his wife can sit. SE gets angry to the rude manner of the man and tells she is not going to make her children stood up. The conductor is invited and because the children have tickets, the man is forced to go away. But SE remarked that she told the man, "had you told it friendly, I had taken my child on my lap and made a place free for the poor woman." And she repeated it to me once more, in order to be sure that I understood this accentuation.

In the examples SE told me, her concepts for "*kavga*" and for "*dövüş*" are differentiated. *Kavga*, quarrel, is



conceptualized as surfacing of conflict, while *dövüs*, fight, is conceptualized as the conflict turns into violence. But both quarrel and fight have a common feature which their cause always is a violation or a threat of violation. Thus, we can ask that why does she qualify the affair in the train as a quarrel, in other words, to her, what is the violation which the affair contains? She and her children have to travel for many hours, because Akşehir is at a great distance, and it is disturbing to sit in her lap a child for many hours. While this fact alone would be a cause for refusing his demand, she prefers to explain her rejection by his rough manner. So, we can conclude that she does not consider or does not prefer to consider a violation against her personal discomfort. She emphasizes the significance of the way the man expresses his demand. He does not request but orders her. But he is a stranger and has no right to order her. But the major factor which leads her attribute significance at this affair is that SE is together with her children but without her husband. That is, the duty of protecting them -and through them the body of the family-lies now at the shoulders of the woman, the mother.

The talking in a strong -forcing- manner of the man, even if its aim is to provide a sitting place for a woman, seems to have taken the form of a threat against the family she has to protect, in the eyes of SE. For this reason, her reaction turns out to be strong. She has the tickets, she has right on her side, she needs not to speak

this man. The man has to settle things with the conductor. But as she understands at the same time one should help a woman, she feels the need to explain, to justify this behavior of not discussing.



## 4.

D.A. Male. 38 years old. From Malatya. Owner of a leather manufacture shop in Gedikpaşa. Living in Istanbul for 20 years. Married with four children. Education level is ilkokul.

As I went to interview him he was irritated -I was quite different from his usual visitors. Still he accepted to talk, because he had the suspicion that I was an official person -I had picked up his name out of judicial entries. However he refused to view the document I got from the university, identifying me and explaining why I was studying this research, by saying "estagfirullah!" This refusal may be explained by his possible reasoning that to view the document would imply suggesting me to be a person "unreliable to its word, a liar". Neither did he object to my use of a tape. But since it was obvious that he was unsettled by my visit, how would he manifest this irritation? In my opinion, he did it by lying. He tried to present himself in a way he thought I would approve. But he did not know me, so while trying to say what was right according to me, he actually expressed what he thought to be "generally valid" or what could be "hardly objected to". But despite being not much unused to lies, he was not used to dissolve the lie in the account of all his relations.

Therefore, to him, the lie was not much more than a

"truthful word" and he was not able to adjust the information about his life or the quarrel example he gave in detail, to this "truthful word".

"Quarreling is a bad thing, of course. One should not quarrel", he said. But when questioned about "There may not be even one person to say quarrel is a good thing but why still everyone is quarreling?", he brought an explanation not in terms of relationships, but in terms of extra factors like the consumption of alcohol, sudden anger, personal nervousness, ignorance, having no manners.

What he told about his life as well as his example of a quarrel corresponded to an order of relationships that contained these extra factors. But the question why these extra factors were coming into effect just at that moment, remained unanswered. For this reason his rejection of quarrels in his daily relations, and his attitude which as if quarrels were nonexistent in the world of his own relationships or were an extraordinary phenomenon seems to be rather a 'facade' designed for protection.

The quarrel DA told me is a fictive one. Two men, already knowing each other, quarrel. Actually, there would be no quarrel if they did not consume alcohol. The quarrel is caused by "kariya bakmak" (looking at the woman).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Not "kadına bakmak". This is a special phrase. In my question I mentioned 'kadına bakmak' and he answered by correcting me as "kariya bakmak". This shows that the words 'kari' and 'kadın' express a classification in his 'terminology'. 'Kari' represents here the low and commonly owned one.

This phrase does not relate to a man staring with his eyes at a woman. The matter is completely between two men. One of the men is unsatisfied with the sharing of the hostesses in the '*meyhane*' and tells his friend -the man-, he is going to prefer the hostess who is his friend's share. Such a demand establishes a very serious cause for fight. DA goes out of work around 6 pm and after dinner at home, mostly goes out to coffeehouse. His relations with his wife are highly determined and regular. Everyone "knows his/her place", i.e. his wife knows the "habit" of DA and acts accordingly. The woman cannot go out of house without permission of her husband, says anything about his outgoing to coffeehouse, such talk is considered as "*karı dirdiri*" (women's nagging), and again disobedience, by him. The sphere conceded to woman is the house. But she has no right to put any thought forward about which friend he would bring home. However D.A. is not forcing the limits of this right and invites no friends to his home. The violating of these borders by the woman would be "an act of dishonour" and its price would be getting beaten. And DA does not beat his wife "if he is not right" on his side. For instance, he certainly stated that he did not/will not beat his wife for some trivial reasons, like her failure for doing housework in time. Further he is voicing the fact that "among us there has to be no beating of women." At ideological level he rejects beating women absolutely.

What could be the causes for such an ideological rejection?

In his accounts about his wife DA remarked the woman would require a beating when she violated the limits conceded to woman. And this violation would mean she was honourless. So if the woman is beaten, this would mean she could not be prevented from violating her limits and that woman is honourless. So his wife is honourless, for that reason he is forced to beat her. This would further demonstrate a weakness of the man to hold the woman within her own limits. And where does the woman enter if she violates her limits? The sphere of man or public. These two may or may not coincide, but the honor of the woman stands in a close relation to the man and that means his sphere of domination is intruded. A man whose sphere of domination is violated by the one whom he dominates, is not a full, strong man anymore. Therefore D.A. regards beating a woman as an evidence of weakness.

There is one more reasoning: It may be related to the beating being practiced at the point where the authority is unable to continue its functioning through internalized acceptance and where the limits conceded by the authority are violated. A culture in which the woman is "subordinated" the permanent situation of beating of woman cannot be admitted because this situation would imply the admission of a permanent state of violation, furthermore, to concede the right of violation to the "subordinated" one.

This quality of woman to be subordinated manifests itself also in the determination of the situations leading to divorce.<sup>2</sup> If the woman becomes a prostitute, the cause is the man. "A woman certainly does not become a prostitute herself, unless the man fails to care for his home, to go home, etc. If he does the woman falls in despair and is forced to that in the end."

"To become a prostitute" means she "looks at" another man. But it is still possible that a woman becomes a "prostitute" despite her husband's behavior "does not force her". In such cases the woman puts forward the behavior of the man as an excuse for herself: "In case, he does not return home, the woman looks at another man."

The argument of the woman not "becoming a prostitute" by herself seems to imply an assumption of a deep distrust against woman. Woman remains honourable only if she is kept under strict control of the man. If the man "loosens control a bit", the woman will immediately, because of her nature, become a prostitute. The probable consequences of this distrust would be to keep the eyes of the woman within the home, not to concede her the spare time, not leave her alone "to find a chance to look at someone." That is consistent with DA saying, "she cannot go out of the house without my permission. If she does, it would be honourless, then I would, of course, beat her."

---

<sup>2</sup> Here the presenting of divorce as an alternative to killing is interesting. "If there is a situation, you get divorced and it's okay."

## 5.

E.B. Female. 37 years old. Married since 20 years. Living in Istanbul for 17 years. Education level is ilkokul. Her husband is a waiter. Her hometown is Bingöl. Mother of three children. Housewife.

EB presents herself as one who wants to get things settled within the family, puts the greatest importance upon being earnest, defines a woman based upon motherhood, tries to protect the rights of her children and herself.

Her marriage has gone to pieces because her husband has a mistress, so E.B. wants to divorce. But she does not apply to the court, wants that her husband applies to the court for divorce. Her thought is that if he applies to the court she can easily empoze her conditions. In order to obtain her aims, she is making a scene regularly and her husband do not raise his voice "because he knows he is being guilty". For E.B. her husband's bringing money, going out with the children and her, even fulfilling his "marital duty" do not come in the first place. What matter is that he should prefer his relation with the woman who is his family, against any other woman, so keep the integrity of the family. And as the integrity of the family is broken, she claims the right to make a quarrel.

By saying family, she means the family she is living within. For instance, she still did not reveal her choice



to divorce to her own parents. On the other hand she talked to her father-in-law- about how she would make her living with her three children, and expressed a trust him who promised he would care for her. Her father-in-law takes party with his bride and not his son, she explains this fact by her husband disregarding the foundations of the body of family. According to EB, her husband has committed a guilt by living with another woman, but this fact has no result automatically, it means that the right situation of EB based on her obedience to the family's rules, but not on her husband's fault. For instance her husband knows all friends of EB and she makes no contacts with people her husband does not know. "He does not interfere in my matters," she says, but at the same time stating, "of course he would be angry if I would see someone he does not know". So, despite the fact that he has been "living a mistress life" for two years, he has the right to be angry with her, in the eyes of EB. Meanwhile, although she expresses a trust her father in law, she actually cannot trust him. We can conclude it from that despite her all trust expressions, she does not accept to be the applying party to the court. And for realizing this aim she is risking her family's peace and is provoking a quarrel.

According to her narration, there is a highly patriarchal structure at home. In the building they are living, every flat is occupied by the brothers and their

families of her husband. The father-in-law also lives there and is the absolute ruler of the families. In their world quarrel comes to effect only when the foundations of this world are threatened. For instance, the father-in-law would not beat any member of the subfamilies in the house, since no one would ever disregard his saying. But a husband beating his wife is quite usual, as long as it does not turn permanent and this is something experienced by the wives and highly tolerated by everyone. It is not taken as quarrel. A quarrel is rather a state of disagreement on the realization way of the rules of their daily life. She seeks a quarrel with her husband because of "his mistress relation", but her husband does not quarrel, he "beats" her. Another aspect is that quarrel belongs to outside, it exists as anything passed by and even then may disturb peace if one does not watch out. Remarking to quarrel with no one else than her husband, EB tells following quarrel: Together with her little child, she goes to visit a relative (a justified reason to being on the street, on the place of incidence) who is living in a distant place. The minibus she and her child are in, is passed by another one, this leads to a quarrel between the drivers. The quarreling parties are armed with knives. EB is concerned about her child "being little and likely to become scared." Then she worries that the incident would escalate and she has to go to the police station, being kept from going her way. But the probability of one of the quarreling parties to be wounded, does not bother her. Asked about this, she

evaded this issue with a little bit of shame.

Here, the thought of the quarrel belonging to the outside, is taken further by ignoring the possibility of one of the quarreling parties to be hurt. They are separated from the nonquarreling persons by supposing if they quarrel then they would know not to be hurt.

Meanwhile in her own world there is a serious quarrel on divorce. EB is resolute on divorce, but with the expectation of profiting from divorce, she is involved in a relation with her husband, within which she is beaten permanently. But this fact cannot be explained only with her intention of ensuring her future but also with her concept of family. When the family relationship comes to disintegration because of her husband's fault, she must do something for ensuring her future and also not hurting her respectability as a mother and a woman. Also there is another question about the children. Here, the woman must take the tasks of a father. And, doing this, she has the possibility of having power in the relations of her house.

## 6.

R.E. Male. 42 years old. Married since 18 years. Father of two sons. Drinks every night and despite this, he is working at the same job for 10 years.<sup>1</sup>

RE sees himself as "a very earnest man". He says he quarrels quite often and in many quarrels he is tight yet not totally drunk, but he thinks that quarreling is unrelated to alcohol.<sup>2</sup> His explanation is that "my nature is such. I cannot stand injustice. It is not that I will become aggressive when I drink." On the contrary alcohol consumption is presented as being a refuge from situations where one cannot quarrel because of the balance of powers at that moment, while there are reasons more than enough: "You cannot pay back at that moment. So what happens? You compensate by drinking."

The importance of alcohol in his talkings does not come from considering alcohol to play a major part in his relations and his quarrels. But alcohol persists to be a significant element in his life. The explanation by R.E. evaluates alcohol rather as a secondary factor, and sometimes just a factor against quarreling.

The element of alcohol is further mentioned in his relations with his wife and his two sons as the content of

---

<sup>1</sup>This may be also commented as an effort to randomize his capacity as an alcoholic. But by providing a theoretical explanation (in detail) that does not build upon alcohol, his opinion deserves to be considered seriously.

<sup>2</sup>RE remarked that he had an alcohol treatment in Cerrahpaşa Hospital for a while. But I did not take this as a sign of deviance from "normal", because his capacities of normality like working for 10 years at the same job and being married for a long time.

his family's passive complains. Neither his wife, nor his sons are pleased with his drinking, his drinking outside, but this disgust is expressed in a very passive way. Still there is a sophisticated difference between his wife's expression of complaint and his sons'. His wife is "of course, not pleased by the drinking of her husband. No woman wants her husband to drink. But it does not become a theme among us." So his wife does not show her dissatisfaction neither by raising her voice, nor by her way of serving him. In this sense this dissatisfaction is rather an assumption. On the contrary, the dissatisfaction of his sons is on a level of verbal expression. "They do not interfere, but say that father, do not drink." This slight difference may be explained by that both of his children are male.

RE told me he was involved in many fights with knives or with his fist. None of them takes place at home or with persons belonging to the private sphere (women, children). But behaviors (of men) towards women or children may become reasons of quarrel between men. This is usual. For RE there are some causes that their presence results a quarrel, as a routine. One of these causes is that the women are sexually obsessed by men. He illustrates his reactions to such a situation at the following way:

"In crowded busses, a man leans against a woman, the woman cannot raise her voice. If you would tell him loudly 'why did you that to her', she would be disgraced. So we look for another excuse and seek a quarrel with him."

Why should a woman be disgraced if it is spoken out that she is sexually molested? For RE's approach, the evil thing is sexual molestation itself. But why should not the performer, but the victim of such an act be disgraced? Here, the implied point is the tentative potentiality of the woman, even her being there is on a justified ground. However the point who you are faced directly afflicts your honour and/or dignity. If the sexually obsessed woman reacts, this means she puts herself in the same level with the obsessor. An example to the latter is that RE does not approve a woman defending herself against such an act of disgrace by hitting the man or even shouting at him. RE does not tolerate the obsessed woman to quarrel with the man or even to cry out. "If she is a good woman, why she cries out a man? I see it in busses and elsewhere. Some do bad action. If that woman hits the man, she is not a good woman in my eyes." How should a good woman act in such a situation? "But there are such women, they are just ladies. You know them. They do not raise their voice to say even a word."

Now we see the limits of being "good" for a woman. The woman should not take action to defend herself even in an aggression on her honour (even if she is faced with openly sexual obsession), and even should not say any word, according to RE. But there is still another differentiation that RE did not mention, but that should be taken into account. If the woman would do nothing against, how will we know the difference between the "good" woman

disgusted by the "action" and the "bad" woman "comforted" by it? In my opinion this difference lies in, the "honourful" woman make the men around feel that she is disgusted, by means of mimic, moving. So she is expected to express her discomfort by a passive image of disgust.<sup>1</sup>

Another quarrel he told -this is the one that led to his name become mentioned in a legal case from where I picked up his name- is also related to people of the private sphere, this time to children. His children fail to return the video cassette to the video-shop in time, for that reason the shopkeeper rebukes them by saying "why are you late?". As RE learns this, he goes to the shop, and states that the shopkeeper should settle things with himself, not with the with the children, and he blames that man for not acting according to customs. During this discussion there are two girls at the shop, this leading the shopkeeper to answer "rude and bullish" -he has to preserve his dignity as a man in their presence. That is the reason for quarrel.

RE defines himself as a father who do not allows strangers "to speak against my children". This is one of the factors leading to quarrel with the video-shopkeeper. "Although he sees RE every morning and evening" for

---

<sup>1</sup>This explanation relies on my own experience. In the end I am a woman who is living in Turkey of the 1980's and in the same town as RE and do not find it wrong to include my own existential experience in this work, though in a conscious kind.

rebuking RE's children the shopkeeper is wrong. Another wrongdoing of that man is that he hits RE despite the fact that he knows RE has consumed alcohol. While, "even at the police station they do not hit against a drunken one."

In his conception of family, the place of the father is a very central one. The father image is authoritarian, having always his way, always being right. This applies as much to himself being a father as to his relation to his own father. He expresses a belief in strict obedience to the father. He told an incident that took place in the first years of his marriage. RE is beaten by his father in the presence of his wife, for quarreling with her. But according to RE the father is right, "there must have been a foolishness of me, if he needed to strike me." Consequently he remarks he would not oppose to his father, would not hit him, would not even imagine such a situation. Even if his father would live with another woman than his mother, even if his father would beat his mother permanently. But this absolute obedience has its limits, as well. This limit lies where the image of the strong and just father would collapse in RE's mind. RE stated, he would oppose his father only in a situation that if the father would become homosexual. If he finds out "such a disgrace", there would be only one thing to do: to kill the father. But this act of killing has to be carried out without taking advise of anyone, no brother, no uncle, so not any elder member of family, because once he was "poisoned" by learning about such a shame, he would not



wish to "poison them" to by let them learnt.

This concept of the father having absolute authority, is applied also to his own. He states that he interferes to the dressing of his wife outside, when to go where, shows his sons the ways to "find the right way", favors to rebuke or beat them if his words are not heard at, to intervene "with all his power". He is also concerned with their education. He beats his wife if she objects him, if she finds wrong a thing he says or does not want to do something he tells, or when she snubs him. There is no word about quarrel, only a beating is mentioned.

In his relations to his wife he outlines that he is always right, because "if I am wrong, I have already admitted it myself." But his wife has not the right to warn him.

From his accounts we can say that he gives great importance to family. But even if he would harm his family by "keeping a mistress", he does not recognize that his wife has the right to be angry with him. It is interesting that his wife who has no right to make even if the slightest warning, the slightest expression of anger to him, "has the right" to go to the "mistress" and speak to her and even quarrel with her. "Of course it is her right, she is my wife formally." This is the situation that woman is equal to another woman and man to man, and the quarrel is possible just only between equals.

## 7.

E.Ö. Male. Around 30. Living in Istanbul for 8 years. Married with three girls. Factory worker. They are living in a flat belonging to his father. His father and brothers are living in apartments of the same building. He does not drink any alcohol. He finds three children too many, but as he wants a son, he is willing "to try" once more. But he remarks that his wife is not much in favor of it.

EÖ portrays himself as a nervous, quarrelsome person. He adds that he is also known in his environment as such. But at home it is different. He does not beat his wife, but this is rather because of her habit. "My wife is meek, okay?" "Her meek mind" is already confirmed by his other tellings. The most important matter which makes him angry is that his words are not followed. If he has to say his request, or his warnings three times, i.e. his same words were not followed for three times, this is not a wrongdoing anymore, but is a guilt and needs to be punished.

From his narration we can conclude that he is opposed to beat his wife "unless it is necessary for the order at home". Namely, he recognizes that all men have the right to beat their wives. For instance, if his father beats his wife (i.e. EÖ's mother), he is inclined not to interfere, "cause the other day, they reconcile and they are good with each other and bad with me. You do not go between husband and wife." Although EÖ does not recognize that his wife has the right of punish him by beating, during a quarrel if his wife slaps him, he tolerates her behaviour as a nervousness, a sudden anger.

EÖ does not stress to showing respect to elder persons. He has not openly expressed such a belief. But in the world he lives in, elder persons and the roles they play has a serious importance. One of the quarrels EÖ told me is with the son of his uncle.

EÖ works for his cousin who is approximately in the same age. One day two cousins fight for some reasons. As EÖ's uncle learns the fight, he is angry with EÖ, by rebuking him why he quarreled with his son. After this event, EÖ states to his wife that she should not visit this uncle anymore, except bairams. His reason for blaming his uncle is that as an elder, he should be impartial in the quarrel. He should urge them to reconcile or mediate, at least, but he did nothing. He can rebuke but not only one of the quarrelors.

According to EÖ it is not important what the reasons of the quarrel are, who the right party for these reasons is, and the uncle is not one of the quarrelors. Here the uncle is seen as the person did not carry out his duty which is expected him, socially. And EÖ express his anger to uncle through forbidding his wife's visits.

EÖ states that he broke with his family during the first years of his youth, because of his political activities. He is leftist and currently a labor union activist. But his relations with his family, and especially with his father get better after completing military service and entering a steady job, marrying, having children.

EÖ has the notion of respect to the father, not to lift his hand to his father. He answered to the question about this (in which circumstances he would lift his hand to his father), saying that he never would strike his father, because then his father would reject his son. Though this would bear not much "material" consequence, EÖ remarked that his father has taken pains for him so many years and for this reason has to right to be respected. This is an attitude we can call pragmatic. Violence is a means which EÖ can use it in the relations with all persons, as well as with his father, but when his father in question, it is rather improbable.

Being asked about, if he goes out with his family, he answered, "I bring them out to visits anytime I can. Recently, at bairam I brought them to the village and returned, despite it is hard to get leave from my work. After bairam I went there once more to bring them back". He spoke as the first person singular. Further, the reason to "bring them out" is "my family being depressed at home."

One of the quarrels he told, occurs at midnight, in front of their apartment building. A guest of the inhabitants of an apartment in the building finds the main door closed and swears loudly. With that noise, EÖ wakes up as well as all other residents. He dresses quickly and confronts him by arguing that "who you are swearing?" The people around separate them, arguing the man to be drunk. Until this point, the reason of his quarrel is

"theoretical". EÖ agrees that the main door should be kept close at night -it is not himself who closed the door at this time, but he could be as well- and therefore he thinks that the target of the swearing includes him too.

As the quarrelors are separated by the people around, EÖ turns back home. But this time, the man begins to swear by naming directly EÖ. And at the second fight EÖ beats the man very harsh. Nobody intervenes, even the brother of the man. Here there is an unanimous backing from the public.

EÖ says he "never" quarrels for wrong, and never would. Not only in matters of his own, but even in quarrels among persons absolutely unfamiliar to him, he supports the right party. So, for EÖ, there are visible conditions which help a person decide about who is right. Whatever the reason of the quarrel is, one component that determines which party is right, is to be outnumbered and be in a weak position. To be one against two; to be a weak one against a strong one... In such cases EÖ cannot "stand it." But for him, it does not matter, if this weak party being actually wrong in terms of the triggering reason.

Another component of justice is swearing. "Heavy" swearings put the person sworn automatically position of being right. But there are occasions which do not turn into quarrels even by challenge. As an example, EÖ told how it would not come to a quarrel. He stated that nobody does and can put a challenge in a coffeehouse where he is absolutely stranger. If one is inclined to cause a quarrel, he has to

be known to at least one or two persons. He has to know several persons from a game, a gamble or so, at least. Here, we can conclude that for EÖ, quarrel requires relation. If there is no relation, there is no cause to quarrel.

EÖ also intervenes his wife's dressing. He does not allow his wife to veil her hair, although she wants. His wife argues she wants to veil her hair because his father is a pilgrim. Only when she is going to her father's house, he does not interfere with veiling her hair. But as soon as she is back at home, she has to put the kerchieff off her head.

EÖ told that although his wife had a profession and wanted to work, he opposed this and he did not allow her to work because he could earn living his family. Namely, we can conclude that his wife is allowed to work only in a situation that he fails his family's living.

Also, his wife is 'open minded' to his leftist opinions. He tells her which party she votes for, at every election. And he is sure that she does not secretly vote another way. He stated that his wife would not be rightist even if he would. For "her family is leftist, too." Further he had asked her before marriage if she is leftist or not and married after getting a positive answer. But he does not rule out that if he had been rightist before marrying to her, she could have become rightist "to keep on" with him.

## 8.

C.P. Male. 54. Father of three children. Lives separate from his wife. Runs a "kahve" in Mevlanakapı. Short stature (1.60-65 cm), humpbacked, ever smiling. Left ilkokul.

CP portrays himself as a person who is honourable, who avoided ignorance, but still could not managed to escape from it and so many injustices have been done to him because of ignorant people around.

He proposes an "ideal" family structure and in it the role of mother is important. The father is the ruler, decision-maker of home, but the mother is the person who transmits these decisions to the household (the children) and provides for realizing of these decisions. The father has absolute authority and because of this, he does not get directly involved with the children. In this "ideal" family there is no need for beating. Although beating is a means that can be used by the father, if the system is well functioning in essence, details can be ignored.

But in his "real" life, CP stated he had beaten his wife as well as his children; his wife "many times", his children "once". The reason for beating his wife is that she does not transmit the messages of CP to the children and instead, justified their "improper" behaviors by arguing "everyone is doing that". Another reason is that she is causing him to "repeat the same things", that is she

let him demand several times until she carries out some things.

The "only" beating of the children again, is related to the failure of his wife to transmit the principles of the father to them. One of his children does not go to school for 21 days, but CP learns that only when the school reports this absence to the parents. The child has committed the worst guilt, lying. So it requires the beating. But the reason for his child becoming such one, he thinks, is "the ignorance of the mother".

Here I need to reveal my observation: the principle of "women have not to be beaten" is never practiced in his real life and CP is not bothered at all by this contradiction. And CP is the only person who states he was forced to beat his wife. (Other men although stated they had the right of beating their wives, did not accept that they were forced to beat them.)

Let me go on. His children grow up and come of age. In this period, CP confronts once more with the problem of "not transmitting the principles", that is with the problem of "ignorance". The daughter choose their husbands themselves "with democracy". CP does "not react against it, because it had already happened." But as he sees that his advice he has given to his children during the years is in no way taken into account, he thinks it over. After the weddings of his children, he leaves his wife and begins to live alone.

So, during his all marriage life, CP acts according



to the "ideal" family concept in his mind. But because of the "cultural shortcoming of his wife" he is not able to establish this ideal state of family. In several critical moments of his marriage, he warns in first instance the person who has to transmit the authority, i.e. his wife, and after that, the ones who have to receive the messages of authority, i.e. his children. Finally, he beats them as his last resort.

The term "last resort" fits very much into this situation, because CP is eager to keep the order of the family as close as possible to his ideal. But at times when reality proves to be in open contrast with his concept, he never tries "extreme" sanctions like refusing his children or divorcing. He even cannot think of them, because such sanctions have the capacity of disintegrating the actual family in effect. But after the children are married and therefore have left his sphere of dominance and responsibility, CP divorces from "that woman who in fact deserved to be slaughtered".

His "loyalty to his principles" is in consistence with his words about the world outside his family. Quarrels are caused by ignorance. That is some people disregard the rules of behavior that should be followed. They have bad manners. Then CP has to react.

Both quarrels that CP told, support this idea. In the first example, CP buys a coffeehouse from a man and pays the money, but the man takes some goods with him as he

goes. CP together with some people, finds out the man and invites him into the coffeehouse to beat him. Despite he is thinking quarreling as a means "used only by ignorant people", he explains his attitude with the ignorance of the other man, instead of his own. The man may be unaware of the rules of the trade "in the city", but he has to know how to bargain "for a donkey" in a "village" at least. And the trading rule is that if you have sold a good together with its accessories, the price for the accessories is included in the price for the good. But the man who sold the coffeehouse to CP disregards this rule "for a couple of coins" and "steals" something from CP. In such case CP does not apply to judicial authorities, to the police. He restores the undone balance: He batters him. So the man gives back the "stolen" things and at the same time, the whole neighbourhood learns that no one can "fool" CP and whoever attempts this, will be punished accordingly.

The second example is between a man and CP. The man is searching for a waiter named Ali, working in CP's shop, because of "a family matter" (*ailevi bir mevzuu*). CP, in his capacity of the owner of this workplace, intervenes "because such matters must not be talked in public places.

Here are two significant points at the level of his principles. The first is that "family matters" must not be talked in public. Second, if such is attempted, the owner of this public place sees himself directly as a party, even if he was in no way involved in the affair. For this reason CP does not think of informing Ali. Instead, he

argues with the man, tells him to go.

In this account of "quarrel" there is also a problem of procedure. The man is wrong in principle. At the same time he says that he is "the nephew of Oflu". To be the nephew of Oflu, a highly prominent mafiosi means here: despite being at the wrong side of justice, he attempts to use "force". Now CP decides to use the means of "quarrel" or "battering", but the man is actually not "a nephew of Oflu" and goes away.

In summary, in the life of CP, both beating and quarreling are a means. A means that is used, at least, for holding together the elements of real life which CP tries to put into an order as it should be. But the use of this means is also a matter of culture. But wrong use of this means would hurt, above all, the life that has to be defended. Such improper uses establish new violations. The attempted quarrel of "the nephew of Oflu" with the waiter Ali might be taken as an example of such use. On the contrary, the example of right quarrel that prevents other quarrel which creates a new violation -thus puts life into order according to his principles- is his quarrel with the nephew of Oflu.

## 9.

Z.Y. Male. 37 years old. From Çorum, but he has been living in Istanbul for 16 years. Works for 16 years at Istanbul Medical School Hospital as a hospital attendant. Married with two children. His wife is a housewife.

ZY portrays himself as calm and peaceful, religious person, and loyal to home and his work, and stresses the importance of stability. He lives within a relation network where the traditional family structure prevails for the greatest part, or at least he presents the world he is living in by this way. At home the father has presented as the person who has the right to decide on all subjects. These subjects consist of seemingly irrelevant matters as where and when his wife has to go, with whom she would meet, which rules his daughter has to follow in her wearing, which kind of haircut and shave his son has to have, who will take part to the visits at bairams, besides how far the education of their children should go.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>According to his opinion, "children do not know themselves". They get into bad ways. They get involved into "anarchy" (he means political terror) or so. For the girl there is further danger of losing honor. For this reason the personal opinion of ZY is "not to let the girl study." As the reasons mentioned here are all applying also to the boys, we may conclude that the decisive element not to send the girl to higher school is honour. But there is another element that is in no way mentioned, but that I think to be in effect here. That is the close relations between studying and getting a profession and between profession and earning the living of the household, in his mind. And this is man's job. "The woman has not to be sent working." For this reason the education of the girl has not primary importance and is only an extra. And in accordance with his expressions, ZY stated that he does not allow his wife to work.

Meanwhile he said that his wife is not allowed to go outside of their neighbourhood; she can only go out her next door neighbours. He also said that "outside of the neighbourhood" means anywhere necessitates to travel by a motor vehicle.

Here it is significant that all the subjects mentioned above can be grouped as the rules about which forms the members of his family can exist or live at the outside world surrounding his home. The mother -his wife- transmits these decisions to the children mostly "spontaneously", but if the mother fails to do it, the father warns her and she informs the children on the will of their father.

But, in this system, too, where the father is presented as a person who has absolute authority, some troubles arise. Then the father "has to" beat the one who caused the trouble. This beat is not applied to his son because his age is now 17 and "it would be improper to get him beaten from now on".

But for his wife the situation is different. ZY does not beat his wife "excessively". Only "as it is at every home". That means he is beating her at a "normal" rate and to a "normal" degree. To deserve a beating, she has to disobey. For instance "if at dinner just when" he "said her not to slap the child and she disobeys and slaps", then just the right situation for a beating emerges. Let's go into detail. Beating the child, just at

the dish, when the family has gathered for the meal, while the stress has to lie upon unity, is one aspect. The other is that whatever the justification for the mother to slap the child at this time and this place, she has regarded her own opinion to be more valid than the father's, and demonstrated this in practice by slapping the child.

Meanwhile, "deserving a beating" applies to ZY in no case, because of his manliness and/or fatherhood. Although ZY is the wrong party in a conflictual situation, his wife cannot strike at him. But she has the right to express her reaction. In some cases, during some fierce discussion even if she hits him, this is not one of her rights. It is regarded as a losing of self-control, because of extreme nervousness and for this reason it can be tolerated, by ZY.

This theme of the absolute justice of the father applies also to his relations with his own father and with his uncles. "You never lift your hand to the father." The image of father includes the uncles. The father or the uncle cannot be beaten, even if they are wrong. There has to be intervention by "goodness". This order of ranks may be disregarded if the elder brother beats the father, so the elder brother may be beaten a little.

In the relationships ZY told above, there is no quarrel. There is only getting beaten of the subjects by the strong one in order to keep the order of things continued. So ZY sees quarrel as an event belongs to

outside of his own world. He thinks quarrels emerge mostly out of alcohol consumption. And who are the ones who quarrel? Quarrels emerge between "people who have no self-respect." When one swears "ana avrat", the other puts out the knife. According to ZY most of the quarreling persons are unemployed or working in a job "they are not fully loyal to".

Here, the dose of violence implied by the term quarrel deserves interest. There is no fistfight, but use of knives. Another striking point is that the quarreling parties have general qualities. These qualities are "not to have a job they are loyal to" at the level of relationships and social status and "having no self-respect" at moral level. According to him, the quarrelors equal to each other in the respect of having same qualities. So ZY describes the quarrel and/or fight as a phenomenon that contradicts with any established lifestyle.

It is interesting that quarrel and/or fight belongs to the outside world surrounded ZY's relations while beating belongs to his daily relations. But this is merely his presentation, his "ideal" , in my opinion. Because, firstly, the limits of his world and outside are not clear. As a matter of fact ZY is a person who had quarreled with some of these "rowdies". Although he is not the aggressor, he is a party of a fight. If he is supposing that quarrels occur between equals anyway, how he involved -even if justified-in a quarrel with people he does not regard as

equals to him? Further how does he explain this situation?

ZY explained this fact with a psychological concept. It consists of "exceeding the limit of patience". That is to be excessively angry and to lose self control. Further he explained that he always enters the quarrel "to separate" the parties. But if one of the quarrelors insults him heavily, ZY becomes a party in fight.

Out of his explanations, we can comment that whatever his claims are, ZY is a person who has knowledge of quarreling/fighting. And other point is that even if the quarrel occurs between equals, this equality is not equality ZY presented. Namely quarrels in ZY's life do not occur only between "non-established" persons.



## 10.

H.E. Male. 22 years old. From Urfa. Living in Istanbul for 14 years. Being the oldest of eight children, he is living with his mother, two sisters and four brothers. Until three years ago he was grilling and selling steaks on the street in Aksaray. Now jobless.

He presents himself as a person, who is "humiliated" by his surroundings, and who even could not fulfill his "duty to the fatherland" (military service), who does not think about marriage, and who has no job and no money. However, the major cause of all his defects is his illness.

But in his mind he has a social knowledge about his future style of living. And although his actual situation is "hopeless", he does not attempt to adapt his expectations to this actual situation. So he does not concede his concepts on issues as how a man should be, which circumstances should accompany a marriage. Instead of concessions, he abandons such plans "provisionally", and suppresses his expectations into his dreaming. For instance, although he has no money, he does not even think about a cheap wedding ceremony, about a wedding without buying gold for the bride. Instead, he accepts to be unable to marry.

"As you cannot manage a foreign girl", he considers that the "normal" way would be to marry to a girl from Urfa, his hometown. He dreams to live in a flat with three rooms, one room belongs to him and his wife, one to the

children, and the last is the common place of the family. His wife is fond of the children, -it is his wife's task to take care of them-, they will go to the *Lunapark* and *cay bahçesi* (teagarden), together. In this family order, the ideal situation is that the woman should not disobey. But if she disobeys this means that the wife "goes excessive". Then, she should be warned firstly, and beaten if it is necessary. "Being excessive" means to say "no" to husband's word and to insist on this "no".

HE states openly his dissatisfaction about his surroundings because he is "humiliated" in his relationships. But he stresses that this dissatisfaction does not cause "quarrel". However, from his account of his life and of the examples for quarrels he told, we can see that quarrel is in no way unusual in his relations.<sup>1</sup>

But can these two factors -to quarrel is an usual, common event and HE does not quarrel in spite of his humiliation, continuously- be explained together? To explain this, we have to review the reasons that lead him to be humiliated. His surroundings humiliate him, because he has not completed his military service, does not work, has no money. No one can lend him money for he would not be able to repay. He is a person cared by his brothers.

---

<sup>1</sup>What is usual is not quarreling itself but a state of quarrel. Because the quarreling parties are expected to be calmed down by the onlookers who are in turn the parties of another possible quarrel. Calming down the quarreling people is a rule, to such extent that the quarrelor(s) can design strategies based on being separated by the onlookers.

His own view about the reasons for his low status is important. It is the army that did not recruit him. If it depended on his decision, he would serve in the military. HE would work, if he were not ill. The obstacle is his illness, not that he thinks it is wrong to work or he is unwilling. This is confirmed by his remark that "until becoming ill", it was HE who earned the living of the household -of his mother and his brothers and sisters. Further his brothers, do not see it as the "fault" of their elder brother, either. In spite of earning their elder brother's living too, they continue to respect his authority, ask for his permission when they want to go somewhere and explain it to him.

For these reasons HE considers that he does not deserve this humiliation, at least in moral terms, but his words imply that in practice he fulfills the conditions for a state of despise, or that it can be seen this way by "the world outside" . HE says he does not quarrel in his surroundings for this humiliation. Because this humiliation is permanent, seeking a quarrel to his surroundings would mean, for him, to falling in a position of being seen as wrong by his surroundings, despite he actually would not be wrong.

Furthermore, this quarrel would not be a single affair, because HE lives and will live in the same place with the persons who despise him. In short, his behavior of not quarreling despite living in permanent discomfort in

his daily relations, or at least the fact that he presents himself this way, can be explained by these circumstances.

But in his imaginary quarrel, his behavior has another facet: Walking on the street, he accidentally bumps into a man and the man reacts by addressing him to "lan". HE finds this word unbearable and quarrels.

In this example the threshold of quarreling is significantly low than the threshold in his daily relations. What is the argument of HE? The man has overreacted to an accidentally movement by using a vulgar tone. By reacting immediately, HE would become "a man who does not allow words against him". Probably, a kind of identity restoration. But, if the man who says "lan" to him was a familiar person, I mean, from his surroundings, would HE still "being unable to bear" this word and quarrel? Would the threshold of quarreling be low?

We can conclude that the answer would be no. It follows out of the other things HE told. So how can we explain that his threshold of quarrel is at such a low level towards strangers?

I find it is to be explained by the same reason that ensures the threshold being so high for quarreling with familiar persons. Although HE experiences a permanent despise by familiar people, he in fact shares the same "ideals of manliness" with them. He affirms the superiority of having money in his pocket, of letting others say no word upon him, of having the right to speak

about others; in short, the qualities of manhood that makes a man equal to the other men. But among the persons who know him, it is impossible to forget and let forget his lack of these qualities. With strangers, however, it is quite different. If the stranger (who is a man, too) uses the least "improper" word, HE recalls his position of justice -he has bumped into the man accidentally-, reacts at a level that would cause a quarrel and by this he demonstrates that he would not let others say anything against him. This seems to be a kind of restoring the identity.

His dissatisfaction about his surroundings is also projected into his opinion on actors. For instance he does not buy music cassettes of Ibrahim Tatlıses<sup>2</sup>, despite that "Tatlıses comes from the same town", because "that man does no good to his fellows". But he likes Kadir Inanır<sup>3</sup>, because he "is a father to the poor".

His hatred to his surroundings is revealed in his dreams about his future. If his dreams will come true and if he will have money, HE expressed that he will not behave friendly the persons who give him money now. And expressed that he will not do any good to them when they need. Also, he stated that he has intention of "not to speak to them, not to face them", because "now they treat supposedly friendly, give some money, but they despise you."

---

<sup>2</sup>He is a singer.

<sup>3</sup>He is an actor.

## 11.

C.Ö. Male. 18 years old. His birth place is Kars, but he is living in Istanbul for 8 years. He has 4 brothers and 5 sisters. He is not married.

Cö presents himself as a "youth" in his wearstyle, with his friendships, his pleasures, expectations from life and with his "belief" into the fulfillment of these expectations. And according to Cö, to be young is not to be entered public life, not to establish his own order yet.

His elder brother has a house where one flat belongs to Cö; further Cö plans to open a food-shop in Harem (that is, in a city district with an opportunity of intense shopping); he thinks to marry to his girlfriend "after completing his military service", then not to let his wife work -despite that she has a profession; all these are an adaptation of an "a priori" lifestyle which is familiar to him. His presentation of the plans about his future life has no detail I mean, it is merely a scenario, it is very "normal" or supposedly "normal" for Cö. As one would expect, one aspect of his very "normal" presentation is moral. Cö affirmed that he listens to the advise and word of his elder brother\*, by his attitude and words during the interview.

---

\*Cö is living with his elder brother in Istanbul for 8 years, that is since he was 10 years old. The chief of the family is his father who lives, however, in Kars. Therefore his elder brother represents the authority. Cö's "obedience" can and should be concluded out of his

attitudes towards his elder brother.

In the "young" world of Cō, quarrel does not emerge as an independent phenomenon. The causes and the triggering reason of the quarrel have an importance that at least equals the importance of the quarrel itself. And he imagines the relations which lead quarrel, on condition that one of the quarreling parties represents himself.

For instance firstly, he attempted to tell me an example of two men quarreling. But then, he changed the story with a flirting girl and a young man, a dispute between the girl and her elder brother, the girl being insulted and sent home by her elder brother and perhaps getting some slaps in her face and the young man entering a "semi-quarrel" with the elder brother. It is a "semi-quarrel" because as the young man's "plans about the girl are serious", he avoids to hit his future brother-in-law. The young man is the beaten party, but this is not an important consequence.

Here, the quarrel is presented a scene in which the actors perform their tasks socially. It is expected that elder brother gets angry with his sister for her flirting, and that the girl is sent to home. And all these expectations occur. It is necessary that the young man defends his relation with the girl. But he "has serious intention", that means he wants to marry to her, it is necessary that he does not quarrel with his future brother in law. Namely, neither the young man does avoid from the

quarrel, nor does hit his future brother in law. Therefore, the result of the quarrel is known from the beginning, the party who will get beaten does not intend to avoid it.

CÖ's other examples are about "to make insinuating remarks to a girl" in the street. He tolerates such behaviour to his girl-friend, because "as passing by, we can make remarks, too." As it is a normal thing, it does not require a reaction. In this situation, there is no reason to quarrel. But if insinuating remarks would be made to his future wife, i.e. his fiancée, he stated that he "could not stand it", and would quarrel. Here the relationship between the girl and CÖ is changed by marriage expectations and this change has directly an effect on CÖ's relations with other men.



## 12.

Ç.M. Male. 28 years old. He is from Kayseri, but he is living in Istanbul for 12 years. Married. Graduated from junior high school. Working in the canteen of a publishing house. No crime record.

ÇM presents himself as a person who is self-confident, who knows and fulfills his responsibilities. In a marriage, to earn the family's living is the duty of man. For ÇM, there is a direct connection between working to earn family's living and having a family. If a man cannot earn the living of his family, should not marry. "If a man sends his wife to work, it is better that he does not marry". The duty of a wife is to do housework, take care of the children.

In the relations ÇM told, a man has greater value than a woman. Also, he applies different standards to woman and to man on the same issue. These differences directly affect the points and the places in which violence is manifested and also the form of violence.

For instance, according to him, if "a woman looking for someone outside", this is "the woman's fault" and has to be punished, while "a man looking for someone outside" has to be tolerated as "it is quite human." Although a man's behaviour is wrong, it is not necessary to be punished.

In certain situations men can and should beat women, according to ÇM. But there is no situation women can beat men. Even if a man has a fault, a woman cannot lift her hand against him. Slapping or beating is a right that can be used only by the man, yet only at certain conditions. So ÇM says, "beating a woman does not match with being man" (*kadın dövmeğe erkeklige sığmaz.*) This principle is not surprizing if we remember that a woman is not regarded as equal to a man. Because it means to beat the weaker, the powerless one who is unable to retaliate.<sup>1</sup>

The only condition in which the woman is beaten is that a woman behaves "like a whore", becomes honourless. This is a situation in that a woman can afflict the man's reputation, in spite of her low status.

Although housework is in women's responsibilities, a failure in fulfilling her duties is not seen as a "guilt" that requires her to be beaten. So we can conclude that for ÇM, a man has the right of beating his wife only in a situation which she challenge his position.

Now, we face a problem. The functioning of this ideological structure depends not only on the man, but at

---

<sup>1</sup>For instance, the difference between the context of use of the verb beating and the word quarrel. "Beating" implies a one sided relationship. One beats another, but they quarrels, and as a result, one of the quarrelors is beaten. Even if he has not thought about this difference in linguistic terms, ÇM speaks about "a woman is beaten", but the men quarrel. So we may conclude that he is doing this "consciously", in the sense of "standing within ideology".

the same time on the woman. At this point ÇM is "confident" in his wife. He stated he is sure his wife does not hit him, even he does wrong. But if his wife attempts to hit him, what will his reaction be? ÇM answered that then, she trespasses the limits of her rights, and he would have to beat her. Two quarrels told by ÇM include "hard" violence. First is a fight and after fight an attempt of stabbing. In the second case, there is an ambush and a murder by use of a knife. In the former, ÇM hears some noises from outside, suspecting that the noises are his brothers', and goes out. Although the quarrelors are not his brothers', he attempts to separate the quarrelors, because one of them is the weak party and gets beaten. ÇM attempts to prevent the strong one. But since he swears ÇM, he beats him. Some days later, the man with one of his friends attempts to stab ÇM. As for the latter, although he witnesses a case in which a man was killed, and although he loves this man, his nonintervention to the affair is explained by the term of fear.

## 13.

M.T. 29 years old. Pub owner. Married with 2 sons. His birth place is Malatya, but he is living in Istanbul for 16 years. His education level is ilkokul. He does bodybuilding and karate.

MT portrays himself as a self made man, who faced much pains in the past, but now has settled his difficulties, respectable in his environment.

His relations at home are "happy", he told. He makes money enough for his household, and his wife takes care of the children and the household without trouble. In such a situation where everybody does his/her own part, he finds "unnecessary" to beat his wife. He thinks his wife would not do a thing that "would require her to be beaten". But if she would, he stated, then he might beat her.

In MT's pub, quarrel and fight is a routine thing. Disregard of rules may turn, if the opponent does not have manners, into quarrel. Here, emphasis should be given on two points: First, the existence of rules; disregarding them is seen as important, as a challenge directed against the values they live within. (These rules are such like not to swear, to show a certain restraint -not to provoke, etc.) The second point, disregarding rules is seen as a defect of the performer of such behavior, as "having no manner". Such an implicit acceptance means an approval of the values prevailing in the world they are living.

Still, MT considers the disregard of "manners", because of its frequent occurrence, as "normal". He stated

he was at peace, because he was able to control the people with bad manners, who go beyond the limits. That is, he is "confident in his muscles".

MT does also some sports helps him to maintain his confidence in his muscles;. He does bodybuilding and karate. With such a success that he teaches bodybuilding in a sport studio nearby.

Self-protection is not the only, even not a prevailing reason for his sports activity. The major reason for his sport activity is the reputation it supplies. So, his style of telling about "teaching sports", the young people showing respect and love to him, supports this thought. In this regard, the major element in his respectability lies not in the fact that he became a co-owner of the pub where he had worked as a waiter, but that he became a sports teacher who is respected by his surroundings.<sup>1</sup> MT comes to Istanbul with his elder brother. First they sleep in front of the shops, then find an old woman to stay with as her tenants. The old woman cares for them "like her own sons"; MT falls in love with a girl, her family rejects him because he is an "Easterner"; he runs away with the girl, gets married; becomes a partner to the pub where he is working now; becomes a father; buys a flat,

---

<sup>1</sup>M.T. is explaining his long way from the days of poorness to his wealth of today, by "having educated himself" an "hardworking", but actually he admits that he would not have a good financial position, if there were not the 7.5 million TL, he won at the horseraces. His position as a sports teacher is in this aspect highly significant.

plans to open a sports center. MT presented a kind of "American Dream". A component of this dream, is to know how to "compromise to survive". For instance, the basic meaning of the political splitting of society into left and right, previous to the 12th September, to him, is "rowdies who have the potential to crash the furniture of the pub"; he gives them attention only in their capacity of having the physical force to make an effect on him. Since he is able to be in good relations with both groups, the leftists and the rightists usually avoid to fight in and damage his pub. So, having managed to preserve the pub from both leftists and rightists has, in his eyes, the meaning of knowing the rule of surviving and overcoming.

As a conclusion, we can explain the innocence of quarrel, or at least such a presentation by him, at MT's household, while his "public" life is frequently disturbed by quarrels, by the term of "control". In the public sphere MT is not in the position of selecting and controlling the people involved. He can only "protect himself" and "manage them" if the rules are disregarded by people "having no manners". But at home, since he has selected (his wife) or decides about (his children) the inhabitants, he can control them. As this control is assumed as taking also the shape of auto-control, so no one at home behaves like "having no manners", there are no quarrels.

## 14.

H.B.: Male, 55 years old. Married with 3 children. Retired watchman. The beaten party in the case through which I found him. From Elazığ, but living in Istanbul for 20 years.

HB presents himself as a person with respect to the law, not ignorant, who does not forget manners even in hard situations, who has his common sense. Quarreling is a situation, HB is "by profession" used to. As he said to me "on the issues you are going to ask I have a great knowledge." While quarrel is familiar, it is not a phenomenon that belongs to his life, from his presentation. As he is a watchman he carries out the duty of dispersing quarrels and catching them. And quarrelors are "ignorant people".

HB states that there is only one quarrel he was a party in and this is the one that led to the legal case from which I found him. HB buys some lemons and puts them into the back of his utility car to "make use of his spare times." HB and his young son got to the market to sell the lemons. But the market people provoke his son by swearing and by hitting and a quarrel develops. Both HB and his son got beaten, to such extend "If the police did not arrive, they would have killed us".

HB said that during the fight he was carrying a gun with him, but he thought, those people were not worth to shoot upon and further he is not "such an ignorant man", so

he did not fire the gun.

In this account of quarrel, a striking point is that in his world, the borderline between quarrelsome, ignorant people and non-quarreling, not ignorant people, which HB presented, seems to be highly unclear. Despite his son being not ignorant, he reacts to the market people's provocations because of his "youth". Although HB is neither ignorant nor young or inexperienced, he takes part in the fight just because his son involves in the fight.

Being ignorant, thus having no manners, is the major criterion by which HB classifies people. And if we combine this with his other remarks, it may be said that the life experience of being ignorant corresponds the harder, the more rigid and thus a more contested life. Not being ignorant, on the other hand, corresponds to living in better conditions, in higher cultivated environments and being more "civilized."

In this regard, HB's insistence of HB on he had quarrelled only once in all his life and this was with "ignorant market people" seems significant.

Now, lets return again to the distinction between quarrelsome and non-quarreling people, made by HB. It is perhaps because of the ambivalence of this differentiation, that HB gives a great importance to status of profession. He told me he was a retired policeman,<sup>1</sup> while his wife had

---

<sup>1</sup>A police man has a higher status than a watchman. Further, he unveiled his other occupation (of being a driver) with shame.



told me he was a retired watchman. If we take into account that he once tried to sell lemons at the market and at present is working as a driver, it would not much speculation to assume that his pension does not keep up with their household expenditures, so he is forced to work for an additional income. But HB explained his attempt to sell lemons, as well as his occupation as a driver, as "make a use out of our spare time". During our conversation he did in no way mention financial problems.

His eagerness not to link selling lemons to financial difficulties, may also be seen in the light of having status, being civilized. Because, "the market people, you know, are ignorant people. One has to avoid to get involved with them." But even with the ultimate justification of earning his living, selling lemons leads him becoming equal with lemon sellers and getting involved with them. Meanwhile HB sees himself in no way equal to lemon sellers. Earning the living of the family bears further significance. Making the living is a state upon which in Turkey most men build their main responsibility, even their manhood.<sup>2</sup>

HB is not in favor of beating. Neither at home nor outside. At home, he stated he did not beat his wife, because it was not ever necessary. He cannot think about a

---

<sup>2</sup>The parents of girls in marriage age are unwilling to consider unemployed men and those who had not accomplished their military service, as a fiancée for their daughter. The importance attributed to having a job and completing military service is obvious.

situation in which his wife could hit him; but if she does, it may be tolerated because of her anger. For his wife is actually a good tempered woman, only may be outraged for that moment, this is "quite human".

Outside home he is also not in favor of fights. In my opinion his own physical weakness plays a great part in this attitude. He explained why he did not retaliate against his opponents in the fight in question, by saying, "I did not hit them, because my strength already does not match theirs... Then, my age is also improper, I cannot hit them...they are all young, they are not my age, I would be ashamed in hitting them."

First, here is lack of power. Then, even if he had the strength their ages did not match. So, even if he does not quarrel, that does not mean he has not strict rules about quarreling. On the contrary, the relation between quarrel and beating he establishes makes one think he may be considered highly "experienced" about quarrels.

First of all, his words imply the thought that anyone who gets beaten in a quarrel loses his reputation. On the other hand his position does not allow him to ignore the fact of being beaten. So he pushes the situation to a more dramatic level where a behavior, that in no way can be approved at "civilized" dimensions, becomes necessary. His remark about having a gun with him and about not having fired, because he is "not ignorant like them", is an example.

## 15.

M.D. Male. 37 years old. Not married. He was born in Artvin, but until 1985 had lived in Zonguldak, now has been living in Istanbul. Busdriver. Previously miner and "kabadayı". No criminal record. Stayed in detention for several months in the aftermath of the 12th September.

MD presents himself as a person who defends his rights, does not avoid fights, a man of honour who views "matters" in a human way, honourable in the eyes of people including fascists, despite the fact that he is leftist, bearing responsibility, but not intervening into the lives of others, concerned with ensuring them to develop their own attitudes, who lives for others.

His family is from Artvin, he was born there. He tells about his father being a "rough". "He had a nickname in Artvin", as every "külhanbeyi" in the town did. In his childhood his family moves to Zonguldak for work. So, he remarked also that during his life in Zonguldak he worked in the mines, too.

The neighbourhood they lived in Zonguldak, is a slum district of that town. The street, water and electric power supply, the garbage disposal do not function. It is also stated that this neighborhood has a reputation for producing "troublesome" people. In the "pre-political" period (he means the 1970's), MD walks around as rough, "külhanbeyi" in this district and sometimes takes tribute from people. But "I did not challenge weak people. I did

not oppress nobody." He is trained in boxing and in using weapons. But has no criminal record, yet he visits the police station quite often.

In the days of his youth there are some "usages" (*racon*) he applies too. For example, to "send to buy cigarettes" those who are "the beginners of the coffeehouse." The nicknames given to the persons indicate to some degree their position in the group.<sup>1</sup>

Besides, there are some "usages" MD "does not like" and has not been applying. The use of beads (*tesbih çekmek*), is one of them. As he tells, it seems to be a hint about staying in prison so long that it produced addiction to beads. But the action that leads to imprisonment has to be "shooting a person" or so, such guilts like theft, adultery, etc. would cause humiliation, "nobody would look into your face in prison."

Another behavior that has a standard meaning is "to bang ones fist onto other's table". That means insulting that person (it is conceived this way both by the performer as well as by the addressee.) MD tells he would not "let alive" someone who dared to do this.

In his review of those days he sees some continuances and some differences. The continuances are

---

<sup>1</sup>"Kolejli C." who is sent for cigarettes by MD, later becomes "Baba C.", "chief of the fascists". Here the nickname changes according to the status and, the direction indicated by this change is of interest. So M.D. remarks that he wondered who "Baba C." was, but remembered him as "our Kolejli C.". His own nickname was "Hacı".

quarrelling and fighting only, their causes and the levels of fights have changed, according to him.

The first one of differences is his "view of the world. For instance his sister, who once would not dare to speak in his presence, can now tell him her problems. He sees the women equal to himself, or more exactly he wants them "to get their financial independence, become free".

In his period of "*külhanbeyi*", he says, he put great importance on "feudal" values like friendship, grace, bravery, solidarity, etc., but he states he is not feudal anymore. This difference he could not tell very clearly, but he contented with saying, his "attitude towards life" has changed.

About his period of "*külhanbeyi*" he tells that in his neighborhood it was forbidden "to look at the girls", to flirt, that means, they had been forbidden by themselves. But in this banning he is very sincere. As he told about a girl he loved in that period he summed up his relationship with the girl as follows: "That is, I had a photograph of her that I hid in my place."

In that period his relations with his parents are "more stormy" than today. But a continuing element in his family relations that he stresses, is that he does not allow them to interfere with his own affairs, that he draws his own sphere and does not allow his father to intervene there. To avoid acting insincerely, he smoked and drunk time to time in his father's presence, despite traditionally one does not do this, he told. Another thing he does not allow

his father to interfere is his hair and beard length and style and his wearing.

MD divides his life into two periods: Before and after becoming a revolutionary. Being a revolutionary is a struggle to change himself, viewing the world and the relations he is living within in a broader range, an effort to explain the life. But in evaluating this effort, he is unable to explain the differences he has experienced being a revolutionary in the same clarity as the continuities.

After becoming a revolutionary, he begins to work for "revolution" with all his power. He shoulders the problems of his neighborhood. When the curves of the street lead to the killing of a child in a traffic accident, he gathers the neighborhood and propagates to dig holes into the asphalt to make the drivers slow down. This is carried out then by the people of the neighborhood.

Other example he told is that there is a cinema in the neighborhood that shows "sex films", because "it would not make money with other films".<sup>2</sup> As the owner of the theater insists on showing sex films, MD organizes a neighbourhood committee including leading CHP, AP, and MSP members and provides for the shutdown of the cinema. And they achieve their aim.

MD's most significant ideological component that

---

<sup>2</sup>Children are among the onlookers. M.D. goes there to see what "the people" watch. When he dislikes the film, he cries slogans saying "this is a bad film, it is disgusting." The owner of the cinema begs him to be quiet.

prevails during both his "külhanbeyi", and his revolutionary periods, is in my opinion, being a "member of the neighbourhood".

This appears both in fighting with the problems of the neighbourhood, and in his remarks about the behaviour of the "fascists" and the "police" towards him. When telling about the police director giving him advice, he says "of course, he knows what Soguksu<sup>3</sup> is." Similarly he remarks that the fascists could not touch him, because they knew if something happened to M.D., the whole neighborhood would have to "carry after him."

Two affairs of running with a girl, can demonstrate the change of ideological attitude in MD.

The first incidence takes place in Zonguldak when MD is a "külhanbeyi." The fiancée of his sister is "a type who does what his parents say." "A month before the wedding" MD tells him "to find a job", but the fiancée fails to do it. MD reacts by preventing the wedding plans. This he does without consulting his sister, because he says, "at that time, she could not say any word to me". But his sister flees with her fiancée and marries. After that, M.D. threatens them and the married pair cannot come to Zonguldak for a year. Their father negotiates with M.D. and only after this, his sister is able to visit her parents' house. When she sends her newborn baby to MD, he

---

<sup>3</sup>The place where the events mentioned above took place, is in Zonguldak.

gets reconciled with his sister, too.<sup>4</sup> His explanation for this affair is that "well, there was then manhood for me."

The second affair is about his nephew. His 18 years old nephew elopes with a 16 years old girl and gets imprisoned for this. He spends three months in prison and leaves the prison thanks to MD's intervention helping him marry the girl. After this, MD brings his nephew and wife to his own home in Istanbul. He finds a job for his nephew and plans to send the girl to a computer course. He explains this second intervention by "the father of my nephew, that is my elder brother, fails to do his duty as a father." Secondly, being imprisoned may well bring reputation to his nephew in Zonguldak, and since his nephew is very young he can take the advantage of this reputation and become a "parasite".

If we take these affairs diachronical, we really observe a certain change of attitude. But here, a matter of interest, the question is about continuity. A striking common feature in both cases is MD's capacity as an "active man".

In both affairs which in fact are not directly affecting his life, he is highly, perhaps as much as the

---

<sup>4</sup>In affairs of running away with a girl, it seems to be a widely common pattern that the parents or the elders forgive when a "grandchild" has born. The compromise of MD might also have been predicted. But by expressing the reaction he finds necessary, he keeps his reputation unchallenged. It seems improbable that he would refuse his sister "for a life period". May be, MD had the expectation that "the others" would mediate and reconcile him.



original figures and having a determining role, involved in the events.

While stating that he and his view towards life has changed, he is indirectly admitting that this change is not radical in all aspects. For instance, he states that his attitude to his nephew would be different if the cause to his imprisonment were homosexuality instead of running away with a girl. He said to me that he would defend him in the sense of putting him out of prison, but he would further help him only if his nephew lives heterosexual life. In contrast, he stated also that "in the past" he would "not have let him alive" if his nephew became homosexual.

We may understand MD's attitude towards women by considering his attitude on marriage. In this regard, I will compare his opinions about two possible marriages. The first one is his sister's. The husband with whom his sister once married by eloping with, died in a traffic accident. MD states he does not oppose her "marrying" again and that this "is her matter". But he opposes to his sister "living with a man without marrying", because he thinks his sister would be "unhappy", if the man would see this relationship as an "adventure". And he is eager to save her from being unhappy, because he thinks, in the end it would be him who has to cope with the emerging problems.

The second possible marriage is his own. He has two love affairs in his revolutionary period and he lives with each girl respectively, for a long time, without marrying.

As he states, the main problem in both relationships was the girl's "desire to marry." MD evaluates the demands of girls to marry, to make their relationship official, as "seeking refuge". To the question, why it should be the woman who seeks refuge in the relationship, he answers "the point of view of people of that level is such."<sup>5</sup>

But while he wants "women to be free and emancipated", he states the women are stuck to the idea of "marriage".

Both in his love affairs and his relations with his family, he states a dislike of quarreling, that means "grumbling and nagging." Despite he is well known for his quarrelsome behaviour, he remarks that the people in his environment are aware of this and act accordingly. That means it is not he who avoids the trouble, it is the people of his environment.

But he says, he never hit neither his father nor his mother. He did not hit his father because "it does not come up to that." If his father insulted him "in front of

---

<sup>5</sup>The difference of "level" between him and his lovers goes beyond the difference of sex. This difference should be searched in MD himself being a revolutionary while they are not. Being revolutionary is defined here as emancipating himself from the prevailing moral standards and viewing the world in a critical way, in terms of "understanding the world". Consequently these statements are followed by the opinion that the women approach their position with a kind of "wrong consciousness". This wrong consciousness is not only related with being woman, but also with being afflicted by the prevailing ideology and being "alienated" to her own interests. MD also remarked that he told his lovers "the matters" and that they listened, sometimes asking questions.

his friends", he would have him pay this." This does not mean that he would beat his father but he would take aside and warn him in a strong manner. Despite this attitude is not quarrel and does not include fighting, it was told as an answer to "when would you hit your father?" and under the title "then I would beat him." His reason for not hitting his father is the inequality of strength. "You cannot hit someone who does not strike at you. You hit and he stays without any reactions." MD expresses this way that he would fight only with a person who has a comparable strength or that he takes the people he quarrels as equally strong.

He would never hit his mother, for she is a "woman" and is weak by category.

An interesting feature, MD sees quarreling also as a means of communication within, at least, family. So, his mother quarrels and cries at him, while she behaves more "coldly" towards his elder brother. This way, he explained the greater distance between his elder brother and his mother by remarking that they do not quarrel with each other.

Meanwhile MD sees quarrel and the resulting act of beating as imposed on him: "Do you believe, after beating someone, I sit down and cry, asking myself why I did it." But he beats in spite of this, because he gets "angry". At the point where methods of persuasion are exhausted anger begins. "You are unable to persuade either yourself

or the one you face. When it comes not the way you want, you get angry."

MD sees his revolutionary position as a brake to his quarrelsomeness nature. Recently, driving a minibus, he collides with a taxi. The taxi driver swears him. MD tells: "If it happened in the past, and he swore me, I certainly would kill him. I would cut him to pieces." Now he does not do that, because "it as a matter of the system. So, at such a point I stop." Then he pleads with the people around, to take the man away whom he would "cut to pieces" if it happened in the past. He avoids fighting.

To sum up, MD is someone who quarrels and fights in all his life , who chooses the way of quarrelling with different reasons. In his revolutionary period, however (including his years in Istanbul), he states to practice restraint, not to quarrel. But he sees himself not as a weak party, not as one who would be beaten in a figth. Just the opposite, he is someone who at the same time has achieved the goals he aimed with quarreling. But as he concludes that the main problem is a "problem of the system" and he does not want individual solutions anymore, so in a sense has begun to think by the viewpoint of his opponent as well, he does not choose the means of quarreling or fighting. And, as his opponents know or understand that if he wanted he could beat them, disputes are avoided. This establishes in my opinion a good example to the "practice" of violence as a potential threat.

It should be stated that it is not significant

whether MD really uses being a revolutionary as a brake, or whether being revolutionary is really as a brake or not, and whether being revolutionary is an effective brake to the extent MD suggests. What significant is that MD as a person who has been experiencing quarrel and/or fight considers violence as a tool which can be used on purpose.



## 16.

Y.A. Male. 27 years old. Not married. Graduated from lycee. Born and living in Istanbul for all his life. Mechanic.

YA presents himself as an upset, quarrelsome, reckless, sincere, young person with broad relationships, pride of being born and grown up in Bakırköy, newly adult, not yet entered life of responsibility.

He is one of the four fellows, who, on the way from an entertainment where also alcohol is consumed, pick up a man whom they witness to be wounded in a traffic accident, bring him into hospital and there get involved in a fighting with hospital workers.

One point of emphasize in Y.A.'s words about himself is the fact that although they (his family) are settled in Bakırköy since three generations, they have no property at all. This he explains by the different reasoning of his grandfather. That is there is no bad chance, shortcoming, injustice. "They offered the area from Iskele Caddesi to Ebuuziyya Caddesi to my grandfather and he did not buy it. His policy was, a tenant has thousand houses, while a house owner has only one... I was born in the house, from where my father left for military service. We still live there."

In accordance with that we see in his plans regarding marriage the notion of taking responsibility and this means to "afford everything." YA states that his

profession provides him with a good income and despite owning a shop only for two years, he has made the money for a car. His major longing is for making the money for a house as early as he can.

Such a close relationship between having money and fulfilling his responsibilities is also expressed in his thoughts about a love affair that lasts one year. He says, it was the first time, he thought "good things" about a girl, spending his life with her, but in fact, since he had not completed his military service, he deemed his relationship "too early" and he would perhaps be "unable to cope with, thus the affair would end in disillusion." That is interesting, because this is a relationship that has already ended against his will and because it did not achieve the desired goal. For this reason, his reflections about the would be disillusionment (he would experience if the relationship did go on) could be explained by the meaning he gives to being young..

YA sees marriage as the only or at least most important place where one has "his own" home, his "family". That is marriage is a kind of beginning of an independent life on his own feet. For this reason he speaks about "doing everything". As he wants peace at home, he sees it as a duty to provide for all electronic instruments, for a nice stereo set, because his wife would demand it "anyway" and if he could not provide it, the peace in the family would disappear.

Further, when he qualifies himself as young, he

presents this as an explanation for several things he does, at present. He has a stereotype of youth in his mind, and he explains his behaviors with this stereotype -youngsters are not expected to contribute to the family budget, etc. For instance his opinion about his relationship with his family is such. He told he used ththeir home in recent years "like to a hotel, only to sleeping" and he failed to contribute to the household despite he had an income. He explains it by saying "it is because of youth,or so." Being young and being not within a continuous family order have a close connection, for him.

Although YA defines himself as hot tempered and quarrelsome guy, thinks at the same time, he has self-control. For instance he says, he is keeping his anger inwards, because he knows "there would be a quarrel if I said something". He states although he never seeks a quarrel and does not behave like a rowdy, he reason for him to quarrel much when even he was a junior high school and lycee student was that thhe "all troubles fall upon him."

During his education at lycee, he tells, those gangs who emerged in the aftermath of the 12th September in Bakırköy, did not leave him in peace and threatened him with "death". It is because of this that he carries an "instrument" with him. Despite actually having broad relationships, the fact that he is forced to carry an "instrument", he explains as "we did not stick together. They went around like horde. What can you do on your own?"



The weapon he carried is a kind of stick with a chain on it, called "mapçaka".

YA said, despite quarreling very often, he never got beaten. Although he is trained in judo and bears the orange band, he explains this by his "quickness", he finds it unrelated to his judo training.

He says, "the only issue" where YA does not keep down his anger, is "honour". If there is a girl with him, whether she is his girl friend or not, he says to make a quarrel, if they do a "move" to her. Such a quarrel he told, is as follows: In a taxi he takes with his girlfriend, he puts his arm on her shoulder. The driver warns him to get his arm off the girl. As they arrive at their destination he returns to the taxi without letting the girl know and this dialogue with the taxi driver occurs: "Do you have a wife?" "I have." "Is she your honour?" " Yes." "And that girl is my honour. What you say?.. Can you not define a whore, a rowdy from their look? Do I look like a rowdy?"

The emphasis given to "honour" here is of interest. Then he adds that this attitude does apply not only to his girlfriend, but to any girl at his side. While speaking to me YA was very easy, he used his daily language, in his accounts of events he did not choose the way of covering up and for this, he made explanations at points where he thought I might misunderstand him. These explanations made the impression on me that he is a "good family boy"; His words support this impression: when he was brought to the

police station in the case they went to court, his expression of, "with handcuffs, as if we were criminals", his emphasize on going to the teagarden, not to the coffeehouse that is an only men's place, when he told about playing cards, he needed to add it was not for money -that is, it is not gambling. Similarly, when he says quarrel, he does not mean hard fighting. "What do you mean by quarrel? Group quarrels are very rare, but the other type of quarrel occurs quite often."

In the eyes of YA the starting cause or excuse of the quarrel is not important. Or, the seeming cause besides the underlying real reason is unimportant. The two quarrels he told are supporting this view. The first one is his beating the teahouse waiter who has a speech impediment. The waiter is a very ungrateful man. Despite permanently taking cigarettes from YA and his business partner, he never offers one when YA is out of cigarettes, and he requests it. This makes him angry. At that day the waiter comes to take back the empty glasses and YA stands in the entry of his shop, preventing passage. The waiter wants to get through, YA tells him to come later. The waiter attempts to get through and YA hits him with the fist.

This quarrel he told by adding, "Actually I was upset about him, there were other things that made me upset. I did not intend to discharge my frustration on him, but he did not get the beating for nothing."

The second example is the affair that brought him into court. YA says they saw a wounded man on their way and brought him into hospital. despite that in the emergency department nobody cared about the wounded. They called upon the hospital workers to call the doctors. When the hospital workers see the three youngsters who enter the emergency department together as rowdies and attempt to repel them with mobs and the quarrel occurs. Here too, what counts is not being right in procedure that counts, but being right "in essence".



## 17.

T.A. Male. 25 years old. Not married. Graduated from High School. He has one elder sister. Mechanic. Born and living in Istanbul. He lived in Germany for 9 years.

TA portrays himself as a sensitive, introvert person who cannot help helping the ones in trouble whether it is human or animal.

His father is living in Germany, married to a German woman for 18 years, while his mother suffers from paralysis. He is earning his mother's living. He stated that he also had lived in Germany for 9 years, immediately after settling there he had brought his mother to his side, but he had to return to Turkey because of his military service. He is one of the two co-owners of an electrical machines shop for almost two years.

The subject of the previous case YA is a schoolmate and neighborhood friend of his present business partner. In the quarrel that brought them into court they are also together.

TA was present during my interview with YA and in the interview with TA the other was also there. I interviewed YA first. Both requested to do it this way. When I requested TA to tell the same quarrel, he changed it very little. The first difference is about the reasons for taking the wounded man into their car and bringing him into hospital. TA, besides his sensitiveness, also mentioned the

consumption of alcohol as a certain source of courage for intervening. While YA was inclined to outrule the effect of alcohol by reasoning, "we have drunk, but we are not drunken, so are in full consciousness."

The second difference relates to TA falling to the ground and getting a chair hit upon his head during the fight. TA stated that it was not the hospital workers hitting or pushing him, but his feet slipping out that caused him to fall down. "That is there is no reason to beat me."

Except these points, it is the same story. So, the wounded is mainly brought there by TA, at the first hospital they bring him into, the wounded is not accepted, at the second hospital, Çapa, they do not supply a stretcher, nobody cares about the wounded, they are forced to go and take the stretcher themselves. Meanwhile they get in a room where they should not normally get in, and as the doctor comes the hospital workers attempt to force them out, treating them like "rowdies", while a "more rough type" hospital worker pushes YA and he (TA) falls down. This scene cause the quarrel begin.

As I interviewed TA he prepared for his wedding. Regarding marriage he considers himself in a better position than YA because he has completed his military service. He thinks "you need a lot of money" for marriage, because "a house has to have everything". More than this, there is the need to own a house. On acquiring his own house and furnishing it, he tells, he counts on his

father's promise and he will add a certain "saving" of his own. This account may be seen a little more as "leaning upon family, expecting it from the family" attitude if compared with YA. Because YA was accepting that marriage requires every need of household to be completed at once, but told he could manage them on his own. But this does not mean that he wouldn't accept his family's help.

For this reason, it seems to me that the difference does not lie in their expectations from their families; but in their expressions. In other words, it is a difference of personality. So, while TA is considering himself introvert and sensitive, YA tells about himself to have a broad spectrum of relations, being a little wiseacre (outspoken).

In short, while actually their expectations are not much different, one expresses this expectation directly in terms of his family carrying out its promises<sup>1</sup> while the other speaks about his own fulfilling the responsibilities in marriage and passing the threshold of having his own family.

---

<sup>1</sup>It seems significant to me that these expectations which TA expressed in terms of trust, are directed to a father who is living separate for 18 years.

18.

E.G. Female. 37 years old. Housewife. Married with two children. Graduated from primary school. Born into an immigrant family from Romania in Istanbul (in 1920s). Living in Istanbul. Stayed in Germany for 6 years.

E.G. presents herself as a good wife, a good mother who does what is required to keep the order function, who can sacrifice herself, puts herself under pressure and is unable to quarrel, believes also that being unable to quarrel is not healthy.

What are the reasons for this selfpressure? She states that in her childhood her mother was buying the cloth and slippers without telling her father, and she is wrong. According to E.G. her mother disobeys her husband at one hand and does not behave in accordance with the income of her husband. EG finds her mother faulty to keep on seeing a neighbour while her father forbid it, although the reason for that is not that logical. As her mother is acting this way, her father gets angry and beats her.

EG does not find her father right in all occasions, but if it might taken into consideration that these events happen 30 years ago, she thinks her mother should have obeyed her husband even if he was wrong, to "prevent the children to be worried, preserve peace" and she finds her mother wrong by these arguments.

But she thinks that in fact the difference between

being town or country origin underlies the disharmony between her mother and father. She remarks that her mother came from the country and did not change, while her father was from town and more sophisticated. The cause of her father's disharmony is his wife's shortcoming. "My father could not bring home any friend, because my mother did not know a thing." Soon after these words; "I could never speak with my mother, because a quarrel followed immediately. She concludes the reason for her mother staying unchanged as a country girl as her father's pressure to some degree, but also her mother's inability.

Despite being eager to go to school, she is not sent to school after elementary school and kept at home to wait until marriage. But despite there is no other way for her than to marry she finds she is not prepared to marriage. A major cause for this is their immigration to Germany at the age of 13. There, she said, the children went to school, the parents worked, while EG stayed at home and did the housework. "Out there, there were Germans...There were several Turkish families but they were newly wed, so they could not openly speak in my presence."<sup>1</sup> So she grows up without having the chance to prepare for marriage. She cannot find the conditions for developing expectations about marriage. And weds knowing not much what she expects from marriage. "As I wed, I said only, he

---

<sup>1</sup>The girls are not allowed to have close contact with the newly wed brides, with the fear that they might learn about intimacy of marriage.



should not drink, or smoke." Further, "I thought this about marriage. He should not hit at me like my father did to my mother. My father did beat my mother. It was not very often, perhaps once in a year, but it disturbed me well enough."

The fact that she was able to practice this decision up to now in her marriage, depends to a certain degree on her husband, but she thinks it is mainly a result of her policy of selfsacrifice. She says as her husband was the eldest of eight children, "he found comfort when we married." So they continue a marriage where they share the nice aspects and "the demands are not emphasized". But the main responsibility in "sharing the nice aspects" lies with EG. So she remarks that it is she who sacrifices for the most time.

The objects of selfsacrifice are mainly things depending on money like furniture, clothing, holiday travels.

Another basic method to keep her marriage going, is "openlyness". That is she feels she is accountable to her husband, on all her doings, all her buyings, all places she goes. She finds it as a duty to inform her husband, even if he did not ask. So she preserves respect and confidence in her marriage and prevents rumors and suffering in her marriage.

EG is someone who spends her life at home, whether it is in her father's or in her own. Her life is organized

within home. Thus her quarrels belong also to home.

Although she stressed the necessity of being self sacrificing she pointed out that she was not that patient now and wanted to a "good quarrel" which would bring an end, but she could not realize this aim, because her husband neither quarrelled nor changed his attitude in question.

The most urgent issue over which she quarrels is providing for the needs of the children. She tells, for instance, that as she wants to have her children had private lessons, her husband is unwilling, but as he sees that she is ready for a quarrel, he agrees with her demand. She thinks, if they would do a "good" quarrel, many problems would be solved anyway instead of being left suspended, even if she would "get the beating." Thus, her husband measures the degree of her determination. If she refrains from quarrel, her husband does not meet her demand.

But how could it be explained that her husband restrains from quarrel despite he is seen as the stronger party?

EG explains this in short as, "an established order, just going on, he cannot disrupt this, because he is satisfied with it." As they have children, he avoids the probably causes of a quarrel and he tries to keep peace at home. Instead he makes his way through, a little this, a little that way, keeping things at a balance. Thus this is what actually happens. Meanwhile, she says neither she nor

her husband would already be able to take the risk of a divorce and their marriage is "goes on". The only reason for her divorce could be adultery despite she has no savings she can build upon and she thinks that her husband, too, would only attempt to divorce in a similar situation, that is, if there is a matter of "honour". Here the language is significant. Her husband's betrayal is defined by the existence of another woman, but her betrayal is told as "that is my pride, I cannot stand it." This, seems to me, indicates an uncritical takeover of men's concepts, perhaps unconsciously or an infiltration of these concepts to her thinking and language. But this infiltration is not only on the level of speaking, but also on the ideology that is accepted.

Another situation EG feels pressure upon herself, is the responsibility of her brothers and her sister. She thinks her three brothers and her sister are expecting too much from her, since their parents were dead. It is a spectrum of expectations that ranges from acquiring a profession, wedding, to cleaning of the brother's household, washing the dish and caring for the sister's children and tailoring clothes for them.

Whatever the expectations of her brothers and sister might be, she could refuse to feel such pressure. E.G. explains the reason for her feeling this pressure by being "grown up this way. It is in myself." And she cannot do without thinking of them.

A significant point about the expectations is the striking gap between the expectations from her sister and the ones from herself. She describes her sister, EC, as one who "does not want to care even for her own children and does her best to mislead the situation so that I feel the responsibility for them instead of her, and who gets beaten by her husband and her mother-in-law."<sup>2</sup>

As EC is such a person, who does not say a word against anything done to her, who chooses to keep up with it, EG states that no one expects EC to do anything, but everyone does, on the contrary, expect EG to do something for EC: "If I, too, was beaten like EC by my husband, nobody would expect anything from me. If I get beatings, or use weakness as an excuse, then nobody would expect anything from me."

Money is a very basic thing in the world of EG and it belongs to the men. Or at leasts, something handled by them. She agrees that what is up to the woman is not to tell the things her husband failed to buy or achieve, not to embarass her husband by letting others know.

The attitudes of EG's three brothers towards money is different. EG makes this statement and explains this by the difference in the way they brought up. The eldest of her brothers likes luxury much, spends more than he has. The second one is thrifty, keeps up with his income, but

---

<sup>2</sup>I had interviewed E.C. too. But as she got psychiatric treatment for three months, I considered it to more proper to exclude her from this study.

this does not mean using cheap things, but preserving his chosen level of consumption.

She argues that the eldest of her brothers likes luxury, because he is the oldest one of the boys and the father willingly give him pocket money. "As he grew up a little, they took him immediately in a position of man. My father on one hand, my mother on the other gave him pocket money...For example, when they went anywhere, my father liked very much that A spend the money. But B was not in such a position."

So while the big brother achieves manly behavior and learns spending money, the second one is in this regard not brought up "like a man". And this leads to a deviating attitude towards money. He becomes thrifty. If a behavior of being thrifty is to keep with the income, provide for the optimal supply of the household which is regarded as woman's duty, the second brother behaves rather "like a woman."

EG says she quarrels very often with her brothers. But means that she is telling them the things she dislikes in their lives and they listen to the rebuke.

About selfsacrifice and not quarreling and in recent years being unable to quarrel in recent years in her marriage, there is a further aspect. There is a quarrel she reluctantly told me after I put off the tape. In the first years of their marriage, her husband begins to watch a TV program that she finds too noisy. EG turns off the TV, saying "will you watch such noise." Upon this, her husband

puts a slap on her face and turns on the TV again to watch the program. EG does not raise her voice at that moment, but she thinks about it and comes to a conclusion. So she concludes, her husband "temper is such" and modifies her behavior to keep up with her husband. To prevent any other beating, she watches out at her steps.

Despite her practicing this decision for many years and being successful, she told that she feels "to be impatient in recent years" and wants "quarrel, even if I have to get beaten." And she tries to quarrel on occasion.

She says "my demand is that he (she means her husband) takes me seriously....I have been sharing his poverty, I can share his money, too. But he does not say to me that he has some money."

She clearly pointed out that her husband invests his savings or buys real estate, that he not spend his savings for himself, that he does not gamble, etc. We concluded that her husband as a person who earns his family's living fulfills his social duties. But this fulfillment does not satisfy EG, and does not secure peace in their family life.

She says that she wants to participate in the decisions about, for example, the savings. She argues that since she goes shares with her husband in his poverty, that since her education level and her reasoning ability, at least, equal her husband's, her husband should ask her advice on the family's savings. But her husband does not recognize that EG has the right of deciding on family's

matters, she quarrels him. However, her husband neither quarrel nor beat her. Although the real cause of her quarrel is her demand to be taken seriously by her husband, and to participate in the decisions, the occasions are mostly to provide "her" (in fact, their) children's needs.



#### IV. PART 3: GENERAL INTERPRETATION OF THE CASES

##### A. CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND VIOLENCE

###### 1. Ideal and Reality

The narrations of the cases reveal two levels, which are not separated but in interactive relations.

The first is the fictional level. Everything that is considered as ideologically valid is located in this level. These are not arguments only presented this way to the researcher but establish ideal types for the narrators and express a body of relations, which the narrators prefer to conform and to fill up the contents, and reproducing them. Existing and succeeding social and cultural stereotypes also belong to this level.

The second level consists of the experiences of the narrators in their real lives: roles that are not filled up by them, disillusionments, compromises, defeats and also personal interpretations belong to this level.

First we will discuss the elements that are located in these levels. These include the major relationships the individuals are living in, that is, relationships of the close environment, intrafamily relations and the external relations of the family. By analyzing these elements, we will try to reveal the connections between the ideal and the real, and decode the interaction between those two levels.



Further, both levels include power relations and violence; more specifically with the ideal level (as it represents an ideal, static situation) containing a model of domination and the reality containing power relations. Through examining how violence exists in the ideal level, we will discuss the aspect of violence as a social means. Additionally, we will discuss the meanings that underlie the difference between, how power relations are connected by the narrators to violence in the ideal level on one hand, and how they are established in reality on the other hand.

Then, over a comparison of these levels, we will see that a potential of violence is immanent to even a "good" or "ideal" functioning of a system of norms and values. From there we will examine the circumstances under which violence is a necessary, convenient communication tool, a social means.

a. The Ideal: Family Relations, Male and Female Stereotypes

The major social environment of the narrators' lives is the family and interfamily relations. It is emphasized that relations of mutual help, solidarity and respect prove to be continuous. However, for our analysis, the capacity of this family as an economically and politically (bearing the competence of decision) independent unit.

In this independent unit, man is the master of the

house. It is his duty to earn his family's living. His capacity of earning the living of the family provides him a privileged position in the decisions of the family. On the other hand, the woman acts mainly as mother and wife.

Upon this fundament, the home and everything related to it is regarded as the private, while the outside of home is considered as part of the public sphere: this distinction corresponds to the identification of woman to privacy, man to public. The distinction between the private and the public spheres leads to different expectations from man and woman, thus to different stereotypes of female and male identities.

The attributes that establish female identity and 'praise' a woman are consequently, respectability, ladylikeness, manners, morality, kindness, cleanliness, skill, diligence.<sup>1</sup>

On the contrary, man is expected to be energetic, clever, brave, boastful: qualities that aim at coping with the world outside. A close connection between male and work, and having a job is established. Any interruption to that connection may lead to a loss of maleness, at least to such a feeling by the male himself, and to the emerging of situations where this "weakness" is abused by others. (This point of loss of maleness varies. A woman's working may

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf.: Başaran, Fatma: "Ailede Cinsiyet Rollerine İlişkin Tutum Değişimleri", in Türkiye'de Ailenin Değişimi: Toplumbilimsel İncelemeler. Başaran elaborates, in her article, the values affirmed for women and men.

implicate that her husband is unable to provide the living of the household and fails to fulfill his male duties, while in other instances this meaning is established only if the male does not work.)

A common point about women's working is that her job "makes sense" only if it does not interrupt her duties as mother and wife.<sup>2</sup> The relations of women to males outside family is also established through their social roles. In their relationship to neighbours or colleagues, that is to the individuals outside their family, they are referred to with family internal attributes like mother, sister, "yenge" (sister-in-law); so it is stated that they are not related to as females but indirectly over a relationship to their male family members. Both male and female individuals affirm their conforming to this main scheme.

Under these circumstances, where the individuals devote themselves to this division of positions with such "interest", decisions within family are made in harmony and "together". And in situations of disagreement, the problem is solved by "restraint and selfsacrifice". Here, it is not only the female who acts in restraint and selfsacrifice,

---

<sup>2</sup>The assumption of an antagonism between woman's work and mother/wife roles is prevailing also in more modern societies and social sectors. A significant indicator for this is that women who work, have a career often prefer to bear a child at later age. The difference is rather, that motherhood is not regarded as "supreme" to professional career.

but the male too. But male restraint and selfsacrifice is strictly not on matters of principle.

b. Denial of Violence in the Ideal Relations

As everyone knows his/her own duties within these relations, how do the narrators assign a place to force and violence?

Above all, lets take a look at how the actors perceive violence at conceptual level. Violence is perceived by the actors mainly as a sanction, a punishment imposed on another individual. This punishment bears mainly physical implications. It follows that the performer of violence is assumed to have the capacity of punishing the other. (This point will lead us to the conclusion that even if they involve the same degree of physical force, violence between equals cannot be perceived in the same category like violence upon subordinates. But this is to be discussed later.)

Meanwhile, force and violence is distinguished ethically. While existence of violence in the family - except towards children- is rejected, the existence of force, especially of internalized force (obedience) is accepted. So, "restraint" or "selfsacrifice" corresponds to force imposed according to the situation by one party to the other.

It is supposed that the members of the family share exactly the same ideological and cultural premises.

Situations in which certain individuals fall apart of the consented cultural and ideological positions mentioned above, lead not to a questioning of those consents but to argumentations that aim at excluding that individual.

Violence of family members in their relations to others is also rejected. Yet almost all of them were involved in judicial suits because of a quarrel. How do they bring this undeniable precedence into line with their ideal description?

There is only one way for it: To explain violence as a phenomenon that lies outside their daily relations, by external psychological reasons. That is, they explain quarrels they were involved in, in terms of the opponent being "kavgacı" (quarrelsome -male), "sirret" (catty - female), having no steady work, being a rowdy, having no manners, being ignorant. Alcohol consumption is also among the significant reasons suggested. But with the difference that this argument is also used in justifying their own involvement into fight.

Another category for their own involvement is the "transgression of limits of endurance." Since they are surrounded by the ignorant, the quarrelsome, the catty, they may be forced to quarrel when they are confronted with such people.

### c. The Meaning of Denial of Violence in Ideal Relations

We can say that the actors experience but reject

violence in their daily relations. An example they reject insistently is the beating of women. "*Bizde kadın dövülmez*" (Among us, it is not allowed to beat women), "*kadına el kalkmaz*" (you should not lift your hand to strike women). This rejection of beating women, cannot be explained in terms of such behavior is regarded as wicked, since they do not hesitate to state that in their actual lives, their wives can be beaten whenever they feel it necessary. Both women and men speak about possible and actual beating of women (see: all cases). But as we shift from daily life to the ideal level, the beating of women becomes ethically rejected.

How come that they exclude violence from their ideal presentation, though it exists in their daily life without conflicting with the limits of normality and though they may affirm it culturally?

To explain this, we have to demonstrate the difference between the manifestation, -actual violence-, and the potentiality of violence, -"claim to violence", and we must prove that these two have different social implications.

Why does a man beat his wife? Simply because "a behaviour of her that requires punishment".<sup>3</sup>

Therefore, a woman who gets regularly beaten, is

---

<sup>3</sup> This is expressed in the interviews through negations: "I do not imagine that my wife would do a fault that requires punishment." (Case 2, HK); "My wife knows my temper and disposition; as I am aggressive, she stays back." (Case 7, EÖ.)

supposed to have committed all the time "violations" that require to be punished. And that means, there is a proper ground for repeated violations and for the violations to become permanent. Further, a constant need for violence (here punishment), implies frequent repetition of that violation and also an implicit recognition by the performer of violence. This is vividly illustrated by the victims' point of views: "There are such women. My mother, too, did it. She said, then I get a beating. I have to take it." (Case 18, EG) Another instance is CP who tells about his failed marriage, and states: "I have beaten my wife often, because she justified the children's wrong behaviours by arguing 'everyone is doing that'." (Case 8).

In short, the permanence of beating, means, in terms of social order, that the cultural and ideological consent does not exist, at least is disintegrated. For this reason it cannot be accepted and affirmed at ethical level. Situations in which beating have become permanent are excluded as "deviations", despite the fact that they grow on that social and cultural ground, and they occur frequently. From the functioning of the social order, there is for that reason a serious difference of meaning between the potentiality or threat of violence and the manifestation of violence.

The existence of the claim to violence is an element that also secures the quality of violence as a means. The existence of violence as a means at hand, -not necessarily to be resorted yet can be used any violating

act- to punish demonstrates the continuance of the cultural consent. The persistence of violence as a threat, its existence as an element affirmed by both parties, is an evidence of the reproducibility of ideological and cultural consent also in daily power relations. The same interpretation can be applied on the beating of children. The possibility of beating the child within the family is accepted; the parents have a claim to beat their child. But it is insisted that beating is not necessary. The term of "dayak arsızı" (child hardened by beating and hence impudent) is an evidence in this context.

## 2. Manifestations of Violence in Reality

### a. Violence Between Inequals: Beating

It was mentioned above that the primary meaning of violence, emphasized by the actors, is imposing sanctions upon someone, which is done by use or indication of physical force. This refers directly to the social status of performer and victim of violence. So, the existing violence standards dictate who may perform violence on whom and how.

Out of their daily experience, the actors know two major kinds of violence: *dayak* (beating) and *kavga* (quarrel) and *dövüş* (fight). Both manifestations of violence involve performing physical force on another person, and especially on his/her body. But these two



types of violence are referring to different forms of relations and to different cultural codes.

Beating is conceptualized as a realization of the claim to violence. That is, one imposes a sanction upon the other. In this sense, beating represents a form of violence, performed by the dominant to the subordinated. In terms of violence, this difference of status means that the claim to beat by the performer is accepted at ethical level by the beaten person. The beaten ones formulate it this way: "The woman has to avoid being beaten." It is meant in no way that the woman has to oppose her husband's beating, but rather that she has to behave not in a way that would lead her husband to beat her (cases 3 and 18).

The interviews reveal that the actors establish the justification of violence as application of physical force upon another person's body or its indication, on two different levels. We may call the first one, the categorical level. The person on whom violence is inflicted accepts the claim to violence by the performer. The instances of the husband beating his wife, or the parents beating their children being regarded by the beaten persons as a justified claim, a right, are an evidence for this category. The second level is the actual justification.

The victim of violence, or even possible performer of it, putting aside the question whether the performer has a legitimated claim to it, interrogates the legitimacy of the performance of violence in that actual event. So, the person does not accept that the other party is justified,

even if she/he accepts the performer to be categorically "right". Women's speaking about "normal beating" and "excessive beating" is an evidence in this regard.

#### b. Violence Between Equals: the Quarrel or the Fight

The other type for the manifestation of violence is quarrel (kavga) and its incidental form, the fight (dövüş).

Although this type, too, implies application of physical force upon another person's body, it differs from beating by the equality of the involved persons.

The actors speak about beating his wife, his child, getting beaten by the father, being barred from lifting his hand his father or other elders. But a male actor speaks about quarreling with other men, not about getting beaten by them. This can be applied to women, too. Women quarrel with women, men with men. Youths do not lift hands against elders, do not quarrel with them.

As there is an equality between the actors, getting hit in a quarrel/fight does not involve the same insulting, humiliating cultural meaning as it does in getting beaten.<sup>4</sup>

All subjects of cases establish an almost direct tie between quarrel and legitimacy. Nobody enters and ever did a fight in which he is not right. But legitimacy is

---

<sup>4</sup>Getting hit in a quarrel or fight implies on the extreme, failure at defending his rights. The higher the possibility of an actor to being defeated in a fight, the more they prefer to insist on the insignificance of the outcome of the fight, such aiming at minimizing the impact of this meaning.

established on two certainly separated levels: being right in the essential and being right in procedure.

Legitimacy in the essential is a concept related to who is right on the question that led to the quarrel. Legitimacy in the procedure, however, is completely unrelated to the question that led to the quarrel, but refers directly to the compliance with the rules of quarreling, emphasizing the need for compliance with the standards that arrange who will quarrel with whom and how. Legitimacy in procedure is seen as more important than being right in the essential; those who disregard this procedure are excluded as "*serkeş*" ("outlaw") or "*serseri*" ("rowdy").

This insistence on being right in procedure can be explained as an evidence that violence is a social means. The tendency of acquiring his own right by himself is dangerous in the aspect of social order. Further, the success of such attempt depends on a numeric equilibrium, which can change drastically. The existence of rules of violence is a further element that indicates that violence is a social means.

Here we have to make a further point. We spoke about social roles. There are some elements that help the actors to fill out their social role identities. Further we stated that if they fail to provide these elements and do not fill out their ideal social role, this leads to the emergence of an uncertainty. When we speak about the quarrel being carried out between equals, we mean a

categorical equality. That is, there is a quarrel between equal actors without regard to any loss in their identities.

If actors who experienced a certain loss of identity may be able to quarrel with actors whose identity is uncontested, is another question of interest.

### c. Justification of Violence

If it is manifested between equals or between inequals, we can notice that discussion about the legitimacy of violence stays constantly on the order of the day. As there are common premises and as violence has its standards, how should we interpret this constant controversy on the legitimacy of violence?

We can explain this by the phenomenon of the ideological and cultural elements being formed and reproduced again and again within daily power relations. That is, even when there is general, categorical consent, their definitions within the plenty of details of everyday power relations may lead to many differences. If there could be absolute obedience, absolute devotion, any manifestation of violence would become needless.

This controversial aspect of violence may lead to one party win or lose points against the other within the relations where this violence emerges. That is, the preference of violence means may prove to be a disadvantage under certain circumstances, with the result that the

performer finds his distance to his goal growing. But as the actors know about this capacity of violence, the decision of preferring violence or choosing to do without it, has a highly social characteristic.

So, the controversy on the legitimacy of violence is a strong evidence to the instrumentality of violence (to its capacity of being a proper means), while it indicates on the other hand that it is a social element.

### 3. Violence as a Communication Tool

In examining the daily relations of the actors, we see their relations in the family, their relations to relatives, neighbours, colleagues and finally relations at public places (on the street, in buses). The major conflicts in these relations are related to the trespassing of the private and public spheres, loaded with an especially high tension between man and woman.

Failure of men in filling up male stereotypes lead to a certain loss of manhood and identity, while for women it is a harm to their respectability that leads to loss of identity and status.

This is not a new statement. Any harm to the role, to the identity, can directly lead to conflict, to a conflictual situation that prevails, even if it may not always come up to the surface. For instance HE, who is unable to work and so, prevented from acquiring an earning because of a lung-disease, states his environment's helpful

attitudes, their lending of money despite they will never or much later get back their money, but remarks at the same time that they do not behave good: (See: Case 10)

"So what do they as good behavior: it does not matter if they give money, they despise you." Here we have to make a distinction between violence and conflict. While every threat within power relations can lead to a conflictual situation, we see that it is not necessarily followed by manifested violence. Conflictual situations that are caused by threatening of a power, failure in filling out the social roles or the violation of the separation of private and public, do not necessarily lead to manifestations of violence.

The woman may oppose her husbands attitude to decide alone about the savings of the family. take the risk of getting beaten. accept openly that her husband may "beat" her (it is both ideologically and physically practicable for him), try to quarrel with him, but her husband may choose neither the quarrel nor the beating (see: Case 18).

MD does not enter into fight with his opponent who made MD angry by accusing as "a Khomeini"; despite his physical ability to beat the man, he just warns the people around to make him shut up and "get him away" (see: Case 15).

EB keeps up with the deeds that previously led her to get beaten, but her husband refrains from beating her because of that reasons, since the time he got a mistress.

Now, he rarely beats her for the same reasons (See: Case 5).

Despite his grievance and frustration, HE does not act violently against his environment. But he dreams of "becoming rich and not to see anyone of them again (See: Case 10).

In almost every case we may find such kind of evidence. We can state that not every conflictual situation has to lead to a violence manifestation. But the opposite is valid: situations of violence manifestation are necessarily a situation of conflicting power relations. That is, threats that emerge during the continuous production and reproduction process in power relations lead to a conflict, which the actors attempt to solve to their advantage through the usage of violence.

Now, let's return to our statement that not every threat causes a manifestation of violence. Yet, we are not concerned primarily with the question of which threats are attempted to solve through violence and which are not. We will return to it later, but in order to progress, we have to put forward one more statement: If not every conflictual situation has to lead a manifestation of violence, then resorting to violence is not imperative, but a means that may be chosen, preferred or not preferred. Not only is its preference significant, but also a refrain from violence. So violence cannot be explained as a necessarily result of another phenomenon. And it is not to be seen as a phenomenon that has to be condemned on a normative ground.

the "primitive" face of individuals that emerges in situations of stress, but as a means of communication, a social tool, resorted by the actors in certain situations. But now, let me go on.

Remember our hypothesis: We stated that violence may exist everywhere power relations are present and thus, immanent to power relations. Does the finding of violence not being manifested in every situation of a threat to power contradict with the assumption that violence is immanent to power relations?

If we assert that violence can be used even without its manifestation, then the answer should be "no". Thus, violence is, in such situations, not unused but not preferred. That is, power relations imply a potentiality of violence, "the right of resorting to violence", not the violence itself (its manifestation). Women who do not get beaten in their marriage, but accept the possibility of their husband beating them, illustrate this fact.

Another example is that EG (See: Case 18) interprets her husband refraining from quarrel, despite her quest to quarrel this way:

"...no, he does not accept, but it does not come up to a big quarrel.....it would be better if it would. So it would go deeper. Then he would not do the same, again. But he does not quarrel and does the same again and again... My demand is that he takes me seriously. But it is a great deal to do that big quarrel."



There is an obvious conflict here. But at the same time, it is evident the husband of E.G. refrains from violence, because he does not consider it as a proper means of problem solving, in this case.

Do the individuals act completely upon their "free will" in choosing this or that means and what are the factors that let the individuals prefer to apply violence, to retreat or to prefer any other means? In which situations is violence preferred as a proper means?

Is violence as a social means only a matter of tactical preference or can we speak about types of messages where violence is implicitly especially suitable to communicate them? If yes, what are they?

In order to explain this, we have to explain a finding, revealed by the analysis of the cases: If in a relationship the conflict has emerged in a way in which women are in question, we see that the parties are inclined to choose violence. This is seen this way by the actors and can also be concluded out of the descriptions of their relations. The actors, thus consider the means of violence more suitable in the conflicts that involve other sex. For this reason, we have to analyze the tension in the relationships between male and female and why it contains violence.

## B. SEXUALITY AND VIOLENCE

### 1. Tension Between Male and Female

We stated that there is a close connection between the spheres of existence of women and men and their social identities. This connection is based on the existence of women in the private, men in public sphere, women being mothers and wives, men being the persons who earn the means of living and who decide. This is strongly pointed out in the interviews. Woman should not to neglect her duties as mother and wife even if she has a profession. the man has to continue to provide for the living of his household "even if he has a second woman in his life" and if they would not do this they would lose their dignity. This is maintained in every one of the cases.

But in fact, in everyday life, the border between male and female spheres cannot be drawn such exactly and easily. The boundary -if there is one- between private and public spheres is not that clear. And the actors know and experience it, as it is.

Although all narrators built their private/female, public/male identification on the inside/outside home distinction, "this distinction changed from one person to another. "My wife does not go out without my permission...if she does, it would be dishonour, and requires beating." All male narrators expressed it with approximately the same words, and all females said their

husband would be right in such a situation. But, "going out" is described as to visit their nextdoor neighbour, to go out of the neighbourhood which necessitates to travel by a motor vehicle, to go out anywhere as long as under the husband's permission, to go out anywhere known to and reached by the husband.

Women who stated that they had been beaten only once during their marriage, mostly in the first year, also provide also profound evidence for changeability of the spheres.

Both women were not beaten except once (See: cases 3 and 18). The first got a slap in the face in the first year of her marriage because she had refused to taste if the 'pekmez' got sour (because she was pregnant at that time and had a vomiting stomach), the latter got beaten because she found a TV program too noisy and tried to switch off the TV. Both decided from that day on "to act according to the husband's temper" and actually did so, they stated.

A significant aspect is that both beatings occur in the first year of the marriage, when the two individuals do not know each other well. The act of beating defines an example for one of the actors to adhere, rather by its implicit physical harm and mental destruction (trouble in the family) than the actual physical harm it includes. By beating his wife, the man puts forward his opinion on how he expects to be treated clearly.

Further, since there is an identification established between woman and private sphere, there are following practical questions to be revolved in everyday relations: which relations of woman should be considered within the private sphere, and which ones may be considered as an advance of her into the public sphere?

A good example of the identification of woman with the private sphere and at the same time of the non-exact and smooth-crossing character of the distinction of private and public spheres, is provided by the image of the woman on the street. The existence of various rules on the presence of women on the street and the different treatment (by men) according to the form of her presence, may be interpreted as expressions of the smooth-crossing between those spheres in the common consciousness.<sup>5</sup>

To explain the fact that apparent clarity of existing cultural and ideological definitions, are not met by conditions of daily relations, exceeds the limit of this study. Here we discuss not the causes of this fact, but its connections with the use of violence. Meanwhile, the ideal types of woman and man itself and also the society that underlies these types, should not be considered static.

---

<sup>5</sup>The presence of a woman alone (that is, without a man with her; the presence of other women does not mean she is not alone) at night on the street leads to a questioning of the honour of that woman. If she is on the street without a strong justification, it could harm her respectability. If she is confronted with any aggression, she may be confronted by comments supposing she has been "inviting" by being present at that time on that place (see: all cases).

Even if the general descriptions (of private/public sphere) remain the same, their contents vary historically.

Another element related to ideal types is that their existence enhances the strong expectation of an adherence to them. This expectation of adherence establishes a "hegemony" on the individuals.<sup>6</sup>

The existence of ideal types, the social urge they perform for adherence to them, "hegemony", the establishing of the sexual identities through their direct identification with the spheres conceded to them, combined with the vague and smooth character of the transition among the private and public spheres, create a constant tension between the sexes.

HK considers to intervene into the quarrel in the street he is living by. But the moment of decision comes when a pregnant woman dragged into the quarrel (see: Case 2).

RE does not approve that a woman repulses an aggressor by "making a scandal" and prefers to perform violence on the aggressor with any "excuse". Again, in a quarrel that is caused by his late returning of leased

---

<sup>6</sup>The term hegemony belongs to Robert Connell. Connell uses the term 'hegemonic masculinity' for the male identity. This refers to a sole dominant male type that defines the relations of men to subordinated males and females and that urges men to observe it. For Connell, there is no such 'hegemonic' identity for women, as their identity is determined by their subordination to men. I extended the use of this term here to women's identity too.

video cassettes, RE interpretes that the strong attitude of the videoshop keeper in the presence of his (the shopkeeper's) girl friends resulted in quarrel (see: Case 6).

We may list further evidences from the cases. But there are two assertions to be made: First, as we stated above, the presence of women in a conflict leads to a higher preference to violence. Second, this tendency grows only for men. If the relations between sexes are included in a conflict, the tendency of women's resorting to violence is rather declining.

The instance of a woman molested on the street or in a bus is highly demonstrative. Women, confronted by such aggression, react rather by changing their place, getting out of the public transportation unit or if they are on the street, getting in a cab or bus, than resorting to loudy protest or other reactions that draw attention to the aggression, i.e. themselves. Men, on the contrary, choose preemptive action by quarreling/fighting with the other party.

This difference in attitude between the sexes is of great interest. Above all, we see that women do not refrain from violence in presence of other women. But in relations with men, violence is not a preferred or at least not primarily preferred means. To explain this differentiation of attitude exceeds the limits of this study. Here, we

content with having stated this.<sup>7</sup> It remains unexplained, why the male actors think a conflict may require their intervention, by using violence. We will try to explain this by that intersexual relations and relations in the same sex are impersonal.

## 2. Relations Through Social Roles

If we make an abstraction, we can state that relations between and within sexes are established not through personal, but social roles.

There are rules that determine who has to behave how to whom and how to get into relations with whom. The actors practise these rules according to the person's social roles and the hierarchical degree of these roles.

The 18 year-old automobile spare parts sale assistant CÖ does not regard a molestation to his girlfriend as a cause to quarrel. But molestation to his future wife, to his fiancée establishes a reason to quarrel (See: Case 11).

YA regards any molestation to a girl with him

---

<sup>7</sup>Still, I may make an attempt for explanation. I think there are two elements in effect: First, the effect of their subordinated position on their lives and consciousness. Second, the premise that violence is related to physical strength, thus requires physical strength in order to achieve results. The latter is related to the phenomenon of images of violence being determined for men. Apparently because strength is defined in regard to man, man's properties, women are weak "as such".

(whatever her relation to him) as a reason to quarrel. His personal connection to that girl does not matter (See: Case 16).

Although in an apparent contradiction, both examples indicate the same phenomenon. In the first, the social position (the status of girlfriend and fiancée) is considered, with the aggression towards the girl ranking at second place. In the second example, any girl, as long as she is with him, ranks prior to the relation towards that girl.

Another evidence is that the mother cannot be beaten, but the wife can. A man cannot beat his mother. He would be blamed for that. Even if he quarrels with his mother, it is not approved if this quarrel includes force against the mother. While the same man does not find it wrong when his mother is beaten by her husband (i.e. his own father). So, the same woman can be beaten as a wife (as subordinated), while she becomes untouchable as a mother.

The fictive quarrel told by D.A., demonstrates another aspect: Two men, already knowing each other, quarrel. Actually, there would be no quarrel if they did not have consumed alcohol. The quarrel is caused by 'kariya bakmak' (looking at the woman).<sup>e</sup>

---

<sup>e</sup>In contrast to: "kadına bakmak". This is a special phrase. In my question, I mentioned "kadına bakmak" and he answered by corrigating as 'kariya bakmak'. This shows that the words 'kari' and 'kadın' express a classification in his 'terminology'. 'Kari' represents here the low and commonly owned one.



This phrase does not relate to a man staring at a woman. The matter is completely between two men. It is one of the men being unsatisfied with the sharing of the hostesses in the "meyhane" and telling his friend -the man-, he is going to prefer the hostess who actually is his friend's "share". Such a demand establishes a very serious cause for fight. And the hostess whom the men fights for, may even not learn about this. The hostess' awareness is regarded insignificant (by men).

In summary, men establish relations with women not on personal ground, but through social roles.<sup>9</sup> Thus, a threat to that social role, to the meaning in the world of that man, is a prior concern than the actual violation against that person.

Another important aspect is that men also establish relations with each other through women. Returning to our examples, we find, that CÖ establishes a relationship to males that molest his girlfriend that is different from the relationship he would establish if the girl would be his fiancée. The differentiation of the relationship with the girl, leads him to give a different meaning to the behaviour of the other males towards her and so, the relationship he establishes, changes.

This applies to women as well. Case 1 and Case 5

---

<sup>9</sup>Our concern here, lies in the establishing of the relationship through social roles; what social roles, does not matter in this context. That is, I do not refer to traditional structures.

are typical in this regard. The women there, meet another woman through the relationship of the husband, as mistress and legal wife.

Now we can discuss the connection of violence with the tension between the sexes and its implicit qualities that provide for its preferability.

### C. SUITABILITY OF VIOLENCE

Now we can decode one of the two qualities that provide through images of violence for the suitability of violence. This, is the somatic quality of violence. So, violence is in its very plain sense physical force which an individual applies to the body of another individual. To do this, the individual's basic need is only his own body. Thus, human body is both a tool and an object of violence.

Among the images of violence, swear-words are highly representative of this implication of violence. Swearing has the meaning of threatening action on another individual's body without his approval, exactly against his will: "*Ağzına sıçmak, amına koymak, ağzını yırtmak, bacaklarını ayırmak*". ("to shit in his mouth, to place into his ass, tear off his mouth, tear his legs apart"), etc.

This, the presence of human body as both tool and object of a violence manifestation, is the quality I call somatic quality of violence. The somatic quality means that violence can be performed by and to everyone who has the arms and the legs.

The extreme form of applying physical force upon

another's body, is killing. Violence in this very sense, is the ultimate action upon the other's life. With no regard to other meanings, through manifestations of violence an actor is able to hold another's 'fate' virtually 'in his hands'. The specific conditions for that are another theme. But through the somatic quality of violence and the death/rule it implies, we come to the other quality: its exactness.

By the implication of strong physical punishments that may extend even to killing and the usage of the common premisses of violence, the actors react in a very clear, exact way. We can speak about such a history of violence. The use of expressions like, "*canına tak dedigi noktada*" (the point when he had enough), "*bu kadarı da fazla*" (that's too much) for the moment of resorting to violence is no coincidence. By using the sharp image of violence, the actors find the opportunity of communicating a clear message, with the possibility of being misinterpreted ceased to minimal level, not only to the person they actually perform violence to, but also to everybody.

Another significant aspect of the exactness of violence is that it aims at establishing a valid precedence not only to relations between two, but to all relations of an individual. For example, the parents who beat their daughter because she comes home too late, present their other children a precedence on how they should behave.

Having asserted the somatic quality of violence and

its exactness, we can state that, in violations of social roles, the actors lay preference on violence as an exact and clear tool in order to remove the nebulous character of the spheres in which female and/or male identities reside.

Still, there is a point to be explained. In certain situations, actors prefer not to use violence, but to retreat, or to resort to other means.

For example, despite his wife becoming furious and making a scene, the husband of EG neither quarrels, nor beats (see: Case 18).

Our question remains the same: What is actually leading to a preference of the violence means in this or that situation of violence?

While examining manifestations of violence, we see that the actors resort to that means when they aim at concrete gains. It may be an exact declaring of boundary, a sudden change of the equilibrium of power to their own benefit, or a thrive for equality by restoring their own identities in the sense of defending honour.

Thus, these concrete gains are not meant to be material. They are mental or they are a change in relationship. For instance the lower threshold for violence in HE's confrontation with people who are completely strange to him can be explained by his humiliation (see: Case 11). HE is constantly humiliated because he does not work, thus not able to provide for his living, being penniless, prevented from marriage and owning a home, because his illness had prevented him from military

service. All these, disgrace him against other men, causing a lessening of his male character. As long as he is unable to remove these reasons, he is prevented from restoring his dignity. On the contrary, he is more likely to be accused of being dreadful, with emphasis laid on his unemployment, idleness. Thus, he communicates to his environment the message of defending his dignity whenever he can, through the mediation of strangers.

Another demonstrative example, is a quarrel about selling lemons (see: Case 14). Here, the threat and practice of violence is introduced in order to discourage other people from entering lemon business and sharing the same market.

To sum up, preference of violence can be explained by the features which are immanent to it and to the situations in which violence is manifested. Violence is especially suitable in the relationships which are established through social roles of actors. Violence, with its exactness and its somatic quality, forms a clear response to the impersonal quality of these situations.

## V. CONCLUSION

Violence is immanent in everyday power relations, but here we must distinguish the concepts of the threat of violence and the manifestation of violence. What immanent in everyday power relations is the threat of violence, or in other words the potentiality of violence. And this does not mean in any power relations the manifestation of violence is necessary.

Manifestation of violence is connected with the emerging of a threat in power relations. Any situation in which the violence is manifested means the existence of a conflictual situation in power relations.

But this does not mean that in any conflictual situation violence is manifested. When we are looking at the situations in which violence is not preferred as a problem solving method by the actors, it can be seen that violence is not an impossible means, rather it is not-preferred tool. So, violence is commented as a social tool which is used for communicating a message to others.

Again, we can and must answer the question of how the actors prefer the violence as a social tool. What are the immanent features which are the factors of the actors' preference, of violence and of the situations in which the violence is preferred?

The features of violence which cause its suitability are, simply, a) the violence is a tool which easily can be used by a human body to another, i.e. its

easily availability; b) its images which have strong and certain connotations; and c) depending on its commonly usages it has the meaning loads that anyone knows.

As to the situations which the violence is especially preferred, these are often inter-sex relations. Between the sexes, in conflictual situations which are through other sex, violence is a preferred tool.

But here when we say that the violence is a preferred tool, it is only valid for the male sex. Because in the situations which have inter-sexes tension and conflicts, only the male sex has increasing tendency of using violence. Both females and males do not like that females manifest violence to males. (It does not mean that females never manifest violence against males. They can and do.)

To explain the causes of tension in the relations of males and females is beyond the limits of this thesis. But we discuss connections between this tension and manifestation of violence. The social identity of the members of both sexes is closely formed with the spheres which is assigned for the sexes. But, there is a terrible transitivity between the private sphere which is identified by the female and the public sphere which is identified by the male. These two spheres, even if they have the ideal and stabile descriptions, need to be produced and to be re-produced in daily power relations. That means actors can describe and fill up these ideal

concepts through their personal struggles. This factor causes the uncertainty of the spheres. The factors that the social identities of males and females are directly described in relation to these spheres, and that descriptions of these spheres are not constant, cause the continuous tension between the sexes.

The question of why the actors prefer to use the tool of violence is answered by that manifestation of violence forms a contrast with this uncertainty because of violence's somatic quality and its suitability. Finally, we must say that violence is not a necessary tool, it is only a possible and suitable one.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Connell, R.W.

1987. Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

Ergil, Doğu

1980. Türkiye'de Terör ve Şiddet. Turhan Kitabevi, Ankara.

Foucault, Michel

1984. Cinselliğin Tarihi, Vol.I. Translated by Hülya Tufan. Afa Yayınları, Istanbul.

Foucault, Michel

1980. Power and Knowledge. Translated by Colin Gordon. Pantheon Books, New York.

Keleş, Ruşen and Ünsal, Artun

1982. Kentleşme ve Siyasal Şiddet. Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasi Bilimler Fakültesi Yayını, Ankara.

ARTICLES

Başaran, Fatma

1984. "Ailede Cinsiyet Rollerine İlişkin Tutum Değişimleri". In Türkiye'de Ailenin Değişimi: Toplumbilimsel İncelemeler. Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği Yayını, Ankara.

Copet-Rougier, Elisabeth

1986. "'Le Mal Court': Visible and Invisible Violence in an Ancephalous Society - Mkako of Cameroon. In The Anthropology of Violence. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Corbin, John

1986. "Insurrections in Spain: Casas Viejas 1933 and Madrid 1981". In Riches, David (ed.) The Anthropology of Violence. Basil Blackwell.

Ferrarotti, Franco

1981. "Introduction". In Social Research, Violence Special Issue, Fall 1981.

Gordon, Colin

1980. "Afterwords". In Power and Knowledge by Michel Foucault. Pantheon Books, New York.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Çiğdem

1984. "Aile içi Etkileşim ve İlişkiler: Bir Aile Değişme Modeli Önerisi". In Türkiye'de Ailenin Değişimi: Toplumbilimsel İncelemeler. Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği Yayını, Ankara.

Kandiyoti, Deniz

1982. "Urban Change and Women's Roles in Turkey: An Overview and Evaluation". In Kağıtçıbaşı, Çiğdem (ed.) Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey. Indiana University Turkish Studies 3.

Parkin, David

1986. "Violence and Will". In The Anthropology of Violence. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Pitt-Rivers, Julian

1966. "Honour and Social Status". In Peristiany, J.G. (ed.) Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society. The University of Chicago Press.

Riches, David

1986. "The Phenomenon of Violence". In The Anthropology of Violence. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

### THESIS

özgür, Serap

1980. Social Psychological Patterns in Homicide: A Comparison of Male and Female Inmates. M. A. Thesis, Boğaziçi University. December 25, 1980.

### DICTIONARIES

New Grolier Webster International Dictionary of English Language, Vol.2

özön, Mustafa Nihat

1965. Büyük Osmanlıca Türkçe Sözlük. Extended 4th Edition, İnkılap ve Aka Yayınları.

Rado, Şevket (General Editor)

Hayat Büyük Sözlüğü. Hayat Yayınları. No date specified.

Türk Dil Kurumu

Türkçe Sözlük, Vol.2. Extended 7th Edition, TDK Yayını, 505/2.

REFERENCES NOT CITED

BOOKS

Foucault, Michel (Editor)

1975. I, Pierre Riviere Having Slaughtered My mother, My Sister, and My Brother...A Case of Parricide in the 19th Century . Translated by Frank Jellinek. Pantheon Books, New York.

Foucault, Michel

1988. Cinselliğin Tarihi, Vol.II. Translated by Hülya Tufan. Afa Yayınları.

Fromm, Erich

1984. İnsanda Yıkıcılığın Kökenleri (Original title is The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness). Translated by Sükrü Alpagut. Payel Yayınları.

Fromm, Erich

1979. Sevginin ve Şiddetin Kaynağı (Original title is The Heart of Man: Its Genius for Good and Evil). Translated by Yurdanur Salman and Nalan İçten. Payel Yayınları.

Key, Mary Ritchie

1975. Male/Female Language. The Scarecrow Press, Inc., Metuchen, N.J.

Kıray, Mübeccel

Ereğli:Ağır Sanayiden Önce Bir Sahil Kasabası. İletişim Yayınları. There is no date. First

publication 1964.

Larsen, Otto N. (Editor)

Violence and The Mass Media. Harper and Row.

Maple, Terry (Editor)

1973. The Scientific Study of Aggression.

Sorel, George

1961. Reflections on Violence. Translated by T.E.

Hulme and J. Roth. Collier Books, New York.

#### ARTICLES

Duben, Alan

1982. "The Significance of Family and Kinship in Urban Turkey". In Kağıtçıbaşı, Çiğdem (ed.) Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey.

Fallers, Lloyd A. and Margaret, C.

Sex Roles in Edremit. In Mediterranean Family Structures. Cambridge University Press.

Kıray, Mübeccel

1984. Büyükkent ve Değişen Aile. In Türkiye'de Ailenin Değişimi:Toplumbilimsel incelemeler. Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği Yayını.

Kıray, Mübeccel

"The New Role of Mothers: Changing Intra-familial Relationships in a Small Town in Turkey". In Peristiany J.G. (ed.) Mediterranean Family Structures. Cambridge University Press.

Kongar, Emre

"A Survey of Familial Change". In Peristiany, J.G.  
Mediterranean Family Structures. Cambridge University.

Kuyas, Nilüfer

1982. "Female Labour and Power Relations in the Urban  
Turkish Family". In Kağıtçıbaşı, Çiğdem (ed.) Sex  
Roles, Family and Community in Turkey.

Levine, Ned

1982. "Social Change and Family Crisis: The Nature of  
Turkish Divorce". In Kağıtçıbaşı, Çiğdem (ed.) Sex  
Roles, Family and Community in Turkey.

Olson Emelie A.

1982. "Duofocal Family Structure and an Alternative  
Model of Husband-Wife Relationship". in Kağıtçıbaşı,  
Çiğdem (ed.) Sex Roles, Family and Community in  
Turkey.