Civil Society in Turkey: A Reading of *Kadin Gazetesi* through a Gramscian Lens

Laura Tocco

The Concept Of Civil Society In Turkey: Liberal Approaches

As everywhere, the concept »civil society« has been the subject of intense scrutiny and vigorous debate in Turkey. Following Turkey's 1980 coup d'état, »civil society« became a central theme of academic literature, and over recent decades different groups have sought to define it through their own ideological lenses. In Turkey, as in the world at large, this field has been dominated by liberal approaches that support the dichotomy between strong-state and weak-civil society. Even if there are different conceptions inside liberal approaches, there is a clear and common background shared by these views. Firstly, civil society is perceived as an autonomous sphere, able to support itself and generate itself. Furthermore, the faculty of civil society encouraging individuals' participation in civil life is perceived as a kind of control mechanism over state's action. Finally, the liberal concept recognizes »equality before the law«, that is the equality of conditions among all elements of the society.

According to this view, the state has the duty to govern the rules ensuring the framework of legal equality where people exercise their rights.¹ Generally speaking, Western tradition regards civil society as the set of economic activities outside of state control. In other words, from this point of view, economic activity delineates the border between civil society and the state. On the other hand, in

1 In the Western world, the tradition of liberalism was not always linked to the duality of civil society-state. For example, the in natural law's tradition, »civil society« is a synonym for »political society« and state. For example, for John Locke (1632 – 1704), father of classical liberalism, civil society was not a separate entity from the state. See, Istituto Giovanni Treccani – della Enciclopedia Italiana di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, 1998, Headword »Società civile«, Roma: Istituto Giovanni Treccani. Available online at: http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/societa-civile_%28Enciclopedia-delle-Scienze-Sociali%29/.

several Turkish works (Heper 1985, Mardin 1973, Keyman 2005), economic activities are not thought of as a parameter to identify the notion of civil society. Turkish literature seems to reinforce the dichotomy of a strong state versus a weak civil society. Indeed, this tradition emphasizes the role of the state as the dominant entity in society while dismissing the role of the economic sphere (see Onbaşı 2008). With regards to this point, following Onbaşı's work (2008),² we can focus on the Turkish debate. Regarding the comprehension of civil society, there are different approaches considering the strong state-weak civil society dichotomy, such as the socio-historical approach or the state-tradition approach. The former, represented by Şerif Mardin, takes into account peculiarities of social history and social evolution. So, the coupling of strong state-weak civil society, perceived as a result of specific socio-historical conditions, stresses Turkish social history and seeks to understand the state tradition from the point of view of social history.³ Otherwise, according to state-tradition formulation represented by Heper,⁴ state structure prevents the development of civil society, thus, the weakness of civil society is the result of the strong state which is also an obstacle to democratic consolidation. While Mardin shows that each society has a specific project in relation to its historical route, Heper takes into consideration the state structure as the reality.⁵

Another part of socialist thought that is shared with the liberal tradition is the usage of the concept of civil society. In fact, since the 1980s the idea of civil society has been one of the most important points on the leftist political agenda. Socialist intellectuals started supporting the idea that the struggle between the two realms is the most important characteristic of socio-political life in Turkey. Thus, this perspective, combining the liberal with the socialist approach, conceives of the strong state as responsible for preventing the development of civil society – as civil society would necessarily pluralize and limit the jurisdiction of the state. Among other intellectuals, Murat Belge, Ahmet İnsel and İdris Küçükömer subscribe to this view.

2 The first part of the article is based on Funda Onbaşı, 2008. *Civil Society Debate in Turkey: a Critical Analysis*, PhD diss., Middle East Technical University.

3 For more information about this approach, see Şerif Mardin, 1973. »Center-Periphery Relations: A Key To Turkish Politics?«. *Daedalus*, 102: 169–190. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20024114>; Şerif Mardin, »Civil Society and Islam«, In *Civil Society: Theory, History, Comparison*, edited by John A. Hall, 278–300. Cambridge: Polity Press.

4 For more information about this approach, see Metin Heper, *The State Tradition in Turkey* (Northgate: The Eothen Press, 1985); Metin Heper, 1992. »The ›Strong State‹ And Democracy: The Turkish Case in Comparative and Historical Perspective.« In *Democracy and Modernity*, edited by S. N. Eisenstadt, 142–164. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

5 See Ali Rıza Güngen and Erten Şafak. 2005. »Approaches of Şerif Mardin and Metin Heper on State and Civil Society in Turkey.« *Journal of Historical Studies* 3: 1–14. URL: http://www.ata.boun.edu.tr/grad/Issue_3/Gungen&Erten_Abstract.htm.

However, other leftist literature represents the liberal-republican tradition. According to this thought, »citizenship« should be restored on the basis of the individuals' political participation and their claims. Thus, civil society is the place where individuals realize their active citizenship. Fuat Keyman, a leading thinker of this tradition, in his *Değişen Dünya Dönüşen Türkiye* (2005),⁶ asserts that civil liberties do not emanate from an individual's ability to resist the actions of the state. Rather, he argues, referring to the concept of participatory citizenship, liberties should be considered as tools for scrutinizing social processes.⁷ Together with Fuat Keyman, İlhan Tekeli is considered a leading thinker in the liberal-republican tradition. In his *Katılımcı Demokrasi ve Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları* (2004), he states that the world has been challenging the ways to live in a democracy such that every individual should behave as an active citizen and social actor accountable to the whole of society.⁸

Gramscian Approach to Civil Society

According to Karl Marx, civil society is the set of material relations that is the sphere of socio-economical life marked by uneven conditions. As the state is the realm where every individual has the same rights, in modern societies the political-juridical framework does not correspond to material conditions. So, the juridical structure sets only an illusory equality. At the same time, the state, in representing the interests of the dominant class, plays the role to consolidate the uneven relations of power trying to maintain the bourgeoisie's authority.⁹ In Marx's opinion, material and economic relations are marked by forces of production and represent the entity of civil society and thus »the anatomy of civil society has to be sought in political economy« (Marx 1976: 4).

6 About this approach, see Fuat Keyman, *Değişen Dünya Dönüşen Türkiye* (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005); Fuat Keyman and Ahmet İçduygu, 2003. »Globalization, Civil Society and Citizenship in Turkey: Actors, Boundaries and Discourses.« *Citizenship Studies*, 7,2: 219–234. URL: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1362102032000065982>; Fuat Keyman and Ahmet İçduygu, 2005. »Citizenship, Identity, and the Question of Democracy in Turkey.« In *Citizenship in a Global World: European Questions and Turkish Experiences*, edited by Fuat Keyman and Ahmet İçduygu, London, New York: Routledge.

7 Quoted in F. Onbaşı, *Civil Society Debate in Turkey: a Critical Analysis*, 235. See Fuat E. Keyman, *Değişen Dünya Dönüşen Türkiye*. (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005).

8 Quoted in Onbaşı, *Civil Society Debate in Turkey: a Critical Analysis*, 236. See İlhan Tekeli, *Katılımcı Demokrasi ve Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları* (Ankara: Ayrıntı Basımevi, 2004).

9 Bobbio Norberto, Nicola Matteucci and Gianfranco Pasquino. 2004. *Dizionario di Politica*, Headword »Società civile«. Torino: UTET.

According to Gramsci, civil society refers to the place where cultural and political hegemony is embedded. As Burgio states, the concept refers »to the ideological structure of the dominant class, which implies the material organization of intellectual and moral hegemony: newspapers, journals, publishing houses, schools, libraries, clubs and every kind of entity able to shape public opinion, including architecture, urbanism and toponymy« (Burgio 2003: 31). We can see the supremacy of the dominant class in two actions: domination and direction. A state, or dominant class, can use domination, that is coercive force, but, at the same time, it needs to persuade society of its pretension of being obeyed and respected. To reach this aim, the dominant class has to direct society's mind including it in its ideal cause. So, the concept of civil society refers to the domination of one class over others through a cultural and ideological operation. This kind of control is not executed by coercion, but rather by creating a consensus within the society (Burgio 2003).

In other words, hegemony is a phenomenon that tries to build a mutual code of values and civil society, and is functional to people in an ideological and cultural way (Bobbio 1976). In his *Prison Notebooks*, Gramsci writes about fixing two superstructural levels: the first, »civil society«, is the group of private entities; the second is the »political society« or »the State«. Whereas the level of civil society corresponds to the direction which the dominant group exercises through civil society, the level of political society corresponds to the domination that the same group exercises through political society. For this reason, direction, or hegemony, having its place in civil society, tries to gain the masses' consent, while domination, having its place in political society, employs coercive force to gain people's consent (Anderson 1976). Differently from Marx, in Gramsci's opinion, civil society does not belong to the base, but rather to the superstructure.¹⁰ Thus, the organization of civil society is not only the expression of the economic-social structure, but also a tool of intellectual influence. Concerning this, the concept of state refers to the political society, or dictatorship, or coercive structure that implies a direct domination. Actually, Gramsci associates the state with a specific social

10 What we can do, for the moment, is to fix two major superstructural ›levels‹: the one that can be called ›civil society‹, that is, the ensemble of organisms commonly called ›private‹, and that of ›political society‹ or ›the state‹. These two levels correspond on the one hand to the functions of ›hegemony‹ which the dominant group exercises throughout society and on the other hand to that of ›direct domination‹ or command exercised through the state and ›juridical‹ government. Antonio Gramsci, *Quaderni dal carcere*, (Torino, Einaudi, 1975). Given this, Bobbio (1976) states that for Gramsci, civil society is »not all material relationship (which means a base) but all ideological and cultural relationship; not the whole of commercial and industrial life but the whole of spiritual and intellectual life« Norberto Bobbio, *Gramsci e la concezione della società civile* (Milano, Feltrinelli, 1976).

group which is the strongest economic group, or rather the state, that is made up by state apparatuses (strictly speaking), and by hegemony's private system of the dominant class. So, the state is the set of practical and theoretical activities that the ruling class uses to justify itself and to gain the consent of the ruled (Burgio 2003). Briefly, the idea of civil society is conceived of as the intellectual and moral direction coming from the bourgeoisie that has gained political authority. Thus, the bourgeoisie, building a social code of values, tries to direct society in order to consolidate its approval.

Challenging the Hegemonic View

Although the majority of academics in Turkey have joined the liberal project, there are important studies that challenge the dominant view. One of these critical investigations ¹¹ follows Marx and Gramsci's approaches and the idea concerning the uneven relations of power, inequalities, domination and marginalization. Following Onbaşı's work, among the Turkish scholars dealing with this kind of approach, Galip Yalman (2002), speaking about civil society, stresses the economic and material inequalities, criticizing the dualism between state-civil society. In his works, civil society is falls in considered to be the realm of economic relations. Actually, the balance reached by class forces is preserved within state and civil society representing the struggle between different classes.

On the other hand, Necmi Erdoğan (2000) challenges the dominant view of civil society analyzing the role of organizations adhering to Kemalism. Through analysis of discourses and practices, Erdoğan explains that the non-official Kemalism is not an expression of Kemalism, but is instead what he terms *Sivil Kemalizm*, which refers to a renewal of the official ideology. Regardless, the common values of those organizations clearly show their support for Kemalism. Indeed, they try to create a context in favor of the official ideology, persuading people to accept their values.

This approach showing the dialectical relation between state and civil society, as entities steadily shaped by the conflict marking socio-political life, criticizes the fact that the dominant view overlooks the uneven relations of power and the consequent struggle in civil society. Such an approach provides us with unique insight into the complex nature of this reality. In addition, by calling attention to the

11 Among these critical approaches, there is also a critical perspective representing the communitarian-republican concept of civil society which is seen as the place where individuals can experience civic friendship and love of community. This tradition is represented by Sarıbay, 2000.

historical process, the theory of hegemony can be used as a key to interpret history and analyze social phenomena. Far from considering the reality as a monolithic block, the Gramscian perspective understands the factual basis as a process wherein different factors interact with one another. Actually, it takes into consideration the economic base and its attendant inequalities. Because it recognizes reality as historically determined, it examines the cultural complexity and the individual motivations that stand behind the human acts overtaking the strict duality of state-civil society. In fact, history is considered in all of its aspects – from the economic system, to social relations, from the political and legal system, to morality and ideology.

Turkish Nation and Hegemony

Gramsci's evaluation concerning state and civil society provides us with an important tool for analyzing the Turkish context. According to the Gramscian perspective, Turkey can be studied as a socio-political entity built to create a citizenry acculturated to authority. Turkish history supports the argument that the dominant class established hegemony in the state, revealing that the use of coercive power alone cannot succeed in conquering the consent of the masses (Öncü 2003). In this context, hegemony represents the »class religion«¹² spread by the social group that dominates economic activities. Hegemony is the accessory of the dominant group whose aim is to amass power. This kind of control is deeply rooted in an economic structure and denotes the supremacy of one class over others. From the economic field, it extends its influence to political and cultural institutions. Thus, we can see the modern Turkish state as the place of hegemony and the ruling class. Then, the form of the state and its activities reflected the dominant class's domination, both in state and in society. Turkish history shows that dominant groups and classes have governed the form and the activities of the state. So, the economically powerful classes have always wanted to establish their hegemony.

In the War of Independence (1919–1922), Mustafa Kemal, the founder of the modern country, emerged as the uncontested leader of the Turkish Resistance. Not only military and bureaucratic classes, but also provincial Committee of *Union and Progress* (CUP) organizations and the Muslim bourgeoisie, supported his efforts. Furthermore, the nationalist leadership showed the revolutionary movement as a fight marked with religious overtones. Declaring the fight against Christians, it sought to gain the support of the Muslim population and was recast an

12 Oppenheimer 1914: 264, quoted in Ahmet Öncü, 2003. »Dictatorshi plus hegemony: A Gramscian analysis of the Turkish state.« *Science & Society*, 67, 3: 306.

anti-colonial struggle (Öncü 2003). World War I and the War of Independence (1919–1922) entailed strong changes in the demographic composition of Anatolia, which lost most of its commercial strata. So, the conflict between bureaucracy and Christian bourgeoisie turned into the expulsion of the latter from the field of social struggle. When Turkish nationalism established the Republic, Anatolia changed in aspect, but not in content. The bureaucracy that had saved its privileges during Ottoman times renewed its role in the country by building a new political apparatus: bureaucracy won the battle between traditional bureaucracy and bourgeoisie. As the control of the state appeared compact and powerful, the surviving commercial class was too weak to create an autonomous group in opposition to the bureaucracy. In fact, nationalism became a »remunerative choice« (Keyder 1987: 82) since the Muslim population hoped to fill positions vacated by departing Greeks. For this reason, merchants and landlords endowed Turkish nationalism with a strong social base.

This alliance between native bourgeoisie and the military-bureaucratic class led the country towards a new definition of the political system. The nationalist group, using its ideology as an anti-liberal economic project, selected the strategy of no-capitalism development. So, the winning class preferred the »bureaucratic reformism« (Keyder 1987: 2) instead of a capitalistic option, and it exaggerated the authoritarian characteristic of the country. The small local bourgeoisie, complicit in the coalition of power, had the potential to lead an autonomous development, but, at that time, did not have sufficient resources to finance this project. Because of the increasing weight of non-native funds, the 1929 crisis exaggerated the weakness of the bourgeoisie. Hence, the alliance between bureaucracy and indigenous commercial classes could remain without leading to a conflict over distribution (Keyder 1987).

During the Republican period, the form of the capitalist state and its activities reflected the hegemony of the prevailing class in state and society. The dominant class transformed the country from above and started building the tools to enforce consent. This process led to a network of associations that defined a process of »cultural fabrication«.¹³ Consequently, ruling was not only domination exercised over civil society, but it was also a way to acquire consent.

During the 1930s, the process of »bureaucratic reform« reached its climax. Policy measures aimed to colonize society by building a system based on the role of the state and a strictly ideological apparatus under the control of the author-

13 »Tension occurs because while the citizenry's belief and the authority's claim should correspond at the same level, the equivalence of belief with claim is never totally actual but rather always more or less a cultural fabrication« (Ricoeur, 1986: 13) quoted in Öncü, Dictatorship plus hegemony: A Gramscian analysis of the Turkish state, 308.

ity. The new press law, university reform and the new labor law were part of this tendency. Furthermore, since 1931, during the Congress of the historic Republican People's Party-RPP, the single party regime became more clearly defined. This kind of politics shared something with the fascist regime, but, at the same time, it was marked by features of state »dirigism«. This strategy of *étatisme* sought to bring political, social and economic sectors under state control, and it was characterized by a strong anti-liberal attitude.

However, on the one hand, fascist ideology represented the reaction of social evolution that attempted to break the contemporary establishment while saving conservative and old values. On the other hand, *étatisme*, working to extend the role of the ruling class and arranging a coalition with the newly developing bourgeoisie, exemplified the continuity between Republic and Empire (Keyder 1987).¹⁴

The Break of the Government's Coalition

World War II put an end to the *étatist* era. During wartime, capital accumulation became an important element in breaking the historical coalition between bourgeoisie and bureaucracy. Actually, until 1950, politics had been the most important issue shared between bureaucracy and bourgeoisie. During the 1940s, the increasing capital accumulation split the equilibrium within the coalition of power that began to break down (Keyder 1987). As bureaucracy was not able to save the old alliance, the bourgeoisie, aware of its increasingly important role, no longer wished to compromise. In fact, since 1946 the struggle between social forces had become more explicit. The bourgeoisie had reached a greater level of maturity and started calling for economic and religious reforms. After the war, inflation increased and dissatisfaction spread throughout Turkey. Religious people complained about secular policies and intellectuals started asking for freedom of speech and press. In this context, religious freedom stood as a metaphor for indignation against the dominant leadership.

In addition, widespread social tension persuaded the bureaucracy to make a choice within the international context. Actually, during wartime, Turkey had maintained an ambiguous position. However, when it was clear that the Axis Powers would lose the war in February 1945, Turkey declared war against Germany

14 In fact, *étatisme* was marked by the attitude to negotiate inside the confines of the élite, whereas fascism was characterized by the strong mass mobilization. Also for this reason, we cannot call the Turkish system a fascist regime, however, we can speak about the »fascistisant« elements that characterized the Turkish regime. See Çağlar Keyder, *State and class in Turkey: a study in capitalist development* (London, New York: Verso Books, 1987).

and Japan. This allowed Turkey to move into closer alignment with the West and, as a result, President İnönü chose the soft shift to a multiparty system congruent with the USA and with Western liberal principles: in 1945 it signed the United Nations Charter, and in 1952 it joined NATO. This strategy allowed Turkey to access American funds and foreign capital contributing to the country's capital accumulation.

Thus, when the multiparty period started in 1946, the Democratic Party (DP), born from the RPP rupture, represented the exclusion of the military and bureaucratic classes from the hegemonic bloc. Within the struggle between social forces, central authority worked to strengthen its force, while the social context showed its peculiar fragmentation in different blocs of power. As previously noted, the new discourse focused on using Islam as tool for manufacturing political consent by joining the religious demands of the rural population and economic and political interests of workers (Öncü 2003). For this reason, a more mature bourgeoisie organized its mobilization on the basis of free market and religious promises. Its project of capitalism contrasted with the kind of capitalism promoted under bureaucratic protection. Actually, until then, bureaucracy had succeeded in reducing internal subordination to the capitalist market. However, after increasing capital, the bourgeoisie could constitute the resistance against dominant class hegemony. This bloc of opposition consisted of different elements of society that supported the DP during elections in the 1950s. That helps explain why these years were marked by harsh debates between the DP and the RPP, which were vying for popular approval.

Analyzing Kadin Gazetesi using a Gramscian Perspective

In 1934, women were granted the right to vote and started taking part in the political process. This achievement had several consequences. This accomplishment was perceived as an achievement which encouraged women to exercise their rights as citizens, and not simply as subjects. While women became aware of their ability to affect public policy, their participation was strictly defined and proscribed by male political leaders and intellectuals. In 1935, the Turkish Women's Association, which had been established in 1924, was closed following the regime's advice. Actually, the corporatist approach denied the existence of a conflicting social class interest in favor of a corporatist model of society. Thus, the government controlled women's movements, worker's associations and other cultural clubs. This »state feminism« attitude speaks to build a system where schools, newspapers, media, press and tools of mass communication were instrumental in shaping Turkish attitudes in accordance with Kemalism (Arat 2000; Durakbaşı 1998).

In spite of the radicalism of creating a space for women in the public domain, Kemalism sought to encourage a kind of activism equivalent to its model. So, by removing every kind of activity out of the control of the state, it attempted to create a kind of legalized feminism whose aim was to define the borders of legitimate actions. These measures led to the glorification of »woman« as a symbol of Westernization and modernization. Thus, this kind of emancipation marked a historical split with the Ottoman past, and defined Turkey as a Western country (Al-Ali 2002). The relation between women's claims and modernization had an emblematic meaning. The regime's propaganda promoted an image of the Republican woman characterized by »national mission, love of duty« and by feelings of »belonging, gravity, modesty, severity« (Göle 2004: 110). Women were cast as the protectors of modernization, which therefore made them instruments of Republican ideology.

A Case Study: Kadın Gazetesi

Starting from the approach described above, the relation between hegemony, civil society and consent will be explicated. Examining the feminist journal *Kadın Gazetesi*,¹⁵ I will try to answer the question of how the journal helped transmit the regime's ideology and how domination can have a place within civil society.

Kadın Gazetesi was a weekly founded in 1947 by a group of intellectual women, among those İffet Halim Oruz, who was the first Turkish female journalist. The periodical was established to voice women's demands, thoughts, feelings and ideas. The journalists did not deny the contribution of Atatürk, and they also acknowledged the influence of the Republican period on women's intellectual growth (Yaraman 2001).

In this part of the article, I am going to analyze some writings published in 1947 and 1948 showing how the system adopted by the Republican hegemony sought to mold Turkish consciousness. Because of that, an investigation of the role of women, as seen through the lens of one of their own journals, helps us understand some aspects of Turkish civil society. Indeed, the historical-political reading of the newspaper allows us to better comprehend how state ideology can place itself in civil society. This approach affords an in-depth look at a given context. By focusing on the historical process, it is not limited to a superficial examination of the facts, but encompasses the profound complexity of society and its factors - including the role of the authorities and of the masses, individual motivations, polit-

15 *Kadın Gazetesi*, founded in 1947, published until 1979. Periodicals are preserved in the archives of Kadın Eserleri Kütüphanesi and in those of Atatürk Kitaplığı in Istanbul.

ical struggles and the dynamics of power. Moreover, it highlights the importance of political strategies and the potential for weaker groups to build a new political strategy. By looking at the motives underlying individuals' behavior, this approach attempts to explain how an idea can take root in society. In this manner, the case study puts the individual and his relations in central focus. Thus, it allows us to comprehend the relationship between the economic base and human consciousness, and to understand the underlying reality.

Kadın's influential publications from different columns relating to domestic policy, foreign policy, society, culture and fashion were collected and analyzed. Each section offers news using different ways of reporting, such as stories, cartoons, political analysis, opinion writings, pictures and letters. The first edition of the journal appeared on March 1, 1947. In the center of its front page it shows an image of Mustafa Kemal, the father of the country. This depiction clearly communicated the political orientation of the journal, unequivocally portraying Mustafa Kemal as the hero of the nation. Next to the picture, in the article *Çıkış Amacımız*¹⁶, the journal's founders, İffet Halim Oruz, Emel Gürler, Münevver Ayash, Füzüzan Eksat, Nimet Selen and F. Elbi,¹⁷ explain Kadın's mission, stating their devotion to the Republic. More precisely, they describe the national revolution as a step that helped woman achieve a high level of personal realization:

The Republican revolution has given us the place in an advanced international womanhood. Turkish women's blood and soul contributed successfully to this process. The journal is not interested in Turkish past womanhood, it does not need to discuss about equality between man and woman. Kadın Gazetesi deals with social and sexual issues. It debates about science, art, and ideas that are instrumental to womanhood's emancipation and that will be useful to the country and family. Turkish feminism movement will always find in Kadın a place for its feelings, points of view, and ideas. (...) Our biggest aim is to become the root and the place for woman's sensitiveness and compassion.¹⁸

The founders explain the importance of women's feelings in social, economic and cultural events. Further to that, their commitment to advancing the cause of women was explicitly stated as well. As this operation calls for republican womanhood, it implies the personal sacrifice for the sake of the country. The articles ex-

16 March 1, 1947, n. 13. *Çıkış Amacımız*.

17 Birsan Banu Okutan. 2007. »Women and Nation in Turkey« *Kadın Gazetesi* (1947–1950) and *Kadın Sesi* (1957–1960),

18 March 1, 1947, n. 1. *Çıkış Amacımız*.

press respect and devotion for Atatürk or, as a poem from Kadın states, »the hero most important in history«.¹⁹

Mindful of his formidable legacy, the journalist uses poetical expressions and nostalgic tones, such as the article, »He is with us!«²⁰ that describes Atatürk as a warm and smiling father whose first matter concerns childhood issues. Specifically, according to the articles, women have the important charge of educating children in compliance with national values. Narrating the announcement of Atatürk's death, the journalist describes the pain and the agony felt by the entire Turkish community. The memory of those moments reminds the readers of the national tragedy as a fact shared by every Turkish citizen. It is for that reason that on November 8, 1948 the journal published an article entitled »Womanhood is crying«.²¹ Despite the pained tone of the article, it nonetheless sought to encourage Turkish consciousness through this tragic event.²² In another writing, Kadın expresses the devotion to the successor of Atatürk, the President İnönü:

Estimable President *İnönü* is our most powerful support. *İnönü* is Atatürk's closest friend from revolutionary period; he is the person who together with Atatürk improved this revolution and continues to do so.²³

In the section *Dünya Karikatürleri*, a comic depicts²⁴ the women's evolution from the time of marriage onward: she gets married, she wears pants, she goes to war and she goes to vote – while her husband is shown taking care of their children. It presents a model of womanhood very different from the one rooted in the historical imagination of the country. It shows, in fact, a woman who almost replaces a man in his typical duties. Regarding mothering, the journal discusses the significance of the role of women in the maintenance of the nation. This is also important in order to teach national consciousness to the next generation. So, mothering means teaching Republican values, Turkish traditions, and the love of country.

Concerning the Cyprus issue, Kadın explains the importance of its defense. Maintaining a strong Turkish presence in Cyprus is of paramount concern, according to the article, and this helps to solidify Turkish values around this issue:

19 November 8, 1948, n. 89 *Atatürk*.

20 May 24, 1947, n. 13. *O bizimle!*

21 November 8, 1948, n. 89. *Kadınlık Ağlıyor*.

22 November 8, 1948, n. 89. *Yine Atam İçin*.

23 Okutan, »Women and Nation in Turkey,« 56.

24 Okutan, »Women and Nation in Turkey,« 56

Cyprus, I have fallen in love with your land. You have flowed into my longing breast like poison. We are unable to abandon you.²⁵

Kadın explains that Turkish Cypriots feel great pride and the strong devotion to Turkish nation:

In Cyprus there is the eternal Atatürk's spirit. (...) We saw the respect for Atatürk and the faith for *İnönü* in every place when we went to Cyprus.²⁶

The newspaper clearly communicates that, the nation is perceived of as a family where a woman sacrifices herself for the benefit of Turkey. Thus, the country is like a huge community where women act as leaders, working for the sake of the nation. In this pursuit, their priority is safeguarding society's interests generally, instead of being limited to specific realms such as domestic duties. She takes care of her community, as well as her home. She looks after her husband and children as well as Turkish citizens, and she teaches love of state and national values. The Turkish woman, in raising children in line with patriotic feelings, encourages passion towards her homeland. Actually, the ideal woman »prepares necessary nourishment to the nation, home, and child but with the pride of completing her success like a sovereign«.²⁷

According to Kadın, women's empowerment means national advancement. Indeed, women's self-actualization is instrumental to the development of the nation. This process leads to a model of Republican womanhood that embraces the modernization in a Turkish way. In fact, this woman is loyal to the founding father and glorifies the *İnönü* period and the transition to multiparty period. On the other hand, she believes in Western women's emancipation and she advocates for modern feminist values as exemplified in the Western world. Regarding this issue, Kadın speaks about the cooperation with the American women's movement, which involved regular meetings. In 1949, the journal launched a worldwide column in English dedicated to an international campaign for advancing the cause of women and to its connection with Turkish movements.

Kadın focuses on the role of women in building the nation. Women are seen as transmitters of culture, and they help define social and cultural parameters. As stated by Kemalist propaganda, playing an active role in the national struggle, women have become national actors. During the Independence War, they proved

25 Okutan, »Women and Nation in Turkey,« 66

26 October 25, 1948, n. 87. *Kıbrıs Notları. Atatürk ve İnönü Sevgisi*.

27 Okutan, »Women and Nation in Turkey,« 53.

their allegiance to the country, giving their lives to the cause of national victory. In the article, »İstiklal Savaşında«, the author explains her self-sacrificing feeling:

All Anatolian women sacrificed their lives, blood, jobs in the independence war and through their incredible sacrifice and heroism, they showed that they are real mothers of Turkey.²⁸

Kadın's message encourages women to be modernized, free from religion and forward looking. May 19th was designated as the date that religion was divorced from national interests, laying the foundations of the secularist Republic. In fact, the article *19 Mayıs*²⁹ states the importance of secularism and cautions against anti-secular forces that threaten the revolutionary spirit. Mainly, the article speaks to the nation's youth reminding them of the importance of May 19th, as well as admonishing them to maintain nationalistic sentiments and to perpetuate national values in history.

Embracing the Kemalist moral code, the journal acts on Turkish memory and arouses national emotions. It tries to undercut the opposition's attempts to galvanize broad social support against state ideology. In fact, the aim of the journal seems to manage the challenge between classes. The articles described above, speaking about women's rights, refer constantly to the founder, the nation, the Cyprus issue, Westernization and the War of Independence – all topics related to state ideology.

It is evident that the issue of women's rights is used as a proxy through which the Republic is lauded and promoted. By the end of the 1940s, a more consolidated opposition increased its role and started to organize resistance based on universal tenets of economic and religious freedom which unified different social classes. On the one hand, this social fragmentation accentuated Kemalist values in opposition to religion and free market, which came to be seen as emblematic of the opposition. In fact, the market and the religion were the two issues used by the bourgeoisie to mobilize opponents of Kemalism against bureaucracy which had sought to decrease the dependence of the internal market on capitalism. For this reason, the journal, working on women's issues, simultaneously seems to have supported the continued hierarchical class model.

28 August 18, 1948, n. 25. *İstiklal savaşında*.

29 May 24, 1947, n. 13. *19 Mayıs*.

Conclusion

Kadın Gazetesi engaged with discourses related to nation, homeland, democracy, issues of modernization and Americanization. It sought to promote and disseminate the image of a new, emancipated, modern woman, which, in turn, implicitly promoted Western and democratic values. The women's movement, vis-à-vis its promotion in Kadın Gazetesi, was an effective tool through which republican values were propagated and spread. Republican tools of hegemonization succeeded in defining a model of femininity in line with Kemalist ideology that encouraged, »an educated professional at work, a socially active woman engaged in organizing clubs and associations, a properly trained mother and wife, a feminine woman dressed in gowns and dancing at ball« (Arat 2000: 16). Thus, Kemalism produced the tools to hew a new cultural direction. Women's liberation was one area where Turkish ideology sought to impose its values while the celebration of women was related to attempts to broaden the Kemalist sphere of influence. The journal gives a platform with conservative segments of Turkish civil society which then contributed to preservation of the dominant class' role. The state's support for the women's movement, as promoted through the journal, was an effort to broaden its sphere of influence. . In other words, it represented not only the dominance of one social class over others, but also the ability of the dominant class to project its own way of seeing the world.

Finally, the old Kemalist formula of legitimation left an imprint that has slowly faded over time. The new corporate interests that now occupy a central position in society can be seen in its place. Indeed, in co-opting the old hegemonic structure, corporations have filled it with their own ideas. In fact, the strong emergence of capitalism has affected the new configuration of class alliances and the consequent phenomena of hegemony. Thus, even if the old Kemalist hegemony has not totally disappeared, it is clear that the forces and the relations of production, the division of labor and the conditions of work have been significantly altered. For this reason, we can use the same tools of analysis to look at the modern strategies of embedding intellectuals, media, schools, politicians, foreign media, writers and journalists.

References

- Bobbio, Norberto. *Gramsci e la concezione della società civile*. Milano: Feltrinelli, 1976.
- Bobbio, Norberto, Matteucci Nicola, Pasquino Gianfranco. *Dizionario di Politica*. Headword »Società civile«. Torino UTET, 2004.
- Burgio, Alberto. *Gramsci storico: una lettura dei Quaderni del carcere*. Rome: Bari. GLF Editori Laterza, 2003.
- Çaha, Ömer. 2011. »The Transition of Feminism from Kemalist Modernism to Postmodernism in Turkey.« *Turkish Journal of Politics*. 2,1: 5–19.
- Dikici Bilgin, Hasret. 2009. »Civil society and state in Turkey: a Gramscian perspective.« In *Gramsci and Global Politics: Hegemony and Resistance*, edited by Mark McNally and John Schwarzmantel, 107–118. London: Routledge.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Quaderni dal carcere*. Turin: Einaudi, 1975.
- Gruppi, Luciano. *Il concetto di egemonia in Gramsci*. Rome: Editori Riuniti, 1972.
- Heper, Metin. *The State Tradition in Turkey*. Northgate: The Eothen Press, 1985.
- Heper, Metin. 1992. »The ›Strong State‹ And Democracy: The Turkish Case in Comparative and Historical Perspective.« In *Democracy and Modernity*, edited by S. N. Eisenstadt, 142–164. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- İnalçık, Halil. 1969. »Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire.« *The Journal of Economic History*. 29, 1: 97–140.
- Keyder, Çağlar. *State and class in Turkey: a study in capitalist development*. London, New York: Verso Books, 1987.
- Keyman, Fuat E. *Değişen Dünya Dönüşen Türkiye*. Istanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2005.
- Keyman, Fuat E., İçduygu, Ahmet. 2003. »Globalization, Civil Society and Citizenship in Turkey: Actors, Boundaries and Discourses.« *Citizenship Studies*. 7,2: 219–234.
- Keyman, Fuat E., İçduygu, Ahmet. 2005. »Citizenship, Identity, and the Question of Democracy in Turkey.« In *Citizenship in a Global World: European Questions and Turkish Experiences*, edited by Fuat Keyman, E. Fuat and Ahmet İçduygu, London, New York: Routledge.
- Mardin, Şerif. 1973. »Center-Periphery Relations: A Key To Turkish Politics?,« *Daedalus*. 102: 169–190.
- Mardin, Şerif. 1995. »Civil Society and Islam« In *Civil Society: Theory, History, Comparison*, edited by John A. Hall, 278–300. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Marx, Karl. *Per la critica dell'economia politica*. Rome: Newton Compton, 1976.
- Onbaşı, Funda. 2008. »Civil Society Debate in Turkey: a Critical Analysis.« PhD diss., Middle East Technical University.
- Öncü, Ahmet. 2003. »Dictatorship plus hegemony: A Gramscian analysis of the Turkish state.« *Science & Society*, 67, 3: 303–328.
- Özdemir, Elvan. 2010. »Kemalist Tradition and Kemalist Women's Movement in Turkey After 1980.« *Turkish Journal of Politics*, 1,1: 99–113.
- Şafak, Erten, Ali Rıza Güngen. 2005. »Approaches of Serif Mardin and Metin Heper on State and Civil Society in Turkey.« *Journal of Historical Studies*. 3: 1–14.
- Şimşek, Sefa. 2004. »The Transformation of Civil Society in Turkey: From Quantity to Quality.« *Turkish Studies*. 5, 3: 46–74.

- Vacca, Giuseppe. *Appuntamenti con Gramsci: introduzione allo studio del Quaderni dal carcere*. Rome: Carocci, 1999.
- Yaraman, Ayşegül. 2001. Durgunluk Döneminde Cüretkar Talepler: Kadın Gazetesi. *Toplumsal Tarih Dergisi* 087: 36–41.