UNDERSTANDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND WIDER SOCIAL CONFLICTS: AN ANALYSIS OF THE DISCOURSE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AMONG WOMAN'S ORGANIZATIONS IN TURKEY

By

Simge Huyal

Submitted to

Central European University

Department of Gender Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Supervisor: Andrea Krizsan

Sara Meger

Budapest, Hungary

2016

ABSTRACT

While in feminist theories the concept of patriarchy has been mainly used in domestic violence studies, other experiences of interpersonal violence such as the militarization of domestic violence that complicates the perpetrator/victim binary is neglected. Adapting an intersectional approach in understanding domestic violence moves beyond the simplistic assertion that theorizes and frames domestic violence merely in relation to patriarchy. Not only sociological and anthropological studies reveal the relationship between wider social conflicts and gender violence, but also feminist theorists in international relations put great effort into raising questions on how international violence affects micro-practices such as the connection between armed conflict and interpersonal violence. The aim of this research is to understand how the intersection of domestic violence and culture of militarism in women's organizations is understood in the context of highly militarized Turkey. Eight semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted with women's organizations in three different cities, namely Ankara, Diyarbakır and Istanbul. The research findings reveal that women's organizations are strongly critical about the continuity between societal and interpersonal violence, while this awareness yet remains at a rhetoric level. I argue that although acts in defiance of political forces to fight against domestic violence exist on a (public) rhetorical level, they are still awaiting to be put into practice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

PTSD: Post-traumatic stress disorder

NGO: Non-governmental organization

KAMER: Women's Center Foundation

PKK: Kurdistan Workers Party

DIKASUM: Research Center for Women's Affairs Diyarbakır

UNFPA: United Nations Population Fund

BDP: Peace and Democracy Part

ŞÖNİM: The Center for Preventing and Monitoring Violence

to my father…

Yaşamak bir ağaç gibi tek ve hür
Ve bir orman gibi kardeşçesine

To live! Like a tree alone and free
Like a forest in brotherhood/sisterhood

Nazım Hikmet

Chapter 1   Introduction

1.1   Research Motivation and Theoretical Background

> […] there is a huge incidence of domestic violence also linked to soldiers who have
> finished their service or even soldiers who are still in the service but home on leave,
> but it was one of the things that were kind of pushed to one side.

These are the words of Patrick Stewart (2013), as part of his speech to Amnesty International about

violence against women. Stewart was subjected to domestic violence when he was a child. While

he focuses in his speech mostly on his mother's experiences, he also reflects on his father, who

was a World War II veteran suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and argues that

"violence is never, ever a choice that a man should make"[1].

When I listened to his speech for the first time in class, it suddenly hit me. I started to make

connections between my own father who fled to Germany as a political asylum in 1980 following

the military coup in Turkey and the possibility that he too might be suffering from PTSD. Was

there even the slightest hope that if a correlation as such had been made and he had been offered

more support by individual social services at the time, that things could have been different for my

whole family? Could this missing element, understanding the relationship between military and

domestic violence, resolve the dichotomy between how and why I have experienced violence

differently from what I was told by many others who had been exposed to some sort of domestic

violence? Weren't we always told by the well-rounded, high-minded intellectuals that domestic

violence is a result of patriarchy? And after all, isn't violence just violence so why bother and

---

[1] For the complete speech: http://www.msnbc.com/the-last-word/watch-patrick-stewart-emotionally-discusses

name the problem differently? These questions and many others were racing through my head all day long, which obviously needed answers; but what mostly triggered the writing of this thesis was the realization that I had previously never established a direct link between domestic violence and larger systems compounding social inequality and power relations. Even more striking was the fact that I came to realize all of this for the first time in my life in an academic environment? Was this a coincidence, or a subliminal lack of recognition in the public sphere which as Stewart says, "was one of the things that were kind of pushed to one side".

My academic interest on the subject of domestic violence grew into a strong desire to understand my own experience by making sense of the interconnection between wider social conflicts and domestic violence. While I was looking more into different opportunities in this field, I found out that the programs designed to study domestic violence have mostly framed this problem as a product of patriarchy pertaining to male violence. Becoming more familiar with the term PTSD and studies that suggest an increased partner violence among combat veterans with PTSD is more likely to observe, I became interested in exploring the impacts of political violence on domestic violence in the specific context of Turkey. This thesis presents a critical exploration of women's organization in Turkey from various intertwining perspectives, including an analysis of how the relationship between domestic violence and military culture in women's organizations in Turkey is perceived and handled. I argue that although acts in defiance of political forces to fight against domestic violence exist on a (public) rhetorical level, they are still awaiting to be put into practice.

Adapting an intersectional approach in understanding domestic violence moves beyond the simplistic assertion that theorizes and frames domestic violence merely in relation to patriarchy. Not only sociological and anthropological studies reveal the relationship between wider social conflicts and gender violence (Merry, 2009; Enloe, 2000; Rabrenovic and Roskos, 2001), but also

2

feminist theorists in international relations put great effort into raising questions on how international violence affects micro-practices such as the connection between armed conflict and interpersonal violence (Caprioli, 2005; Peterson, 2007). In chapter two, I discuss how feminist theories, in understanding gender violence as a product of patriarchy, shift to a more holistic and inclusive approach that thinks about gender intersectionally, that looks at race, class and other identities as well as social inequalities and power relations. I use the conceptual framework of "intersectionality", as a tool to understand the cause for women battery, which helps the reader to understand that gender violence as a social problem is a common phenomenon; yet is experienced in different forms and within different social contexts. I look particularly at the broader conception of intersectionality that examines the relation among structure, power, and identities, in order to understand the military culture, namely how the link between militarism, militarized masculinity and gender violence intersects. Using an anthropological approach is still a comparatively immature perspective in domestic violence studies and theories. A theoretically informed practical approach following an intersectional trajectory on the issue of violence against women has yet to be adapted.

1.2 Woman's Activism in Turkey

In Turkey, violence against women has gained increased attention over the last years both in academic and public discourse due to continuously increasing numbers of violence and murder cases filed every year. There currently exist a group of feminists in Turkey with varying specializations, however ultimately the goal is to end all violence against women. After the military coup in 1980, the Turkish women's movement, also influenced by the second-wave feminism, became apparent in public space, while during the 1990s the growth of women's non-governmental organization (NGO) in different cities emerged (Altınay & Arat, 2007, p. 17).

During the 1980s, feminist movements developed as a resistance against state policies and challenged the patriarchal state; in fact, they refused to have any collaborative relations with governmental services and agencies. In the 1990s, however, feminist groups chose to work within the formal structure of the state to achieve greater efficiency in combating violence against women. This was followed by the institutionalization of feminist discourse in Turkey through the establishment of women's research institutes. These organizations were inevitably fragmented into multiple segments, yet the ultimate aim was to end violence against women that eventually, to some degree, united various groups.

The Purple Roof Foundation, The Foundation for Women's Solidarity, and Women's Center Foundation (KAMER) are three of the most active and influential civil society organizations that particularly work on issues relating to domestic violence. Their policies are based on women's empowerment in fighting against violence (Altınay & Arat, 2007). They, thereby, empower battered women by providing shelters and job opportunities to break away from violent relationships. These organizations also arrange many social projects and workshops to raise consciousness about women's oppression and subordination. For instance, KAMER, by following the second wave feminism movement, uses the method of consciousness rising to mobilize all women regardless of differences in identity politics (Kurdish, Turkish, Arab, Alevi or Sunni) so as to raise awareness and foster gender equality (Altınay & Arat, 2007, p. 23). Moreover, women's organizations in Turkey, also achieved great success "in pushing for extensive legal reforms in both the civil and penal codes by organizing advocacy coalitions, working with the Parliament,

4

implementing national campaigns, and winning public and media support"[2]. For instance, "in the last two decades, the feminist movement had succeeded in achieving the annulment of Article 159 of the Civil Code"[3]. Similarly, in 2002, Article 152 was abolished, in which the man was declared to be the head of the family. Yet, it is also crucial to remember that these achievements are not easy to attain, feminists are facing many challenges as they "play a pivotal role in the struggle for democratization and equal opportunity in Turkey –ensuring that women's right and gender equality continue to be defended". (ICAN, 2015) To my knowledge, organizations in Turkey fighting against violence as experienced in the form of cultural 'male violence' have thereby focused either on the nature and extent of violence against women or challenged existing laws and policies to target the patriarchal social orders and the patriarchal state. Although these organizations have contributed enormously to the empowerment of women and achieved great successes in legal reforms to ensure gender equality, other key contributing factors of domestic violence analyzed within the context of wider social inequalities and power relations have to be integrated into causes and theories of domestic violence rather than only situating patriarchy at the center. In chapter four, I explore Turkey's socio-political environment in more detail to understand why the inclusion of wider social patterns of power and inequality is pertinent to the study of domestic violence in the case of highly militarized nations.

---

[2] For further information, see the complete report on "Resisting the New Conservatism: Women's campaigns for rights, peace and participation in Turkey": http://www.icanpeacework.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Turkey-Brief.pdf

[3] For further information on reforms in Turkish Civil and Penal Codes see: http://www.amazone.be/IMG/pdf/Efsa_Kuraner.pdf

1.3　　Research Significance

There are several reasons why domestic violence should be studied in relation to wider social inequalities and power relations. Firstly, the intersectional approach as an analytical tool incorporates the notion of intersecting diverse identities and complex social situations and therefore moves beyond a restricted definition such as a "stable identity of 'women' or 'men'" (Merry, 2009, p. 13). The oversimplification that depicts 'women' as victim and 'men' as perpetrator has failed to comprehend the complex structure on a societal level. On the contrary, the particular meaning attached to the practices varies within cultural and social contexts; as a matter of fact, the historical, material and ideological power structure plays a significant role in shaping gender violence that cannot be solely explained by a patriarchal analysis. Analyses of certain cases therefore needs to be done from different perspectives as for instance this one shows, "men's violence is both an effort to assert honor by controlling their women and a response to their own vulnerability in economic and social terms" (Merry, 2009, p. 18). Although feminist theories have manifest that men's privileged positioning in society enables and reinforces gender inequality, it does not offer any further explanation on how "structural violence that increase individuals' vulnerability to interpersonal violence" (Merry, 2009, p. 102) shapes gender relations. As Sarah Hautzinger clearly points out, focusing on "men's vulnerability does not excuse their violence, but it does help to understand" (cited in Merry, 2009, p. 18) how women and men are influenced differently under certain circumstances (Cockburn, 2004, p. 28). Secondly, understanding domestic violence within a framework of wider social conflicts enables to reinterpret how we understand gender violence, what we mean by it and who are the ones that are culpable and who in the first place we should include or exclude. The presumption of patriarchy as the major reason for all violence against women, has failed to explain why certain groups are

more vulnerable than others and therefore was unable to predict any contingent victimizations that can happen outside partner relationships (Bograd, 2005). Naming the problem, therefore, is important to create a social movement that potentially has the power of "organizing politically to do something about it" (Merry, 2009, p. 28), which constitutes the third reason for writing this thesis. Many feminist studies point to how individual social services, techniques, models and strategies in combatting domestic violence remain insufficient in cases where social groups are confronting structural violence (Lockhart & Danis, 2010; Bograd, 2005). This prompts the question of how militarized societies play a significant factor in increased numbers of gender violence incidences as is especially the case in highly militarized Turkey.

1.4   Research Methodology

Between April and May 2016, I conducted in-depth interviews within a semi-structured framework with specialists on domestic violence who are active in designing, theorizing and developing solutions on topics related to violence against women. I conducted 12 interviews with 8 women's organization and traveled between three cities, namely Diyarbakır, Istanbul and Ankara. Although, at first, I wanted to conduct skype interviews with organizations in Diyarbakır, due to time limitations and the ongoing civil war in Diyarbakır. However, no one from Diyarbakır agreed to participate because of two reasons; firstly, as an outsider, they were skeptical about my positionality as a researcher and did not want to speak about state violence through Skype. Secondly, they strongly believed that conducting research about the organizations in Diyarbakır without experiencing first-hand the atmosphere there would not result in a meaningful outcome. Although, my participant observations were gathered in a limited time frame, my analysis and discussion chapters are complemented by participant observation notes, which give further insight

on the depth of this topic. My research motivations and interests were shaped by this entire process

as well as by friendships, which I acquired during the interviews.

Chapter 2   Theoretical Framework and Conceptual Issues

2.1   The Relationship between Patriarchy and Domestic Violence

Patriarchy is a widely and mainly used concept in theorizations of domestic violence in second-wave feminism where patriarchy is defined as "a set of power structures, social practices, and institutions that disadvantage and marginalize women" (Code, 1988, p. 1). Towards the 1960s, as Betty Friedan describes in her book, *The Feminine Mystique (1963),* the impact of patriarchal social orders on white housewives in the United States is analyzed as she describes it "the problem that has no name". Feminist articulations, thus, on the control over and the exploitation of women's bodies and lives have shifted the attention to the public sphere to frame the problem as a commonly shared experience. Studies in the sixties, on rare occasions, mentioned about domestic violence, it was however classified as resulting from psychopathological mental disorders or lower class/minority issues. In the seventies, the issue of women battering was examined within a broader social perspective (Gelles, 1980, p. 873). In calling attention to understand domestic violence within a general system theory, feminist researchers have thereby gained more cognitive skills on the history and impact of patriarchal social orders by demanding equal rights, equality in legislation as well as abortion rights and public recognition of domestic violence and rape. While the patriarchal culture or male dominance with its form, nature and implications might vary in time and space, radical feminist theories tend to view the presence of male violence as the underlying cause of all abuse against women (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Anderson, 1997; Straus et al., 1980; Bograd, 1988). Leoane Walker's (1979) book, *The Battered Women,* for instance, reflects on the power struggle in incidences of domestic violence in which the cause of violence is viewed as the male's desire to seek control over women in which the "learned helplessness" theory is used as an explanation of violence against women. While she does not particularly use the term "patriarchy"

9

as an explanation for battering women, she argues that "sex-role stereotyping that exists in [her] family of origin is an explanation" (Walker, 1979, p. 16). Susan Brownmiller, in her early feminist work on rape, similarly, describes the power relationship between men and women as the underlying cause of violence to women, as she defines rape as an "act by which a male demonstrates to female that she is conquered-vanquished-by his superior strength and power" (1975, p. 49). The violence against women, hereby, is formulated as a problem that is "far from […] the experience of aberrant women" and shows that it is in fact the "backdrop against which women's lives are lived" (Radford & Stanko, 1996, p. 78). As male is value in patriarchal societies, male violence "as one of the defining characteristics of patriarchal societies" reinforces women's role as subordinate to men in the family (Radford & Stanko, 1996, p. 78).

The underlying picture of patriarchy is still fairly common among many feminist researchers in contemporary studies of domestic violence. Donna Chung, for instance, in her analysis on young people's intimate violence, argues that "micro-practices" of heterosexual relationships are closely related to power relations between men and women, that "demonstrates the influence of heterosexual dominance in supporting patriarchy, reproducing gender inequality and hegemonic masculinity" (2005, p. 447). In reference to Sylvia Walbey's theorization of patriarchy, Chung sees heterosexual relationships essentially as patriarchal, since the concept of patriarchy is defined by Walbey as "indispensable for an analysis of gender inequality" (1990, p. 1). In the article, "Gendering Violence: Masculinity and Power in Men's Accounts of Domestic Violence", Kristin L.Anderson and Debra Umberson, in a similar vein, show how the gender hierarchal system is reinforced by reconstructing men as masculine and women as feminine, that which supports also the gendered system of power relations theory, namely the relationship of male supremacy and female subordination. Another study, in "Girlfriend Abuse as a Form of Masculinity Construction

among Violence, Marginal Male Youth", Mark Totten shows how the patriarchal values in societies reinforce violent behavior at home. The focus of the case study is an investigation on male gang members to analyze the development of familial and gender ideologies on the masculine identities. According to Mark Totten, males in underprivileged societies tend to behave in a more violent way towards their partners as a result of their lack of access to traditional institutional benefits of patriarchy. The patriarchal-authoritarian model in the family, as a way to keep control over women, plays a significant role in Totten's discussion and analysis. The inability to exercise the ideals of patriarchal social order outside their community or family groups, according to Totten, leads them to use violence against their partners as one way to express their masculinity.

2.2 Beyond Patriarchy: Theorizing and Framing Domestic Violence Using Intersectionality

Feminist theories of violence against women have "greatly advanced our understanding of domestic violence by highlighting the broad social context in which abuse often occurs and the manner in which patriarchy has historically spawned violence against women" (Tracy, 2007, p. 578) in comparison to theories based assumptions of situational and individual factors such as psychopathological problems. The feminist perspective based on patriarchal explanations, therefore, gives profound insights; however, to comprehend the wide scope of violence against women requires approaches that encompass multiple identities and multifactorial situations in which each experience of individuals must be considered within hierarchal power relations. While patriarchy surely justifies and gives rise to domestic violence, as Merry (2009) argues, many other factors account for violence against women as well. Yet, the theory that patriarchal social orders are the ultimate cause of domestic violence inherently bears a heteronormative perspective in

11

which the power struggle between individuals is oversimplified to opposite-sex relationships. For instance, Janice Ristock (2002, cited in Merry, 2009), in her work on lesbians who have experienced intimate violence, recognizes some shifting between roles of the abuser and abusee and argues that in some situations violence is not about control. Merry argues that feminist theories that investigate patriarchy rely on the dichotomy of powerful male and powerless females. This dichotomy, however, does not explain "the complexities of violence or the experience of violence within gendered relationships" (Merry, 2009, p. 18).

As an alternative theoretical and inclusive model, intersectionality, which broadly speaking incorporates the inclusion of race, class and gender, is regarded as one of the more prominent contemporary theoretical contributions in the field of women studies (McCall, 2005, p. 1771). Kimberly Crenshaw (1991), the creator of intersectionality, uses this concept in her article, 'Mapping and Margins', to understand how different power structures/systems such as racism, sexism, or classism are interconnected with lives of multilayered identities. The black women, which is Crenshaw's primary focus, are not only discriminated against through racism or sexism but both racism and sexism. Thus, intersectionality helps to understand that "people are defined by a host of other identities based on race, class, ethnicity, nationality disability, sexual orientation, and many other characteristics as well as gender" (Crenshaw, 1994, cited in Merry, 2009). These categories are by no means mutually exclusive, hence moving beyond a monistic definition and a stable identity. Similarly, as Mohanty (1984) implicitly reveals[5] in her early feminist work, "Under Western Eyes", the classification of "women" differs in educated, upper- middle class, wealthy white women as compared to uneducated, poor, black women.

Overall, the term 'intersectionality' is now used in many other literatures in underlying new theoretical and methodological advances within women's and gender studies as well as other

12

disciplines and research areas. Domestic violence theories, too, were influenced by the intersectional perspective. Based on Crenshaw's work, Michele Bograd (2005), for instance, uses the concept of intersectionality to strengthen domestic violence theories by including other dimensions such as race, class, and sexual orientation. Bograd argues that domestic violence as a social phenomenon cannot be viewed as a monolithic phenomenon, but rather should be analyzed from an intersectional point of view and questions "how it is experienced by self and responded to by others, how personal and social consequences are represented, and how and whether escape and safety can be obtained" (2005, p. 26-27). She points to the significance of including "other social dimensions" in analysis of domestic violence. Rather than seeing them as stressors, each factor should be recognized as key explanatory factors. (2005, p. 27). In other words, to understand the experience of abused women in depth, no dimension should be privileged, such as gender inequality. (2005, p. 27). For instance, members of devalued racial identities, such as women of color, are disadvantaged in finding solutions to escape from their violent partners/husbands as a result of not reporting the case to the police since the victim may fear to be subjected to racist treatment (Skoloff & Dupont, 2005; Crenshaw, 1994). Although calling the police because of domestic violence is typically a first reaction, women from devalued racial identity groups hesitate "turning the men of their community into the hands of a system often seen as oppressive and racially biased" (Merry, 2009, p. 14). Therefore, women find themselves unwilling to report incidences of violence against them and as a result numbers of violence cases committed against African American women has increased (Merry, 2009, p. 14). Thus, single factors cannot be the sole explanations for domestic violence. Examining the questions of power over others is important instead of placing patriarchy in the central stage (Girshick, 2002, cited in Merry, 2009).

In a more recent essay, "Intersectionality's Definitional Dilemmas", Patricia Hill Colins, however, draws attention to the lack of not having a clear definition of what counts as intersectionality, despite its general consensus[4]. Colins brings to the discussion of intersectionality a more well-defined perspective in which intersectionality is analyzed "as a knowledge project whose raison d'etre lies in its attentiveness to power relations and social inequalities" (2015, p. 1). Colins hereby invites the reader to integrate the focus of power relations into theory and practice by using intersectionality as an analytical strategy that can help to understand "how intersectional frameworks provide new angles of vision on social institutions, practices, social problems, and other social phenomena associated with social inequality" (2015, p. 3). According to Collins, the intersectional framework has started to become a new research tool in rethinking violence and similar social problems. Thus, a wide array of topics in heterogeneous forms of violence are included in analysis of violence against women (2015, p. 12). "Violence against women in Iraqi Kurdistan (Alinia, 2013), nation-state violence of militarism and war (Peterson), the treatment of sexual violence and ethnicity in international criminal law (Buss, 2009), and hate speech itself as part of relations of violence (Matsuda et al., 1993)" (Collins, 2015, p. 12) are some of the examples. As "experiences of domination can change and can vary for different groups and for individuals within groups" (Josephson, 2005, p. 86); using intersectionality plays a significant role in understanding individual experiences, particularly "disproportionate forms of interpersonal vilence" (Merry, 2009, p. 102). Considering these social changes is particularly important to move beyond a universalistic approach in which "new theories and technologies are developed […] and [that] must be anchored in descriptions that they are intended to serve" (Bograd, 2005, p. 33).

---

[4] Collins defines the general consensus of intersectionality as the following: "The term intersectionality references the critical insight that race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, nation, ability, and age operate not as unitary, mutually exclusive entities, but rather as reciprocally constructing phenomena" (2015, p. 1)

Andrea Smith, for instance, in her article 'Looking to the Future', points to "the connection between military violence and domestic violence" (2005, p. 426) and similarly argues that there is a need to apply alternative strategies in combatting violence against women that cannot be simply described with explanations of violence rooted in the power of men over women. "Strategies designed to combat violence within communities (sexual/domestic violence) must be linked to strategies that combat violence directed against communities, including state violence (for example, police, brutality, prions, militarism […]) (2005, p. 417). This consideration prompts the question of how larger structures of violence such as "ethnic attacks, military occupation, warfare" (Merry, 2009, p. 2) play a role in increased numbers of gender violence incidences in highly militarized societies. This seems particularly relevant given the increasing level of military culturism around the world, especially in countries with ongoing armed conflicts, war or ethnic attacks.

2.3   Militarism, Masculinity and Domestic Violence

Establishing a relationship between violence against women and military culture has increasingly gained attention over the last years, both on the academic level and in public discourse. Military culture is "the set of norms and values found within military communities and focused on ideas of masculinity, sexuality, violence and women, is conducive to rape, sexual harassment, and domestic violence, according to some activists and researchers" (Adelman, 2003, cited in Merry, 2009, p. 159). Cynthia Enloe's analysis, for instance, defines militarization as "a step- by- step process by which a person or a thing gradually comes to be controlled by the military or comes to depend for its well-being on militaristic ideas" (2000, p. 3). Besides wartime, the militarization of a society therefore manifest itself also in peacetime in which the military needs and assumptions are

15

cherished and considered natural. The military values maintenance and develops certain social norms as it implicitly shapes gender roles in society. The construction of masculinity as military masculinity and the figure of men as the warriors and protectors of the family facilitates the practices of everyday life. The militaristic ideology, therefore, legitimizes, publicizes and institutionalizes various forms of violence that "centers on continual mobilization of society to prepare for, support, and fight wars" (Adelman, 2003, p. 1123). The heroic masculinity that goes hand in hand with homosocial bonding is, thus, shaped thorough ritual and daily practices that normalize violence and rewards men for "proving" one's "manhood". It is through such rituals and practices that military culture creates a new and symbolic abstraction to differentiate men from women to maintain the hierarchical social order in military.

Although some studies have shown that there are various forms of militarized masculinity and therefore, cannot, be analyzed in a monolithic description, overall "feminists have argued that militarism and its gender hierarchies are linked to men's violence against women" (Merry, 2009, p. 160). Enloe (2000), for instance, argues that within the gendered nature of the military, where men are seen as defenders of the nation, the national duty of women is identified as reproduction. It is thus expected that women perform their task by helping her husbands, washing clothes, looking after the children, so that the "patriotic duty for nation and state" is fulfilled (Cockburn, 2004, p. 114). Even violence at home, according to Enloe, was at some point seen as something that must be tolerated due to the husband's stress (cited by Cockburn, 2004); therefore, the military's "culture of violence seems to reach from armed conflict to relations in the home" (Merry, 2009, p. 160). Violence against women, thus, gets justified under the cover of protecting women from other men. Rabrenovic and Roskos, for instance, argue that "during the post-conflict period, the culture of violence that developed during the period of open, armed conflict can continue to

16

make women likely targets of rape and domestic violence" (Rabrenovic & Roskos, 2001, p. 50). Jacobs and colleagues, who explore the connection between intra-state conflict and domestic violence, similarly argue that "evidence from women in Croatia echoes the experience of women Northern Ireland, that during armed conflict domestic violence involves many more incidents with weapons; the battlefield and home are not separate as ideology suggests they are" (2000, p. 59). Important findings in a research paper by Haj-Yahia and Abdo-Kaloti (2003) on 1000 Palestinian youths also show how social factors such as political violence play an important role in studying domestic violence. They argue that the growing number of domestic violence occurrences, mostly in post-conflict populations cannot be merely seen as a product of maleness and cultural practices, but rather has to be regarded in the context of militarization and war. Cockburn also draws particular attention to the "affinity between men and gun" (2012, p. 232) due to military intervention, which leads to an increased usage of firearms in domestic violence cases resulting mostly in death. Cockburn states that in Uganda the increase of domestic violence in recent years is linked to the continual use of guns during armed conflict among men, which is seen as "a respected way of 'doing manhood' (Cockburn, 2012, p. 232). More women, thus, become victims of violent crime. Enloe (2000) draws attention to an organization, led by the Serbian feminists group "Women in Black", to point out similarly a connection between war and domestic violence:

> […] domestic violence had increased inside homes in Belgrade during the 1991-1995 war, and that increase was no mere coincidence. The official nationalistic-militaristic ideology that fueled rapes in Bosnian war zone had also fueled the battering of women on their homes back in Belgrade. (Enloe, 2000, p. 147)

Although Merry (2009) argues that the nature of militarism and the forms of gender violence are debatable; in some countries in which the boundary between military and civilian life is obscure, the transition between militarization and militarized ideas of masculinity and

17

mainstream society can be observed. (2009, p. 159). "As societies become more militarized, such gendered cultural categories tend to spread more widely in the society" (2009, p. 162). The military functions as "the school of nation" by constituting a form of masculinity that is particularly linked to various kinds of violence, discipline, and the ability to fight. The increased prevalence of violence is not only visible in public sphere; researches show that violence at home has increasingly become an important issue whereby consequences of war and conflict become visible in a form of domestic violence towards female partners.

2.4   Conclusion

To create a social movement, according to Merry (2009), it is important to name the problem. Naming the problem is crucial to develop a framework that explains it and offers solutions and as a result makes "sense to people and can be used to understand their experiences" (Merry, 2009, p. 28). Although gender-based violence is the major term used in international agendas and lays great emphasis upon the importance of gendered identities on violence, an analysis that relies on this assumption fails to see other social dimensions as contributing factors and thus remains incapable of fully accounting for causes and effects on "the disproportionate victimization of women" (Merry, 2009, p. 28). In this chapter, we have seen that through an intersectional approach gender violence should be treated as an issue that is mutually affected by and takes different forms within different social contexts (Merry, 2009). Gender violence "is never distinct from larger systems of social inequality and power based on race, class, and strength, nor is it distinct from other forms of violence such as warfare, state oppression, racism, or caste differentiation" (Merry, 2009). Therefore, each case of interpersonal violence needs to be analyzed according to its own dynamism, not only to fully comprehend the experience of violence, but also to spark a movement,

and create alternative solutions that move beyond monolithic, ineffectual endeavors to fight and

end all violence against women.

Chapter 3   Research Design and Methodology

3.1   Introduction

According to Marjorie L. DeVault (1999), interviewing and analysis within a feminist methodology requires different strategies. De Vault prefers to use the term 'strategy' to imply that there is no "single model or formula" (1999, p. 59) on how to conduct an interview. Yet, talking and listening from a women's standpoint, for De Vault, is an essential ingredient to conduct interviews in this field. As the principal method of inquiry for this thesis, I adopt a feminist methodology to create a welcoming space for dialogues with participants in this study.

3.2   Data Collection: In-depth Interviews

The interviews were conducted within a semi-structured framework allowing for in-depth and one-on-one conversations with the participants. The interviews were guided by a prepared set of questions, but were not limited to those as to provide a means for the participants to express what they believe is vital in evaluating the circumstances. For my analysis, I made use of some notes, which I compiled from my participant observations. Each interview lasted about 50 minutes to 2 hours. I recorded and transcribed all of the interviews. Although according to Robert Weiss (1994, p. 54), the preference to use tape records might differ from one researcher to another- he personally believes that using a tape recorder makes it easier for the researcher to follow the discussion and not worry about writing down all the participants' words. Having access to the original interview recordings also helped me to construct the research topics more carefully and to gain more familiarity with essential vocabulary without which an in-depth analysis of the entire conversations

would not be possible. Before I started recording, I asked every participant for permission and paid attention to not include their personal data in the recordings as a safety measure but only keep them for my personal records.

I conducted the interviews with eight women's organizations in three different cities, namely Diyarbakır, Istanbul and Ankara. In some of the interviews there were more than one participant. Inclusion of interviews conducted with organizations in Diyarbakır is of particular importance as Diyarbakır is known to be one of Turkey's biggest Kurdish-majority cities and has been the target of the Turkish Armed Forces due to armed conflicts with the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) since the 1980s. As a result, Diyarbakır has been subjected to excessive state violence till today. Reconciling concepts such as political factors and identity politics might offer a ground on how one should perceive on a more fundamental level the effects those have on a domestic setting such as in relationships between intimate partners which can often manifest itself in form of domestic violence.

While most of the participating organizations are independent women's organizations, two of them are affiliated with the municipality of Diyarbakır[5] namely the Research Center for Women's Affairs Diyarbakır (DIKASUM) and Kardelen Women's House (Kardelen Kadın Evi), while another one is a representative of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) in Turkey. Conducting these interviews with organizations which are not closely linked to governmental institutions was crucial for this study, as I assumed that the state cannot be relied on to heal domestic violence while being simultaneously the creator of violence on all social levels.

---

[5] The greater municipality in Diyarbakır and its four district municipalities; Sur, Bağlar, Yenişehir and Kayapınar are governed by pro-Kurdish parties since 1999.

A brief introduction of all the organizations I interviewed is outlined as follows:

Independent women's organizations

The Purple Roof Foundation (Mor Çatı Kadın Sığınağı Vakfı)

This foundation, which is located in Istanbul, was established in 1990 to create solidarity among women who experience violence as well as to raise public awareness on domestic violence. The foundation is also known as the first women's organization to combat domestic violence in Turkey. In 1995, the organization opened a women's shelter. Due to financial difficulties the shelter had to be closed intermittently. Today, the foundation still runs the shelter and is active in campaigns for combatting domestic violence, and provides psychological and legal support to women. I interviewed one person from the foundation who is in her 30s and worked there as a social worker for five years.

The Foundation for Women's Solidarity (Ankara Kadın Dayanışma Vakfı)

The foundation is located in Ankara and was established in 1991. Its mission is to fight all types of violence against women. Domestic violence, however, is at their focus. Raising public awareness of domestic violence, as well as providing training programs on combating violence against women are their main undertakings. I interviewed only one person from the foundation who is in her 30s and started her career as a volunteer when she was a student in college. Now she works as a full-time social worker at the foundation.

Selis Women's Counseling Center (Selis Kadın Danışmanlık Merkezi)

This foundation is known as a Kurdish organization and is located in Diyarbakir. In 2002, the foundation emerged as an organization to provide social, legal, educational and psychological support to victims of domestic violence. Their main benefactors are women coming from different backgrounds and professions, who participate as volunteers. Only one interview was conducted with a member of the foundation. She has been part of this center for two years as a member of the executive board.

Istanbul Rainbow Women's Platform (Istanbul Gökkuşağı Kadın Derneği)

The foundation was established in 2003 by Kurdish women activists. It is located in Istanbul, and their main mission is to create solidarity among women. They offer workshops and similar activities to empower women to participate fully in economic life. They also adopt an anti-war approach. I interviewed four women, most of which have backgrounds in women studies and are members of the administrative council, while some of them have established close relations with Kurdish political parties and are actively working as members of their women's branch.

KAMER Women's Center Foundation (Kadın Merkezi Vakfı)

KAMER was established in 1997 in Diyarbakır. Today, the foundation has 23 branches in all provinces of eastern and southeastern Anatolia. It was founded to provide a space to protect women in emergency and wartime/armed conflict zone and as a resistance against male violence. Their main goal is to empower women in combatting domestic violence. I interviewed one woman who is a member of the administrative board and worked at the center since 1998.

<u>Non-Independent Women's Organizations</u>

Kardelen Women's House (Kardelen Kadın Evi)

The foundation is affiliated with the Bağlar municipality and is located in Diyarbakır. The center was founded in 2011 and works closely with Kurdish political parties. The center runs workshops on psychological traumatization and offers educational programs on protection against violence. The foundation is also active in research. I interviewed one person who is in her 50s and has worked there as a coordinator and social worker for seven years.

DIKASUM Research Center for Women's Affairs Diyarbakır (Diyarbakır Kadın Sorunlarını Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi)

DIKASUM is a subunit of Diyarbakır Metropolitan Council's Women and Family Directorate and was founded in 2001. After 2014, a women's policy department was established, and I had a conversation with two women who work in the subdivision of violence against women there. The unit runs two women's shelters, provides psychological as well as legal support for women, who are exposed to violence and works jointly with other institutions such as social welfare and Kurdish political parties. Workshops and activities to promote women's economic independence are also one of their main tasks. One of my participants is the head of the unit and worked there for one and a half year, while another participant is a social worker and has worked at the unit for eight months.

International Organizations

UNFPA United Nations Population Fund

UNFPA is a one of the United Nations' agencies working closely on projects to promote gender equality. Since 1971, UNFPA has worked closely with the government of Turkey and is active in conducting research and campaigns to combat gender inequalities. Supporting projects which help

to empower women and to combat violence against women and acts such as human trafficking, are among their main responsibilities. I interviewed one person in her 50s from this organization who has worked as a coordinator in the department of gender equality since 2003.

Initial attempts at reaching out to these women's organizations via electronic communication and/or phone calls has proved difficult. Most of the emails I have sent out to different organizations were left unanswered, or phone calls got returned negatively. I reached my first participant from Istanbul Rainbow Women's Platform (Istanbul Gökkuşağı Kadın Derneği) through a friend who works closely with some Kurdish women's organizations in Diyarbakır that I mentioned above and through a snowball sampling strategy, I was able to reach other participants. While introducing the research topic to the participants of this survey, I generally avoided talking about state violence at first. As someone who does not belong to the group, I anticipated that it would be difficult to gain trust if I raised the issue of state violence directly without first introducing myself and revealing in detail what my research methodology and objectives are.

Furthermore, maintaining a good relationship between me as a researcher and the specialists on domestic violence was occasionally challenging. To ease the tension, I revealed my personal experiences to establish a "more direct and honest" (Emerson et al., 1995, p. 21) relationship. In this regard, my first-hand experience as a child of a politically detained father and having witnessed domestic violence when growing up, has helped me when approaching the participants to start conversations. In fact, I even clearly expressed my positionality in regard to these matters as a researcher. This research effort was conducted bearing in mind Turkey's crackdown in freedom of expression; particularly, in regard to a more recent incident that put many Turkish academics, who signed a petition denouncing attacks on Kurds, under the threat of arrest for spreading "terrorist propaganda."

The interview questions were devised such that the issue of state violence was generally discussed halfway through the interview. This was done for two reasons; firstly, to create a friendly environment so that participants have a chance to get better acquainted with me and therefore would answer all questions in full detail reducing concerns about the veracity of the responses. The second reason for structuring the questionnaire as described was to prevent any external influences which could potentially shape the responses given by the participants. As the focus of the survey is to examine how the intersection of domestic violence and culture of militarism in Turkey is conceived by women's organizations, asking questions about the relationship between state violence and domestic violence has postively impacted the participants' responsivity. To gain a deeper understanding of the nature and extent of ongoing practices and how this situation is dealt with, the interview questions were directed at issues on how these organizations mediate efforts to combat violence against women both on a personal and organizational level, how domestic violence programs have employed particular strategies and why or what type of program models have been adopted (i.e. multi-agency approach, programs for perpetrators), what kind of collaborative engagements they have with other organizations, and how the awareness of political, economic and cultural differences is integrated in studies on gender violence.

3.3   Data Analysis and Interpretation

Pertinent to Sprague and Zimmerman's argument that "without feminist analytic narrative or interpretation of data, readers will impose their own" (1989, p.78), a feminist standpoint was adopted in this study. However, Emerson (1995) points out that there is a high possibility that resulting from a feminist stance, researchers continue to select what to observe or may frame interviews in accordance with their own suppositions; therefore, Emerson and collaborators invite

26

readers to be careful in their disposition as researchers where the term 'careful' should be understood in the context of "analyze more carefully the specific ways that interviewers use personal experience as a resource for listening" (DeVault, 1999, p. 71). Listening, for DeVault, is not only about the interview and studying transcripts, but the actual interpretation of respondents' accounts (1999, p. 66) and through listening "a focus on attention to the unsaid" was made so as to "produce it as a topic and make it speakable" (DeVault, 1999, p. 71). By following an emic approach, I thereby paid attention on how participants position themselves in an effort to avoid imposing my own perspective on the respondents. In addition, Katherine Borland points out that "the narrator's commentary on and interpretation of a story can contribute greatly to the researcher's understanding of it" (1991, p. 71). To avoid possible misinterpretations, the intention was to give respondents an opportunity to read and edit their contributions in the analysis, which however did not take place with the limited time constraints.

27

Chapter 4   Sociopolitical Contextualization

4.1   Political Violence in Turkey and Social Mobilization in Kurdish Society

On December 14th, 2015, Turkish authorities declared a curfew in the predominantly Kurdish, southeastern city of Cizre. The military force, conducted operations targeting the PKK and partially lifted the curfew on March 1st, 2016. The Human Rights Foundation of Turkey has recently reported that the city has been destroyed with growing evidence of large-scale military involvement while dozens of civilians have been killed[6]. A state of emergency was not only declared in Cizre; but Turkish forces also intervened in several other cities in East and Southeast Anatolia such as Mardin, Nusaybin, Yüksekova, and Şırnak.

History reveals many periods of mass violence in Turkey in which direct violence as well as different levels of structural violence have resulted in the death of thousands of people and extraordinary levels of individual suffering. Political violence in Turkey is not a new phenomenon; it can be traced back to the late 1970s. Intensified torture in police centers, prisons, and military prisons prevailed in between the interruptions of the regime by two periods of military rule in 1971-1973 and 1980-1983 during which institutionalized political violence became the norm. The armed conflict between the Turkish Armed Forces and PKK, which started in the mid-1980s, plays a significant role in shaping the Turkish political history as well as its social dynamics. On September 12, 1980, the military forces declared martial law in most of the provinces of Turkey, which was progressively withdrawn and finally lifted in 1987. Despite the withdrawal of military control throughout most of the country, the East and Southeast of Turkey was ruled under state of

---

[6] For the full reports see: http://en.tihv.org.tr/tag/cizre/

emergency until 2002. During this process, for instance, approximately one million people were forced to leave their homes and 3428 villages and towns were evacuated (Yayman, p. 2011). Since the mobilization in the 1980s, Diyarbakır has played a significant role in Kurdish society with its current socio-political status quo. The increase in its population and significance of its geopolitical location shapes, too, the relationship between Kurdish guerilla and society[7]. That is to say, the politicization of Kurdish identity and the ongoing armed conflict also results in the politicization of families. Leyla Neyzi and Haydar Darıcı's book, *I am Free but I am Committed: Youth from Diyarbakir and Muğla Speak,* for instance, shows how the "memory wars" in Turkey are transferred from one generation to another. Young people in Diyarbakır, according to Neyzi and Darıcı, carry the experiences of the previous generation in their own memories as a collective memory as if they have experienced it themselves (2013, p. 15). They further argue that living in a conflict and violence zone since the 1980s, has also deprived the children of having a normal childhood in the Kurdish society (2013, p. 15). As Cuma Çiçek argues "the Kurdish movement is characterized by its social network. It is not just the idea of socialism or independence that drives the Kurdish. It is mainly the personal networks. Each militant will involve its whole family" (cited in Devalpo, 2015). This social enthusiasm within the Kurdish society has also mobilized the political wing.

4.2 Wider Social Conflicts and Continuum of Violence in Everyday Life

The overwhelming military presence and superiority in East and Southeast Anatolia have not only led to the social mobilization and affected the sociopolitical situation there, but also the entire

---

[7] For further information on the hypothesis of the relationship between Kurdish guerilla and society see:

history, social family relations and developments of the country have been deeply affected. The impact of various forms of political violence has created imbalances in social relations such as an escalation in ethnic, political or religious grievances, poverty and problems in family relations such as interpersonal violence in families. For instance, Aksu Bora and Ilknur Üstün (2005), in *Warm Family Environment,* point to the significance of looking at social inequalities and power relations when referring to gender relations. In-depth interviews with seventy-eight participants were conducted for this research study with a people from various backgrounds and identities such as women, men, youth, Alevi, Kurds, members of religious communities, etc. Although, in their analysis, the term intersectionality is not used explicitly, the norms and patterns on gender relationships are examined from an intersectional perspective. For example, Bora and Üstün, argue that the political oppression of the country has influenced the entire society resulting in increased levels of depression among young people. While all narratives of their informants from Diyarbakır mentioned about the effects of political oppression on various levels, similar experiences were also expressed by other people from different regions (2005, p. 29). For instance, Şahin, who was imprisoned for being a member of a political organization during his college education in Sinop, has struggled to lead a "normal" life with his wife and son afterwards (2005, p. 29). Şeyhmus' story, similarly, points to the impingement of larger power systems. When he was young, military forces killed twenty of his friends. Şeyhmus believes that what we experience today in society in form of family violence or social pressure has strong connections to his experiences as a youth. He points out that in Diyarbakır it is unlikely to meet an adult who was not subjected to torture or remained under custody (2005, p. 29). Another informant named Kadir similarly, identifies a connection between political violence and violence in everyday life. As a product of patriarchal

social order, violence was always a part of our lives for sure, says Kadir, but with political conflicts the continuation of violence become visible (2005, p. 29).

Although the process of modernization for decades in Turkey has changed circumstances including the economic, political and education system; the occurrence of violence is systematically reproduced, reinforced and normalized through institutional power structures and discourses (Çoşar, 2010); increasing rate of police brutality, ongoing torture practices that have extended over public spaces, the growth in numbers of gangs and the increase of violence against women and deaths within the last years are only some of the examples.

4.3   Military Service and Militarization of Everyday Life

The culture of militarism manifests itself not only through a macro structure, i.e. policing, but also through a micro-structure, i.e. hypermasculinity, reproduction of violence. The compulsory military service, in contemporary Turkey, is exclusive to heterosexual men, who reach the age of twenty. This act of male bonding by compulsory military service defines a gendered citizenship status and develops the construction of masculinity (Enloe, 2000; Cockburn, 2012; Altinay, 2004). It is this male exclusiveness, which initially sparks a motivation to perform military service. The willingness of men to die for the nation, to give their lives as a sacrifice for the nation or having served in military service is rewarded through gendered language, social life and violence. Women, on the other hand, "who will never have access to such knowledge of the nation, of arms, of machines, of the homeland" (Altınay, 2004, p. 78) are therefore "bound to be seen as incomplete citizens" (Cockburn, 2004, p. 113-114). Ayşe Gül Altınay, in her book *The Myth of the Military-Nation*, examines military service in Turkey by investigating deeply its structure and developments, how militarized masculinity is constructed and how the identification with the state

31

leads to further construction of male superiority over women. Altınay, argues that the concept of gendered citizenship was created through compulsory enrollment in a way that "lawmakers were aware of the impact of their decision when they passed the Military Service Law" (2004, p. 77). Altınay further refers to a fictious story to make her point clear on gendered citizenship. The story is about Hüsmen, narrated by Celal Sıtkı Taranci and published in *Ülkü*- a popular periodical, who has become a commander and dreams about showing the things he learned from military service to his wife (Altınay, 2004, p. 77). The story is narrated as follows:

> After he is back in the village and has his wedding, he will tell Kezban all about the things he learned in military service…When Hüsmen says it all to Kezban, she will be dumbfounded (*parmak ısırıp kalcak*); the fascination of his wife…will make Hüsmen proud (gururunu okşayacak, koltuklarını kabartacak). He will first teach Kezban how to identify herself (*künyesini belletecek*). When he calls "Kezban", Kezban will run to him like a soldier, stand in front of Hüsmen and after giving the offical greeting, she will say "Ali's daugther Kezban, 329 Poturlar [presumably her address]. yes, sir! (*Emret, efendim*)" and will wait for his orders. (Sıtkı, 1993, p. 250-251 cited in Altınay, 2004, p. 77)

Altınay argues that "in this story, participation in the military is linked directly to masculinity where military knowledge is power over women" (2004, p. 77-78). She further argues that Hüsmen may have experienced negative feelings and experiences during his stay in the military such as being beaten up by the commander, but "he is guaranteed the *unconditional* position of the commander at home" (Altınay, 2004, p. 78). Altınay, hereby, refers to "the level of micro-processes and practices, violence and violations by organizations and collectivities can be ways of reinforcing relations of domination and subordination; developing resistance; refining gradations of status and power; facilitating alliances, coalitions, inclusions, exclusions and scapegoating; and forming identities" (Hearn, 2012, p. 46). Men's collective structural power, here, refers to a larger social system by which it systematically reproduces and reinforces gendered practices, hegemonic masculinities and violence.

32

Chapter 5   Research Findings and Analysis

Chapter two, deals with ways on how traditional feminist theories frame and theorize gender violence, thereby evaluating the shortcomings, strengths and likely outcomes of the theories. Scrutinizing this discourse was of particular importance to understand why patriarchy as the sole explanation for violence against women reflects only a narrow perspective and "does not describe the complexities of violence" (Merry, 2009, p. 18). In chapter four, I assess the relationship between social conflicts and domestic violence in a broader scope within a socio-cultural and political context. This analysis has prompted the question about how militarized societies play a significant role in increased numbers of gender violence incidents, which we encounter more specifically in form of domestic violence. As an example, highly militarized Turkey has experienced many massacres, conflicts, and violent military coups. These have left the entire nation with deep scars imprinted on their psyche, yet has not changed the fact that different forms of violence emerged, as examined in the previous chapter. The central concern in the present research analysis is how the intersection of domestic violence and culture of militarism is conceived/studied by women's organizations in Turkey. In fact, this chapter will discuss the discourse on gender and domestic violence among women's organizations in Turkey to evaluate the extent of how the wider social conflict in the society is directly associated with other forms of violence such as domestic violence. Although all participants almost exclusively hinted as strong link between state violence and domestic violence, as my main finding shows, there is, however, a discrepancy between public rhetoric and practice at the organizational level. In what follows, the information gathered from these interviews will be examined under four headings.

5.1 Patriarchy as the Major Cause of Domestic Violence

Although there are marked differences between the organizations I have interviewed regarding their political interests, ethnic infrastructure, mapping methods, tools, and design strategies; all my participants argue that patriarchy as "a system of social structures, and practices in which men dominate, oppress and exploit women" (Walby, 1990, p. 214) is the major cause of domestic violence. A common slogan of the early feminist movement said "the personal is political,", one of my participants similarly as asserts that "response to social structure in which women are systematically dominated, exploited and oppressed" (Hartmann, 1981, p. 175). The Purple Roof Foundation, the Foundation for Women's Solidarity and KAMER, along with all other organizations I interviewed, particularly make it clear that domestic violence is not simply a private family matter but rather it is a serious social problem that is shaped by the patriarchal structure of society. The concept of family, which is generally accepted as a private entity by society and governmental institutions, is therefore challenged and is in some sense perceived as a political institution. The following comments of Zeynep (Istanbul Rainbow Women's Platform), for instance, examine the concept of family as an executive institutionalized unit powered by men; in her words,

> We see the family as a small prototype of the state. It is the smallest constituent of society that is shaped by the male-dominated system. Here, social gender roles are shaped by the family; this affects the socialization of boys and girls. Well, this society is a male society, and society together with the family institutionalizes this masculine mentality. I mean, we see the family at the same time as the smallest constituent of the state that is institutionalized in which the state creates itself within the family.

Here, the family is regarded as inseparable from the state in which the patriarchal state mirrors the patriarchal family and vice versa. Similarly, Selin (Kardelen Women's House) emphasizes the significance of the father in the family when investigating domestic violence. She says,

34

> Well, Marx says, you know, that the family is a prototype of the state. He told something that is in fact very true. […]. The father presents the state in the family. It turns out that both children and women are under the authority of the father, and the father exists to maintain the male power in the family. We need to look from this perspective while addressing domestic violence.

As Heidi Hartmann argues, "there is some evidence to suggest that when patriarchy was first institutionalized in state societies, the ascending rulers literally made men the heads of their families […]. Men are dependent on one another (despite their hierarchal ordering) to maintain their control over women" (1981, p. 177). Selin's narrative, too, deals with the status quo of the patriarchal family that mirrors the patriarchal state and enforces men's control over their children and wives. As I explained in chapter two, the patriarchal social order here refers to "male dominance" in which "male control" is described as a continuum of gender roles by which the male power is systematically maintained over females. Patriarchy, therefore, in any and all forms, is seen as the major reason for all types of violence and abuse against women. Even though Selin believes that there are many other contributing factors to the choice of using violence against women, she underscores several times the importance not to overlook the issue of patriarchy and omit therefore its systematic and widespread reality. If we were to analyze every single case or every single man's life to understand the reason of domestic violence says Selin, establishing the cause and effect relationship might result in understanding the reason of domestic violence differently and maybe all together erroneously. Selin was not the only one who was extremely critical in looking at the causes of domestic violence. Similarly, Didem believes that risk factors such as unemployment, anger escalation, drinking habits or witnessing family violence as a child are intensifiers of potential domestic violence, yet cannot be entitled as the sole explanation for domestic violence. Eda (UNFPA), too, points to risk factors such as social and individual factors. While unemployment and social conflicts are categorized as social factors, individual factors can be linked with drug addiction and alcohol addiction. These factors, however, are not the main

35

reasons for domestic violence, "the main cause is the desire to gain dominance over others (one gender over another gender)" according to Eda. She continues as follows:

> In no way, whatever might have happened, there is no excuse for violence and threat. There is only one reason for violence, and this is patriarchy, namely the patriarchal social order.

Here, the social relations of power between men and women, which she describes as patriarchy, is seen as the major reason for domestic violence. When I asked the causes and risk factors of domestic violence to Nilay (KAMER), she, too, narrated that domestic violence is caused by patriarchy. She defines patriarchy as a system that wants to keep its power alive under all circumstances, and gender roles are an instrumental means to maintain men's power. The power relationship here is also restricted to heterosexual gender relations. The gender roles refer to the powerful men/powerless women binary, and as men are the privileged ones they can do whatever they want. In other words, "men batter women, the argument went, because they can" (Merry, 2009, p. 16).

However, there is another key observation that needs to be elaborated on to understand the whole picture. The state control over civil society organizations seems to play a significant role in keeping women's organizations alert to any topic related to the patriarchal system. "By the way we lost our rights in abortion, you know, right?" says Didem when she mentioned about the state control over the society. The banning of abortion is still a topic of heated debate in Turkey. While the law has not been passed yet, Didem argues that abortion in state hospitals becomes more and more difficult to access, "the ministry put a ban on abortion". Although this practice is not legal, says Didem, the society also becomes radically shaped by this discourse. At this point, she continues, "when you start worrying about not losing all your existing belongings, you cannot even think of changing the agenda, make new policy, demand new things". As I mentioned in chapter one, what women's

organizations have gained throughout history has not been earned easily. By adopting a powerful stance against patriarchy, "ensuring that women's rights and gender equality continue to be defended"[8] is the first and foremost priority here, which heavily shapes their daily agenda.

The Center for Preventing and Monitoring Violence (ŞÖNİM), for instance, which is funded by the state, seems to play a significant role in setting the priorities in women's organizations. The remarks of my participants regarding the actions, methods and design strategies of the center in combatting domestic violence were at large negative. The center was established in 2012 under the law 6284. In Article 15 it is formulated, that this center besides offering shelters for women, also has social services available for men such as rehabilitation programs for male perpetrators. The aim of these services are described as follows: "Attending anger management, stress management, training and rehabilitation programs aim to change the attitude and behavior by raising awareness to prevent violence"[9]. Viewing the tendency to violence as a psychopathological mental disorder, drew negative reactions from my respondents as violence cannot be prevented by simply learning nonviolent ways to control anger. Didem, for instance, told me that although some of the practices that are offered by the center can be relevant and helpful in preventing domestic violence; in general, since their approaches to prevent violence against women reflect the priorities of the ruling patriarchal social order, the existence of the centers does not lead to many promising outcomes. She continues as follows:

> The causes of domestic violence are nowadays commonly expressed at the governmental level. They mostly speak about rehabilitation programs for male perpetrators of domestic violence, who are typically labeled as mentally ill people.

[8] ICAN (2015). *Resisting the New Conservatism: Women's campaigns for rights, peace and participation in Turkey*: http://www.icanpeacework.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Turkey-Brief.pdf

[9] For further information about the purpose of the Law 6284 see: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---ilo_aids/documents/legaldocument/wcms_235174.pdf

[…]. These people are not psychopaths; they are normal people like you and me. But as you see, they describe the perpetrators as ill or psychologically abnormal.

Here, Didem describes that the classification of perpetrators as mentally ill constitutes a questionable situation. As pointed out in chapter two, the prevailing theory in the United States back in the 1970s of why men use violence was based on psychopathological explanations. According to this theory, male perpetrators of domestic violence were labeled as mentally ill and were hence considered as treatable through medication or psychological services. (McCue, 2008, p. 12) Although some researchers have been successful at implementing solutions that minimize violence to some extent, feminists nonetheless believe that "it excused the batterers and did not take into account the patriarchal structure of the society." (McCue, 2008, p. 12), which according to their theory is the source of all violence against women. Didem, similarly, points to the feminist worry that "such research will divert attention from the broader societal changes" (McCue, 2008, p. 12). In her words:

They are approaching them [male perpetrators of domestic violence] as clinical cases. Thus, the Ministry of Family and Social Policies offers many training programs to teach how to control anger. I do not say that we should not adopt such kind of programs, but it is very important to know how and for what purpose to use them.

The purpose here, according to Didem, refers to the patriarchal social orders that reinforce gender roles and hierarchal power relations between women and men. This center, according to Didem, supports male dominance even further, let alone fixing the problem. Selin's (Kardelen Women's House) reaction towards the operation of the center was similar to Didem's. Selin first criticized the name of the ministry; the once called Ministry of Women and Family Affairs has replaced with the newly established Ministry of Family and Social Policies. Instead of empowering women and providing a safe zone for them, according to Selin, women are considered as part of the family

rather than independent individual beings redefining the category of women within the parallels of the patriarchal system. Selin moves on:

> They started to perceive domestic violence as a family issue. Families consist of man, woman, and child. However, men are not subjected to violence, so why would they examine the whole family then? They passed new laws and legislations and established the Center for Preventing and Monitoring Violence in many cities. Yet, the centers are a failure. […]. There is an increase in domestic violence today.

Selin is not against a holistic approach to fight domestic violence since these centers bear the potential to be pioneers in combatting domestic violence. However, she criticizes the way how the practices are implemented. Working just with other state institutions without cooperating with independent women's organizations, for instance, will be stagnant according to Selin- "the state already manifests violence at the social level so how will they prevent domestic violence".

Didem, on the other hand, points to the repressive state apparatus that sets the overall public agenda on issues of domestic violence. A growing effort of women's organizations to keep women's rights and cultural presence visible to the public necessarily shifts the focus to other dynamics. Berivan (DIKASUM) similarly reflects on the collective effort of women's organizations that have to fight to defend their existing and hard-earned gains. She says:

> We as NGOs, an alternative organization, have to check whether the laws are implemented or not. In cases, where it is not put into effect properly, we have to apply pressure.

Here, the "we" in Berivan's quote refers to other women's organizations and their overall collective efforts. Her statement expresses the struggle between the state and women's organizations by which the public agenda is formed through an action-reaction chain. Making new policy or demanding new things, therefore, requires an overwhelming effort, much more than what women's organizations already do; and, in fact, the breadth of the discussion on what and how

political and cultural factors intensify the tension between the state and women's organizations is much wider than this research study concentrates on and will not be further discussed. Still it is noteworthy to point out that the state plays an important role in shaping the current discourse on domestic violence. In other words, I argue that the reason why women's organizations are highly sensitive and venomous regarding issues on patriarchy is not simply because they are influenced by the second-wave feminism that portrays patriarchy as the root of domestic violence, but rather the existence of a complicated relationship between the state and women's organizations, which perpetually keeps the public discourse on patriarchy alive. As a result, the developing dominance of centers like ŞÖNİM within the past few years has thus not only subliminally influenced the answers of my participants, but as I will discuss in the next section, has also deeply influenced their approach to combat and prevent domestic violence in an effort to provide more effective solutions such as working together with male perpetrators.

5.2   The Perspective on Working with Male Perpetrators of Domestic Violence

There remains a great debate among feminist activists whether men should be involved in prevention efforts of violence against women. While a significant number of feminist critiques underscore dangers associated with it, a certain degree of optimism and hope does exist within the feminist tradition in the belief that working with male perpetrators may result in success[10]. In the interviews, nevertheless, as I discussed briefly in the previous section, all my participants responded negatively as I inquired my participants on whether they involved men while working

---

[10] See Capraro, 1994 and Corcoran, 1992, for detailed discussion on feminists support of men's involvement in prevention of domestic violence.

on resolving domestic violence cases. During the interviews, I asked them several times directly why they were opposing the inclusion of male perpetrators in their programs. Some claimed that such an approach would relieve the male perpetrator from his responsibility of admitting and facing his transgression and therefore divert the awareness of "gendered" and "patriarchal" social orders. Others argued that their priorities are women and women's empowerment. Interestingly, although I did not explicitly mention ŞÖNİM in my interview questions or never asked what they think about these centers, all of my participants, separately, mentioned about the centers whenever asked questions on their opinion of what they think about working with male perpetrators.

Sinem (Purple Roof Foundation), for instance, told me that they are against a criminology based approach. In the following paragraph she implicitly criticizes ŞÖNİM for its strategies on prevention of domestic violence such as offering rehabilitation aids for male perpetrators. Sinem states the following:

> Violence against women is not something that can be solved with rehabilitation. [...]. One out of every two women systematically experience this violence. They experience the same thing that we all encounter every day and the causes for this violence is neither women's behaviors nor the perpetrators' so called "sickness." The perpetrator's violence is a choice; if violence would be an uncontrollable behavior or sickness, then why don't they systematically hit their bosses on their head with an ashtray every day. We never hear such kind of men's stories. This shows how it is possible to control anger; the perpetrator knows pretty well where his power domain weakens and where it becomes more powerful.

Men's violence against women is strictly defined as "male violence" in Sinem's narratives. The causes of "male violence" are described as gender inequality which she sees as "a product of patriarchy". Interventions with every single perpetrator, therefore, would not be an efficient strategy in situations where systematically broader societal patterns are involved. When I asked whether they incorporate male perpetrators in their programs as a campaign to target violence against women, she made it very clear that they do not work with male perpetrators, "of course not

41

because we are a women's organization". Women are their priorities, as they are socially and culturally oppressed. In their handbook, *Combatting with Male Violence,* which was published in 2014, they frequently make reference to ŞÖNİM whenever they define violence. ŞÖNİM is used as a counter argument to highlight that violence against women is far more than lack of anger management. The bigger social system, namely patriarchy, men's domination over women, is the reason for exercising violence (Uçan et al., 2014, p. 13). Sinem further says that she also personally does not believe that a grown men's behavior could ever be changed - "There are many examples worldwide that show us how pointless these programs can be." The intolerance to men's involvement in prevention of violence, in Sinem's narratives, is salient as she clearly expressed that "even if women demand this [involving men] we do not do it."

Although Didem's (Foundation for Women's Solidarity) opinion regarding this matter was to some degree more moderate than Sinem's, she, too, defines the foundation she works at as a women's organization that works only with women. "We aim to create solidarity among women," says Didem, because men are the root of the problem. In her words:

> We do not aim to end or stop the violence because only the one who exercises violence can stop it. We try to do our best to keep women away from male violence, provide self-protection strategies, or establish solidarity among women to find different solutions to stop violence at some point. […]. Violence is a choice. Those who exercise violence are not pathetic people, […], and men decide when and where they commit violence. […]. Men manipulate to gain dominance over women. For this reason, we do not prefer to work with men.

At a personal level, however, Didem thinks that it could be helpful to work with men, as her words point to a positive attitude towards the inclusion of male perpetrators in the previous section. She nonetheless still believes that it is quite hard to adopt such a program in today's condition, especially if "we consider the fact that the ministerial budget for women's studies is limited". According to the White Ribbon Campaign report 2011 "there is fear and concern that recourses

may be re-deployed to work with men and boys […]. Some women's organizations may question funding for programs engaging men and boys in preventing violence against women when funding for women's program is reduced or eliminated"[11]. Similarly, Didem's evaluation of recourse scarcity is reflecting this fear as she strongly believes it is better to use the money for women's empowerment than using it for violence prevention programs for perpetrators.

Zeynep (Istanbul Rainbow Women's Platform), on the other hand, at a personal level, narrated how important it is to involve men in combatting domestic violence and more importantly believes that an inclusion is compulsory to challenge the heteronormative, male dominated social orders. However, this attempt might not result in success unless men's violence prevention programs are pro-feminist and are not merely restricted to services offered by the Ministry of Family and Social Policies according to Zeynep. She further continues:

> Well, with a limited time of rehabilitation everything can be easily destroyed. Therefore, the society must change from the bottom-up and this problem cannot be solved with rehabilitation. For this reason, it does not look very realistic to me, since here the issue is not anger management. For example, the male perpetrator does not use violence towards everyone. This is a not a traumatic problem; it is a systematic action. For this reason, we have to change the society altogether, we cannot solve it with rehabilitation processes, this is not realistic.

The strategies used to prevent violence, such as anger management, are considered unrealistic not only by Zeynep, but also by most of the remaining participants. While most of them agree to some extent that including men might be useful in combatting violence against women, they are critical about current practices and the reasoning it rests on. Yet, overall, the significance of men's role in preventing men's violence is positively recognized.

---

[11] See White Ribbon Campaign Report 2011, 35

Moreover, although the organizations I have interviewed do not conduct perpetrators programs in their workshops and/or training programs, some of them mentioned about cases of positive outcomes after having worked with male perpetrators as an alternative solution. Selin (Kardelen Women's House), for instance, raises the importance of inclusion of male perpetrators while she also illustrates how they do it. Here, the shift from rhetoric to practice becomes obvious. Selin points to the fact that not every woman wants to stay permanently at the shelter or leave/ divorce her partner. In such cases, the organizations function as arbitrageurs, so to speak. Selin shared a story that had recently happened at the women shelter as an example on how and when they included male perpetrators. Due to violence and serious conflicts at home, a woman has left her husband with two children. Approximately after six months, says Selin, she suddenly wanted to go back home because of a fight she had at the shelter. Although they have tried to convince her to stay at the shelter for their own safety, at some point "we had to respect her decision" says Selin. Then, they decided to let her go under one condition; they convinced the woman's husband and his family would to meet with them to agree on terms such as the safety of the children and that they would not be taken away from their mother. Selin thinks that the meeting went quite well, despite increased tension as the room was occupied by ten men and only four women. The reason why she thinks the meeting went well is because they "spoke in a way so that they [men's side] would understand us" says Selin, and continues her story as follows:

> As a response, they told us that she was welcome home back. But if they would not have accepted to come and listen to us, they might not be able to see the children again.

Using an ethnocentric approach, the foundation, therefore, provided an alternative solution by facilitating an interactive conversation with men in order to combat with violence. However, "the relationship between feminism and respect for cultural differences is a

difficult one, constantly subject to debate and renegotiation" (Merry, 2009, p. 16) as Selin's narrative exemplifies:

> We had a meeting with men. But if you look from a feminist perspective they would have told us not to negotiate with men. For example, if you have an interview with Purple Roof Foundation, you will see, they would say, 'how dare you speak with men, who are they', but that is not what we do. The culture here is different; we do not empower men here. On the contrary, we try to raise alternative solutions for women.

The cultural relativist approach was not only emphasized by Selin, Rojda (Selis Women's Counseling Center) similarly points to the geopolitical and socio-cultural differences of Diyarbakır. When there are problems related heavily to men, Rojda explains that in such cases, they usually direct them to political parties such as HDP (People's Democratic Party) and BDP (Peace and Democracy Party). The dynamic structure of the Kurdish society plays a significant role here that allows both sides to work in collaboration[12]. Selin (Kardelen Women's House), very often refers to how the Kurdish movement and its historical transformation has a great influence in relation to the political wings. She links women's struggle to the larger struggle, namely to the Kurdish movement and argues that this collective struggle has a positive influence on the societal level particularly regarding gender issues. The cooperation and alliances between the political parties and women's organization in Diyarbakır, thus, have created an analytical and facilitative environment for new alternatives in combatting violence against women including strategies such as working with men. Although this involvement is not systematically incorporated into training programs yet, there is a growing tendency to work with men. More importantly, this tendency

---

[12] As I explored in the previous chapter, although, methodologically speaking, there are differences and similarities between the political wing and militant PKK, which have a constantly shifting and evolving interrelation, gender equality issues are grounded fundamentally as the guerilla movement has deeply influenced the political discourse of Kurdish parties.

remains not only at the rhetoric level but manifest itself also in practice and bears a transformative potential that may reveal itself in new social movements.

In the next section, I explore how state violence, particularly political violence and military intervention, mobilizes the discussion on male involvement in which men's actions are perceived from a different angle by taking into account their vulnerability within larger power systems. Militarization and its impact on people's lives are also topics that I elaborate on.

5.3   The Connection between State Violence and Domestic Violence

A roaring conversation began with Didem (Foundation for Women's Solidarity) when we turned our focus to the issue of militarization in Turkey. A more detailed interrogation on this subject revealed that the Foundation once has planned to launch a project to raise awareness on the issue of militarism in Turkey and its subsequent impacts on society. Yet, these attempts ended up fruitless. "This, unfortunately, cannot be our priority now; our agenda is set by our current situation, which is also the case for other women's organization" says Didem. Here, the "current situation" refers to the struggle between the state and women's organizations that I mentioned about in section one. "There are many things we are capable of doing but just simply are not allowed to do" says Didem, because it is not the women's organizations that decide on what problems to tackle, but it is very much the state. "At this point the only thing we can do is to resist and try to maintain what we have gained till today" says Didem and added "It is of course not impossible to change the course of things, but doing this is difficult."

Although Didem personally believes that initiating anti-militaristic projects is an absolute necessity, there are some factors among others that make the realization impossible such as the normalization and legitimization of military values. Didem expressed that she was scared to see

46

police and military officers daily on the streets after the two bombings happened in Ankara[13]. "They knew that there will be a bombing but they did not do anything; they even attacked the injured people with gas bombs" says Didem and added, "what we have experienced here in Ankara is a minimized version of course, people in Diyarbakır have to live with it on a daily basis." As our discussion went on she elaborated more on the militarization of society and emphasized that one cannot draw a clear parting line between state violence and domestic violence. She moves on and says "in general we can say that the culture of violence maintains violence against women"[14], theorizing the perpetuation of violence against women unless one isolates oneself from violence all together.

For Didem, advocating for an anti-militarist policy is however a vexed subject since talking about militarization is considered a taboo in the society. This makes the subject that much more difficult to talk about. According to Enloe (2000) "militarization is a step by step process by which a person or a thing gradually comes to be controlled by the military or comes to depend for its well-being on militaristic ideas" (2000, p. 3). The military way of life and the value system associated with it innately predisposes society "to imagine military needs and militaristic presumptions to be not only valuable but also normal" (Enloe, 2000, p. 3). Speaking publicly about militarism therefore as Didem articulates is a sensitive topic by which someone who approaches this subject critically can "experience a negative response". As I discuss in chapter two, militarism is an ideology that cannot be thought as isolated from institutional arrangements. Militarism as a national institution, in which male violence and dominance is established as a legitimate form of control, is not only a

---

[13] On 10 October, 2015, one of the largest terrorist attacks happened in Turkey/Ankara followed by a second one on March 13, 2016.

[14] Didem defines violence against women not only as domestic violence here, she also talks about direct acts of state violence on women such as sexual harassment in conflict zones.

socially approved arrangement but also "the continual mobilization of society to prepare for, support and fight wars" (Adelman, 2003, p. 1123).

Like Didem, a similar approach was echoed by Esin (DIKASUM) when I asked her about the state violence in Kurdistan. Esin raises concerns over the ongoing civil war in the region as the current situation bears different forms of violence that should not be overlooked such as direct acts of violence against women by military officers. Although the public is to some degree determined to do something and is distressed at the ongoing war in Kurdistan, according to Esin, besides the lack of coordination and progression among organizations, the legitimized military values play a significant role in preventing people from participating in any anti-war projects. "Even demanding peace is now a crime in Turkey," says Esin. Activists who want to get involved in such projects were denounced as "terrorists". Here, in both narratives, it is becoming evident that as Henry A. Giroux argues "a state of permanent war needs willing subjects to abide by its values, ideology, and narratives of fear and violence" (2014, p. 232). This situation does not only constitute a problem in Turkey, but also appears within similar contexts for example in Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia, the Philippines, Japan and Chile, where feminists who draw attention to "the causal connection between militarism and all forms of violence against women" (Enloe, 2000 p. 149) are criticized for their 'feminist' reasoning and are accused of being divisive, aliens and even traitors.

The ongoing struggle between the state and women's organization here demonstrates how much the political discourse on domestic violence is shaped by the state of public discourse. Although most participants had supporting opinions on the existence of a relationship between domestic violence and the culture of militarism, one of the main reasons why a strong link between the culture of militarism and domestic violence remains buried, is the state's continual effort to keep women's sight and focus on the public agenda by producing anti-feminist politics. The

normalization of everyday military violence also plays a significant role in the superficial disconnectedness of domestic violence from political violence that results in theorizing domestic violence as a product of patriarchy. The fear of being accused as a traitor or in the case of Kurdish people as terrorists has prevented the causal link between militarism and domestic violence from rising up to the surface.

Direct intervention of state forces, however, have fueled a backlash against the state in my participants, which was more effective than reactions induced by indirect acts of state violence. For example, some participants mention about the police violence on Kurdish women, others point to the ongoing civil war in Kurdistan and how Kurdish women's bodies and sexuality became the direct target of state violence. Thereby, the systematic state violence against women here is mostly considered as a direct intervention; whereas militarism as a contributing factor for constructing manhood and its indirect effects on women such as domestic violence remains in the background, largely unexplored.

Some of the participants even expressed that they did not think about this connection thoroughly. For instance, Sinem (Purple Roof Foundation) hesitated for a while before she answered my question about the relationship between state violence and domestic violence. At that time, I asked her immediately whether I should pause the record[15]. She rejected my offer and responded as follows: "No, no, no; I just could not decide how I should answer your question". Looking at the vicious violence cycle was another way of reconciling both phenomena; Esin (DIKASUM) established an analogy between state violence and its effects on children and continued as follows:

---

[15] This has been done so for ethical reasons and consideration of the current situation in Turkey, assuming that she might not want to be recorded while speaking about state violence.

> You can even see the side effects of state violence on children. Children have been throwing stones at passing police cars as a sign of their anger. Indeed, this picture shows how state violence bears new kind of violence, but unfortunately, we do not conduct any projects particularly on that.

Selin (Kardelen Women's House) further continues and says that "our scope is quite broad maybe, actually you know, how can I say it, there exists such intense violence that we never thought we should turn a hand to there, now you said, I thought". Yasemin (Istanbul Rainbow Women's Platform) similarly expresses that "this is something that needs to be examined from another dimension; till now, I never thought so, I mean about state violence". Seda, on the other hand, shared her memories that her ex-husband has changed after he was released from prison. Seda told me that she never related this behavioral change within the wider contexts of power relations such as political violence. "I never thought of my story in this way, because I found a way out; it was short and to the point," These expressions attest to the anthropological perspective "that it is critical to understand how violence between individuals is a dimension of violence by states, by communities, and by institutions" (Merry, 2009, p. 20).

By sharing my own experiences in the discussion, the atmosphere has become sincerer and connected. Growing political violence, the cycle of violence on a societal and personal level, ecological problems, and sometimes even personal memories were among the discussed subjects. One of the most intriguing points, however, was about men's vulnerability. Rojda (Selis Women's Counseling Center), for instance, turned the discussion of state violence towards a discussion of men's traumatic experiences. Although, according to Rojda, the high level of state violence and its effects culminate on women; men, too, are comparatively affected by it maybe even more. The state power itself "is a product of male domination, as a matter of fact it applies to men as well" says Rojda and refers to the theory of a cycle of violence, "what men learned or psychologically gained inside and within the state is going to affect the children in any case, other family members,

relations among men, or women." Rojda's awareness of the power dynamics among men and her observations on performing masculinity that does not only show to be relational within a cause-and-effect relationship between men and women, but also men and men is a response to the hegemonic model of masculinity that "the 'microculture' of masculinity in everyday life articulates very well with the demands of nationalism, particularly its militaristic side" (Nagel, 1998, p. 252). Esin (DIKASUM), too, reflected on men's vulnerability by noting the warlike situation in Kurdistan, and while framing this problem, she criticizes herself and other organizations for not conducting a project that particularly focuses on men. She says:

> Yeah, maybe it is men who are mostly exposed to violence now. We started to talk about women and children from the beginning and how much they get affected in this process, but no one has considered men. For example, what will happen to those men, how will they get through the experience of violence? Maybe, they will engage in violence towards their children and wife at home. This is an inadequacy; this is, for all of us, a failing, but unfortunately, we do not have such a project.

Although Esin's narratives were usually relatively critical about male involvement especially in the beginning of the interview, through sharing experiences and interchanging ideas the discussion became more productive and worthwhile. Zeynep (Istanbul Rainbow Women's Platform) was another participant, who drew attention to the link between military, masculinity and domestic violence. She did not define male dominated mentality necessarily based on the binary of powerful males/powerless females, but rather examined "the questions of power over others" (Merry, 2009, p. 17) as well. "Who has the power is capable of everything," says Zeynep; men are powerless when it comes to state power, and so are women to men. Military power plays a significant factor in reinforcing these struggles over power according to Zeynep. As Chris Dolan argues "masculinity is articulated in terms of how it differs from femininity, between men it is lived as zero-sum game that allows power differentials between them, notably between military and civilian men, to be established" (2002, p. 78), Zeynep similarly asserts that military power relies

51

on the basis of the "superior-subordinated relationship". Zeynep gives the example of the practice of torture to represent this relationship, and show what kind of acts it prompts:

> For example, someone who was exposed to torture, […], somehow adopts that psychology; in a sense, similar tactics that were applied to him, can be used at home as well, or he uses similar methods against his family."

Here, the "victim-perpetrator cycle" that Zeynep refers to is largely connected to the established power relations between the military and civilian men. "The very sources of power for men contained in the prevalent model of masculinity are also the roots of their vulnerability" according to Dolan who thinks of "the possibility of any man being both a perpetrator and a victim of violence" (2002, p. 78). Zeynep shared her memories of her uncle which portrays this cycle very well. He was subjected to various forms of torture during the 1980s and as a result, the family members had suffered domestic violence after he was released from prison. Dealing with men's vulnerability, however, does not excuse men's violence, as Zeynep enunciates; but it does show the normalization of violence or as Madelaine Adelman (2003) would say the "militarization of domestic violence."

Although Yasemin (Istanbul Rainbow Women's Platform) was at first skeptical about the link between these two phenomena, during our conversation with Zeynep, near the end of the interview her passion towards finding solutions like the possibility to work in close collaboration with centers who work with victims of torture to instill a feminist perspective, shows that they acquired the desire to develop a shift in practice. Nevertheless, this desire remains still fragile and is based on unstructured ideas. Overall, while most of the organizations I interviewed have reacted positively towards understanding the relationship between military culture and domestic violence, it would be incorrect to categorize this level of rhetoric as a substantial set of practices and established beliefs. Still most of the participants believe that this is not their working area, for

52

instance, the Istanbul Rainbow Women's Platform and DIKASUM implied that women's organizations might not be the right place to conduct this kind of research and suggested me to do an interview with the Human Rights Foundation[16]to access more information.

When I asked questions about domestic violence surveys, I recognized that there is a similar attempt to reconcile the concept of domestic violence studies with sociological studies of militarism. I asked questions directed at whether they include/ should include questions about state violence in questionnaires, as "surveys are also critically important in showing how widespread and serious the problem is in the first place" (Marry, 2009, p. 29). Although some of the organizations were relatively positive like the Foundation for Women's Solidarity and Selis Women's Counseling Center about the necessity for including questions regarding state violence in surveys, they have no hope left that it will ever become true: "It should be added but they will never do it", or "we include such questions only when we conduct a survey with the party, you cannot do it via state foundations. […]. Look, there are people who are in jail for years just because they participated in a movement."

In other narratives, however, when preparing the questionnaires "looking both at the intimate details of family life and at geopolitical considerations of power and warfare" (Marry, 2009, p. 29) appear as different fields of research that need to be studied separate from domestic violence. Zeynep (Istanbul Rainbow Women's Platform) for instance, told me that state violence needs to be examined independent of domestic violence because it is about traumatic experiences. Selin (Kardelen Women's House) similarly argued that this is a separate field of study and needs to be

---

[16] They work with victims of torture and offer victims long term counseling sessions.

segmented in different ways. Sinem, told me that they do not believe in the cycle of violence theory, and therefore would not include such questions in domestic violence surveys.

Although, here, separation of domestic violence studies from "militarization of domestic violence" emphasizes the importance of naming the problem, it is not further persuaded how "studies of the militarization of domestic violence may provide a methodological exemplar or corrective to extant research that is based on an overly narrow conceptualization of domestic violence" (Adelman, 2003, p. 1146). On the contrary, based on my analysis, the conceptualization of domestic violence is mainly framed as a product of patriarchy by all my participants although other factors are acknowledged and account for domestic violence as well, these factors are, at first sight, only seen as contributing causes.

Chapter 6 Discussion and Conclusion

Although there is an extant, though relatively young, scholarship on militarism and masculinity in Turkey (Sünbüloğlu 2013, Altınay 2004) and a number of researchers and activists have argued that military culture is conducive to domestic violence (Selek 2008, Halis 2002), there are no studies that look into how "much of the work has focused on providing individual social services at the expense of addressing the structures that leave women vulnerable to abuse" (Richie, 2005, xvi). The distinction between the act of public speaking and the status attached to it, is remarkable. The self-problematization that many specialists on violence against women engage in when discussing the connection between state violence and domestic violence does not necessarily put the ideas (rhetoric) into practice, and remains insufficient in creating a name for the problem. The findings I gathered from the fieldwork in Diyarbakır, namely from organizations such as DIKASUM, Kardelen Women's House, and Selis Women's Counseling Center, were more involved regarding issues on state violence which are related to women's vulnerability, as the geopolitical and socio-cultural factors play a significant role. The fieldwork in Ankara and Istanbul, too, provided significant insights and familiarity with the subject, yet was less engaging with politics. KAMER and UNFPA, however, were in comparison to others, substantially politically aloof, because for them gender equality and women's empowerment is central. These differences between the organizations naturally create a wide span of violations ranging from sexual abuse during civil war to murders of women on family and societal levels; however, this has simultaneously weakened and fragmented the mobilization of collective action against militarism. In other words, for instance, while the narratives of Kurdish women's organizations were filled with expressions of particular attention to women's struggle within the context of the Kurdish movement, other organizations paid more attention on women's solidarity, or the politics

of women's empowerment. The different levels of interest, although ultimately aim is to end violence against women, has alleviated the possibility to act collectively against the military authority in the country. There are other reasons why an anti-militarist perspective is in general avoided in studies of domestic violence. Let me, however, first discuss briefly how militarism overall is elaborated by my participants. The military culture, and the reproduction of institutional violence, and its impact on the societal level, were regarded as a serious problem by all organizations, as the militarist sociopolitical structure is closely linked with gendered nationalism and patriarchy. The recognition of the micro-social expressions of macro-social factors, such as the recognition of a transition from militarism to a militarized society, however, has remained weak. An initial concern of studies on militarism and gender violence is the concept of militarized masculinity (Altınay 2004; Enloe 2000). Researches have thereby shown that "it is not possible logically to disconnect them, neither the dimensions of power themselves, nor the processes that are their vectors. They are distinct, they can be studied and named, but they are intersectional." (Cockburn, 2010, p. 151). As I discussed throughout the thesis, "militarism and its gender hierarchies are linked to men's violence against women. […]. Militarized masculinity can produce women battering" (Merry, 2009, 160). The militarized masculinity, nonetheless, was barely acknowledged by my participants. Male dominance, male oppression, and male centeredness have been studied as the characteristics of a patriarchal system. Not only was the militarized masculinity completely taken out of the domain, but also the normalization of military violence on a daily level was to some extent in effect. As Simten Çoşar says "in Turkey, as elsewhere, structural violence characterizes politics and everyday life" (2010, p. 155). The normalization of violence in everyday life, is rooted in the violent history of the country. The two bombings in Ankara are given as examples by Didem to represent the culture of normalized violence, when she expressed that she

was scared to see military officers on the streets every day. Another reason why an anti-militaristic perspective has been avoided, it seems, is because of Turkey's current political circumstances in which even demanding peace has become a crime today[17]; this has obviously infused collective anxiety through the society. Yet, it would be incorrect to interpret this situation as peculiar to Turkey's current political authority. Pinar Selek, who is known as one of the famous antimilitarist activist in Turkey, was taken into custody in 1998 for conducting a research study on PKK, during which she faced many challenges even in the following years. Her antimilitarist standpoint was seen as a potential threat to national security; similar to what Serbian feminists have experienced, Selek was criticized for her 'feminist' logic and accused of being divisive, alienating and even a traitor.

A third reason for not adopting an antimilitarist standpoint is due to the fact that women's political agenda is shaped by the state dynamics. The gendered language and discourse within the state keeps women's organizations out of its politics. Their presence in politics therefore, mostly, appears as a resistance to the patriarchal order that does not allow them to "even think of changing the agenda". In the 1970s, women's organizations in Turkey, as was discussed in chapter one, have worked with different government departments and agencies to change laws, and patriarchal social orders as an alternative solution to provide gender equality. Yet, this has rapidly changed towards the 1990s as various independent women's organizations started to work independent from state apparatus. Today, women's organizations and feminist activists "play a pivotal role in the struggle for democratization and equal opportunity in Turkey –ensuring that women's rights and gender

---

[17] Four Turkish academics were arrested in March 2016, for making "propaganda for terrorism" and signing "The Academics for Peace Petition". For further information, see: https://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/margaret-owen/to-demand-peace-is-not-crime-turkish-academics-on-trial

equality continue to be defended"[18]. Didem, as well as other participants mentioned frequently that we should not underestimate the fight that women's organizations continue today; when we look from a larger picture we see in fact only "a handful of women" activists. "And the very same amount of these women try to reach out everywhere while they are continuously attacked by the state" says Didem. This, apparently, too, prevents women's organizations from shifting their agenda towards underlying matters lying at the root of all problems. Although it is relatively obvious that most of the narratives were deeply influenced by the second wave feminism, as the discussion moved on to patriarchy as the ultimate reason for all type of violence against women, the current political discourse, too, has fundamentally shaped their way of perceiving domestic violence. The establishment of ŞÖNİM, for instance, as it also provides services for male perpetrators, has created an anxious atmosphere among women's organizations. Most of my participants believe that these centers are far from promoting gender equality and believe that they even reinforce gender norms and roles within the context of patriarchy. For that reason, most of my participants had negative reactions about involving male perpetrators in domestic violence programs.

While there is a limit to how strong of a claim I can make regarding the validity of my assertions on the subject, this thesis however bears a strong potential to make a critical contribution. The main finding of this research study points to a significant shortage in practical applications as the recognition of the relationship between state violence-particularly political violence and domestic violence-not only in the context of Turkish politics, but also in many other contexts- is revealed

---

[18] ICAN (2015). *Resisting the New Conservatism: Women's campaigns for rights, peace and participation in Turkey* : http://www.icanpeacework.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Turkey-Brief.pdf

on a rhetoric level (Richie, 2005; Bograd, 20005). These studies fail in providing alternative solutions in practice. Although some key studies on domestic violence in which an intersectional approach was adopted have widened our perspective on gender violence, the lack in practice necessitates an examination that brings many critical perspectives into the picture. Scrutinizing this missing element is particularly important, as Merry argues, in order to name the problem to create a social movement, as well as to develop a framework that explains it and offers a solution (2009, p. 27). My findings show that militarism is an unspoken, taboo topic that has collectively influenced everyone. I was told several times that women's organizations are not the right place to conduct this research and access the information that I was seeking. Did most people not break their silence because dealing with militarism requires more efforts and people are afraid of all challenges that are yet to be faced when revolting against state and domestic violence? Does studying domestic violence as a product of patriarchy position us within a safer zone, than framing domestic violence within the larger context of militarism? As the example of various feminists, who wanted to raise awareness on the causal connection between militarism and all forms of violence against women, demonstrates, it is very probable to be accused of being divisive and a traitor (Enloe 2000, 149) and are we all afraid to be chosen as the next victim as Pinar Selek? These questions still need to be answered for a true understanding of the topic to provide solutions for preventing and hopefully all together stopping violence against women which would also encompass "disproportionate forms of interpersonal violence" (Merry, 2009, p. 102).

Bibliography

Adelman, M. (2003). The Military, Militarism, and the Militarization of Domestic Violence. *Violence Against Women*, *9*(9), 1118–1152. http://doi.org/10.1177/1077801203255292

Altinay, A. G. (2004). *The Myth of the Military-Nation: Militarism, Gender, and Education in Turkey*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Anderson, H. (2008). *Conversation, Language, and Possibilities: A Postmodern Approach to Therapy*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Anderson, K., & Umberson, D. (2001). Gendering Violence: Masculinity and Power in Men's Accounts of Domestic Violence. *Gender and Society, 15*(3), 358-380. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3081889

Bora, A. & Ustun, I. (2005). *"Sicak Aile Ortami": Demokratiklesme Surecinde Kadin ve Erkekler.* Istanbul: TESEV Yayinlari.

Borland, K. (1991). That's Not What I Said: Interpretive Conflict in Oral Narrative Research. In Gluck, Sherna B. & Patai, D. (Eds.), *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: men, women, and rape*. Bantam Books.

Caprioli, M. (2005). Primed for Violence: The Role of Gender Inequality in Predicting Internal Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, 49(2), 161–178. doi: 10.1111/j.0020-8833.2005.00340.x

Chung, D. (2005). Violence, control, romance and gender equality: Young women and heterosexual relationships. *Women's Studies International Forum*, *28*(6), 445–455. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2005.09.005

Cockburn, C. (2010). "Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War: A Feminist Standpoint," International *Feminist Journal of Politics*. 12(2): 139-157.

Cockburn, C. (2004). *The Line: Women, Partition and the Gender Order in Cyprus*. London, UK: Zed Books.

Code, L., Mullett, S., & Overall, C. (1988). *Feminist perspectives: philosophical essays on method and morals*. University of Toronto Press.

Collins, P. H. (2015). Intersectionality's Definitional Dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *41*(1), 1–20. http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142

Cosar, S. (2010). Reconstructing Women in Postconflict Rwanda. In Chandler, Robin M. et al. (Eds.), *Woman, War, and Violence*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241-1299. doi:1. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1229039 doi:1

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241-1299. doi:1. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1229039 doi:1\

Devalpo, A. (2015, February 26). In Diyarbakir, in Turkey, the Kurds are gaining their autonomy step by step. Retrieved from https://blogs.mediapart.fr/alain-devalpo/blog/260215/diyarbakir-turkey-kurds-are-gaining-their-autonomy-step-step

DeVault, M. L. (1999). Liberating Method: Feminism and Social Research. Temple University Press.

Dobash, R. Emerson & Dobash, R. (1979). Violence Against Woman. New York, NY: Free Press.

Dolan, C. (2002). Collapsing Masculinities and Weak States - A Case Study of Northern Uganda. In Cleaver, F. (Eds.), *Masculinities matter!: Men, Gender, and Development.* New York, NY: Zed Books.

Emerson, Robert M. & Fretz, Rachel I. & Shaw, Linda L. (Eds.). (1995). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Enloe, C. (2000). *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. University of California Press.

Friedan, B. (2013). *The Feminine Mystique*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Gelles, R. (1980). Violence in the Family: A Review of Research in the Seventies. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 42*(4), 873-885. doi:1. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/351830 doi:1

Giroux, Henry A. (2014, April 8). Neoliberalism and the Machinery of Disposability. Retrieved from http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/22958-neoliberalism-and-the-machinery-of-disposability

Haj-Yahia, MM. & Abdo-Kalati, R. (2003). *The rates and correlates of the exposure of Palestinian adolescents to family violence: toward an integrative-holistic approach.* Child Abuse Neglect 2003; 27(7), 781–806. doi:10.1016/S0145-2134(03)00119-4

Halis, M. (2002). *Batman*'da *Kadınlar Ölüyor.* Istanbul: Metis Yayıncılık Ltd

Hartman, H. (1981). The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism. Towards a More Progressive Union. In Jaggar, Alison M. & Rothenberg Paula S. (Eds.). *Feminist Frameworks.* New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Hearn, J. (2012). A multi-faceted power analysis of men's violence to known women: from hegemonic masculinity to the hegemony of men. *The Sociological Review*, 60(4), 589–610. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.2012.02125.x

ICAN (2015). Resisting the New Conservatism: Women's campaigns for rights, peace and participation in Turkey. Retrieved from http://www.icanpeacework.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Turkey-Brief.pdf

McCall, L. (2005*)* The Complexity of Intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society,* 30(3), 1771-1800. doi: 10.1086/426800

McCue, M. L. (2008). *Domestic Violence: A Reference Handbook*. ABC-CLIO.

Merry, S. E. (2009). *Gender Violence: A Cultural Perspective*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Merry, Sally Engle. (2009). *Gender Violence: A Cultural Perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell Pub.

Mohanty, C. T. (1984). Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses. *Boundary 2*, *12/13*, 333–358. http://doi.org/10.2307/302821

Nagel, J. (1998). Masculinity and nationalism: gender and sexuality in the making of nations. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *21*(2), 242–269.

Neyzi, L., & Darıcı, H. (2013). *"Özgürüm ama mecburiyet var": Diyarbakırlı ve Muğlalı gençler anlatıyor*. İletişim.

Rabrenovic, G. & Roskos, L. (2001). Introduction: Civil Society, Feminism, and the Gendered Politics of War and Peace. *NWSA Journal* 13(2), 40-54. The Johns Hopkins University Press. Retrieved June 5, 2016, from Project MUSE database.

Radford, J. (1996). Violence against woman and children: the contradictions of crime control under patriarchy. In M. Hester et al. (Eds.). *Women, violence, and male power: feminist activism, research, and practice*. Open University Press.

Ristock, J. L. (2002). *No More Secrets: Violence in Lesbian Relationships*. Psychology Press.

Selek, P. (2008). *Sürüne Sürüne Erkek Olmak*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları

Sokoloff, N. J., & Dupont, I. (2005). Domestic Violence at the Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender Challenges and Contributions to Understanding Violence Against Marginalized

Women in Diverse Communities. *Violence Against Women*, *11*(1), 38–64. http://doi.org/10.1177/1077801204271476

Straus, M. M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family*. Transaction Publishers.

Sünbüloğlu, Nurseli Y. (2013). *Erkek Millet Asker Millet / Türkiye'de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek(lik)ler.* Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları

Totten, M. (2003). Girlfriend Abuse as a Form of Masculinity Construction among Violence, Marginal Male Youth. *Men and Masculinities*, 6(1), 70-92. doi: 10.1177/1097184X03253138.

Tracy, Steven R. (2007). Patriarchy and Domestic Violence: Challenging Common Misconceptions. Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 50(3), 573-594. Retrieved from http://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/50/50-3/JETS_50-3_573-594_Tracy.pdf.

Walby, S. (1990). *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Basil Blackwell.

Walker, L. E. (1979). *The battered woman*. Harper & Row.

Weiss, R. S. (1995). Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies. Simon and Schuster.

Yayman, H. (2011). *Şark Meselesinden Demokratik Açılıma Türkiye'nin Kürt Sorunu Hafızası*. Ankara: SETA Yayinlari.

Yllö, K., & Bograd, M. L. (1988). *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse*. Sage Publications.

Zengin, N. (2008, January 9). Kurdish MP: We Condemn Violence, Yet It Isn't Valued. Retrieved from http://bianet.org/biamag/minorities/104049-kurdish-mp-we-condemn-violence-yet-it-isn-t-valued