

**SOCIALISM AND FEMINISM:
AN ANALYSIS OF TURKISH RADICAL SOCIALIST ARTICLES
(1987-1994)**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

BY

MÜNİR CEM KAYALIGİL

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
GENDER AND WOMEN'S STUDIES**

DECEMBER 2005

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Demet Varoğlu
Chairperson of the Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Canan Aslan-Akman
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Canan Aslan-Akman (METU, ADM) _____

Prof. Dr. Yıldız Ecevit (METU, SOC) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Fahriye Üstüner (METU, ADM) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name :

Signature :

ABSTRACT

**SOCIALISM AND FEMINISM:
AN ANALYSIS OF TURKISH RADICAL SOCIALIST ARTICLES
(1987-1994)**

Kayalıgil, Münir Cem

M.Sc., Graduate Program of Gender and Women's Studies

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Canan Aslan-Akman

December 2005, 145 pages.

In this study, radical socialist articles written on feminism, the feminist movement and the woman question published between 1987 and 1994 in Turkey are examined. The study attempts at describing, classifying and analyzing the Turkish socialist discourse manifested in response to the emergence of feminism in Turkey. It is argued that the Turkish socialists' approaches to feminism and the feminists do not differ much, nor a change in their approaches with time can be observed. It is also argued that the theoretical content of the radical socialist articles is usually futile and far from being comprehensive.

Keywords: Socialism, feminism, Turkey, discourse analysis.

ÖZ

SOSYALİZM VE FEMİNİZM:
TÜRK RADİKAL SOSYALİST YAZINI ÜZERİNE BİR İNCELEME
(1987-1994)

Kayalığıl, Münir Cem

Yüksek Lisans, Kadın Çalışmaları Yüksek Lisans Programı

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Canan Aslan-Akman

Aralık 2005, 145 sayfa.

Bu çalışmada, Türkiye’de 1987-1994 arasında yayınlanmış sosyalist eğilimli kimi marjinal dergilerdeki; feminizm, kadın sorunu ve diğer ilgili konular üzerine çıkmış yazılar incelenmiştir. Çalışmada, bu yazılar üzerinden gidilerek Türkiye’deki, feminizme ilişkin sosyalist söylemin tarifi, tasnifi ve çözümlemesi yapılmıştır. Bunlar sonucunda, Türkiye’deki radikal sosyalist kesimin feminizme ilişkin yargıları ve feminist harekete karşı tavrının çok az bir çeşitlilik içerdiği, yıllar içinde değişim göstermediği ve özellikle kuramsal yönden çok zayıf ve yüzeysel kalmış olduğu savunulmuştur.

Anahtar sözcükler: Sosyalizm, feminizm, Türkiye, söylem analizi.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I firstly wish to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Canan Aslan-Akman for her guidance, consideration, advice and encouragements throughout the research. This study has passed through a very long journey that without her persistent help and patience, it would definitely turn into a hopeless and failing experience.

I am also grateful to Prof. Dr. Yıldız Ecevit in many ways. Mrs. Ecevit shared her personal archive of Turkish radical socialist articles with me, initially for the sake of aiding my term paper which was being written for a course that I had taken in 2003. I do not know if she, at that time, could guess that her archive would be my inspiration for taking up the Turkish radical socialist discourse as my subject of my thesis! Thus providing the impetus of the present study, Mrs. Ecevit also supported me a lot until the very end of the research by raising questions, making comments, providing resources and directing me to the people who would be very helpful in advancing my research.

Akın Atauz and Halime Güner were the two people that I was introduced to by Mrs. Ecevit. Mr. Atauz and Mrs. Güner lended their hand sympathetically, and not only shared their memories of 1980s (which allowed me to reach a better understanding of the clash between the

feminists and the socialists of those years) but also guided me to my two interviewees: Emir Ali Türkmen and Handan Koç. At this point, I should mention my indebtedness to Mr. Türkmen and Mrs. Koç, too, by whom my research got more thorough and far-reaching. I should also acknowledge that it was by Mr. Türkmen's archive of socialist periodicals that the research material of this study was supplemented.

I would also like to thank to Assist. Prof. Dr. Fahriye Üstüner for her suggestions and comments.

Besides, Gökçe Aydın, Nihan Saraçoğlu, Cem Kamözüt, Erdem Taner, Can Ayas, Cem Taşan and Mehtap Tatar, and friends in the METU Gender and Women's Studies Graduate Program and in Sinema Dostları Derneği supported me intensely during the whole course of my study. Their company is greatly appreciated.

Lastly, Pınar Karababa deserves a special gratitude: Her incessant, shining love has always been the foremost support for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	17
2.1 Socialism and Feminism: Discords and Challenges.....	20
2.2 Western Feminist Movements versus the Radical Socialists: Some Implications of the Theoretical Clash.....	28
2.3 Historical Background of Turkish Women’s Movement(s) and the Turkish Radical Socialist Stance.....	35
2.3.1 Before and After the Republican Reforms.....	38
2.3.2 1970s: The Radical Socialist Stance, Women’s Socialist Activism and “İlerici Kadınlar Derneği”	50
2.3.2.1 The Socialist Left Before 1980 and the Legacy of Radical Socialist Activism.....	51
2.3.2.2 Women’s Socialist Activism and the “İlerici Kadınlar Derneği” Experience.....	62

2.3.3 1980s: The Rise of Turkish Feminism and the Encounters With The Radical Socialists.....	69
3. ANALYSIS OF THE TURKISH RADICAL SOCIALIST ARTICLES.....	81
3.1 Method of the Present Study.....	85
3.2 The Analysis of Radical Socialist Articles.....	90
3.2.1 The Textual Practice in the Socialist Texts.....	91
3.2.2 Thematic Analysis of the Socialist Discourse.....	99
3.2.2.1 The Theme ‘Socialism’ in Three Discursive Stances.....	101
3.2.2.2 The Theme ‘Feminism’ in Two Discursive Stances	111
4. CONCLUSION	125
REFERENCES.....	132
APPENDICES.....	139
APPENDIX – 1: LIST OF RESEARCHED ARTICLES.....	139

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenal emergence of the women's movement in Turkey in the 1980s founded a new social and political context in the country, to which many people and circles directed their attention. At the core of this novel context lay the conceptualization of the *woman question*, *women's subordination* and the ways to their *emancipation*. As was the case in the Western world, too, the socialists in the country recognized the challenge these brought to the Marxist analysis and soon initiated to form their arguments and rhetoric against the feminists, in order to defend their own stance.

This study is an attempt to examine, classify and analyze the response of the Turkish radical socialists (so to say, the *socialist discourse* manifested through the debates with the feminists) in the articles published in radical-marginal periodicals of the period 1987-1994.

Background to the Discord Between Socialism and Feminism in Turkey

The military coup in September 1980 and the state's pressure in the following years gave a new shape to the political atmosphere in Turkey.

The conflict between the left and right-wing youth groups that had become a militant clash by the end of 70s led to strict restrictions to be put into action by the military rule, from the coup in 1980 to the final annulment of the martial law in 1987. The ban on any kind of political engagement and activities had a great impact on individuals to question their identities and seek for alternative ways to fulfill their political character. It is now certain that the status of politics in social life in Turkey had been impaired irreversibly by then, and both political theory and action endured an alteration of form and style, if not vanished at all. Looking back to the period following the coup, it now appears that such a bitter atmosphere involved at least one positive occurrence, which was the rise of a *feminist consciousness* in various circles. Within several years, it would flourish and develop into the most critical oppositional movement of the 1980s.

It should be noted that before the emergence of Turkish feminism in the 1980s, there were particular instances or movements in history that can somehow be attributed to an overall women's liberation and emancipation. However, being intellectuals who had an awareness of the theoretical discussions in the West, the first adherents of the contemporary Turkish feminism of the 1980s had more intimate links with the *second wave feminism* than they had with this particular past. It was with them that issues like household production, sexuality (of women), abortion, motherhood or (domestic) violence, or concepts like gender, gender

discrimination or patriarchy were brought to the public agenda for the very first time in Turkish history. On the other hand, because of this novelty, these feminists were exposed to a ruthless criticism from various circles. This was not to be taken as a surprise, though: What was being contested was the *patriarchal system* that was so *diffused* in the *genes* of individuals and the whole society, which shaped their ways of seeing and interpreting the world around them so predominately. More important than this feature of patriarchy was, of course, its facilitation of the universal oppression of the women by the supposition that the system was *natural* and *inevitable*. Yielding to the challenges brought forward by feminism would therefore lead not only to the disturbance of prevailing patterns of thoughts and beliefs –that saved the conformity of the individuals-, but also to the undermining of the unrightful dominance and the supremacy which was enjoyed by one sex over the other.

Thus *women's rights*, which although implied an overall social transformation to abolish the patriarchal system with its numerous facets, were reduced by the Turkish public to struggle for a sketchily simple “equality” between women and men – as if women were to dress as men, be and seem rude and vulgar like men; do whatever men had been doing, act just like the other sex: These were what seemed to be the “equality” that the feminists were supposed to be striving for. Perhaps because of the subtle existence and the intricate conceptualization of patriarchy, what other “rights” women had deserved (but not achieved) was inconcievable

for the many, and the true meaning of the arguments of feminism could be rather hardly acknowledged by them. In the eyes of the great majority, women were enjoying their “liberty” since they had been given the rights of suffrage “by Atatürk” 50 years before – and it should be the final point: What rationale could there be in proclaiming such an *obsolete* demand again? What more did women deserve, or what more could they still call for?

It can be contended that the public view of the women’s rights and movement was actually shaped by what is named as the “Kemalist discourse of women’s rights”.¹ In this immensely influential discourse, the *woman question* was viewed as a(nother) matter of the opposition of being *modern-westernized* and *secular* and being *traditional* and under the Islamic rule – which is to say, it overlapped with the foundational concern of the Turkish Republic from the remains of the Ottoman Empire. This discourse had been maintaining that it was the Kemalist-Republican elite (the “founding fathers” [Arat 2000]) who *supplied* the new Turkish women with suffrage rights, the dress code, the family law and other modern civil rights – which both furnished, signified and finalised the modernization project between 1920s and the mid-1930s.²

¹ See (Saktanber, 2001).

² See (Tekeli, 1981; Kandiyoti, 1987; Sirman, 1989: 13-14; Durakbaşı, 1997; Saktanber, 2001).

It was in line with this discourse that for the public, although everything seemed satisfactory in the women side, the appearance of the so-called “feminists” after some 50 years was nothing but a hypocrisy. It was in this manner that the public was confused with and irritated by feminism, and was manifesting this by puns, jokes and verbal attacks.

Besides, it can be contended that the *Turkish (radical) socialist left* played a particular role in offering a different critique of feminism. Apart from the general dissent shared by the public, the socialists had a specific discontentment about the women’s movement, its motives, demands and approach – which had been leading them to develop an *intellectual* critique, that bore a somewhat theoretical fashion. There were two significant reasons behind the socialists’ temper towards the feminists and their movement. The first of these was basically of theoretical nature and was founded on the decades-old conflict between the two sides, which was not specific to the case in Turkey but had been appearing as an unanimously experienced clash in every context where the feminists met the socialists. To state it aptly, this was the debate on which parts of the two theories (i.e. Marxism and feminism in general) to be made use of in understanding women’s oppression and in reflecting on their emancipation (i.e. the solutions for liberation). Being on the side of the exploited and having an overtly political perspective, the feminists had similar concerns and interests with the Marxist discourse in terms of their developing a theory of exploitation, unified with a program (of practice),

which would correct the situation as a whole. Yet the general feminist conception of Marxism was that it suffered from *gender-blindness* – meaning that the Marxist theory, because of treating the classes as the basic units of its analyses, did not recognize that women and men bore distinct realities.³ According to the feminists, due to this lack in the theory, the woman question was greatly overseen in Marxism, save the mentioning of the status of the women belonging to the proletariat or the obligation of the women to serve for their husbands.⁴ Hence was arising a universal discord between the feminists and the socialists on the theoretical bases.

The discord was reckoned by the feminists as a reason for developing theories which either excluded the whole Marxist theory deliberately (i.e. the *radical feminist theory*), or attempting at conceptualizing a relation between the *mode of production* (capitalism specifically) and patriarchy (i.e. the *socialist feminist theory*). Accordingly, feminists generally adopted an independent movement from the socialists, where the *extent* of independence varied regarding *how much* of Marxism was included in the theoretical framework of particular feminist circles. Therefore, the independence from the socialists had been a controversial topic among the feminists as well. On the other side of the discord, the socialists were so much confident of the Marxist theory on the *women's question* that they

³ See (Donovan, 2000: 87-89).

⁴ See (Engels, 1992).

saw feminism quite redundant: After all, no matter how intense was the impact of patriarchy, the women's question was mainly an affair related to the capitalist mode of production. Men's dominance over women took place by the establishment of the *private property*, that is, by the privatization of commodities; plus by the rule of monogamous family for the sake of the maintenance of the private property. Therefore women's emancipation would be realized after the properties collectivized and the abolition of the capitalist mode of production – so to say, after the foundation of a *socialist* system. Following this line, according to the socialist tradition, feminism was perplexed with the history (of oppression) and confusing the real actors (i.e. the capitalist bourgeoisie) exercising power and exploitation.⁵

The tension between the two theories-discourses in the given universal context made up the first significant cause of the Turkish socialists' temper against the feminists. On the other hand, the specific historical background in the country, too, gave birth to socialists' hostility towards the Turkish women's movement. 1980s social and political climate in Turkey was fierce for almost everyone, but it was undeniably the whole leftist circles that were victimized the most by the coup and the following regime. It was a time when some tens of people met before the public, even if they had no intention of making any demonstration, the police

⁵ It has primarily been Friedrich Engels's fundamental work, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State" that constituted the basis of the socialist view of the woman question. For a review of Engels's work, see (Donovan, 2000: 87-89). For the Turkish translation of "The Origin", refer to (Engels, 1992).

force would appear immediately and could question them thoroughly. On the contrary, the feminists were publicized activists who could still gather and march on the streets, voice slogans, distribute pamphlets or initiate sign petitions. Not all of their activities were being done against the state, indeed; nor were they totally free of the bothering of the police. However, in a medium where the socialist left was comprised of people whose political activism was definitely curtailed by the state's threat of strict investigations and prosecutions, it was so natural for the feminist movement to be subjected to the grievance of the socialists: For it constituted more or less the singular political group for which the state was apparently unconcerned with. Moreover, a lot of the feminists were known to be affiliated by some socialist circles before the coup. Accordingly for the socialist discourse, the Turkish feminists were deviated bourgeois Marxists whose movement was individualistic and apolitical, therefore "a prospective threat to class solidarity" (Tekeli, 1986: 195); they were challenging virtually nothing and at most aimed at making petite reforms.

The presence of the feminist movement, which gained an exquisite publicity by 1986, had initiated an interest in various popular magazines and newspapers, as well as less-known periodicals on cultural, philosophical or artistic matters since 1982.⁶ Some of the latter periodicals

⁶ See (Ovadia, 1994) and (Öngen, 1996).

were known to have an engagement with the leftist ideologies, too. However, periodicals with an overt political identity would be allowed to be published by 1986 ⁷ and it was by this emergence that the socialists found the most direct and major medium for conveying their discourse against feminism. It was in this context that there appeared the periodicals like *11. Tez* and *Birikim*, which had an academical-theoretical perspective and embraced thinkers from the various wings of the whole leftist ideology (for instance people from the Kemalist left, the social democrats, the New Leftists, and the socialists).

On the other hand, there were the *radical socialist periodicals* as well (for which being “radical” could be conceived as synonymous to being “marginal” in the leftist political-ideological scala), which were being circulated within a *narrow* group of people *by definition*, who were more likely to read, write and discuss for the sake of self-validation and making the propaganda of the circles they were adhered to. Besides the debates on the classical, contemporary, universal or local issues of the Marxist theory and socialism, these radical socialist periodicals included Marxist approaches to specific issues that had been brought forward by the feminists, such as women’s emancipation, domestic labor, gender roles, the family, women and class analysis, women and organization and so forth. In any case, the accounts of the Turkish socialists had functioned as

⁷ The publication of these journals was initiated by the various socialist groups after the gradual ceasing of the martial law between 1984 and 1987. The martial law in the three big cities was ceased in March 1985 (Ankara and İzmir) and in November 1985 (İstanbul). (BELGEEnet, 12 Eylül Belgeleri, Sıkıyönetim Uygulaması)

an unchallengeable, dogmatic belief system and rendered these socialists' own perceptions of and considerations about the feminists (and the issues the latter had articulated) quite inconceivable. Furthermore it gave rise to repetitive patterns of condemnation for the women's movement in the socialist texts.

Regardless of the extent of their prominence, it should be acknowledged that these type of periodicals played an important role in *sustaining* the socialist discourse against the transition led by the coup. In this respect, the existence of feminism may be said to serve a novel context for the Marxists-socialists of different traditions (Maoist, Leninist, Trotskyist, Kurdish nationalist-socialists, etc.) to have a greater accordance in their discourses. Put differently, while the positions of authors writing in these periodicals in other issues could vary substantially, when the woman question and the women's movement was of concern, the differences between the respective authors' thoughts, argumentation and the style of writing diminished. Handan Koç reasons that this is partly because in the early 1980s, while the feminists were newly awakening, the Turkish socialists had to deal with burdensome personal matters with the oppressive force of the state on them (the investigations, sentences, imprisonings, etc.). Therefore when it was time to face with the feminists (i.e. by 1986), the socialists "hurried" to assert their own presence in whatever possible way. This, for Koç, when joined with a general lack in the act of theorizing, criticism and argumentation observed among the

whole Turkish intellectuals, made the socialists resemble to each other in the particular topic of woman question.⁸

The Rationales, Method and Organization of the Study

In this study, a sample of articles written on feminism, the woman question, the feminist movement in Turkey and other related topics, which appeared in some Turkish radical socialist periodicals published between 1987 and 1994 are examined. There were several motives for undertaking such a document study. The first rationale was to *make use of* a personal archive of texts by socialist authors,⁹ which would perhaps otherwise remain as an idle historical record. The publication dates of the

⁸ Handan Koç, personal interview.

The situation of the Turkish socialist intellectual tradition and practice, especially after the military intervention in 1980, unfortunately seems as a topic that is not sufficiently delved into by academic studies. Constituting a motive for undertaking the present research, here, the lack of resources related with this problem is attempted to be overcome by making interviews with two people who had an insight in the Turkish socialists' situation in 1980s. The first of these is *Handan Koç*, a feminist activist and writer since the rise of Turkish women's movement. The other interviewee, on the other hand, is *Emir Ali Türkmen*, who is an ardent archivist of radical socialist periodicals solely because of -in his own words- a personal *addiction*. Handan Koç owns a stationary store in Galatasaray, İstanbul. Emir Ali Türkmen owns a bookstore and a small publication company in Kızılay, Ankara. The interviews with Emir Ali Türkmen and Handan Koç were made on June 27, 2005 and on November 10, 2005, respectively.

⁹ 121 copies of texts collected by Professor Yıldız Ecevit, 100 of which had been written on the mentioned subject matter and published in radical socialist periodicals. The other 21 texts are excluded from the present study. This corpus is aided by Emir Ali Türkmen, who provided eight issues of the periodical *Yeni Öncü*, from which 5 texts added to the corpus. Thus the content of the whole corpus comprised of 105 texts. The list of periodicals can be given as follows: *10 Eylül*, *Çağdaş Yol*, *Çözüm*, *Deng*, *Devrim*, *Devrimci Mücadele*, *Emeğin Bayrağı*, *Hedef*, *İktidar Yolu*, *Komün*, *Özgürlük Dünyası*, *Saçak*, *Sınıf Bilinci*, *Sosyalist Birlik*, *Sosyalist Demokrasi İçin Yenyol*, *Teori*, *Toplumsal Kurtuluş*, *Yeni Açılım*, *Yeni Demokrasi*, *Yeni Toplum Sosyal Demokrat*, *Yenyol*, *Yeni Öncü* and *Zemin*. See Appendix 1 for the full list of the studied documents.

issues from which the studied texts were taken from span the interval of 1987-1994, which exquisitely embraces the heyday of the Turkish women's movement (that can be said to be the years from 1987 to 1991 ¹⁰).

The significance of the corpus (which was the second driving force for this study) is thought to be due to the socialists' representing the only persistent and more or less systematic intellectual critic of feminism in Turkey. The media of this critique was not limited by the periodicals, though. Meetings on the woman question also served as contexts of direct arguments between the socialists and the feminists. Handan Koç acknowledges that there was an accordance between the socialists' critique (of feminism) in their periodicals and those they had brought forward in the meetings with the feminists. She further acknowledges that, however the socialist critique would be made up of plain accusations, bear the imprint of unquestioned viewpoints or unjustified arguments, in those meetings, there was no other choice for the feminists other than having a concern for and responding to the socialists.¹¹ Therefore, it can be argued, the socialist critique of the (Turkish) feminist movement, however inarticulate it might be, *today* deserves attention to arrive at an understanding of that particular past. Else, one part of a social reality,

¹⁰ See (Ovadia, 1994).

¹¹ Handan Koç, personal interview.

perhaps one whole political stance itself ¹² will be hidden, allowing no reflections to be made.

A similar study to this is also available – that is Fatime Güneş’s “The Sociology of Women: The Discourse in Radical Journals in Turkey” (1997). In her study, Güneş examines another corpus of socialist periodicals (partly intersecting with the one used in the present study) in terms of issues and concepts. That is to say, she reviews the socialist approaches to the woman question and the related topics in the following contexts: History of women’s oppression and private property, women and the production process, the family, class analysis, women’s two-way subordination in the capitalist system and the household, patriarchy, feminism, organization, emancipation and socialism. Güneş’s study is valuable in presenting a complete picture of the socialist perspective of the woman question. Nevertheless, that picture can still be complemented by a more general look at the *socialist discourse itself*, underlying the particular approaches almost fully included in Güneş’s work. This comprises the project undertaken in the present study.

Looking at the discourse underlying at the socialist texts, which is a project of *discourse analysis* that is carried out in the present study, involves

¹² Here, the “stance” refer to a marginal/radical interpretation and practice of socialism, which is believed to have been shared by a community of like-minded people. The stance, however introverted its adherents were, is believed to have a face value of being influential among a group. Therefore, the attempt and will to describe such a stance is assumed to serve as a sufficient condition to embark on a research.

exploring and describing its *forms*. The socialist discourse *realized* in the texts on the woman question and its attributions is found to be not having a unitary structure. This discourse rather seems to embody several *discursive stances* which all pertain to the theory and practice of socialism, but have some differences corollary to the various interpretations of the Marxist-socialist world view of the authors writing of the issues related with the women's movement and feminism. For instance, even the authors of the conflicting discursive stances like being pro and against feminism¹³ are similar in being socialists, or in writing through a socialist discourse. Therefore the socialist discourse analyzed in the study should be regarded as one *multi-faceted* body of theoretical and ideological framework.

This study is organized so as to allow a systematic view of the discursive stances of the socialist authors writing of the woman question: That is to say, it attempts to delineate the points the stances differ from and resemble to each other. This is done by firstly classifying the texts according to how the socialist authors view socialism and feminism. This two classes (named as the *themes* found in the texts) are then grouped within, according to the differing and mutually exclusive discursive stances.

The subsequent chapter is devoted to lay down the theoretical and the historical background and context relevant to the discussions taken up in

¹³ See Section 3.2.2.2, "The theme 'feminism' in two discursive stances."

the socialist texts. The theoretical background includes the debates on Engels's work on the woman question (which represents the core Marxist view of the issue), particularly the arguments in the context of *socialist feminism*. Next, the relationship of the feminists with the radical socialists in the West are examined. So to say, some implications of the theoretical and practical discords between the two theories are given, in order to draw a resemblance with the clash between the feminists and the radical socialists in Turkey. This is followed by the historical review of the Turkish women's movement and the radical socialist stance: The keystones on the path to the feminist movement of the 1980s are put as the Kemalist reforms in the early years of the Turkish Republic and the women's socialist activism (particularly the case of *İlerici Kadınlar Derneği*¹⁴) seen in the 1970s. Between the review of these two legacies lies a survey of the radical socialist activism of the period 1960-1980, which is seen to be compulsory for an understanding of the Turkish socialist fashion of argumentation in the research material. Then reviewed the emergence of the Turkish feminism in 1980s and its particular relation with the radical socialists.

The study is believed to serve for an understanding of the Turkish radical socialist discourse, especially in its outcomes on the debates on the woman question and feminism. By the analysis, it is argued that the futility (or, the superficiality) in defending the socialist discourse against the feminist

¹⁴ "The Progressive Women's Organization" (1975-1979).

movement is both because of the Turkish socialists' perpetuated lack in theoretical argumentation, and their *rush* to make use of the discord with the feminists as a mean of gaining their own solidarity back (which was lost by the military coup in 1980). It is held that due to these, the socialist articles written on the issue of woman question and feminism are conservative, reactionary and *brutal* in their rhetoric.

Although the studies on the Turkish feminist movement can be said to be abundant, the situation of the Turkish (radical) socialist left after the military coup seems to remain as a topic which is still not adequately analyzed or examined. This thesis work is believed to offer a modest attempt to fill one part of this gap in the academic literature. More importantly, however, this attempt should be viewed as a call for further analyzes to be taken up in the general situation of the socialist discourse in Turkey.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The political and social life in Turkey have passed through a series of severe turning points within the 20th century. Rapid alterations have followed each other in a very short time; and among these turning points, the three military coups *squeezed* in the period of 1960-1980 have been representing the major ones, save the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. A peculiarity of the three coups is that, they all have noteworthy associations with the Turkish socialist left: The coup in 27 May 1960 opened the way for the socialists to be *legalized*. For before that time, they had no other choice than doing politics in a hidden and illegal manner. It is after this coup that the following establishment of a political context allowed the socialist to even enter into the parliament. Then would come the coup in 12 March 1971, for whose proclamation, the extremist activism of the socialists initiated at the beginning of the decade played a determining role. The martial law which was exercised afterwards would hold back all the socialist political activity in the country, be it legal or illegal. Moreover, so many socialists would be sued and imprisoned. After the amnesty announced in 1974, however, socialist activism flourished again. It even became more marginalized than it was at the start of the 1970s. This time, the numerous radical socialist groups would be more

daring than before and by the counter existence of the radical rightist groups, a great turmoil was to be witnessed all around the country by the end of the 1970s. The chaos would be ended by the intervention of the Turkish military forces with the last coup, proclaimed on the 12th of September, 1980. Socialist activity in the country was to be hampered again, far more than it had experienced before.

Soon after the coup in 1980, small groups of women in the big cities started to be gathered. These women were intellectuals who had a familiarity with the *feminist literature* developing outside of the country since the end of the 1960s. All over the world, women had been activated by the wave of feminist theory and questioning their status in the society. With this wave, the United Nations had announced 1975 to be the “Women’s Year” and by this, it had showed the unanimous importance given to the *woman question*. The world had been explicitly passing through new conceptions, questions, formulations and analyses. Seeing this, the above mentioned women felt a need to partake in this wave and attempted to adopt a new line of thought, firstly with the aim of reaching to a personal awareness, which would soon develop into action to excite the public. This would be the emergence of the Turkish feminism in the 1980s.

In short time, the Turkish feminists would appeal the interest of the socialists, too. The socialists would join the feminists’ gradually

publicizing meetings, initially because of curiosity, but then, with a critical perspective: For them, there was Marxism as the tool of understanding the women's oppression and the socialists had already had an awareness of and solutions for the problem. For instance, as the other socialists around the globe, the Turkish socialists (including the socialist women), too, *did* have a specific concern for the woman question, in the second half of the 1970s. Then, the feminists' appearance in the Turkish social scene seemed to the socialists with this perspective as an intrusion to the socialists' domain purged by the coup of 1980.¹

Following the gradual annulment of the martial law in the country between 1985 and 1987, and the permission to the socialist activity, this critique would reverberate in the Turkish radical socialist periodicals as well. Socialist articles on the woman question, feminism and the (Turkish) feminists (which comprise the research material of the present study) would be found in every periodical of different socialist circles. In regards to the interpretations of socialist theory and activism, *diversity* had been the inherent feature of the socialist left of Turkey since the second half of the 1960s. Nonetheless, against the feminist theory of woman question, the socialists would involuntarily be quite united and bring forward similar arguments, along parallel rhetoric. This could be observed through the articles in their periodicals.

¹ The Turkish socialists' mentioned view can be found in their articles, which are analyzed in the next chapter.

This chapter is devoted to lay a framework for an insight in the disapproval of feminism by the Turkish socialists. Their discontent can be said to rely both on the legacy of a general discord between the theories of socialism and feminism and on the historical background to the 1980s' political and social context. Thus the present chapter is written in three sections. In the first section, the feminist challenge to the Marxist understanding of women's oppression is surveyed for a comprehension of the theoretical clash between the feminists and the socialists. In the second section following this survey, some outcomes of this theoretical clash between the two movements in the Western world is reviewed. Lastly, the particular histories of the Turkish women's movement(s)² and the Turkish socialism are considered in Section 2.3.

2.1. Socialism and Feminism: Discords and Challenges

The debates on the women's subordination by men, which had taken their cue from the new conceptions of equality and freedom by the French Revolution, were soon to be embraced by the Marxist theory and the socialists in the 19th century. It was a time in which the proletarian movement was to reach to its peak, in opposition to the developments in the capitalist mode of production and its direct reflections in the workplace. In that period, women's subordination was conceptualized

² The term "Turkish women's movement" is usually taken to denote the deliberate feminist movement of the women after the coup in 1980. However, history also involves other instances of "women's movement", not necessarily to be considered to bear a contemporary feminist consciousness. This point is elaborated in Section 2.3.

quite as the equivalent of the women's lack of legal rights. This would be treated in the Marxist approach to oppression as another facet of the class conflict, and the women's movement was therefore be internalized as a crucial part of the total socialist revolutionary struggle.

For the Marxist analysis of women's oppression, Friedrich Engels's "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State" would lay the groundwork.³ At the basis of Engels's arguments lies some anthropological suppositions, which are taken by him to indicate that the epoch preceding the establishment of *private property*, the community had a matriarchal character. In that social structure, due to the centrality of their work in the domestic field, women were conceived "a little more equal" than men (Donovan, 2000: 87). Nevertheless, as the *exchange value* of commodities (such as cattles) rose, and the corresponding labor of men in the public domain gradually developed to be the major service of the household, women's dominance was replaced by the men's. The surplus wealth due to men's labor was also slowly appropriated as their private property, by the help of the establishment of the monogamous family and thus, the definitions of the true and legal *sons* for the governance on the rights of *inheritance*. The privatization of commodities, plus the rule of monogamous family, improved men's dominance over the women, both in the domestic and the public spheres. In summary, women's relegation from the public sphere to the household was required as a complementary

³ For the abridged English version of "The Origin", see (Engels, 1993). For the Turkish translation of the whole book, refer to (Engels, 1992).

service to the wealth-bringing husband, and also for the maintenance of the wealth-bearing family.⁴

Giving rise to capitalism, too, the historical shift of power from the woman to the man lay at the origin of the state apparatus “to fortify and legalize the institutions of private property, male dominion and the father-family.” (Reed, 1993: 171) Therefore, women’s emancipation would be realized back again after the properties collectivized and everybody’s personal work joined to the public sphere (meaning that the household would no more be the domain limiting women’s work and labor) – that is, after abolishing the amalgam of *capitalist state* and founding a *socialist system*.

Engels’s material/economical analysis for the oppression of women remained unchallenged until the introduction of the concept of *patriarchy* by the *second wave feminism* in the 1960s.⁵ The emergence of the second wave feminists was actually in accordance with the rise of personal politics in the second half of the 1900s, and the conceptualization of the women’s oppression by “patriarchy” can be considered as a novel attempt to gather the experiences of each and every individual woman. The woman question was now being extended towards the private realm, as the agenda of the feminists was enlarging with new problems that were

⁴ See (Donovan, 2000: 87-89) and (Reed, 1993: 170-171).

⁵ The term “first wave feminism” was then ascribed to the women’s movement of the previous century and those that existed at the beginning of the 1900s, for which the main aim can be said to be the women’s gaining civil rights. As far as their struggle is considered on the basis of politics of equality (in the public sphere), the first wave movement can be viewed to achieve a considerable success.

unseen before. *Gender*, sex/gender system, sexuality (of women), violence, motherhood, sexism in language, sexism in science were representing some of the new concepts and notions brought forward by the second wave feminist movement: This was a call for a fresh look at the status of women of *every* nation, race, color, age, religious belief – and, of course, *class*.⁶

With its emphasis on the patriarchy as a total system transcending the virtual differences among the women, the second wave feminist theory involved a critical look to the Marxist analysis. It should be firstly put that within this feminist movement, two traditions had different accounts for the relation between the patriarchal structure and the capitalist production mode. On the one side, there were the *radical feminists*, who held patriarchy distinct from capitalism. The radical feminists were inclined to establish an analysis of women's oppression on the base of the biological differences between the two sexes. The common view of the various radical feminists was that, the structuring of patriarchy was based on the perception and treatment of the reproductive functions of the female sex by the society; and in history, men's domination over the women was established long before the formation of classes and the birth of capitalism.

⁶ Yet, by the 1990s, the attempted inclusiveness of the second wave feminism was challenged. For instance the third world women, women with black color, or lesbian women were dissatisfied by the feminist theory. For them, feminism could not be *that* all-embracing and its endeavor to be so had involved a critical failure of ignoring the differences *within* the women. Some of the theorists argue that this is the emergence of a *third wave feminism*. At this point of history, the debates around the *effectiveness* of feminism has not been resolved yet.

Hence, a genuine social revolution could be based only on challenging the *biological destiny* of the women (which comes to mean, not on the class conflict, as the Marxists had supposed).⁷

On the contrary side to the radical feminists, there were the *socialist feminists*. The socialist feminists caught a glimpse of analytical potential in Marxism for the formulation of the woman question and emancipatory solutions for the women.⁸ Various accounts for the relation between capitalism and patriarchy are suggested within the socialist feminist current, and all of them viewed the relation to bear some sort of *intimacy*. The attempt to appropriate Marxism with and for feminism can be said to have made the socialist feminists more critical of the Marxist theory, than the radical feminists were.

It is argued by Savran (1988: 1566) that for the Marxist *method* of analysis, there is a category more fundamental than the concept of *class*, which is the category of *labour*. It was chiefly this category that provided a considerable foundation for the socialist feminists to deal with, both in their critique and adoption of the Marxist analysis of the woman question. The socialist feminists made use of this category in developing the concept of *sexual division of labour* and blamed the Marxists for neglecting it and the overuse of the class concept instead. Owing to this failure, the Marxist

⁷ For a survey of different accounts in the radical feminist current, see (Donovan, 2000: 154-182).

⁸ See (Bryson, 1999: 16-18) for a list of the reasons of appeal of Marxist approaches to feminists.

analysis had difficulty in distinguishing women's status in capitalist society from men's. If women were victimized, it was because *the proletariat in general* was victimized; so it was assumed (in the Marxist tradition) that the study of women's exploitation could be done via the same terms with class analysis (Eisenstein, 1979: 11).

In fact, the concept of sexual division of labour was mentioned in Engels's "The Origin" and the Marx's classical work, "The German Ideology." Yet it was not elaborated fully: It was only put as the "first division of labour" in history and seen as "coincidental and *identical* with the birth of private property." (Eisenstein, 1979: 12; original emphasis) The relationship between man and woman was taken as the one between the bourgeois and the proletariat - that is, it resembled the conceptualization of the class conflict. Such a categorization meant the subsumption of the relations of *reproduction* under the relations of *production*. Furthermore, nothing was said on the significance of family (except that its being the reflection of class society) in structuring the society by reproducing the patriarchal ideology, nor on the respective positions of men and women *outside* of the family.⁹

However, for the feminists, the true content of the sexual division of labour lay at the argument that women's domestic labour had been *dominated by the men*: Both the productive and the reproductive labour of

⁹ See (Eisenstein, 1979: 13-16).

the women for the maintenance of the family had become *men's* benefit. The domestic labour was unreciprocated: By the sexist ideology, women were supposed to gain satisfaction on *emotional* grounds, in the limited sphere of home, in the name of an adorable motherhood/wifehood. Since they were regarded as an *extra* in the public domain besides the men, the women were seen secondary in the workforce and supplied with low wages and insecure working conditions (including [sexual] harassment at the workplace). Therefore, men were far more advantageous than women, because they were both being served at home and given prominence in the public domain (Savran, 1988: 1566). These arguments comprised the first challenges of feminism to the Marxist theory.

Another debate was that made on the issue of *alienation*. Women's domestic labour was deemed to be unalienated by virtue, for their *life* and *work* were considered as very much associated to the point of forming a unity. This was not only the account of the Marxists, though. Feminists like Lise Vogel and Eli Zaretsky were also in line with this, and they maintained that because the household labour displayed the unique case of unalienation, women could develop an independent and critical stance from this, contrary to the violent subsistence of capitalism. The Marxists and the feminists in this perspective were opposed by other feminist figures like Zillah Eisenstein and Mariarosa Dalla Costa, who saw the household labour as *alienating* for the women, with its being trivial and repetitive (Donovan, 2000: 90-92).

How feminism was *interrelated* with capitalism had also been another important matter of debate and challenges among the feminists. Christine Delphy, Heidi Hartmann and Zillah Eisenstein were the pioneering figures in the conceptualization of the *capitalist patriarchy*.¹⁰ The figuring of capitalism intermingled with patriarchy was attempted as a challenging project to the one in the Marxist analysis. In the Marxist theory, the patriarchal structure had been conceptualized on the infrastructure of economic and material relations and as a result of the foundation of private property. Yet, the socialist feminists were led by the depiction of the gains of capitalism from the oppression of women: Women's being bounded in the domestic sphere freed the capitalists from paying them the equivalent wage of the men's. Besides, women's working for the maintenance of the family and their husbands also came to mean low wages to be paid by the capitalists to the working men, as men's subsistence was partially provided by the hidden domestic labour of the women at home. On the other hand, it was evidenced that women comprised a *reserved army of labour* for capitalism to be substituted for men in the periods of crisis. A corollary of this would be the women's existence on the market becoming a threat for the men. Thus capitalism made use of the supposition that women deserved low wages in the work force, in establishing the market as a field of *competition* between the two sexes, which was not only a divisive function for the whole class, but also

¹⁰ See (Sargent, 1989) for a collection of important articles in this debate, namely the debate of "unhappy marriage" in reference to the name of Hartmann's groundbreaking article (1979). For a Turkish translation of a succinct review of the debate, see (Vogel, 1990), which has originally been published in the book edited by Sargent.

reproduced the *sexist* ideology –in other words, the patriarchal structure-already inherent in the society.¹¹ In sum, while patriarchy supported capitalism, in return, the latter was functioning to augment the former.

Apart from these challenges, feminists also furthered both their own theory and Marxism in the issues like ideology (specifically the role of family in maintaining it), consciousness, racism and ethnic oppression. In some ways, feminists were linked to the overall critique of the Marxist method initiated by the Frankfurt School, too.

2.2. Western Feminist Movements versus the Radical Socialists: Some Implications of the Theoretical Clash

While in the USA, the chief birthplace of the second wave feminist movement, the women's movement was emerged with a gist of influence from the black movement, a common feature of the second wave feminist movements in Europe was that the women's movements in different countries emerged from the student and youth movements of the second half of the 1960s. This was the case in Italy, Britain, France and Germany: The women in the student groups in these countries principally had an engagement with the Marxist theory and socialist politics. Soon, by the influence of the surfacing of a feminist consciousness, these women would start to question the place given to them in the Marxist theory, the

¹¹ See (Öngen, 1996: 137-138).

conceptualization of class and the proletarian emancipation. The relations between the proletarian and student movements and the woman question was then open to discussion in the women's factions being founded under the umbrella of the leftist organizations in the European countries. These factions would gradually develop into autonomous women's circles and organizations, which became critical of the socialist movements they were rooted in.¹²

As an example of the confrontation of the feminists with the socialists, the case in Britain can be examined. By a review of Rowbotham, Segal and Wainwright's book, "Beyond The Fragments" (1979), the experiences of the British women with a socialist feminist orientation give the impression that the clash between the feminists and the radical socialists in Turkey followed a similar line with that in Britain. Hence, this section summarizes the reflections in the book "Beyond The Fragments" so as to reach a consideration that the attitude of the Turkish radical socialists towards the woman question and feminism was resembled their counterparts in other countries.

As acknowledged by Rowbotham, in regards the women joining the women's groups in Britain in the 1970, while there was a continuity with the earlier groupings of the socialists and socialist feminists, there were

¹² For a brief review of the women's movements in Italy, Britain, France, Germany and the USA, refer to (*Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi [The Encyclopedia of Socialism and Social Struggles]* vol.5, 1988: 1562-1567).

also “exiles” from Trotskyist and other left groups, and women for whom those women’s groups were their first political circles. For Rowbotham, this comes to mean that in years, “there [was] no longer an automatically shared background of movement politics.” (1979: 42)

In spite of their autonomy from the socialist circles, the (socialist feminist) women’s groups in Britain were mainly seeking for “a common programme of political and social change, meeting the needs of all oppressed groups”, including the women’s movement, black movement or the trade union movement. They were considering that the sources of oppression-exploitation for which each movement was battling against were not unconnected to each other (Wainwright, 1979: 4). Segal writes that feminists did need a socialist perspective, but on the other side, Marxism should base itself on a feminism and conceive that “the division within the working class and society as a whole necessitates a strong and autonomous women’s movement.” (1979: 191) It can be inferred from these that the British socialist feminists attempted at challenging and improving the socialist movement with a feminist consciousness, by being a force intentionally remaining away from the socialists on the organizational basis.

In doing this, the feminists directed their conceptualization to the “everyday life” of the women. An insufficiency was observed in the socialist politics that theory was understood as something abstract from

experience per se, particularly when the experience of the women was of concern. Socialist politics were seen as “something professional, for men and among men, for the shop steward or the party activist.” (Wainwright, 1979: 13) This was in accordance with Wainwright’s observation that the socialist organizations were

organized in ways more appropriate to seizing power (...) than to the necessary preliminaries of raising and extending socialist consciousness and grass-roots organization among the majority of working people. (1979: 2) ¹³

The women’s movement was a challenge to such an understanding of politics and theory.¹⁴ It was primarily aiming at raising the consciousness of women and encouraging their self-organization (Wainwright, 1979: 2). Furthermore, its theory was founded on the women’s own experiences and was a remedy to “get stuck defending entrenched feelings”, “meeting critics head on” and find an alternative “without getting too puffed.” (Rowbotham, 1979: 44) For Rowbotham, the feminists’ views were valid as they came from “within” the women and their conceptualization was the opposite of the leftist language which was valuing itself with correctness and objectivity (1979: 41).

Lynne Segal points that the feminist movement in Britain had four important aspects in its relation with the socialist politics. The first aspect had been the emphasis on autonomy, which meant that the women would

¹³ This is also held to be the case in Turkey. See Ahmet Samim’s reflections on the situation of the Turkish socialist politics (1981; 1987), which are reviewed in Section 2.3.2.

¹⁴ Rowbotham writes that she realized that “theory” had a “weighty meaning on the contemporary left”, which came to mean “something unattainable except by the few.” (1979: 55)

have to fight on their own against the male domination. Otherwise they would again be subordinated in other organizations which were not giving enough importance to the woman question. However, the stress on autonomy was to be responded by the socialists blaming feminists for being “divisive” for the class struggle, as the women’s emancipation could not be thought separately from the proletarian politics (Segal, 1979: 164).

A second important aspect was that the feminists extended politics to the personal and subjective domain and believed that a total politics could not be possible if the link between the personal life and oppression of women at home, and the exploitation of both of the sexes in the public realm was not recognized. Therefore, the one to be emancipated was not an abstract *class* anymore but each and every woman per se (Segal, 1979: 164). However, Segal writes that the socialists ignored the personal experiences of the women (like harassment or violence that the women were facing everyday) and were referring to them as “soft issues” (1979: 189). That is to say, the socialists saw the everyday experience of the women as diminutive problems and did not bother to analyze them.¹⁵

In relation with the stress on personal and subjective politics, the third aspect was that the feminists were organized around the women’s own

¹⁵ The stress on personal and subjective politics was a central and general tendency among the different feminist movements in the world. In Turkey, the radical socialists abused this feminist emphasis and mistook the feminists as if those women were striving for “boundless sexual freedom.” Some examples of this view is included in the analysis in the next chapter. See Section 3.2.2.2, p.117.

oppression and, as mentioned in Section 2.1, looked for making a combined analysis of capitalism and patriarchy. Segal mentions a slogan used by the feminists in 1970: “Women in labor, keep capital in power.” (Segal, 1979: 165) In such a way, the woman question was believed to serve an important –yet an overlooked- dimension in the Marxist analysis of capitalist domination.

Lastly, the feminist movement was against the “stageism” in the socialist politics, which was the socialist idea that the women’s emancipation would be possible (only) after a socialist revolution (Segal, 1979: 166). Termed by Rowbotham as “politics of deferment”, this socialist belief in the revolution was rejected by the feminists, as what was required was rather the progressive emancipation of the women starting from “here and now” – which came to mean that nobody could wait until the future that would bring a revolution. The making of socialism was also seen to be possible only on the ground that it would be the *present* to be concerned with (1979: 140).¹⁶

Both Rowbotham and Segal acknowledges that the feminists were criticized by the socialists for having a “bourgeois consciousness” or coming from middle-class origins. Rowbotham writes that an “unchanging polarity between bad ‘bourgeois feminists and good

¹⁶ “Stageism” or “politics of deferment” is also observed in the Turkish radical socialists’ articles. Instances of such an attitude are observed and given a special importance in the next chapter and are analyzed by the term “postponing attitude.” See Section 3.2.2.1.

working-class women" was inherent in the socialists' conception (1979: 64). Reviewing the British *Socialist Workers Party's* (SWP) treatment of the feminists, Segal makes an observation parallel to that of Rowbotham:

Their basic attitude to the women's movement is determined by the way they see themselves as the only 'real revolutionaries'. This means that for SWP, fighting for women's liberation, like building the class struggle, is one and the same thing as building the SWP. (...)

The term 'middle class' is one of the favorite terms of abuse used by the SWP. Of course, they never bother to define the contemporary working class, or the position, for instance, of teachers. For the SWP, teachers are working class when they are in the SWP or are attending union meetings, but middle class when they attend a women's liberation conference. (Segal, 1979: 185-186)

It can be seen from these examples that, while attempting at forming an autonomous women's movement in Britain in order to further the Marxist analysis and the socialist politics, the (socialist) feminists had to face three main critiques from the socialist side: The first was their being *divisive* for the socialist struggle and the proletarian emancipation and the second was that the feminists were dealing with *diminutive* and *trivial* problems, for which the deferred ideal of socialism was believed to offer the solutions; and lastly, the feminists were attacked for being bourgeois-minded, meaning that they were away from the proletarian reality. As mentioned previously, all of these critiques should have an equivalent in the debates between the socialists and the feminists in Turkey, too. By the analysis of the articles of the Turkish radical socialists in Chapter 3, the socialist discourse critical of feminism is seen to involve a rhetoric in line with that of the socialists in the British case.

2.3. Historical Background of Turkish Women's Movement(s) and the Turkish Radical Socialist Stance

The emergence of the Turkish feminist women's movement in Turkey in the 1980s can be said to have very weak links with a past that might hardly be considered to provide a *tradition*. What the past had involved was actually some instances of women's voicing their demands to take part and enjoy gender equality in the public sphere; or women's activities and network establishments for the economic, social and intellectual benefit of their counterparts residing in rural areas or isolated districts in big cities. While the first occurrence -which took place between the first decades of the 20th century- can be attributed with a somewhat egalitarian policies, the latter instances -which belong to 1970s- bore slight reflections of a *socialist feminist* tendency.

The earlier occurrences took place in the late Ottoman era, got strong during and after the Second Constitutionalist period and kept alive until the end of the first decade of the Turkish Republic. These earlier endeavors included contribution to various publications of the time, publishing independent magazines, the attempt to establish a separate political party and the establishment of a women's federation.¹⁷ All of these were helpful in the construction of an awareness among the Turkish women, an awareness that women *had* the right to be equal with men. On

¹⁷ These occurrences and events are detailed in Section 2.3.1, "Before and After the Republican Reforms."

the other hand, this particular historical period is assimilated by the nationalist-secularist-modernist Republican project and is still rather unknown besides the Republican reforms concerning the Turkish women.

In the term preceding the emergence of the feminist women's movement in Turkey, the second group of activities and practices worth of mentioning were associated with the socialist activism of 1970s. These were done via mass organizations which had tens of thousands of woman members, with a concern of *reaching out* the women who were excluded from the urban life and suffering of poorer life standards, in order to advance their conditions.¹⁸ Some of the leading staff of these kind of activities would take active part in the women's movement of the 1980s as well (arguably, after gaining an evident feminist consciousness).

Nevertheless, the definite influence on the situation of Turkish women had not been through the aforementioned groups of practices, but the official discourse and the the state's policies. This influence was so intense and durable that it remained almost unchallenged until the foundation of of a novel and deliberate feminist activism and consciousness – so to say, until the feminist women's movement initiated by the 1980s. It can be argued that since the real concern of these feminists was questioning

¹⁸ There were many civil women's organizations in the 1970s, which were known to be engaged with not only a socialist consciousness, but also with the socialist parties (either being legal or illegal) of the time. In Section 2.3.2.2, the most prominent figure of such an organizational practice, that is the *İlerici Kadınlar Derneği* (Progressive Women's Organization), is reviewed. Some other women's organizations of the 1970s are also mentioned by their name in the same sub-section.

directly the *patriarchal social structure* (which had been maintained also through the position of the state apparatus vis-à-vis the women), the movement can not be regarded as the *continuation* of the earlier experiences. Rather, its rise depended on the discontent as conceived by the second wave feminist movement and had a more direct connection with the women's movements outside the country.

The frustration of the women manifested by the rise of the Turkish feminism can also be stated to be due to their dissatisfaction with those activities that were done under the considerable influence of a socialist engagement in 1970s (which hardly included a true feminist consciousness). For although these prior occurrences were realized because of the foregoing condition of women (and realized *for women*), the essential presence of a patriarchal system had never been acknowledged or challenged by them. This was the novelty in the 1980s feminist movement, which distinguished it from the previous examples.

At any rate, given that the discontentment of the feminists itself had a certain historicity, what the past had involved deserves attention. The following two sub-sections thus can be read as efforts to picturize the historical conditions which paved the way for the formation of a feminist consciousness among Turkish women. In the third subsequent section, on the other hand, the feminist movement of the 1980s is delved into, particularly in terms of its relation with the Turkish socialist left. Before

looking at the 1980s, in section 2.3.2.1, the situation of the socialist left prior to the military coup is reviewed as well. This review is believed to serve a historical basis for the analysis of the Turkish socialist periodicals of the 1980s, too, which is carried out in Chapter 3.

2.3.1. Before and After The Republican Reforms

The establishment of the modern Turkish Republic represents the most significant turning point in the Turkish women's history. It is because the reforms of the time and the general attitude of the Kemalist "founding fathers" (Arat, 2000) towards women were given a distinct value in the overall transformation of the society. As long as the construction of the new society constituted a historical reference point for the reflections concerning the past, the day or the future, what were done for the women by the state has provided a complementary rhetoric for indicating the extent of progress achieved in those years. The stance shared by the Turkish feminists in the issue of the effects of the Republican reforms on women has been both the approval of women's gaining access to the public sphere and the dissatisfaction caused by the institution of patriarchy in the face of modernization. This standpoint is aptly formulated by the dictum "emancipated but unliberated" (Kandiyoti, 1987; Toprak, 1990; Arat, 2000), articulated to state the complete situation of the Turkish women as a result of the Republican reforms.

Although the endeavor to constitute a contemporary (meaning modern or westernized) society had largely been an elitist, top-to-down initiative, it was welcomed by and large by the general public. The Kemalist reform program, however, did not represent a real breakthrough on the side of the society at all as it has claimed to be. Being an exemplar of the whole modernization project, women's status in the society turned into an issue where the actual beneficiary became not the Turkish women but the Republican ideology itself. For the issue was actually put as achieving an upheaval in the appearance of the women in the public domain: In such a limited context, the policies *did* work in amending the *outlook* of the women's status and the force of the Republican ideology was thus approved. However, *the woman question* was not only an issue of public domain – this was what being ignored by the *founding fathers*.

The attempt to modernize the women was undertaken for instance by encouraging them to have a profession just as the men, allowing them to join the parliament, or abolishing the old, traditional dresses (that signified the presence of the Islamist rule) and substituting them by western-like fashionable ones (which served to signify the end of the Islamist rule). On the contrary, for instance, the notion of *motherhood* was stressed “as the most important function and virtue of women”; or the emphases on the necessity of the education of the women was not because the women should develop a liberal individual consciousness, but rather because the *whole nation* was projected to be improved by the hand of the

educated women (Arat, 1994: 59-61). Put in other words, the handling of the *woman question* by the *founding fathers* epitomized the patronizing character of the reformist framework, for which the question was not seen as relevant to the patriarchal structure or to the private domain. For the Kemalist Republican ideology, the woman question was instead a *symbolical* and *instrumental* issue of the modernization of the Turkish nation.

It should be noted that the woman question had started to be discussed about half a century before the Republican reforms, within the attempted Ottoman modernization. Starting from the 1880s, some newspapers had specific sections on women, and several intellectuals (including women) debated the status of women in the society. In the 1890s, several newspapers for women and about thirty women's magazines started to be published. Although these publications were generally contributing to the submissive role attributed to women (the "good wife, good mother, good Muslim" discourse), later magazines of the 1910s (like *Kadınlar Dünyası* and *Mehasin*) are known to represent a more challenging and more or less a feminist position. The focus of these magazines were women's right of education, participation to social life, social activities and the public space, and the right to work (Tekeli, 1982: 196-201; Yaraman-Başbuğu, 1992).¹⁹

¹⁹ See also (Say, 1998).

Several women's organizations had been established in the late 19th century as well, but their number increased actually after the proclamation of the Second Constitutional Rule in 1908. Although their initial aim had hardly ever been questioning the women's position or struggling for women's rights (most of these were women's charities and organizations established to aid in the war), their activities paved the way for such initiatives (Tekeli, 1982: 198-199). As Başbuğu underlined, "[w]omen's organizations [preceding the establishment of the Turkish Republic], in all aspects, constituted a significant groundwork to found a social and political consciousness of womanhood among the Turkish women." (1991: 289). In such a historical context, the Balkan Wars, the World War I and the War of Independence also had the effect of creating the obligation of substituting women for the positions in the work place, left by the men. All these changes advanced the role of women in the public sphere, made their existence visible and most importantly, gave them self-confidence. Nevertheless, within the social diversity, it was the women of urban elite that had gained a wider vision, and the majority of the whole society was still far from accepting them as equal citizens. The discussions in the newly formed parliament (the Turkish Grand National Assembly) would demonstrate the necessity of struggling more for the rights of women (Tekeli, 1982: 205).

On the other hand, the Republican regime did not allow women to perpetuate their actions independently. The case of *Kadınlar Halk Fırkası* ²⁰ illustrates such obstruction: Initiated by Nezihe Muhiddin in 1923, the attempt to open it (which took place before the foundation of the *Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası* ²¹) was reckoned to be inappropriate on the grounds that the women had not yet acquired the necessary political rights and was considered divisive for the political space by the Republican male elite. The women were advised to form a women's union, which thus led to the foundation of a women's federation, the *Türk Kadınlar Birliği* (TKB) in 1924. ²² In 1927, the representatives of this federation presented their demands for women's nomination to the parliament for the coming elections, but were discouraged and rejected. The reason was stated to be that it was not the *right time* for the demands to be realized. On this reasoning, Şirin Tekeli ²³ claims that in terms of legal preparations or public motivation, nothing changed much between this date (i.e. 1927) and the years in which women were finally granted voting rights for municipal and parliamentary elections (1930 and 1934, respectively). Hence, any suggestion in such line of justification for the rejection of the federation's demands would be unsatisfactory. For Tekeli, the rationale for the timing of these reforms rather lay in the impression

²⁰ "Women's People's Party"

²¹ "Republican People's Party"

²² "Turkish Women's Federation" - see (Arat, 2000; Berktaş, 1994; Saktanber, 2001)

²³ Tekeli is acknowledged to be the first representative of the Turkish feminist discourse (of the 1980s) critical of the Republican reforms.

the regime aimed to create in the Western world (Tekeli, 1982: 211-217; Arat, 1994: 67).²⁴ Following this, TKB was made to be closed after hosting the Congress of the International Federation of Women in 1935 in İstanbul. The women were told that their organizational independence had been intolerable and in any case, their motives for organizing were made obsolete by the granting of rights. It is noteworthy that the women, too, were convinced of this argument. Afterwards, it would take fifty years for women to voice their demands again to the state.

The single party regime of the Kemalist elite took pride in restructuring the legal framework, which was supposed to fulfill every aspect of establishing gender equality. Apart from the legal changes in the political sphere, the adoption of the Swiss Civil Code in 1926 was also important for women: The new Civil Law involved progressive and modernizing changes regarding women's rights (such as those concerning inheritance, abolishing polygamy, giving them the right to divorce, maintaining women's maternal rights after divorce and so forth). However it involved no attempt to challenge the patriarchal structure within the family: It was still the husband who had the right to represent the family, decide the place of residence, give permission to his wife for engaging in a job, or take the ultimate guardianship of children upon disagreement. Not only the Family Law but also the new Criminal and Labor Laws included many

²⁴ This point will be clarified in the forthcoming pages, by the argument of "symbolic benefit" (Tekeli, 1982: 216).

overt patriarchal norms restricting women's social entitlement and confining them to the private sphere with still few rights.²⁵

All these lead to the following point: The state's policies pertaining to women indicate that, emancipating women at that time was not seen as an end in itself nor had an intention of responding to the women's demands. As long as the state had considered women's rights as a *facet* of restructuring the society (in the endeavor for modernization, westernization and the implementation of a secular order), women's *real* liberation was overlooked and subordinated under the state's concerns for divesting itself of the backward, anti-modern, traditional values (Öngen, 1996: 139).

As Çağatay and Soysal notes, in the newly formed third-world countries it becomes the common rule that "the attitudes and reforms concerning women are regarded to be the essential signifiers of abolishing the previous order and disengagement with the outdated." (1990: 328) Apparently the same was witnessed in Turkey: Referring to Tekeli (1981), Kandiyoti suggests that granting some rights to women had such a crucial role in the abolition of the political and ideological bases of the Ottoman state, which meant the primary context to be surpassed. This context, for the Republican discourse, was marked by its theological structure. Hence the abolition of the Caliphate in 1924, and the changes regarding women's

²⁵ See (Arat, 1994: 63-67) for an inclusive review of the "legal policy framework" of the Kemalist regime. See also (Berktaş, 1994: 25-26).

civil, social and political rights which were non-existent in the religious rule. Women's enfranchisement in two steps (the changes in 1930 and 1934), particularly, was seen to bear a partial importance in Atatürk's attempt to dissociate the single party regime from that of Hitler's or Mussolini's as well (Kandiyoti, 1987: 320-321). In Tekeli's words, "What was aimed at that stage was not women's true participation to political life but rather the *symbolic benefit* that they would serve with their admission to the parliament." (1982: 216; emphasis added)

Apart from the *symbolic importance* attached to them, women, indeed, had no importance as individuals and the reforms can be said to reserve them a *supportive role* for the validity and popularity of the nationalist discourse. This role was defined through their being the "indirect facilitator[s] of the modernization process" as *wives* and *mothers*: They were expected to be the *instruments* engaged in "rais[ing] the next generation of men better" who would then "transform Turkey into a 'civilized nation' acceptable to the West." (Arat, 1994: 59-61). In other words, the assumed role for women was the acceptance of male hegemony for the sake of nation-wide development. Especially Atatürk's quotes involved many emphases on motherhood, glorifying it in terms of the labor that should be put for creating a better future. Even the educational right of women was seen to be important not per se but for aiding in parental care (Arat, 1994: 60-63).

Moreover, motherhood was the sole feminine identity that women were allowed to enjoy. The *new woman* of the newly formed Republic was to be married and have children; hardworking and be in harmony with her husband: These constituted what were expected of women in the private sphere. In the public sphere, on the other hand, she was expected to be the *asexual agent* of the elitist stance. Education (teaching) was the prominent profession she was encouraged to pursue, since it was considered as the continuation of her developmental role in the household. Besides, she should get rid of anything that could suggest the fact that she was a *woman*. As Kandiyoti writes;

In a society which was segregated definitely on the basis of sex and where men's honor is linked to women's behaviors, women's participation to the social life could only be possible by preserving their reputation and assuring men of their sincerity in not presenting themselves as sexual objects. The unveiled "new woman" of the republic adopted principles that put new restrictions to her identity: Dark colored dress, short hair and no make up. These not only signaled that the woman dedicated to working life had no time to spare for ornaments but also worked like a powerful symbolic shield (1990: 381).

Such a conservative attitude was, in a way, coinciding with the traditional perspective (which the reforms were aiming to pass beyond) that banned women from enjoying their feminine identity in the private sphere. As seen in the legal framework, men's and women's roles in the private sphere kept its patriarchal tone. After all, "the primary concern was to equalize women to men in the *public domain*. Differences between men and women, especially in the private domain, were ignored." (Arat, 2000: 115; emphasis added) Yet the discourse that shaped the public sphere, too,

maintained gender inequality. In the final analysis, the reforms could not achieve the liberalization it seemed to aim at.²⁶

On the other hand, the creation of *false consciousness* about the success of the Republican reforms for women has been the most significant phenomenon for the Turkish feminists to challenge. Öngen writes that the Kemalist reforms in the status of women were put as a finalized project, and the idea that women had been given all the rights is greatly embraced by the literate, urban, working middle-class women. Actually gender inequality was maintained within the male dominant reformist and populist discourse. Nonetheless, for Öngen, the aforementioned group of women –both because they have been enjoying more opportunities than the women of other social contexts and are more inclined to form class solidarity (i.e. associating with the men of their class, with whom they share similar social and economic origins, for the common interests)– do not have a radical perspective on gender inequality at all (Öngen, 1996: 142-143).

The general prospect of the Republican ideology (which was cast and spread by Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası) was the construction of a classless society, which depended on the hope that solidarity of citizens could be established on the basis of an inexact principle of nationalism and populism. Its consequence on the case of women had been an ignorance of

²⁶ See also (Saktanber, 2001: 327-330).

cultural and economic segregations that was definitely present in those years. Following this, the Republican reforms were not internalized equally by the women representing a diversity of social contexts. It has been mostly the middle-class women (who preferably had a professional job) that enjoyed the access to the public domain which was more or less made possible by these reforms. As İlkkaracan addresses, this has led to the creation of a dichotomy between these (the urban elite) and the rural women. The former has been in contact with the latter usually for the sake of *helping* them, without much effort to prevent their superior status from surfacing (1997: 6). Thus the urban elite women have been considering themselves as the bearers of the Republican modernist ideology to those that have been believed to be remote from it. Furthermore, in the later years, especially in times when the Kemalist basis of the Turkish Republic is supposed to be under threat,²⁷ it is the very same group of women which attempt to convey the idea (distinctively to the rural women) that women's problems are rising due to the deviations from the Kemalist principles.²⁸ A last note at this point should be that, the elitist (and patronizing) character of the middle-class women was being criticized by the Turkish socialist left in the 1980s, too; and more importantly, while bringing forth such a critique, the socialists were not distinguishing the feminists from those women bearers of the Kemalist ideology. In other

²⁷ 1990s can be given as an example of such a time, where the Islamist resurgence was supposed to be the threat.

²⁸ See (Saktanber, 2001), especially page 329. See also (Tekeli, 1986: 193) and (Doltaş, 1992: 62-63).

words, the feminist challenge to the elitist approach of the middle-class women was unseen by the socialists; because of the fact that the feminists, too, were typically of the middle-class origin (and this seemed to be a sufficient reason for the feminists' being blamed together with the women they were challenging, by the socialist circles).²⁹

In the final analysis, "the discourse of 'granted rights'" (Çağatay and Soysal, 1990: 330) rendered women *dedicated* to the Republican ideology, without allowing much critical awareness to be developed. In spite of everything, it should be acknowledged that the Republican reforms has been a valuable step in depicting the need for total gender equality and opening a space for women to realize their potentials. Yet, as Berktaş holds, the struggle for the *true liberation* of the women would be initiated only after "the refusal of the definitions forced upon them to surrogate with their own." (1994: 25)

²⁹ It should be highlighted that what the socialists were criticizing was neither the Kemalist ideology, its handling of the woman question, or the specific group of women adhered to the Kemalist ideology. Rather, the critique was towards the *elitist manner* of the middle-class, urban women, who were supposed (by the socialists) to ignore the *true problems* of the proletarian and/or rural women – that is, the problems raising from *the class conflict*. The feminists were considered to bear such manner and this was why they were exposed to this particular socialist critique.

2.3.2. 1970s: The Radical Socialist Stance, Women’s Socialist Activism and “İlerici Kadınlar Derneği”

The second important keystone in the path to the Turkish feminist women’s movement in the 1980s is the women’s socialist activism in the 1970s. These were the years in which the socialist consciousness among the youth groups reached to its peak and brought numerous legal and illegal organizations, sects and circles into being. The same happened in the Turkish youth inclined to the right-wing (i.e. nationalist, patriotic and anti-communist) ideology and politics, too. By the end of the decade, the radicalization/marginalization in the two opposite sides (i.e. in the left and the right) would cause bloody militant battles to take place in the streets and all over the country, and amidst the chaotic environment, thousands of people would get killed. The military forces would be dissatisfied by the politicians’ attempts to prevent the on-going war of the youth groups, and after several implementations of the martial law, would totally intervene to politics in by the coup in September the 12th, 1980. In this section, before looking at the women’s activism in the 1970s, the situation of the socialist left in those years should be examined.

2.3.2.1. The Socialist Left Before 1980 and the Legacy of Radical Socialist Activism

In the introduction to his extensive and brilliant fundamental work “The Socialist Movement in Turkey 1960-1980”, Igor Lipovsky describes the 20-year-period between the two military coups in Turkey (that is, the interventions of the military force to national politics in 27 May 1960 and in 12 September 1980) as the “unique moment in the history of the propagation of socialist ideology” in the country. For the socialist movement was not allowed to exist legally before 1960 and several years after the coup in 1980 (1992: 2). What the Turkish left had done in this period is formulated succinctly by Ahmet Samim as “[struggling] to match its remarkable militancy, and not inconsiderable support, to the realities of its country and its time” (1981: 60; 1987: 147) – a struggle that was mainly due to “superficial” accounts of Marxism (1981: 80; 1987: 168) and “the obsession with power.” (1981: 82; 1987: 169)³⁰ Here in this sub-section, the outcomes of the Turkish left’s struggle in this particular period is reviewed in line with primarily Samim’s and Lipovsky’s works. It should be remarked that it is because of the marginalization of politics especially in the second half of the 1970s that, in the following review, the term

³⁰ *Ahmet Samim* is actually an old moniker of Murat Belge, a famous and significant figure as an academician and essayist in the Turkish intellectual scene (Özpalabıyıklar, 2001: 249). As his two referred papers are nearly almost identical, from here on, for the sake of simplicity, only one of them is given as the reference. Yet, for bibliographical coherence, the moniker is chosen to be used instead of the author’s real name. For the Turkish, but less detailed and less academic version of these two papers, the reader may also refer to (Belge, 1989: 37-67).

“Turkish left” is regarded as quite the equivalent of “Turkish socialism” or “Turkish socialist left.” What is more, to lay a basis for the analysis of the socialist periodicals between 1987 and 1994 made in the subsequent chapter, the below survey of the Turkish socialist movement of the period 1960-1980 inclines more on the *activist* currents and sentiments than on political parties and their policies. Accordingly, Ahmet Samim’s concluding reflections on the general outlook of the movement are found to be elemental for an understanding of the ideological remnants of Turkish socialism passed on to the period after the coup in 1980.

In the period between 1960 and 1980, both the establishment of and the segregations in the *Türkiye İşçi Partisi* (TİP)³¹ is known to have a central role in the drastic changes in the situation of the Turkish left (Özman, 1998: 141; Samim, 1981: 67).³² This role is considered to be due to the party’s being the legal medium for a fresh and unorthodox socialist arguments to be flourished among the newborn working class in the country. Lipovsky addresses the difference of TİP from the earlier founded and illegitimate socialist parties as its being founded by non-intellectuals who were the members of the working class (1992: 11). This would be joined by the capability of the party in being “heterogeneous to the point of populism” and linking the “socialist arguments to the concrete problems of the masses” (Samim, 1981: 67). On the other hand, soon after

³¹ “Turkish Workers’ Party”

³² TİP is also translated as “The Turkish Labor Party” in Lipovsky’s study. See (Lipovsky, 1992: 9-82) for an extensive review and (Şimşek G.H., 2004: 43-59) for a brief overview of the history of the party between 1961 and 1971.

its foundation, the number of the intellectuals in the party grew, mainly owing to the character of the new chairmanship, Mehmet Ali Aybar. This actually seems to suited the expectations of the founders of TİP, who offered Aybar the highest post themselves, for the very reason to attract the intellegentsia (Şimşek G.H., 2004: 52). Accordingly, the respective status of the workers and the intellectuals in the party cadres would be a major topic of discussion in the First Congress of TİP in 1964 and led to the resign or expelling of some of its members.

In the 1965 elections, the party would win 3 per cent of the total votes (making almost 270,000) and gain 15 seats in the parliament: This would be considered as a true success, as the criterion was not of course gaining the majority, but entering into the parliament with an explicit socialist perspective (Lipovsky, 1992: 18-19). However, the votes showed that the success was not due to the acceptance of the socialist program by the workers, but rather by the “middle-class progressives”. Thus, in Samim’s words, “the argument that the workers represented the base for an enduring socialist strategy seemed gravely weakened, while at the same time leftish radicalism surged.” (Samim, 1981: 69) Nonetheless, the party program maintained the emphases on voicing the demands of the working class.

The Turkish left of the 1960s was also witnessing another ideological group, organized around the weekly periodical *Yön*, which had a contrary

vision to that of TİP.³³ Whereas TİP was attempting to create a consciousness among the workers and claiming to be the representative of this mass in the parliament, the *Yön* movement was after an “anti-feudal, *étatist*, yet Third Worldist” project. The movement was considering that the Turkish working class was not ready to gain a progressive consciousness; therefore it would be by the cooperation of the state and the private sectors that a national democracy and an independent, socialist-oriented economy (i.e. a “national front”) would be founded (Samim, 1981: 68; Lipovsky, 1992: 85).

Eventually, the adherents of the *Yön* movement were also found within TİP, whose critique of the workers-oriented party would cause them to be expelled from the party membership in the Second Congress of TİP in 1966. Furthermore, the student members of TİP would also begin to leave TİP as the party seemed pacifist and parliamentarist to them, which was by then regarded as rather unacceptable: In the historical worldwide context of the second half of the 1960s, the leftist-revolutionary thought appeared to rub shoulders with direct activism and even armed struggle (Şimşek G.H., 2004: 55). The project of founding a *national front*, on the other side, had actually experienced some shifts after the closing of the periodical *Yön* in 1967 because of the decrease in its circulation and two new periodicals was competing to take its place, *Ant* and Mihri Belli’s *Türk Solu*. Concerning its overt stress on the independent student militancy, the

³³ The circulation of *Yön* reached 30,000 copies in a short time. Samim mentions of this figure as “phenomenal (...) for a leftist paper in Turkey at that time.” (1981: 68)

latter weekly would be more influential among the revolutionary youth. Samim summarizes the perspective of Mihri Belli/*Türk Solu* as “[s]tudents would agitate, officers would strike, and a national junta would take power” (1981: 79). Named as the *Milli Demokratik Devrim* (MDD),³⁴ this project would be fulfilled on an anti-American/anti-imperialist and an anti-feudalist basis. For the Western powers and the feudal forces were maintained to predominately obstruct to form an autonomous social and economic development in Turkey (Lipovsky, 1992: 110). These changes in the late 1960s would cause TİP to lose votes in the 1969 elections and the gathering of the students of the MDD ideology in Dev-Genç³⁵, “a hybrid formation which was part student movement, part revolutionary association.” (Samim, 1981: 71). The Dev-Genç formation would experience numerous splits, which would give rise to a scattered scene in the Turkish left by the start of the 1970s.

In regards to the “‘militaristic’ virtues”, which Samim indicates to be overwhelmingly dominant in the struggle of the Turkish left, the late 1960s represents the crux of the youth’s motivation for partaking and encouraging the armed clash (1981: 62). The governance of these virtues was effective on the left’s equalizing the highly approved War of Independence ruled by Atatürk to the socialist struggle to gain power. This is in line with what is conceived by Samim as “the most pernicious legacy of Kemalism”:

³⁴ “National Democratic Revolution”

³⁵ “Revolutionary Youth”

[T]he most pernicious legacy of Kemalism for the left has been its combination of radical-progressive policies imposed *from above* on the masses. It has created a Jacobin tradition in which the militant struggle for state power, or what is seen as such, continues separate from and even against the wishes and concerns of workers and peasants (1981: 64; original emphasis).

The TIP experience was the unique attempt to challenge this legacy. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, it failed and the Turkish youth had seen this. On the other parts of the world, the socialist tradition of struggle was being enriched by the examples of the Chinese revolution and the guerilla warfare eminently seen in the example of Latin America. These would echo in the Turkish left, too: The Dev-Genç formation would experience the splitting of the Maoist group, which would be named by the periodical they initiated, the *Proleter Devrimci Aydınlik* (PDA); and also by the fall of Dev-Genç would born some Guevarist urban-guerilla groups. In that historical context, all the adherents of the MDD thought (either in or out of Dev-Genç) was convinced that the armed force would be crucial in abolishing the existing regime in Turkey. The actors with this force was conceived to be different, though: For instance Mihri Belli was encouraging the arming of the working class alone, while the PDA circle depended on the “left-inclined section of the military and civilian intellegentsia.” (Lipovsky, 1992: 121)³⁶

In 16 June 1970, by the organization of *Devrimci İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu* (DİSK)³⁷, over 100,000 workers (which was 5 times the

³⁶ See also (Laçiner, 1998: 12-13) for a brief review of the related debates within the MDD discourse.

³⁷ “Confederation of Revolutionary Workers Trade Union”

expected number) demonstrated in İstanbul against the legislation which threatened to limit trade-union organization. The message of the demonstration is contended by Samim to be “mistaken” by the adherents of MDD, as if the unexpected massive support did not signify that a renewal in the proletarian politics was required, but it was the rightest time to take the way to the mountains, that is to embark on the guerilla struggle (1981: 71). At this point Laçiner’s note on the armed activism and struggle is imperative, that within such a context, the armed fight could not be seen as a “requirement” of the strategy of a socialist struggle. Rather it was taken to bear a “functional” value of manifesting and “confirming” the existence of the very movement (1998: 15). The extremist and outrageous groups, *Türk Halk Kurtuluş Ordusu* (THKO)³⁸ and *Türk Halk Kurtuluş Partisi-Cephesi* (THKP-C)³⁹, which were two of the numerous factions that had splitted from Dev-Genç, would strike in the aftermath of the June the 16th demonstration (Samim, 1981: 72; Lipowsky, 1992: 119).

The existence of these illegal organizations would be one of the major reasons of the military coup of 12 March 1971. The coup was organized by the superiors of the left-inclined military officers and it pursued a counter-guerilla campaign with their American equipment: This did not comply with the MDD thesis, whose adherents would be “horribly tortured by their military *allies*.” (Samim, 1981: 72; original emphasis) The coup would

³⁸ “Turkish People’s Liberation Army”, led by Deniz Gezmiş.

³⁹ “Turkish People’s Liberation Party and Front”, led by Mahir Çayan, Münir Aktolga and Ertuğrul Kürkçü. See (Laçiner, 1998) for the roots and initiation of this organization.

not only put an end to the MDD dream, but also hold back all the left-inclined politics, agitations and activities.

After the amnesty in 1974, the four leading activists of the socialist movement sought to form their own parties which would actually “institutionalize” the split in the left ⁴⁰ (Lipowsky, 1992: 130). The amnesty also gave rise to “wild variety of groups and sects, much more diverse and complex than in the sixties.” Their situation is aptly put as “a frantic *strategy hunting*” by Ahmet Samim (1981: 73; original emphasis):

Militants became fed up with historical analysis, and had no tradition of proven political theory to draw upon. (...) In particular, there was no Marxist analysis of Turkish life or politics which approached the country from the point of view of the masses. (...) The historical class experience of Turkish workers and peasants had become highly varied. But socialists were determined to change it, before they really knew what it was (Samim 1981, 74).

Samim views the ideological currents of these groups of militants in three categories. The first category comprises what he calls “the independent left”, which include the non-Maoists idolizing Mahir Çayan, the assassinated leader of THKP-C, and the ones splitted off from them with a critique of Çayan. The former were greater in number and would begin to call their grouping as *Devrimci Yol*.⁴¹ The latter group criticizing Çayan and Çayanist dogmatism, on the other hand, organized around the periodical

⁴⁰ The four socialist parties were Mihri Belli’s *Türkiye Emekçi Partisi* (“Turkish Laborers’ Party”), Behice Boran’s *Türkiye İşçi Partisi* (the second TİP), Ahmet Kaçmaz’s *Türkiye Sosyalist İşçi Partisi* (“Turkish Socialist Workers Party”) and Mehmet Ali Aybar’s *Sosyalist Parti*, which would later be renamed as *Sosyalist Devrim Partisi* (“Socialist [Revolutionary] Party”). See (Lipovsky, 1992: 125-130) for a review of these parties. Some of his translations for the names of the parties do not suit the ones here, though.

⁴¹ “Revolutionary Way”

Kurtuluş. Samim remarks the paradox that while the Devrimci Yol group gradually evolved into a less dogmatic circle open to contemporary Marxist thought, the *Kurtuluş* circle would lose its critical attitude inherent at the beginning (1981: 76).

The second leftist current in the 1970s was Maoism, which Samim addresses to be the predominant thought in the atmosphere after the amnesty (1981: 76). The most important group in the pro-Chinese and Maoist line was that publishing the aforementioned periodical PDA. Samim argues that this group was expert in “Maoist argumentation and ritualistic self-criticism”, but was supposed (by other Maoist groups) to be weak in *militancy* and would be challenged in suchwise (1981: 77). Some of the extremists who challenged PDA were the ones forming the organization TİKKO/TKP-ML⁴² and the others organized by the name *Halkın Kurtuluşu*.⁴³ The former organization would find support among some peasants and in some Kurdish regions. The latter group, on the other hand, would later abandon being Maoist and follow the Hoxa of Albania (Samim, 1981: 78).

The last of the leftist currents of the 1970s is given as “the *Sovietics*.” The pro-Soviet tendency in the Turkish left proliferated mostly in three political parties, and for Samim, its growth in the second half of the

⁴² *Türkiye İşçi ve Köylü Kurtuluş Ordusu / Türkiye (Marksist-Leninist) Komünist Partisi* (“The Turkish Workers and Liberation Army / The Marxist-Leninist Communist Party).

⁴³ “Peoples Liberation”

decade was an outcome of the response of the Turkish left to the rightist orientation in the latest Chinese foreign policy (Samim, 1981: 78). Behice Boran's TİP was one of these parties, which had the same inclination in Mehmet Ali Aybar's leadership, too (i.e. in 1960s). Ahmet Kaçmaz's Türkiye Sosyalist İşçi Partisi was another, which had been founded on the heritage of Dr. Hikmet Kıvılcımlı. Shortly referred as "The Doctor", Kıvılcımlı was acclaimed for his authentic analyses, advocating a "Turkish synthesis of Leninism." (Samim, 1981: 78) The third pro-Soviet party was an illegal, partly hidden, yet a legendary one: *Türkiye Komünist Partisi* (TKP).⁴⁴ Starting by the 1970s, TKP would be in a considerable populist effort, with its periodical *Atılım*, with radio broadcasting and many side-organizations.⁴⁵ Members of TKP would successfully "capture" posts inside DİSK, the aforementioned confederation, in 1975. Yet, TKP's eliminatory policies within DİSK would end up with the expulsion of many socialists from the unions. It would result in weakening of the confederation and the Turkish left, according to Samim, would then become "even more isolated from decisive sectors of the working class." (1981: 79-80)

As an overall critique of the socialist activism in the 1960-1980 period, the concluding remarks in Samim's article can be referred. Samim criticizes Turkish socialism firstly for its lack of comprehensive insight in the

⁴⁴ "Turkish Communist Party". Since the early years of the newly founded Turkish Republic, TKP was compelled to do politics secretly.

⁴⁵ The foundation of the women's organization *İlerici Kadınlar Derneği* would be due to this effort of TKP. See the following sub-section.

Marxist thought: The different accounts of Marxism in the Turkish socialist left had all been superficial, and the socialist groups paid no heed to training before going into action. For Samim, this had furthered Marxism becoming “a doctrine to be learnt by heart” among the numerous socialist sects, as far as it was not treated as “a method of thought” but rather as a “closed ideology, even a faith” in order to base the orientation towards pure activism (1981: 81).

Samim underlines that in the 60s, both the program of TİP and the MDD thesis were aiming at founding a strategy that pertain to the structure of the country. On the other hand, Samim regards that the strategies in the 70s resembled a cookery book, “in which both the structure of the country and the masses were no more than mere ingredients.” For *power* per se became an obsession and thus, the socialists could not grasp that they were driven away from the reality (1981: 82).

Militancy is seen to be one of the outcomes of the interest in gaining power. Furthermore, Samim argues that the “fetishization” of power had reflections on the socialist periodicals, too: These publications worked as “propaganda organs” primarily aiming at the prevention of the loss of supporters. Samim’s observation is that in such way, groups gathered around certain “theories” which functioned as emblems; plus, this had pushed them into defensive positions: “defensive against the bourgeoisie

as well as towards *other* [socialist] groups.” (1981: 82-83; original emphasis)⁴⁶

Samim’s remarks for the situation of the socialists in the 1970s are not *explanatory* but *conclusive*. Nonetheless they are enlightening for an understanding of both the Turkish socialist ideological heritage which was carried to the 1980s and its repercussions in the socialist periodicals of the following decade, which comprises the research material analyzed in the subsequent chapter.

2.3.2.2. Women’s Socialist Activism and the “İlerici Kadınlar Derneği” Experience

In the 1970s, especially the period after the proclamation of the amnesty in 1974, women were as activist as the men in the various socialist organizations. Their motivation is viewed by Akal Aslan as follows:

The women, many of whom witnessed May the 27th [1961] and March the 12th [1970] [the military interventions], and who were not on the side of the dominating classes but pro the good of the proletariat and the laborers, found themselves amid the meetings, strikes; labor unions, professional and democratic mass organizations; communist/socialist/revolutionist parties and movements in the second half of the 1970s. Nobody had forced them to be so; they chose socialism for a livable world with their own free will. (2001: 471-472)

⁴⁶ Samim indicates that addressing the “archetype of traitor” inside a group, whose existence was supposed to be a hindrance to the projected revolutionary movement, played a chief role in reproducing the defensive position of the socialist groups (1981: 83). This is an essential observation as regards the analysis in the next chapter, as the same archetype would be used in the later periodicals of the 1980s and 1990s against the feminists. See Section 3.2.2.2, p.118.

The socialist circles in which the women joined were mainly legal parties and organizations.⁴⁷ As indicated in the previous sub-section, the illegal *Türkiye Komünist Partisi* (TKP),⁴⁸ would attempt for an upheaval of embracing the masses in the mid-1970s. Saadet Özkal mentions that for the attempted popularity among the Turkish public, the party encouraged some of its woman members to establish a women's organization.⁴⁹ Özkal contends that a majority of the male members of TKP was actually unaware of the woman question and that their sole vision was to organize within a seemingly autonomous woman's organization as a party (2005: 23). On top of the initiation by TKP, the proclamation of the year 1975 as "World's Women's Year" by the United Nations and the related considerations that led to CEDAW⁵⁰, implying the impressive concern about the woman question all over the world, were another factor in the institution of a women's organization on March the 8th, 1975⁵¹ (i.e. on the World's [Proletarian] Women's Day⁵²) (Özkal, 2005: 22). Thus would *İlerici Kadınlar Derneği* (İKD)⁵³ be founded.

⁴⁷ On the other hand, it is known that there were women in the illegal militant circles, as well.

⁴⁸ "Turkish Communist Party"

⁴⁹ Özkal was one of those women.

⁵⁰ "The Convention On The Elimination of All Kinds of Discrimination Against Women", The UN convention that Turkey, too, would ratify in 1985.

⁵¹ The official date of foundation of İKD is given as June 3, 1975 (Akal, 2003: 105).

⁵² The name of the day (whether it should include the notion "proletarian" or not) is an unanimous matter of debate between the feminists and the socialists. For the historical background of the debate, see Section 3.2.1 below.

⁵³ "The Progressive Women's Organizaton"

The autonomy of İKD (from the initiator party, TKP) has been a highly debated matter. On this point, Özkal stresses that “Although had been initiated by TKP, İKD was not a work [of the party] but the women.” (2005: 23) This is highlighted by Akal, with the arguments that in İKD, there were women who had not been members of any political party and the openness of the organization to the women in a time when TKP had not started to register the masses (and so, the women) to the party. Furthermore, Akal contends, although the ideological line and the slogans of TKP was internalized by İKD, the organization never directly made the propaganda of the party. Akal says that this was because there was also a concern not to distress the women –who were at the first stages of gaining a consciousness- with an overt propaganda of the illegal party, TKP (2003: 112-114).

İKD was not the only women’s organization established in such a historical context when *masses* were becoming socialists. There were other ones as well, usually involving a revolutionist emphasis in their names (as İKD had), such as *Devrimci Kadınlar Birliği*, *Devrimci Kadınlar Derneği*, *Emekçi Kadınlar Derneği* or *Karadeniz Kadınlar Derneği*.⁵⁴ Akal Aslan sees this as a result of the inspiration the achievements of İKD in reaching to masses gave to other leftist sects; who had once blamed the organization for being acquiescent, revisionist, opportunist, accomplice of the

⁵⁴ “The Revolutionist Women’s Union”, “The Revolutionist Women’s Organizaton”, “The Laborer Women’s Organization” and “The Karadeniz Women’s Organization”, respectively.

bourgeoisie and also *feminist* (2001: 471-472). İKD was really so successful that it had 1,500 members after its establishment in 1975; which would increase to 12,000 two years later. In 4 years time, the organization founded 33 branch and 35 representative offices spread around the country. Moreover, its publication named *Kadınların Sesi*⁵⁵ was enjoying a circulation of 35,000 (Akal Aslan, 2001: 461, 478).

Perhaps a more significant fact about İKD was its structure enabling the self-governance of the women. It is said that it was ultimately the women who were making decisions, organizing and taking part in all of the activities (meetings, campaigns, seminars, classes, workshops, etc.), writing, publishing and distributing *Kadınların Sesi* and so forth (Akal Aslan, 2001: 473). It is due to these that Akal Aslan advocates the autonomy of the organization in reply to the feminists, who she mentions to be regarding the organization as an extension of some socialist parties or under the charge and control of men. For her, if İKD had not been a *real women's organization*, then the other so-called *socialist/revolutionist women's organizations* would not have labeled it as *feminist* (2001: 456-457, 461).

However, criticizing the attitude of TKP towards its women members who also held a membership in İKD, Akal Aslan feels sorry for these women who were not promoted to higher status within the party mechanism. She says that “with İKD, there somewhat established both a women’s *party*

⁵⁵ “Voice of Women”

and a men's party (TKP)" in the Turkish political scene (2001: 477; emphasis added). Akal Aslan addresses that a majority of the women members of İKD later joined to TKP (without ceasing their membership to the organization), but they were not allowed to advance along the hierarchy of the party (i.e. TKP). She draws the following distinction between İKD and TKP in their treatment of their women members:

Whereas the İKD Central Executive Committee entitled the enthusiastic and competent women to all the positions and qualifications and these women (...) would be active within the whole country, TKP was reluctant [to do so for its women members]. The women were represented in the higher posts of the party with very few numbers and their rejection from those cadres should be seen as an overt discrimination (2001: 478).

Given the belief that İKD was a free and autonomous organization, Akal Aslan's cited statement is rather contradictory with her previous emphases. If İKD was really a women's organization *on its own*, which Akal Aslan equates to be a *political party*, then why bothering for the case of women in TKP? Why would someone feel sorry for the women who could not rise in the party, but still had the opportunity to do so in an equivalent medium? With the limited number of studies on İKD, such a question seems to render Akal Aslan's argument on women's autonomy in the organization doubtful. Arguably, the İKD women usually felt an inexplicit fixation to TKP and an urge to prove their legitimacy to the male members of the party. In that context, perhaps they should not be regarded to have enjoyed *freedom from male hegemony* in all aspects.

On the other hand, as Öngen addresses, İKD played an important role by delving into the issue of gender inequality from a different viewpoint than

the official discourse (1996: 143). The İKD stance is put as *marxist feminism* both by Akal Aslan (2001: 478-479) and Özkal:

What was important for us was 'the women question' . . . 'Woman is the oppressed gender' was the stressed point here. . . . A second point was 'historical materialism' and by this, the oppression was seen to have a historicity. The emphasis was put as follows: 'There was no male hegemony in the pre-capitalist communal order . . . Women's unequal, secondary status has been a result of private property. The slave society, feudal society and capitalism are systems that augment this situation. Women's emancipation –İKD was using this term- can only made possible by the abolition of private property and for this, socialism is essential.' At this point, pronouncing 'Women's emancipation should be their work' was also important. In other words it was not put as 'Socialism will be achieved and liberate the women' but 'Women will liberate themselves by socialism.' (2005: 24-25)

The activities of the organization are given by Özkal as, initiating educational workshops for all the women in the country that were addressing the woman question (as understood within a Marxist framework) and the role of women in the societal struggles; the campaign for nurseries, in which the members obliged both the factories, the labour unions, and the women to take effective action for the establishment of sufficient number nurseries; demonstrations for peace and disarmament; and later, organizing discussions on the family, prostitution and the history of women's movement (2005: 27-29). Yet a gist of Marxist method or an over-emphasis of socialism is said to be inherent in all of İKD's activities. Reviewing them today, Özkal makes a self-criticism about the stress on motherhood for its social value and neglecting the presence of men. For instance, for the campaign for nurseries, Özkal says that they were pro the foundation of nurseries in every district and in every workplace, which she still holds to be approvable. Yet she says they did not campaign for the bearing of the children by their fathers (besides the

mothers) with a notion of mutual responsibilities of husbands and wives (2005: 27). Furthermore she also criticizes the İKD activities for promoting the demonstration of women against unemployment and inflation with saucepans in hands. According to her, these made İKD overlook the true concern of the woman question; besides, it reproduced the institution of housework and the sexual division of labour (2005: 28). On top of these, Özkal mentions that they (i.e. the İKD members) bore a patronizing intellectual stance and while talking of the woman question, self-reflection was ignored and they did not question their own status as woman (2005: 32).

As seen by these, İKD had an articulate Marxist feminist ideology that, issues arising from patriarchal relations were in some way subordinated under the Marxist conceptualization. In fact *patriarchy* was not pronounced, its separateness from economic-material structure was overseen and as criticized in Özkal's words, "We were saying 'Sexism is a superstructure' and analyze everything through this perspective, attributing such superiority or inferiority to the concepts." (2005: 33) Such a concern for class-based analysis was too much that the woman question per se was regarded insufficiently and "its role as an important component of the socialist struggle was ignored, too." (Öngen, 1996: 143) On the other hand, it should be remarked that, at that time (i.e. in the second half of the 1970s) there was a lack of feminist and socialist feminist literature in the country. Therefore, the women in İKD could be said to be

naturally unfamiliar with concepts like patriarchy or gender discrimination; which might be a reason of their commitment to a pure class-based analysis instead. It would be by the Turkish feminists of the 1980s that the feminist literature was to be conveyed to the country, which would be influential in the establishment of a feminist consciousness.

İKD was closed in April 1979 by the Commandership of Martial Law in İstanbul, with the unanimous verdict to put an end to all the political activity, in the days that gradually took Turkey to the military coup.

2.3.3. 1980s: The Rise of Turkish Feminism and The Encounters With The Radical Socialists

The seeds of the Turkish feminist women's movement were sown by 1981, just after the coup, when some intellectual women gathered for the project of translating the feminist classics by Kate Millett and Juliet Mitchell.⁵⁶ Şule Aytaç says, the rationale for the establishment of the translation group was founding a women's stance, in accordance with the feminist literature that had flourished in the west. For before that time, what was known as the women's stance was limited with being "a variation of socialist, rebellious and opposing perspective." The sought stance, on the other hand, should be more individual (2005: 43). Thus, these women were

⁵⁶ See (Aytaç, 2005: 42). Aytaç gives the name of the women in this group as follows: Şirin Tekeli, Stella Ovadia, Gülnur Savran, Yaprak Zihnioğlu, Gülseli İnal and Ferai Tınç.

familiar with the radical feminist motto “What is personal is political” at the outset, and like their sisters in the other parts of the world, were regretting all the external attempts to define their status and hinder their individual autonomy. This could also be taken as an implicit critique of two legacies, which did not allow them to speak for themselves but for a *higher* project. The first of these legacies was the Kemalist Republican, reformist and statist ideology, for which the higher project was conceptualized as the achievement of modernization. As was elaborated in Section 2.3.1, this ideology disseminated a misconception among the society that the rights of the Turkish women had been granted to them. Nonetheless, the severe changes undertaken for the women’s appearance in the public sphere had neither challenged women’s oppression nor were more than quick modifications in the social outlook. The reforms even reinforced the women’s secondary status by leaving the private sphere untouched and with the particular emphasis on motherhood. The individuality of the women was suppressed for the sake of national solidarity and maintenance.

The second legacy, on the other hand, was the Marxist ideology where the higher project was this time the proletarian emancipation under socialism. In this legacy, women were not conceived as distinguished individuals from men, as long as the analytical category of *class* did matter. Some of the pioneering figures of the Turkish feminist movement had a background of socialist activism of the 1970s. When the feminists initiated

the first *consciousness raising groups* (CRGs) ⁵⁷ in their own houses in İstanbul and Ankara, the ex-socialist activist women questioned whether becoming a feminist would mean a disloyalty to the socialist struggle (Aytaç, 2005: 46). However, it should not be taken as so, because the plane feminism was making its analysis on was different in the sense that it was directed towards personal (not collective) politics. This is explained by one of the participants of the CRGs of those times as follows:

One of the most important feature that distinguished us [the feminists] from the other women's movements was that we had no concern about conveying our experiences to the women other than us. At the outset we were asking 'Wait a minute – who are *we* and what does happen to *me*?' Thus [our movement] was not elite at all. And this is what 'consciousness raising' actually is: 'What does happen to *me*? To *us*?' Because we are aware of the theoretical support, too, saying that in all levels of the society there are a lot of different types of oppression, exploitation, subordination; and if you do not delve into, question and analyze the ones in your *own* life, so to say if you do not form your *own* word, then you have nothing to say to the others, either. In this respect we were different from the [socialist] left.⁵⁸

In short time, the CRGs of the feminists evolved into more popular meetings and the discussion groups got more crowded. Because of the martial law, though, organizing meetings were still illegal. Ovadia notes that the population of participants was limited by the limits of houses, which was 25 women (1994: 55).

⁵⁷ The practice of gathering of the women for free discussions on personal matters, for the exploration of the self and the woman reality. This practice had become a crucial tool of progress for the second wave feminist movement.

⁵⁸ Ayşe Saktanber, personal interview. This interview was done much before the initiation of this thesis study (on May 27, 2003), but used here as it is seen relevant for the point of this sub-section. Other interviews of this sort were also used here, that is the one made with Yıldız Ecevit in two parts, on May 15 and 29, 2003; and the one with Nazik Işık on June 2, 2003. Saktanber and Ecevit are two professors of women's studies at METU and their affiliation with feminism is not preceded by engagement in socialist activism but was led by readings in the feminist literature. Işık, on the other hand, was a socialist activist in İKD before 1980 and she said that her feminist identity was stabilized during the course of feminist movement in Turkey, but it never made her exclude the socialist stance.

After a period of hardworking and discussions, in 1984, the feminist women founded a study group, as a company named *Kadın Çevresi* ("Women's Circle") in İstanbul. Its concerns were diverse (publishing materials, organizing panels and meetings and also "providing care, health and consultancy services for women." [Şimşek S., 2004: 125]) and its foundation thus manifests the deliberation of the feminist women to legalize their agenda in these preparation years.⁵⁹ It was also the first time that the women's movement was publicized in the dailies, with the title "Defenders of women's rights institute a company." (Ovadia, 2005: 62) Starting with this, the feminists were exposed to a growing interest by other intellectual circles. In 1984-1985, theoretical periodicals like *Yeni Gündem*, *Yapıt* and *11. Tez* reserved some pages or issues for the feminists to write on the woman question and the related topics. *11. Tez* was a periodical devoted to the debates on the Marxist theory and analysis, and its November 1985 issue was put as "Marxism and Feminism." (Ovadia, 1994: 56)

The year 1986 marked the date for the Turkish feminists to achieve a true publicity, by the petition they initiated to demand the realization of the UN convention *CEDAW*, which had been ratified by Turkey in 1985. The petition was signed by 7,000 women and acclaimed by many groups and people. 1986 was also the year in which a steady resurgence of the socialist activism had begun after the initiation of the gradual annulment of the

⁵⁹ See (Tekeli, 1986: 197).

martial law in 1985. Radical socialists could now publish their own periodicals. In those times, Kadın Çevresi had been functioning as a meeting place for women, who had previously been in different socialist organizations like TİKKO, Devrimci Yol, TKP and TİP, including the ones who had been tortured or imprisoned, and/or the ones whose husbands were still fugitives or in jail. In short, women who, in Koç's words, "had passed through different stories" could find each other (and of course the feminists with no socialist past) at Kadın Çevresi and meet at the common ground of *being woman* (2005: 102-104). Not only in İstanbul but also in Ankara and İzmir, the CRGs were still gathering, too. Yıldız Ecevit states that socialists were joining to these meetings firstly out of simple curiosity but later, a majority of them would decide to stay with the groups. However their staying did not necessarily mean that they were grasping the feminist principles. When *theories* of abortion or motherhood got involved with the discussions in the CRGs (by their introduction by the intellectual women familiar with feminist arguments), sometimes looking too much individual and abstract, these would make some socialists to cast doubt on the applicability of them, for mainly to the illiterate, rural women.⁶⁰ Handan Koç says that the critique of the socialists to the feminists in these contexts of discussions was far from being comprehensive and sound, and it usually involved plain accusations – contending, for instance, that feminism was the product of the bourgeois mind to disintegrate the proletarian struggle, or, that feminism was a

⁶⁰ Yıldız Ecevit, personal interview.

degraded movement as, in the name of individuality, it argued for boundless sexual intercourse.⁶¹

However, there were other socialists who would question their background in the socialist settings, particularly their activities in İKD. Saadet Özkal, the author of the self-critique of İKD referred in the previous sub-section, was one of these women, and so was Nazik Işık. Işık was one of the participants of the *Bağımsız ve Demokratik Kadın Tartışma Grubu* (BDKTG)⁶² founded in Ankara in 1987 by the former members of İKD, as a discussion platform of the socialist women who had not defined themselves as “feminist” yet, and for this, been criticized by the feminists. The women in BDKTG initially questioned their personal political stances after the emergence of feminism and also looked for possibilities of establishing women’s organizations. BDKTG, although was being criticized by the feminists, contributed to all the women’s activities in Ankara in the second half of the decade. Işık acknowledges it was by the discussions in BDKTG that she and many other women came to the conclusion that “the left was not far from a patriarchal approach, and

⁶¹ Handan Koç, personal interview. See also (Koç, 2005: 105). As mentioned in Section 2.2, blaming the feminists for being “bourgeois” (or “middle-class”) was a common behaviour among the radical socialists in the West, too. The analysis in the next chapter also involves examples for this sort of condemnation, taken from the Turkish radical socialist articles.

⁶² “Women’s Autonomous and Democratic Discussion Group”

those circles striving for democracy themselves were not sufficiently democratic whenever the issue was women, either.”⁶³

In May 1987, the feminist women marched against the battering of women, which was actually the first campaign in Turkey organized after the coup in 1980. In the same year, *Feminist*, the first periodical of the feminists had also been initiated.⁶⁴ The activist soul of the feminists could be said to reach to its peak and was stabilized in that year. Koç thinks, it is because of this that it became a *must* for every political movement and circle existing in the country to take up a position against the “explosion” of feminism (2005: 107). The numerous socialist periodicals would thus serve the main medium for the socialists to achieve this goal. However, because they were relying on a tradition for which, theoretical argumentation was pointed essentially towards the goal of propaganda for the maintenance of the solidarity of particular circles and was lacking in elaboration of the premises⁶⁵, they would fail again in furthering their critical stance against feminism. This would sustain to be so in the coming years, too, regardless of the changes in the agenda of Turkish feminism, its losing publicity and the changes in the general political context of the country.

⁶³ NazikIşık, personal interview.

⁶⁴ See (Koç, 2005) for a review of the *Feminist* experience.

⁶⁵ This was the observation of Samim mentioned in Section 2.3.2.1. See (Samim, 1981: 82-83).

In 1988, a second periodical published by the socialist feminists was born: *Sosyalist Feminist Kaktüs*.⁶⁶ Savran highlights that there was a great difference between the two periodicals of the feminists (i.e. between *Feminist* and *Kaktüs*), that for the latter one, the target group was deemed to be primarily the socialist women:

We [the feminist women] were much elitist and intellectual (...) In order to become a real political and social force, we should meet with women familiarized with politics, knowing what activism meant and got used to this [stance]. Therefore, with an explicitly deliberate manner, we were aiming at developing, improving and enriching ourselves with the leftist-socialist women (2005: 122).

Yet Savran adds that defining themselves with the term “socialist feminist” was criticized intensely both by the socialists and the feminists. For it was seen “very opportunist” for not getting rid of either of the socialist and the feminist stances (2005: 122).

In 1989, two important congresses were held. The first was held in February, after the call of feminists in Ankara and named as the *1. Feminist Haftasonu*.⁶⁷ The historical slogan “*Emeğimiz, bedenimiz ve kimliğimiz bizindir*”⁶⁸ was one of the outcomes of this great meeting and encapsulated the essence of feminism very well. On the 8th of March, 1989, feminist women marched together with the socialists. However, the slogans of the two groups were conflicting: Against the feminists’ slogan “*Kadınlar kurtuluşumuz için elele*”, socialists were voicing “*Kadın erkek elele*,

⁶⁶ “Socialist Feminist Cactus”

⁶⁷ “The First Feminists’ Weekend”

⁶⁸ “Our labour, our body and our identity is *ours*”

özgür günlere.”⁶⁹ (Ovadia, 1994: 57) The togetherness of the feminists and the socialists was to be tried once more, in the second congress of 1989, but it would prove to be unsuccessful again.

The Women’s Congress that was organized by *İnsan Hakları Derneği* (Human Rights Association) in İstanbul in 19-20 May 1989 can be said to represent the endpoint of the controversies between the socialist groups and the feminists. The call by the association to gather women of every political perspective and class was approved by the socialists and the feminists and this two groups both partook in the preparation of the congress. The acceptance of the slogan “Not tomorrow, but now!” for the congress by the socialists was taken as a source of hope by the feminists. For it was actually in line with the feminist argument challenging the Marxist dream to emancipate the women by socialism, that is in an indeterminate future. Another point that yielded discussions between the two sides was the question of the place of men in the congress: That is, whether to accept the men to enter the congress or not, or whether to allow them to speak or not. The discussion was resolved with the decision that men would be allowed to enter the congress, but they would have to sit at back seats and would not be allowed to interrupt the women’s participation to the congress (Pakeri 2005: 189-190).

⁶⁹ Respectively: “Women [be] together for our emancipation” and “Women and men [be] hand-in-hand, to the days of freedom.” The latter slogan was reverberating in the Turkish radical socialists’ articles, too. See the analysis in the next chapter.

Nonetheless, when the day of the congress came, feminists were faced with a deplorable picture: 2500 women attended to the congress, 70 papers were to be presented and 150 people would have to talk (Paker, 2005: 191). The congress was suffering of technical problems like the lack of time for presentations of papers and discussions and auditory difficulties. Furthermore, the socialists were anti-democratically dominating the congress (which led the feminists to label the congress as “The *Socialist Women’s Congress*” [Ovadia, 1994: 57]), people (mainly men) who were not supposed to talk were incessantly interrupting the presentations, the women were being harassed, the socialists were talking of their experiences of torture which was surely out of the context of the congress, and so forth. It all turned out to be a shocking experience that the radical feminist circle submitted the following message to the council of the congress to be read for all the parties:

We have come here for a women’s congress, but it seems we have actually come to a socialist congress. We were expecting that we would talk on women’s oppression and the problems we experience due to our being women; but it seems we have come to see the hostility against us, the feminists. We were thinking that we would join with women of different opinions; but it seems we have come to listen to the twattle that the men that oppress, exploit and violate will save us. Where shall we talk of ourselves if it is not the women’s congress? We call the women’s congress to talk about our being oppressed as women. (Ayşe and Handan, 1989: 5)

Yet the message was ignored. Lots of feminist women then left the congress while the the slogans of the feminists and the socialists were clashing. Women who had left the congress joined one week later under the name of *The Woman Platform*, and published a concluding paper for the congress. The first emphasis was on the need for an *autonomous* women’s

movement, “without ignoring the historical-social-national-class differences between women” organized in the contexts of demands specific to women. The second emphasis was on the following disappointment of the women with the Women’s Congress, as the woman question was not sufficiently articulated. It was said that future meetings should yield concrete solutions (Paker, 2005: 192).

As indicated by Şirin Tekeli’s words, the Women’s Congress was the bitter end of a decade of feminist struggle in the sense that from then on most of the feminists thought it would be a mistake to attempt for a dialogue with the left:

For whom was this congress organized? For what purpose was it made? What was the point in it? What were its results? I can not give any meaningful answer to these questions. With a sour mood and despair that is left and growing inside me, I think it was just a pity. (Tekeli, 1989: 68)

On the other hand, in her review of the congress, Paker says, by that meeting, she understood that the woman question could not be solved “by one or two activities in İstanbul” and the feminists were unaware of the “others.” (2005: 194)

After the congress, feminism would change its *style* of struggle: The next decade would be a period signified with *institutionalization*: Some instances of it being the establishment of the *Mor Çatı* shelters for the battered women, non-governmental organizations to support the entrepreneur women or the women candidates of the parliament, the Women’s Film Festival undertaken by the private company *Uçan Süpürge*,

the foundation of the Library for the Women's Works, academic research centers and masters programs on women's studies and on the top of these, the governmental directorate *Kadının Statüsü ve Sorunları Genel Müdürlüğü*.⁷⁰ All of these modified the domains of struggle for the Turkish feminist movement.

On the other hand, as can be observed from a survey of radical socialist articles on the issues of feminism and so forth, the socialists remained somewhat *indifferent* to such changes in the feminist movement. This can be interpreted again with the same reason of lack of theoretical argumentation inherent in the Turkish socialist view of the world. The analysis of the radical socialist articles in the next chapter is believed to present examples of this lack in various stances and contexts.

⁷⁰ "General Directorate of Women's Status and Problems"

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS OF THE TURKISH RADICAL SOCIALIST ARTICLES

It was just after the first appearance of the feminist women¹ that papers on the woman question and the related issues started to be published in some periodicals in Turkey. It appears that, in a period between 1984 and 1986, there had not been any periodical that was *evidently* affiliated with socialism (mostly because of the legal regulations after the military coup in 1980 and the martial law, which forbided such ideological-political publications). In other words, the socialist theory, practice and similar topics would not be discussed within a volume of any periodical until 1986; but only some historical reviews of socialist regimes and experiences could be made on some pages of particular publications ². It is seen that in such a period, periodicals which did not bear an overt engagement to socialism included some papers on feminism, women rights, *the 8th of March* (the World's [Proletarian] Women's Day) and specific issues related with the content of the woman question. Fatime Güneş's "The Sociology of Women" (1997) includes a review of these type of periodicals (as well as the overtly socialist periodicals published between 1986 and 1994) and stands as a resource with archival value. From Güneş's study it can be traced that *Yarın*, *Bilim ve Sanat* and *Düşün-Sanat* had been the outstanding periodicals

¹ As mentioned in the previous chapter, in Section 2.3.3, Turkish feminists gained publicity with the foundation of *Kadın Çevresi* in 1984 and the feminist activities initiated by 1986.

² Emir Ali Türkmen, personal interview.

of the first years of discussions on women issues. These were the periodicals belonging more to the philosophical, cultural, artistic fields than engaged politics. On the other hand, starting with 1986, there appeared directly political (i.e. socialist) periodicals, which would gradually reserve the whole space of every issue for the debates on the potentials and limits of a socialist order (or a socialist revolution), or actions, activities and policies required for a desired socialist future; and daily and either national or global politics viewed through a Marxist-socialist (Maoist, Leninist, Trotskyist, Kurdish nationalist-socialists, etc.) ideological framework. These periodicals were being circulated within a narrow group of people who were more likely to read, write and discuss for the sake of self-validation than having a political effect and assertiveness. However marginal they might thus be, these periodicals reflected and represented the manner and the temper of the people who voiced themselves as socialists. In the present study, the term *socialist periodicals* is used to signify the corpus of these publications. Regardless of the theoretical discrepancies between the general stances of every such periodical, authors publishing papers in these are therefore termed as *socialists*.

By the rise of Turkish feminism in the second half of 1980s, the woman question and the related struggle for women's emancipation/liberation interested the socialists mostly as issues to defy. Almost every socialist periodical was critical of the feminist upheaval, through a somewhat *homogeneous* perspective and by very similar arguments, rhetoric and words. Eventually, while these periodicals were published by a great

variety of socialist circles -which can be said to be in disagreement in almost any other subject matter ³- it was only when the discussions were on the issues of women, feminism, patriarchy and so forth that a great deal of the discrepancies diminished and there formed a fairly *narrow* body of socialist discourse against the Turkish women's movement. This discourse was not against feminism at all, though. It can be argued that in a rush to confront the feminist upheaval, the discourse was rather *eclectic* and *ambivalent*: While in appearance, the socialists were trying to holding tight on a Marxist theory which was taken to be unaffected by the challenges of feminism, in some instances, their discourse seems to verge on a socialist feminist approach inevitably. Arguably, this was because of the condition that in the attempt to posit the Marxist theory as the utter response to the woman question, the socialists could not endure indirectly including the rightful modifications to the theory that the socialist feminists made. Furthermore, the socialists were not prepared to develop an elaborate theoretical argumentation and with the legacy inherited from the 1970s, argumentation was being conceived rather as a tool of propaganda in their own circles.

In this chapter, 23 socialist periodicals published between 1987 and 1994 are examined in terms of their perception and articulation of the woman question and feminism. There was no specific intention in determining the start and the end of the period. The only actual motive for reflecting on the papers in the periodicals of this specific time was to make use of a personal

³ Emir Ali Türkmen and Handan Koç, personal interviews.

archive ⁴ comprised of copies of texts on the mentioned subject. Hence there was not any full issue of a periodical but single papers detached from them. This is supposed to entail no trouble of *context*, though – which is to say, ignorance of the rest of any issue of a periodical is believed to have no apparent effect on the treatment of the single texts written on feminism, the woman question, the women’s movement and so forth. For on these subjects, the socialist periodicals are found to have a perspective almost dissociated from their opinions in other topics. It therefore seems a rightful approach to be concerned with single texts isolated from the issues in which they were published.

In this respect, there are 105 texts of consideration.⁵ One method of reviewing the socialist texts could be to categorize them according to the *topics* they deal with while discussing feminism and the woman question. This is the track followed in the thesis work by Fatime Güneş, titled “The Sociology of Women: The Discourse in Radical Journals in Turkey” (1997), where she addresses the variances or similarities between the approaches of the socialist authors in the following categories: History of women’s oppression and private property; women and the production process; the family; class analysis; women’s two-way subordination in the capitalist system and in the household; patriarchy; feminism; organization; emancipation and socialism. Güneş thus reviews each article in her corpus

⁴ The archive of Yıldız Ecevit.

⁵ The Yıldız Ecevit archive included 100 texts from socialist periodicals. This corpus is supplemented with the 5 texts from the periodical *Yeni Öncü*, archived by Emir Ali Türkmen. The list of 105 texts of consideration can be found in the Appendix-1.

in terms of these concepts; so that the reader is allowed to view the socialist texts with similar thematic inclinations altogether.

In her study, Güneş's assertions include the socialists' lack of conceptualization of the woman question and strict dependence on the concept of *class* in understanding the women's issues brought forward by the feminists. She holds that for the socialists, the woman question is equal to the question of the *proletarian women*. In such a discourse, therefore, it is the production process in the capitalist order that makes up the fundamental form of the oppression of the (working) women, which is discussed via the concepts of *cheap labour power*, *reserve army of labour*, *unskilled labour* and *the sexual division of labour* (which are actually taken from the orthodox Marxist theoretical framework) (1997: 86-89). Fatime Güneş's work thus follows an inductive method, seeking for the outstanding aspects of particular groups of texts (which are classified according to thematic inclinations, arguably being their most dissimilar feature) and reaching to general conclusions about the research subject (i.e. the corpus of socialist texts) from these. Accordingly, a complete picture of that peculiar body of socialist papers is presented, which is valuable in its own right.

3.1. Method of the Present Study

Another method to yield descriptive and exploratory results may be to delve into the *main discourses* of these texts that appear in the articulation of

the socialist stance confronting with feminism. This method, which can be said to be one of the numerous styles of *discourse analysis* ⁶ and is the one followed in the present study, is undertaken with the following notion: Whatever the thematic inclination of a specific socialist paper on the woman question and the related topics may be, a *general view* of the socialist author is thought to be *dispersed* within the whole text. This *general view* is taken to have the most determining force on what is seen as the *text* –that is, the title, the style, the structure, the ideas and the references, concepts, idioms, metaphors and so forth found within- and is comprised of combinations of *discourses*.

For the quite ambivalent word/term *discourse*, Fairclough provides two separate but interrelated definitions: As an *abstract noun*, being the “language use conceived as social practice”; and as a *count noun*, being the “way of signifying experience from a particular perspective.” (1995: 135) For another author, they are “the sets of meanings which constitute objects” – the *objects* usually not having a corporeal existence but exist in the realm of that particular discourse itself. Therefore a “discourse constructs ‘representations’ of the world which have a reality almost as coercive as gravity, and, like gravity, we know of the objects through their effects.” (Parker, 1992: 8)

Discourses pertain to *social realities*: They are historically situated, disseminated through, received and used by social actors; moreover, as

⁶ Rosalind Gill writes that there are 57 varieties of discourse analysis (2000: 173).

indicated above, it is by the discourses that social conditions or phenomena (i.e. the *objects*) are given meaning – in other words “produced and made real.” (Phillips and Hardy, 2002: 3) Another thing to mention of discourses is their being realized and manifested through *texts* – which are not limited only with the written ones but embrace every form of act or product (i.e. the visual and the aural as well): Speech, non-verbal behaviour, the Braille, architecture or bus tickets are some of the instances that Parker addresses as *text* (1992: 7). Every text can be shown to embody some discourse and the vice versa: Wherever there is a discourse, there is a text. On the other hand, as Phillips and Hardy emphasize, texts need and bear other texts – and so, discourses need and bear other discourses- to be *meaningful* and constitute the social reality. Accordingly, an analysis of discourses (or, the practice of *discourse analysis*) is aimed at how texts and discourses are related within and with each other (2002: 4). Fairclough, mentioning the need to analyze “*both context and text*” by discourse analysis (1995: 211; original emphasis), highlights that the method should have a three-dimensional approach: One being the analysis of text per se (interpretation of the relevant text); the second as the “analysis of discourse practice (processes of text production, distribution and consumption)” and the final dimension constituting the analysis of the context (i.e. “analysis of discursive events as instances of sociocultural practice”) (1995: 2).

Discourses are said to have the “action orientation/practical consequences” of constructing the reality (Wetherell and Potter, 1988: 172). Yet, as what is constructed is as many as the discourses, the *world* (equally said, the social

reality) that discourse analysis seeks to describe is thus considered to be established of *conflicting and competing versions (interpretations) of reality* (Gill, 2000: 176). The endeavor of the method is then, “deliberately systematis[ing]” these different versions to achieve an understanding of how one discourse is given value over another (Parker, 1992: 5), how one “discourse is organized to make itself persuasive” to outdo the others it is in clash with (Gill, 2000: 176) and finally, “provid[ing] a description of the kind of world the texts assume” (Sunderland, 2000: 254).

After these notes on what discourse and discourse analysis are, the particular analysis done in the present study can be delineated. As mentioned previously in this section, the corpus of the socialist texts (i.e. the research subject) is analysed according to the discourses which “*emerge from the texts*” (Sunderland, 2000: 154; original emphasis). This comes to mean that the analysis here follows quite the opposite way to the one found in Fatime Güneş’s study (1997): It is not that, the discourses are *reached* by a review of the way the issues are taken up in the texts; but that they are ascertained right from the beginning – the *beginning* here referring not to a point previous to the reading process, of course, but to an intermediary stage after the end of the first full reading of the texts and before making statements about them (so that it means the beginning of the *analysis*).

After the thorough reading of the corpus, it is seen that the texts can be classified according to two broad groups; namely the discourses of/about *socialism* and *feminism* in the researched socialist texts. It should be stressed

that in the research material these two discourses, having a *conflicting* nature which is elaborated in the analysis, are articulated by *one* general political/ideological stance: that is, regardless of its versions, socialism. In other words this study does *not* attempt to establish the differences and similarities between the discourses of *two groups* of people, the socialists and the feminists, or between the two discourses, socialism and feminism; but how *the socialists* take up, conceptualize, present and represent the two theories and the related practices *in their texts*. Hence, although socialism and feminism do signify two discourses on their own (partly coinciding, partly contradicting, partly clashing and partly distinct) it is not *them* that are analysed: The query by the discourse analysis followed here is, which thoughts about the socialist discourse *itself* and the feminist discourse does the *whole socialist discourse* give rise to; or, which *discursive stances* (which can taken to mean sub-discourses) does the socialist discourse bear in order to question and stiffen itself against feminism. The study is therefore believed to serve as a complementary work to Güneş's "The Sociology of Women" as well (1997): taking its cue from her induced conclusion on the discourses in the Turkish radical socialist literature, reflecting back on the texts that comprise a different corpus than she makes use of. However, in both of the studies, there is surely a similar aim of describing/exploring the *world* that the Turkish socialists shared against feminism in a specific period.

Thus, from here on, what is conceptualized as the *themes* of the texts refer to either *socialism* or *feminism* handled in them. Any part of a text (i.e.

several sentences, paragraphs or the whole text) that presents a concern of its author(s) with respect to either of these two is treated in the respective theme. Moreover, as implied previously, the positions of the authors with respect to the themes are classified again. These classifications make up the discursive stances, which are assumed as the subsets of *a complete, yet non-unitary socialist discourse*. Although the stances in a particular theme exclude each other, since they all owe to the socialist theory, they can not be regarded as varieties of separate discourses in themselves. Were all stances embody and present a different interpretation of social reality, they would be said to signify distinct discourses. Nonetheless it is not the case with the stances distinguished in this study. It is always the socialist political/ideological posture –which rub shoulders with what is called *the socialist discourse*- that determine how the authors of the texts analysed here make meaning of (equally said, give meaning to) the social reality.

3.2. The Analysis of Radical Socialist Articles

The following analysis is divided into two sections. In the first section, general features of the socialist texts of concern are reviewed. Given the name “Textual Practice”, the first section is reserved for the characteristics of these texts; so to say, things that are typically found in radical socialist articles on the question of woman, feminism and the related topics. The subsequent section, on the other hand, comprises the essential body of the whole study, where a *thematic discourse analysis* is undertaken. In this section, the socialist discourse is analyzed through the two themes,

socialism and feminism, and the discursive stances they embrace in embodying an intricate socialist discourse on the woman question and the related concepts and phenomena.

3.2.1. The Textual Practice in the Socialist Texts

Ranging between 1987 and 1994, the 105 texts that are analysed for the present study make up a total of 411 pages. There are several 1-page-long texts and this constitute the minimum length for the papers of concern. The longest paper, on the other hand, is of 13 pages (*9e*).⁷

Texts on the woman question or the related topics are seen to be usually published in a separate section within the issues of the socialist periodicals, and these sections are nearly always named by “Kadın” (The Woman). A notable exception to this is found in the Kurdish nationalist-socialist periodical *Deng*, with the section named as “Kadınlarımız” (Our Women). It is remarkable that even the first examples of socialist texts on women (those published in 1987) are presented in a separate section – which arguably implies the importance given to the subject matter in the periodical. In other words the woman question seems be handled by the socialists with the intention to debate continuously in every published issue. Another account for devoting a separate section may be that for the

⁷ In order to differentiate the references of the study from the analyzed texts, the latter group is referred to by specific codes. Inside the text, the codes are shown in brackets, written in bold and italic. For the texts that these codes specify, the reader should refer to Appendix-1.

socialists, the woman question and the related debates are not integrated to their general line of thought. As implied at the beginning of this chapter, in the radical socialist periodicals, arguments around feminism are used as a tool of propaganda rather than the prerequisite of furthering the theory. Thus, it may be the case that separate sections on feminism and the woman question in these periodicals signify the distinctness of the *functions* of writing on the woman question and the related phenomena from writing on other subjects.

A lot of the texts have one author, but there is also a serial written by two authors (23e; 83e).⁸ However there are texts without signature, as well – in which the author then becomes the whole circle publishing the relevant periodical. There is also an unsigned three-part-text serial (84e-b; 85e; 86e). All of the authors write only in one periodical, which signifies and complies with the fact that they *belong* to a circle and the circles are segregated.⁹ Furthermore most of the authors have one text in the corpus.¹⁰ However, Nuray Bayındır is a noteworthy exception: There are 10 texts by Bayındır in the corpus, apparently published regularly between 1989 and 1992, in the periodical *Toplumsal Kurtuluş*.¹¹

⁸ The serial “1990’lara girerken ülkemiz kadın hareketi ve görevler” is a three-part review of the women’s movement in Turkey (written by Emel Aslan and Hülya Gülbahar). Unfortunately only the first and the last parts are found in the researched corpus.

⁹ Some authors, on the other hand, are known to use monikers (Emir Ali Türkmen, personal interview). Whether more than one seemingly different authors are actually the very same person is of course unpredictable, though.

¹⁰ There was no intention in this, as the corpus had not been a “selection” but comprised of and limited by personal archives.

¹¹ See (62e; 63e; 65e; 66e; 67e-a; 67e-b; 68e-a; 68e-b; 70e)

Sometimes the text seems to be produced as a *pamphlet*, with the use of a dominant lyrical-epical voice. It is more to create an enchantment among the readers than to articulate a specific idea. In these texts, usually the sentences get a much simpler structure, too. The following citation is perhaps the most outstanding example of *text as pamphlet*; by the use of short sentence-paragraphs, indented and listed exclamations and idioms:

This order is terrified of women's revolt. It holds women back from working, doing politics and being emancipated.

This capitalist order sees woman only as a capital. It makes her servant, it makes her slave.

This capitalist order imprisons woman in the household, makes her dependent on the father and husband.

This order is the enemy of the emancipation of women. It is the ally of [the ones] selling her, [the ones] that put her on the market.

Capitalism that sees woman as an ornament presents her in shop windows. (96e-a, 52)

Without wonder, there are some unsigned pamphlet-like texts, too: so that they really turn into pamphlets, both textually and contextually (except their being published within a periodical); being circulated among a determinate group of people.

In some of the texts, the titles are tempting with their being slogan-like:

Women's liberation lie in men and women's solidarity in the struggle (27e)

The 8th of March is the proletarian women's call for struggle against paid slavery (36e)

The woman's precondition for emancipation: Being socialist (63e)

Proletarian women [go] to the front in political struggle! (96e-b)

The libertarian women create the revolutionary climate for the equality of sexes (94e)

To every meaningful day fanning the flames of revolution! Hail to the 8th of March!
(108e-a)

Celebrating the 8th of March is to unify it with life (108e-c)

Women's emancipation is not separate from the liberation of the proletarian class
(9e, 73e)¹²

These titles can also be regarded to suggest an inclination to a pamphlet-like text writing. A generalizing inference from this behavior can be the socialists' relying to an *activist background*; that the texts functioning as another media of *propaganda*, rather than being practices to conduct a deliberation on specific issues. This inference, at this point, although seems to overstate a feature of the socialist texts, becomes more clear and meaningful in the following section: As examples of lack of conceptualization and argumentation in the texts are viewed, clearer evidences of the textual practice of propaganda are found.

Lastly in this section, the socialist treatment of the 8th of March, the *World's (Proletarian) Women's Day*, should be mentioned. The issue of the 8th of March is commonly seen in many socialist texts; the reason being that it represents an issue of *ownership* for the socialists. The socialists lay claim on this particular day of celebration because of its historical/ideological connotations: the importance of the 8th of March originating from the American proletarian women's strike and is due to its later being *owned* both by the socialists and the women not belonging to the working class. A

¹² Two distinct texts with the same title.

typical text on this issue is published in the March issue of the relevant periodical and starts with few sentences on the history of the day: That in March 8, 1857, the working women at the textile factories in New York, USA strikes for better opportunities at the workplace; that, many of the proletarian women gets killed during the strike and so in 1910, Clara Zetkin suggests to the 1st Internationalist Congress that the day should by then be annually celebrated as the “World’s Proletarian Women’s Day.” On the other hand, after more than half a century passes and while the modern (second wave) feminism is reverberating around the globe, in 1975 the United Nations entitles and accepts to celebrate the specific day as the “World’s Women’s Day”. Thus for the socialists, the 8th of March means a *front* in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and capitalism; which while once particularly celebrated by the socialists, then became a date that the alleged opponents of the socialists (which include the feminists, as well) lay claimed upon, too. According to the socialists, this is an *attack* on the proletarian essence of the day (therefore also to the proletariat per se), which should be replied back.

After giving the historical perspective in such line, the main part of the socialist text starts, where both feminism and the imperialist bourgeoisie (as represented by the United Nations [UN]) are attacked. As mentioned in Section 2.2 in the review of the clash between the feminists and the socialists in Britain, matching feminism with the bourgeoisie is very common among the socialists and examples of this is frequently found

when the issue is the 8th of March. In the following citation for instance, there is a shift of emphasis from UN to the notion of clash between the sexes:

There is this difference of essence between the 'World's Proletarian Women's Day' accepted in the 1st International in 1910 and the 'World's Women's Day' accepted by UN in 1975. (...) [The latter] means to put the women question not in accordance with the class struggle but the clash between the female sex and the male sex. (48e, 26)

The mentioned clash between the sexes that is supposed to be indicated by the lack of "Proletarian" in the World's Women's Day is known to be used against feminism. In other words, in the socialist literature, it is not the UN but feminism that is blamed for supporting a clash between the sexes (which is seen more clearly in the forthcoming section). Therefore the quick shift of referred actors in the above citation (mentioning UN directly and feminism indirectly) suggests how the socialists equalize the feminists with the bourgeoisie.

A rather different path is followed in (82e): The celebration of the 8th of March comes after mentioning the revolutionary struggles in Argentina, Chile, Nicaragua, Cuba, Vietnam and in El Salvador. Since there are said to be women among the relevant revolutionary groups in these countries, the date serves as a pretext to write about the whole struggle. It is not the situation of women in those countries that the text focuses on (as the date might compel the authors to do so), but the revolutionary practice that could as well be mentioned outside of the 8th of March context. Then comes an acknowledgement about the women at struggle – who by then

become a *sexless* militant-activist in the text, having nothing special to mention of other than their being socialists. On the other hand, when the case in Turkey is considered, there is given a *list* of women for and with whom the 8th of March is celebrated. The list starts with the “women who fought side by side with *their man* against imperialism in the War of Liberty and carried armor and the injured on the cattles” (emphasis added), includes “our mothers and sisters who resist for their kids in front of the prisons and who formed an organized power out of this resistance” and the women doing fasting strikes.¹³ Yet the “women (...) pioneering in the resistance against the demolition of *gecekondus*” are referred, too, who for a socialist (but *not* for a feminist) should be taken as irrelevant of the proletarian struggle. The list continues and the attempt to be inclusive of every woman who somehow has an affiliation with a struggle is apparent. The celebration of the World’s Proletarian Women’s Day ends with the sentence “We were happy and elated; *the men and women, we were one single fist* [against oppression].” (emphasis added) – which aptly shows the socialist conception of the 8th of March: As long as there is a struggle against oppression, men and women should not be separated (as the feminists want to do so). Mentioning of the women of *gecekondus*, on the other hand, somewhat blurs the concept of “oppression” for the socialists (82e, 44).

¹³ This argumentation is comparable to the polarity drawn between the “bad ‘bourgeois feminists’” and “good working-class women” by the socialists, addressed by Rowbotham in criticizing the socialist conception (1979:64). See Section 2.2, pp.33-34.

The lack of differentiated conceptualizations of women and men in the socialist discourse (which is coherent with the theory and intended¹⁴) is aptly given in Seza Mis's paper:

[March the 8th] is not only the day of women's unity, solidarity and resistance. It is also the day of everyone, be it woman or man, who fight against suppression; who supports the humanly life, labor and honour. It is only by this perspective that the 8th of March can be properly recalled, unified with life, used as a lever to reach to the classless society. (108e-a, 4)

Such conceptualization of the 8th of March becomes void of meaning when it is put as the day of *everyone*. Yet the apparent point is that the socialists embrace this vehemently – which perhaps can not be stated more aptly than in the following:

If we do not claim ownership of this day [8th of March], *the oppressors and their by-products* (feminists, socialist feminists, etc.) will undertake it, and by emptying its content they will abuse it for their own purposes (as they actually do today). They will debase the revolutionary character of it and reduce women's rights to bourgeois reformist demands – as they do to the May Day. (108e-a, 4, emphasis added)

Thus, in the eyes of the socialists, the 8th of March is equivalent to the May Day, the celebration day for the working class people. It is because of this that they hold tight on the emphasis on the debated word “proletarian” that distinguishes “the day of” the socialists and that of the “bourgeois-feminists”. On the other hand, the notion of “woman” in the “women's day” seems to have no use for the socialists.¹⁵

¹⁴ It should be recalled from Section 2.2 that one socialist critique of the feminist movement was its supposed “divisive” attitude for the (proletarian) struggle of men and women.

¹⁵ Referring to her past experiences, Handan Koç states that the feminists were having great difficulty to convince the socialists that “Even if the initiation were because of the *proletarian* women, it is the strike being exercised by the *women* that deserves the attention.” (personal interview)

3.2.2 Thematic Analysis of The Socialist Discourse

In this section, the researched texts are analyzed in terms of their authors' conception of socialism and feminism. Through these two, the socialist discourse is displayed in its most visible form. In other words, socialism and feminism stand as the two most frequent themes that the socialist texts were engaged with. Although seeming too ordinary, such an inclination to these themes is still worth underlining and analysing: *Socialism* and *feminism* (both as concepts and two "competing" discourses [Gill, 2000: 176]) of course correspond to be the standard bases of any argument between the socialist and the feminist sides. Yet to yield fruitful results, these base concepts should be examined meticulously by each side of the debate: Their contents should be dissected; what they represent in various contexts, what they mean for different people, if there is a potential to adjoin their parts, whether there is any link or intimacy between them, how are they dissociated from each other... all of these should be questioned by the people adhered to each of them. So to say, a text written for the sake of strengthening one discourse over the other is expected to follow such line of inquiry.

In the socialist texts researched in this study, however, it is the case that there are several simple and stereotypical interpretations of socialism and feminism (which are grouped as the discursive stances). There is somewhat a *futility* in the discussions given in these texts: Their deductions are unauthentic with their limitedness in the fundamental concepts. On top of

that, the debates do not have much theoretical approach and usually, the contemplation on the two concepts (socialism and feminism) is confined with (first) impressions, misinterpretations and prejudices. For these socialist texts, the *faith* in socialism's truth, validity, coherence and inclusiveness represents the primary reference point in determining a posture.¹⁶ Owing to this faith, any force challenging this posture is perceived with a rejection that it is erroneous by any means. This is manifested in the socialist periodicals' approach to the feminists; where there is a strict denial based on the supposition that under the name of feminism, either an *deception* is exercised by the bourgeoisie or people demand some temporary liberal rights from the capitalist state.¹⁷ Accordingly, the texts and the socialist periodicals in which they were published are used as the media of condemnation, or tools of propaganda against feminism.

To sum up, the texts of concern have two main thematic facets, one being socialism and the other feminism; where the former serves to impose an outline that determines the limits and the fashion of examination of the latter. In the following sub-sections, these themes are articulated by examples taken from the texts.

¹⁶ See (Başar, 1990; Güneş 1997)

¹⁷ See (Berktaş, 1990: 318-319)

3.2.2.1 The Theme 'Socialism' in Three Discursive Stances

The discourses of the texts in the socialist periodicals with respect to the role that socialism is believed to play for women can be analyzed in three categories. The first category is formed of the discursive stance that signify an *absolute faith in socialism* and the second an indifference towards the consequences of socialism in the mentioned subject (i.e. the position of the socialist theory and practice with respect to the woman question). Eventually, there are few examples that belong to either of these two categories.

An anonymous text taken from the periodical *Emeğin Bayrağı* includes the unique example to illustrate the ultimate optimism about socialism in the woman question (i.e. the first category):

In the socialist order of the future where relations based on private property will not be dominant and all the human will live humanely, men and women will have equal rights. (38e, 46)

Recalling Engels's theory given in Section 2.1, this type of socialist stance arises from the view that, everything that can somehow be related with the woman question is due to the existence of *private property*. This said, it can be directly inferred that for such a view, there is no *real* woman question apart from the problems related with the proletarian class; and that a socialist order of future abolishing the private property and thus liberating the working class will therefore be the immediate solution to the women's oppression. There is no more detailing in the text, for how socialism will

accomplish such condition. This stance can also be taken to represent the *postponing attitude*¹⁸ – that is, the belief on an indeterminate socialist future, when and only with which the women will be emancipated naturally. It is the attitude of saying “Not yet, tomorrow!” that Zehra Başar mentions of while reviewing the 1st Women’s Congress held in 1989 – where, ironically, posters suggesting the opposite (“Not tomorrow, but now!”) were hung, filling Başar with hope at the beginning of the meeting.¹⁹ The Congress would then turn out to invalidate what the posters suggested (59e, 18). The postponing attitude in short, represented the basic point of clash between the feminists and the socialists.

On the other hand, the second category (the second socialist discursive stance) is in line with the core feminist stance that it regards patriarchy independent from private property (therefore, also from class identity, capitalism, socialism and so forth). Obviously this standpoint corresponds to an unusual case for a text belonging to a socialist periodical with no explicit feminist nature at all (There is even no usage of the concept “patriarchy” in the following text. “System” and “maleness” are used instead.). Although there are some texts by socialist feminist authors in the

¹⁸ The term *postponing attitude* is the translation of “ertelemeci tavır” used both by the feminists (to criticize the socialists), and by some socialists in defending themselves or while making differentiations between the discursive stances. The term should be seen as synonymous with Segal’s term “stageism” or Rowbotham’s “politics of deferment.” For a critique of this attitude by these two authors, see (Segal, 1979: 166; Rowbotham, 1979: 140) and Section 2.2.

¹⁹ See Section 2.3.3, p.77.

corpus,²⁰ even they do not seem to write *as feminist as* the author of the following text:

[T]his system [the male dominant system] (...) has endured with a surprising universality. On the other hand in the socialist countries, where the class system could be brought to an end, [the male dominant system] could not be abolished contrary to all the anticipations. (...) Contrary to the fact that one [of the men] is bourgeois and the other is socialist, they are not dissimilar on the basis of *maleness*. (7e, 46, emphasis added)

Thus it can be said that the few examples belonging to either of the first or the second aforementioned discursive categories stand at the limits of the discursive boundaries of the corpus (when the theme of concern is socialism).

The rest of the texts in the socialist periodicals, actually comprising the majority, stands at somewhat the *mid-point* between the two perspectives shown above. This third discursive stance consists of the approach where there *is a faith* in the socialist order, but it does not suffice the authors of the text for the solution of the woman question. This view can be shown aptly in the following quotation, where the author defends the socialists against the charges about the postponing attitude actually dominant among their side:

[N]o socialist identifies women's exact emancipation with only the abolition of private property. Such an identification suggests that no problem will exist when socialism will be reached, and no socialist is in support of that argument. Surely the woman question will be different [under socialism] than that in the capitalist order. Yet it will more or less continue, too. As a matter of fact, socialism is an order of transition. (...) The full equality between the two sexes can only be achieved when the state fades out and when the differences between mental and physical labor and the urban and the rural disappears. (108e-c, 19)

²⁰ Those who wrote in the Trotskyist periodicals *Sınıf Bilinci* or *Yeni Yol* had been engaged with a deliberate socialist feminist ideology (Handan Koç, personal interview).

Thus seemingly critical of the postponing attitude, the authors writing through the third discursive stance maintain that socialism will not be enough for the full emancipation of the women. There are also some authors who hold that, if the woman question is suggested to be not solved by today (as the socialists agree), this is partly because of the social and economical structure not allowing to do so. On the other hand, as the socialist Nuray Sancar states, "ignoring the slightest problem of women that can be solved by today does not conform with socialism." - therefore, according to these authors, the critics of socialism miss these facts and blame the socialists for their alleged postponing attitude unrightfully (90e, 36). In (56e) too, a parallel argument supported by the past practices of socialism can be found. The author mentions that in the countries where the practice of socialism was attempted, the problem of survival outdo every other problem. The economical reforms to shape the society gave the false impression that the woman question had been already handled and this enhanced the false belief on socialism. According to the author, though, the socialist system could only form the necessary medium to solve the woman question. Supposing it be a direct solution, on the other hand, is due to not contemplating the vehemence of the woman question well (56e, 20).

The socialist authors writing parallel to these arguments (and through the third discursive stance) frequently refer to the desired future where a much more humane order will be achieved and some positive progression in the woman question will be enjoyed. Nonetheless, there is a lot of

indeterminacy about how this future will look like and what steps should be taken from this day on to enhance the overall status of the women. The typical emphasis is on the total emancipation of the proletarian class, where the women will have a natural share. However, most of the selected texts seem to show some prudence about the foreseen limits of socialism. For instance, a text published in *Emeğin Bayrağı* in 1988 can be said to represent both the vague predictive thought about women's emancipation in the socialist order (which is the common solution seen in most of the socialist periodicals, i.e. emancipation due to the abolition of private property) and also the constraints that hold socialism back from satisfying every required condition.²¹ The author of this text holds *religion* particularly responsible in the slavery of women: "It will be one of the greatest obstacles before women to render the effect of religion on the society weak in the socialist order, as well." (46e, 24-25)

However, one can also see that some texts appear to have a socialist feminist tone, without much clue to imply the author's consciousness about their own political stance, though.²² Again the stances are not much elaborated.

It is equally wrong to conceptualize the oppression of women by either socialism or patriarchal relations. (...) Women's emancipation can not be understood *solely by*

²¹ It should be remarked that the unique example used in the first discursive stance (i.e. the stance where there is an absolute faith in socialism in the case of the woman question) is also taken from the same periodical, *Emeğin Bayrağı*. This is important in understanding that the discursive stances usually apply only to the texts (authors), but not to specific periodicals. So to say, it would be misleading to suppose that the discursive stances are determined by the periodicals.

²² It rather implies the eclectic and ambivalent character of the radical socialist authors, as addressed at the beginning of the chapter.

class conflict. (...) The main project should be to analyse how capitalism and patriarchy are interrelated and augment each other. (14e, 23-24, emphasis added)

Neither linking everything to the socialist revolution nor supporting the autonomous organization of the women are true. (18e, p.13)

The implied interrelatedness of patriarchy and capitalism in the first quotation is surely in line with the socialist feminist theory. The second citation, on the other hand, seems to seek for a mid-point between the theoretical stances of the socialists and the feminists who has no engagement to any political organization – the mid-point may be thought to be intersecting with the socialist feminist stance, too.

Among the corpus of researched texts, *Deng* has a special importance as it is a publication of the Kurdish nationalist-socialists. What makes it different than the other periodicals is that, there is *the national problem* that determines the whole perspective of the journal. The peculiar status of the Kurds in Turkey is the primary axis of every analysis made in *Deng*. Contrary to the other journals, *Deng* firstly calls for not a socialist but a *national revolution* that would alter the supposed *colonized* condition of the alleged *country* of the Kurds (i.e. Kurdistan). The establishment of socialism is suggested to be the next step to contemplate on.

Deng has also a specific section for issues related with the status of women, called “Our Women”. Texts in this section appear to be the straightforward *extension* of the major perspective of the journal to the woman question, that the status of the Kurdish women is said to be firstly associated with the national problem (as all the other problems the Kurds encounter) and then to the class conflict. This standpoint is aptly given in the following

quotation, where the faith in the socialist order reminds of the first discursive stance mentioned at the beginning of the present section:

Unless she [the Kurdish woman] gets liberated *together with her nation* (original emphasis), she can not be free independently, either. . . . With the national-democratic revolution, the national suppression of the women will end. The end of class and gender-based oppression is dependent on the further struggle of women after this revolution. *Women's struggle is not independent from the struggle of the whole society for the transition to socialism* (emphasis added). Therefore, as the total emancipation of women will be achieved by socialism, the struggle should be proceeded. (102e-a, 45-47)

As for almost all the other journals, *Deng* does not seem to accept that the woman question has facets that are irreducible to other problems. It is remarkable that although *Deng* denies the woman question, the periodical is somewhat aware of its *content*. For instance the text titled "Being a Kurdish woman: The status of the Kurdish women in the social-economical structure" (102e)-b begins with statements about the falsity of a widely held opinion which suggests that the Kurdish women are not oppressed but greatly venerated in the whole society. It addresses how the women are actually exploited, by giving examples of violence at home, bride price, *berdel* (the Kurdish type of marriage in which the two grooms marry with the sisters of each other, independent of the consent of the brides), *beşik kertmesi* (engagement of couples planned by their parents while they are kids), honour, polygamy and informal work. Indicating a consciousness about women's distinctive subordination, the suggestion of the author for their emancipation is still gender-blind, though, and more importantly, draws an irrelevant connection with the national problem. There is also a critical stance against the postponing attitude, but it is not detailed and so,

what the Kurdish woman should do today so as not to postpone her emancipation to the projected national liberation is left vague.

The Kurdish woman, like her counterparts who will enable their emancipation through their autonomous organization, *will [should] firstly participate actively in the struggle for the liberation of her country Kurdistan from being colonized*. Next, a social revolution will be realized which will prepare the mandatory conditions of her own emancipation. This is not to say that she should postpone her liberation to the period of socialist transformation. Today the postponing attitude is invalid. (102e-b, 34)

For *Deng*, the exploitation of the women is realized in three domains (sometimes referred as “slavery with three fetters”²³), that is on *national*, *class* and *gender* bases. Nonetheless, for this periodical, the whole exploitation should be regarded as a one single, inseparable fact. Apparently however, the importance given to the national problem leads to confusing the types of exploitation; so to say the ruling subjects and the oppressed ones. Similar to the one quoted above, the usual discourse in *Deng* texts involves accepting the presence of patriarchy, but with an indeterminate cause of *traditionality*: “Since the Kurdish society is *traditional*, the patriarchal family structure reigns.” (102e-c, 17, emphasis added) The supposedly straightforward link between being *traditional* (probably standing as a synonym for *feudal* or *anti-modern*) and patriarchy is then left unanalyzed and accordingly, the vision drawn for Kurdish women’s movement has nothing other than an ambiguous reliance on – again- the national and class struggle(s). After implying the effect of *traditionality*, where it is given as the force responsible of the women’s oppression, the same article makes a leap to another ruling subject, the colonizers (of the Kurdish society). The discourse of *traditionality* is

²³ “Üç halkalı kölelik”

abandoned and the standard Deng discourse is back on the scene with a blurred transition in analysis:

The struggle against sexist oppression is not separate from the struggle against the colonizing and feudal order. (...) There is no difference between a man, woman and child for a colonizer oppressing, torturing and genociding the Kurdish people. Similarly, there should be no differentiation in the Kurdish struggle [against the colonizers], too. (102e-c, 17)

In another article, a *tautological* analysis is led by confusing two distinct categories of problems. In this article, social problems like lack of education opportunities, education in native language, cultural poverty and the hindrance of communication between the Kurdish and the Turkish society by the language difference are addressed – which are of course real for the *whole* Kurdish people. Yet the article deals with these as if they are the problems comprising the woman question. Then follows a redundant conclusion that certainly *proves* how the assumed “woman question” is connected to the other problems:

Note that the problems of Kurdish women are no different from the overall social problems [of the Kurds]; they are embraced by and mixed with the latter. Regardless of our approach to the problem, it is always the same essential question of national liberty and class struggle that we face. Thus there is no solitary emancipation [for each single problem], it is the all or none. (102e-h, 35)

Alternatively, though, some exceptions in argumentation are also found in the Deng texts. In these examples, while a belief in the significance of class struggle or national problem is still existent, the standard socialist view (i.e. the view not taking the woman question into account) and its rhetorical reflections are criticised as well:

How can an optimism about the unequals' [men and women] equivalence or about the unequals' capability to fight side by side emerge? (...) As long as we abstain from questioning men's and women's roles in a class society and seeing that these roles constitute the basis of the system, perhaps it is [still] possible to achieve the power, but it will be quite doubtful that what will be constituted is 'socialism'. Just

like the breakdown of a struggle which turns its back on the 'national problem'... (102e-i, 23)

(...) But it is a fact that the Kurdish women experience transformation in the political sense (...) This transformation resulted in the organizations' taking the issue of women's organization more seriously. *[Thus] the approach arguing that the women question and struggle is divisive for the class struggle, that there will be nothing left about the 'woman question' when socialism is established (...) and that it is unnecessary for women to have autonomous organizations has been discarded.*" (102e-g, 38, emphasis added)

Yet, for the second example indeed, the criticism seems to lose its substance when what precedes them is considered. The earlier parts of the same text are quite contradictory with the idea in this quotation; that even when the issue of 'honour' in the Kurdish society is reviewed, the specificity of the woman question is overseen and it is again the debates around the 'national problem' that determines how the issue is set:

In many regions [of Kurdistan], women are subjected to [gynecological] analyses [done by the "exploiters"] to check if their [smuggling] husbands come home or not. (...) The honour of the whole Kurdish society is abused against Kurdistan by the bourgeoisie and many [other] mechanisms that play the role of maintaining it [i.e. bourgeoisie]." (102e-g, 36)

Here, the issue of 'honour' is put as an exemplar of the violence that not the Kurdish women but the whole society experiences. The oppression that the Kurdish women face is not mentioned at all in the text, so that the argument for the transformation of the Kurdish women and the necessity of autonomous organizations put forward in the later part (in p.38, quoted above) is left unjustified and unconvincing.

3.2.2.2. The Theme 'Feminism' in Two Discursive Stances

The second theme of the socialist texts that is analysed in this section is the conception and treatment of feminism (as a theory and a practice) in the socialist periodicals. As has been done in the previous section for the theme "socialism", the analysis in this section begins with determining the discursive categories.

The two discursive categories that are used to classify the approaches in the socialist texts to feminism are the "pro-feminist stance" and "anti-feminist stance". Despite seeming rough, such a categorization is practically exclusive with regards the handling of feminism by the socialists – which comes to mean that when the issue is precisely feminism, no "mid-point" can be found in the stances denoted in these socialist texts: Feminism becomes the name of an ideology and a practice that is either approved or disapproved, where the latter stance (i.e. the disapproval, the second discursive category) is more common among the socialist periodicals.

***i* – The pro-feminist stance**

The socialist texts that display the first discursive stance have an unexceptional correspondence with the mid-point perspective examined in the previous section. That is to say, those authors who support feminism are typically also the ones having a faith in socialism, but think that the

socialist theory is limited in its solution for the woman question.²⁴ Furthermore there are two sub-categories within this position: Feminism is supported by either through a discourse pointing to a *feminist* or a *socialist commitment*. These do not comprise a strictly contradictory or clashing alternatives; however, there is a difference of references and addressees between the two. With remarks on the referred concepts and slogans, the following quotations can be read as examples of *feminist commitment*:

One other important thing to conceive and concur is that, a women's movement should be made up of women. (...) Can there be a women's movement formed together with men? (...) Yet in the March for Women's Solidarity on the 8th of March and in the Women's Congress [1989], some attitudes opposite to this [notion] were experienced. Some of the women deliberately voiced the slogan "Women and men together, to the days of freedom".²⁵ (...) The correct slogans should be like "No more oppression of women"²⁶ or "Stop discrimination"²⁷, etc. (18e, 13)

A track of slogans (or mottos) indeed depicts the engagements and the clash of ideologies more concisely than most sentences can do. The preferred and suggested slogans cited above refer to the singularity (irreducibility) of the woman question, in the same manner with the feminists who criticized the Women's Congress held in May 1989, for the dominance of the discourse of *reliance on men* (see 59e). Similarly, in the below quotation, the hidden reference to the motto "[Our] labor, body and identity belong to us" ²⁸ implies how the feminist ideology is adopted by

²⁴ See the sub-section 3.2.2.1.

²⁵ "Kadın-erkek elele özgür günlere"

²⁶ "Kadınlar üstündeki baskılara hayır"

²⁷ "Ayrımcılığa son"

²⁸ "Emeğimiz, bedenimiz ve kimliğimiz bizindir" - firstly used by the feminists in the *Feminist Weekend*, February 1989. See Section 2.3.3, p.76.

the people in the socialist side and make them speak through its emphases (like “discrimination on *body*” or “*women’s labor*”):

[The program required for liberation] is conceptualized in three main aspects: Ending discriminations on women’s *labor, body and social identity*. (23e, 52)

Political organization and its constituents are another matter of debate between the socialists and the feminists. The socialists, as they refuse the need for an autonomous women’s movement (independent of the class struggle, voicing problems emerging solely from being woman and having a separate program), have two stands. This is an issue of supposed comprehensiveness of the movement and for the socialists, their movement either should exclude the feminists or is *naturally* capable of taking them in (because of the class struggle being above the other problems, the woman question being another dimension of it). Treating the women’s movement distinct from any other faction, in contrast, is the stance of the feminists and therefore the emergence of such opinion indicates that the author of the below citation has an apparent leaning towards feminism:

The women’s movement should be free of all kinds of political structure or ideology embraced within and it should not bear any imprint of them. This does not mean having no ideology, because women’s movement has an ideology and its name is the *feminist ideology*. (...) Within the women’s movement, the only stipulation [to participate] should be to be active in carrying out not the program of one’s own political organization but that of the women’s movement and in making the movement much stronger. (31e, 15, original emphasis)

Actually *Yeni Açılım* (the periodical from which the above citation is made) bears a clear socialist feminist identity. Another author writing in the same periodical is also critical of the other socialists who do not credit the feminist theory, with a commitment akin to that of the feminists. If this

author's writing was limited with the text that includes the forthcoming quotation, it could be accepted that her commitment is for feminism only. However there is another text where she mentions of the feminists with "they", so to say the author there has a commitment to the socialist side (but is still pro feminism), which is cited in the forthcoming pages. This should be noted to be aware of the position of the periodical *Yeni Açılım*, and also to remark that the sub-categories of the discursive position *being pro feminism* (i.e. feminist commitment and socialist commitment) are *imposed* analytical tools based on single texts.

Would not a Marxist pronounce 'the emancipation of the humanity is tied to the emancipation of the oppressed sex'? For he or she is aiming at the liberation of human, would not he/she put the liberation of women as an essential target in his/her agenda? (...) In contrast, in Turkey, the woman question is victimized by subjectivity and the male hegemony. The Marxist tradition proceeds by treading on the women. To where? To which socialism, or to which democracy? (...) Since the male hegemony is *above and autonomous of classes*, the struggle of women against the male hegemony is also above and autonomous of classes. This is a movement of the women of any class or political identity, regretting the male hegemony in any way; initiated by their own will, with their own rules, for themselves and will proceed such wise.(...) *The independent women's movement has nothing to do with the Marxist struggle* except the contribution of the enthusiastic Marxist women. What is left to Marxists is to leave this movement independent, but on the other hand taking the question of woman into their agenda as a social issue." (33e, 27-28, emphasis added)

On the other hand, the discourse of *socialist commitment* in the texts approving feminism illustrates a self-criticism of the socialist circle. Authors of this type of texts represent an indulgence towards feminism and criticizes the other socialist-mannered people for their lack of understanding of the feminists. For instance, the following quotation dissects the typical words of reproach against feminism. Ironically, the perspective that is criticized in this text (published in the first issue of the periodical *Özgürlük Dünyası*) is apparent in the other papers published in

the later issues of the same periodical, too; which indicates an exceptionality for the paper of concern. This may taken to mean that the line of thought in this paper does not correspond with the identity of the periodical itself:

Lacking an attempt to see the fact that there are rightful elements in the discourses and activities of the feminist and independent women circles, *these groups* are blamed altogether. *They* are being displayed as if they are obsolete, confusing, divisive and devoted to sexual intercourse. [People who qualify feminism as such] do not bother to comprehend what (not) the whole left did for the woman question in the past. That is why they can not empathize with the reactions of the feminists. Furthermore –because of somewhat sentimental reasons, but essentially due to being affected by traditional patriarchal approaches and prejudices– they can not evaluate these [feminist] movements’ rightful demands, their being democratic and objective opposition to this order. The only thing that they see in feminism is: ‘It is an anti-revolutionary bourgeois ideology’ (Why? How? Which feminist trend? No satisfactory answers are given.) (89e, 34, emphasis added)

The underlined words in this quotation (“these groups” and “they”), referring to the feminists, obviously signify the aloofness of the author from the feminist circle. Therefore it can be held that the author does not feel a belonging to the side he/she ²⁹ approves of but to the socialist circle, maintaining a predominant critical perspective. Later in the same text, the author writes about a limitation in the feminist stance, which is found to be the only lenient Marxist/socialist critique of feminism that is free of prejudices and contempts. On the other hand, it involves a covert critique of the Marxist theory, too:

Feminism can attain a particular and limited effect and power of publicity only under the condition that the Marxists are programatically insufficient and practically inert in the woman question. (89e, 38)

²⁹ The signature “Yüksel Yüksel”, which sounds like a moniker, lacks an indication of the sex of the author.

Another self-critique of the socialists adduces a similar argument of deficiency in *improving* the Marxist theory towards the end of (theoretical) issues concerning women. It argues that it has been the feminists who have brought forward the necessary approach in the woman question and they deserve an appreciation:

The feminists (...) have done what the socialists should have done but did not do. They have done this of course in their own style. *We* [the socialists] can only respect this fact and the difference in *their* [the feminists] theoretical approaches and analyses. We have already lost a good deal of time to prove that our opinion was the most correct one. (101e-a, p.39, emphasis added)

What is being criticised within the socialist circle can sometimes be identified with a *dogmatism* in the viewpoint as well. Starting with a quite odd view on the relationship between the bourgeoisie and feminism, the author of the following two excerpts, while taking up the issues of autonomy and (women's) organizations, criticizes the "dogmatic left" for its faith in the class struggle:

Bourgeoisie has mainly regarded feminism as a pestilence. With no doubt, this is because feminism is in clash with the gains of the bourgeoisie. Moreover, the bourgeoisie has occasionally contested feminism as a *communist trend* and so, as an opponent.

But then why does the dogmatic left see feminism as a pestilence, too? Is it because there are deflections in feminism? The dogmatic left does not look for deflections in feminism; it treats feminism as a deflection as it is. The dogmatic left thinks that it can supposedly undermine feminism by identifying it as a bourgeois ideology. Moreover, by this fashion, it assumes that a 'marxist' ideological struggle is being done against feminism (...) The dogmatic left presumes that women's real liberation is possible without an autonomous women's movement [free of the socialist-marxist tradition] (...) [I]t appears that the dogmatic left is neither frank in the women's question nor can contemplate on the emancipation of women.(...) 'Women and men, side-by-side' is the motto of the dogmatic left [and it aims at] dragging women back to the male hegemony. (110e, p.132, emphasis added)

Anti-capitalism is the common denominator of socialist feminism and class struggle. (...) Yet this does neither validate nor necessitate a single-way relationship between feminism and class struggle or [forming] unified organizations (...) The approach

that sees feminism dependent on the class struggle is in no way rightful. Because in this way it is not possible for the women's movement to be an effective force, and it means wasting a motive fundamental for revolution and postponing the solution of the women's question. (110e, p.135)

ii – The anti-feminist stance

Seeing feminism as a *deflection* or a *deviation from the socialist path* is truly the characteristic of the socialist authors who are strictly against this theory and the movement. While developing a discursive stance hostile to feminism, reference to the bourgeoisie is a usual phenomenon among these authors and makes up the dominant rhetoric found in the socialist periodicals.

This discursive stance is also the one where an ethical concern on sexual dynamics appears, too. Such concern emerges from the misconception of the feminist struggle for the women's freedom in the private domain (or, as given in Section 2.2, from the misconception of the feminists' stress on personal and subjective politics). The struggle of course includes the sexual freedom, too; but although the feminist conception of *sexual freedom* does not convey any crude idea like "sexual extremeness" or "unlimited sexual intercourse", some socialist writers seem to perceive it so:

The ones claiming that 'women should do whatever men do' behind the outcries of 'feminism' or 'socialist feminism' and reducing the male-female relationship to the level of *sexual satisfaction* have been the examples of constituting the *extensions of the bourgeoisie*. As is proven by the instances experienced in our country with the motto 'women's freedom' meaning *boundless sexual freedom* or with the desire to 'free love' that is *unrelated with class consciousness*, what is signified is nothing but '*sexual extremeness*' or '*unlimited sexual intercourse*'. Yet the weird thing is that all of these have been defended by some circles *in the name of Marxism*." (28e, 58, emphasis added)

As can be inferred from the indication “in the name of Marxism” cited above, the socialist perception of the feminists relies on the unanimous notion *the enemy within*, generally having the following connotation: The *enemy* is so *mischievous* that it does not assault openly but stealthily, doing more harm by its gradual and covert attacks. Furthermore both the attacks and the damage can be hardly perceived, because they appear to be in accordance with what is taken as *legitimate* within the circle (be it a political group, an organization, an army, a nation and so forth). This rhetoric that calls for an awareness for the enemy within, is also employed in other contexts of political clashes and well-known with its effect on forming a solidarity among the supporters of a particular stance.

It can be said that taken in the present context of the Turkish socialists against feminism, the above approach is a continuation of what Samim (1981: 83) addresses as the “archetype of traitor” used among the socialist circles in the 1970s³⁰ and it relies on the historical fact that some of the Turkish feminists were once socialists (and then became feminist after the military coup), or preserved their socialist character still after adopting a feminist stance.³¹ The following citation (together with the one above) provides an example of the rhetoric *the enemy within*:

³⁰ See Section 2.3.2.1, p.62.

³¹ As mentioned previously, there are socialist feminist authors writing in the periodicals of concern (*Sınıf Bilinci* or *Yeniyol* are mentioned to be the willful representatives of such a stance), who belong to the latter group of people. On the other hand, Turkish feminists were not limited with people of socialist background; there were also ones who had been *autonomous* in respect to the engagement with socialism (the interrogated Handan Koç, for instance, being an example to this group) (Handan Koç, personal interview). This said, it should be noted that such a historical fact (of some feminists having a socialist

Today, *solutions of the bourgeois thought* like feminism or socialist feminism attempt to *deviate* women's path to liberation from the social liberation path of the proletariat. (. . .) Especially in the environment created after September the 12th [the military intervention in 1980] these movements have grown within the revolutionist circles as well, as a *component of eliminatory revisionism*." (46e, 24, emphasis added)

Another socialist approach that is against feminism contends that the feminists are in support of a pointless struggle, because feminism is in line with capitalism *by definition* and in such a togetherness, a little remain for feminism to challenge (as it theoretically has to stay and struggle within the present system – yet it is *this system itself* that gives rise to the woman question). The following citation is an example in this fashion; but it is particular in defending that the feminism supported in Turkey (contrary to its counterpart in the USA) experiences a lot more contradiction – the reason is put forward as, capitalism exercised in the country has a disturbing property to everyone (not only to the socialists) and the Turkish feminism is thus left without the company of the structure (i.e. capitalism) it rises from:

[Feminism] contends that women are abused in every [social-political] order and whether it is capitalism or socialism the result is the same at any rate. Ones that blatantly approve feminism in this fashion are the organizations and the movements of the imperialist metropolitans. For instance the American feminist movement is against socialism. The feminist movements in our country, on the other hand, can not dare to support this pure form of feminism. [Because our society is suffering under the attacks of the capitalists.] It is so clear that under these conditions, people can not get interested with either the pure or mixed form feminism. That is why our feminists are in need of defining themselves as 'Marxist feminist' or 'socialist feminist'. Since feminism is a bourgeois wave, it can not be together with Marxism or socialism. If it is put together in this way, then it becomes something [an oxymoron] like 'socialist capitalist'; which is a word of absent-mindedness. (73e, 14)

background) is arguably *overemphasized* by the socialists making use of the rhetoric *the enemy within*.

Within the rhetoric of the togetherness of feminism and capitalism, the emancipation of the women that feminism looks after is either regarded as a trivial task (as if it is no more than “women dressing just like the men, doing what the latter does” [48e, 25])³², or as a subservience to the capitalist bourgeoisie:

According to a feminist trend pro the [capitalist] order (...), liberty means the liberty to tyrannize or being tyrannized within the capitalist system. Actually, it is not that simple to gain any freedom in a society where sexism defines the whole process of identity formation (from the motives of consumption to sexuality); *without smashing down the whole system* in which the male hegemony functions. (101e-b, p.20, emphasis added)

The feminist struggle is sometimes taken as a –deceptive– call for clash between the two sexes as well:

Today feminism, which generally is [means] a *hostility towards men*, is also a hostility towards women. Because no woman can be happy by being hostile to the other half of the life. Hence we witness the depressions and miseries of the feminist women altogether. (108e-a, 10-11, emphasis added)

The feminist trends which have *amazonian* slogans like ‘It is time to women’s say’, ‘The future is women’s’, etc. that bear an excessive hostility towards men has no chance to create a modern amazon society. In addition, consider how much good can humanity find in a life where *woman is the oppressing and man is the oppressed sex*, (...) where the woman becomes the bourgeois and the man becomes the proletariat of the household. If it is held that a man whose woman [wife, lover, etc.] is unliberated is not free either, then the converse is also valid: Nor is a woman free whose man [husband, lover, etc.] is not liberated.” (108e-c, p.20, emphasis added)

[O]ur women know the redundancy of dealing with the differences between being a man and woman in the fight for freedom from being colonized [as a nation, i.e. Kurdistan] and enabling a liberated and democratic living. (102e-f, 32)

In the socialist periodicals, disputes with feminists writing in their own periodicals are rare occasions. An instance of this is seen in a paper

³² This is in accordance with the attitude of the socialists in Britain, who Segal addresses to see the feminists tasks as “soft issues” (1979: 189). See Section 2.2.

published in *Yeni Demokrasi*, which quotes the words of Handan Koç and Fatmagül Berktaş; two feminists who address the need for socialists proving a frank inclination to the woman question to banish the patriarchal thought and accepting the distinctiveness of the feminist movement:

Where in the world can the oppressed count on the one oppressing for the sake of the struggle? (...) [W]e believe that we need to unite with no one else but our counterparts of the same gender for our struggle. Else, there will always be someone making us forget who oppresses us. (Koç, cited in *108e-a*, 14) ³³

Handan Koç's words thereafter encounters the rhetoric against supposed separatism, which seems to deflect the argument from its point to a superficial quarrel: "Will we the women and men be enemies clashing all the time? (...) Yet how nice it is for men and women to live their lives jointly, equally and freely." (*108e-a*, 14)

In the eyes of the socialists, the main theoretical source of discontentment lies in the feminists' not giving enough importance to the problem of private property. Following this discontentment, some socialist-tempered authors write that "women's liberation lies at the struggle against private property" and so, this is not the issue of any woman *nor the proletarian-working woman*, but that of the *whole proletariat*: "Today, then, the liberation of the working women is not distinct from the proletarian emancipation but exactly the same with that." (*48e*, 25-26) This line of thought is not only against feminism but also excludes the presence of (the problems of) women other than the ones belonging to the proletariat. Alternatively,

³³ Handan Koç's paper was published in the feminist periodical *Feminist* and was also quoted fully in the socialist periodical *Yeni Öncü*. See (Koç, 1987)

authors that stick to the notion of private property but who hold a milder position against feminism seem to have a weak contemplation of the concept of *patriarchy*. These authors eventually leave this term out of their texts and prefer to use the word *male hegemony* instead and sometimes refer to *men's traditionality* or *bourgeois-feudal values*. For instance in the third paper of the series titled "The status of women in Turkey" published in *Özgürlük Dünyası*, one "indirect cause" of the emergence of feminism in the country is put to be the "bourgeois-feudal values and mores" of the men in the revolutionary groups; which hindered the progress of their women counterparts, made those with "good intentions" get "confused" and be feminist. (86e, 43) Another author even *minimizes* the meaning of male hegemony:

Feminism would be a rightful solution if the problem was nothing but male hegemony. It could be argued that, although feminism can not bring about the freedom of the class, if it achieves abolishing or retarding the male hegemony, why not accepting that it would then accomplish a positive result? The socialists who see feminism as a progressive movement base their arguments on such rationales and analyses. Yet this is deceptive. [Such arguments] ignore the source and thus the solution of the problem [i.e. the private property]. (...) [Feminism] merely holds *men's customs and being uncivilized* responsible of the problem [the woman question]. In this line of thought, the women strive for claiming themselves in the social life and regrettably there rises an enmity towards men." (108e-b, 25, emphasis added)

The corollary of the socialist theoretical stance (i.e. holding that the major problem is the existence of private property) then becomes blaming feminism for its assumed narrowness. Yıldız Tan, for instance, writes of feminism as a "supraclass perspective"³⁴, which can indeed be taken as true due to the feminist conception of patriarchy being above and distinct from the class structure. Yet the term "supraclass perspective" appears to

³⁴ "Sınıflarüstü bir anlayış"

have a somewhat different connotation for Tan that she then says feminism has a *partial* effect on the solution to the woman question and that feminism can not offer a “coherent social project as socialism, towards the aim of the ultimate emancipation of women.” Likewise, the socialist temper expectedly dictates its own terms and concepts for the understanding of particular issues, too; whose example can be found again in Tan’s paper: The author criticizes the feminist “Campaign Against Battering”³⁵ by equalizing the husband battering his wife with the mother battering her child. She then writes: “Therefore it would be genuine when the focus of such a campaign was not the man-woman relationship but that between the powerful and the oppressed.” (56e, p.19) It is of course natural for any side of the dispute to think and write in terms of the concepts his/her theoretical perspective determines and bring forward this concepts repeatedly. This means not disapproving, for instance, Yıldız Tan for her belief in socialism as a “coherent social project” or in the compatibility of the types of violence. Nonetheless what is noteworthy is the *attitude* of addressing the concepts themselves *granted*: When Tan denies the manifestation of patriarchy at home and generalize the violence in the battering of women, she writes as if hers can be the last word of the debate with the feminists and does not delineate the theory she relies on. Yet in a context where the feminists take specific issues and make activities in order to challenge the existing conceptions, there should be an urge to revise these issues and especially if one holds the contraposition, reviewing and elaborating his/her own concepts become the musts of the attempted

³⁵ The campaign which was initiated in October 1987. See Section 2.3.3.

conviction. In summary, the reaction of Yıldız Tan against the campaign can be viewed as an example of the general rigidity of the socialists against feminism, holding a tight commitment to the very conceptions which were by then challenged.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

In this study, the response of the Turkish socialists to the woman question, feminism and the Turkish women's movement are examined and classified through an analysis of their discourse manifested in their periodicals. The Turkish radical socialist periodicals of the 1980s were published by the successors of the socialist circles before the military coup in 1980. Starting with the year 1986, numerous radical socialist periodicals were published, and it can be supposed that there were roughly as many radical socialist circles as the number of periodicals. Hence, the fact that there have been so many socialist periodicals since that year may be taken to reflect the diversity in the approaches in the Turkish socialist left. However, as the research material of this study, however, does not involve the whole issues of the periodicals but particular articles taken from them, the differences between the general approaches of these socialist circles/periodicals might not be touched sufficiently here.

It is demonstrated by this study that when the issue is the woman question and feminism, there are not much differences among the Turkish radical socialists' approaches. All of these approaches can be taken to represent a certain *version* of the socialist discourse and be found similar

in this fashion. Nonetheless, it should not come to mean that the socialist discourse is *unitary*. In particular, the socialist discourse put against the feminist theory or stance (or, feminism *as a topic*) stands as a *total*, formed of several varying *socialist interpretations* of the issue. In this study, these *parts* of the whole of discourse are attempted to be marked by *discursive stances*. Furthermore, the discursive stances are put as *exclusive* categories in the socialist discourse against feminism and the feminists, and they are viewed on two planes: On “socialism” and “feminism” as the *themes* of the socialist articles, taking the woman question, feminism and the feminists as their issues. Therefore, in the analysis, each discursive stance is differentiated from another (that is, each category of discursive stance is exclusive of another) in order to follow a meaningful *descriptive* and *exploratory* analysis of the totality of the Turkish socialist discourse articulated against feminism (as both another discourse and stance, not necessarily excluded from socialism). Three discursive stances are described for the analysis of the socialist articles with the theme of “socialism”: On the issue of the woman question, the stance expressing an *absolute faith* on socialism, the other being *indifferent* to socialism and the last one situated at the middle of this two extremes. For the analysis of the articles with the theme of “feminism”, on the other hand, two discursive stances are described: The *pro-feminist* stance, and the *anti-feminist* stance. It is found that, even in two articles opposite to each other for instance in terms of their stances on the theme “feminism” per se (i.e. one being pro- and the other being anti-feminist), both of the stances are similar in their

association with a Marxist-socialist framework. In other words, they are put forward as parts of the same *discourse*, that is the discourse of socialism.

In this study, by the discourse analysis method, the general response of the socialists towards the feminists, the characteristics and patterns of their discourse, how the responses resembled to or differed from each other, and how the socialist articles served to maintain a socialist stand are examined. The review of the clash between the socialists and the feminists in the 1970s in Britain serves to draw a similarity between the Turkish socialists and their counterparts in the Western world. It is seen by this similarity that, matching feminists with the bourgeoisie, positing their concerns as contrary to those of the working class and seeing the feminists as divisive for the class struggle was an attitude not unique to the Turkish socialists. In the Western world, too, the encounter of the feminists and the socialists gave rise to a comparable rhetoric among the latter group. Likewise, the *postponing attitude* inherent in the socialist politics (i.e. deferring the women's emancipation to an indeterminate socialist future) was criticized by the feminists both in Turkey and the Western world.

It can thus be inferred from these that the clash between the socialists and the feminists has actually relied on the discord between the discourses, which has transcended the temporal and geographical distinctions of the

conditions that put the two sides in opposite positions. Conversely, the attempts of the socialist feminists to transform and further the Marxist analysis and the socialist politics (both for the sake of founding an emancipatory programme for the women and analyzing the integrity of capitalism and patriarchy) have been to manifest that the two stances (i.e. feminism and socialism) are not necessarily exclusive of and opposite to each other.

The research material of this study comprised articles in various issues of 23 Turkish radical socialist periodicals published between 1987 and 1994. It is found that within this period, there was not any significant variation in the discursive stances with time. This is to say that, articles published in for instance 1988 and 1992 do not differ in terms of the discursive stances they bear. Thus, they can be regarded side by side as the examples of the same discursive stance. On the other hand, it should be noted here that the articles of different times differ in terms of the *issues* (e.g. state's policies regarding the women, the feminists' activities, or the Kurdish national liberation movement) they elaborate. However, the variation in the issues regarded in the socialist articles is a point excluded from the analysis of the present study on purpose. For the focus has been on understanding the socialist discourse *itself*, underlying the perspective the socialist authors have in looking at this or that issue.

To sum up the points mentioned above, it can be said that the Turkish socialist articles of the period 1987-1994 written on the woman question and the feminist theory and practice do not differ much in terms of the periodicals and the time they are published in. Based on this, the major argument of this study can be stated as follows: The Turkish socialists, despite the diversity in the general interpretations of the Marxist-socialist tradition, emphatically resembled to each other in their lack of theoretical argumentation on the woman question and feminism. Their superficial, eclectic, reactionary and conservative accounts on these topics or the related matters persisted, as long as they had refused to grasp the feminists objectively. The Turkish radical socialists elaborated the true historical discord between the two theories, Marxism and feminism, not much for the sake of reflecting on the woman question. With a firm conviction that the socialist theory had already given all the answers for the woman question (its formulation and the solutions to surpass it), they repetitively misused and overemphasized the discord to *condemn* the (Turkish) feminists for looking from a false perspective. In this line, the radical socialists' debates on feminism and with the feminists had taken a specific function of maintaining their solidarity: The feminists were mostly regarded by the socialists as "the enemy" and they were usually equalized with the bourgeoisie directly attacking at the Marxist theory or the socialist viewpoint to defeat the class solidarity.

By this understanding, the Turkish radical socialists gained another means of *propaganda* to be directed at their own circles to be gathered again, with a vision to overcome their grave defeat after the coup in 1980. The legacy they have adopted from the socialist activism of the 1970s allowed a continuity in *brutality* to emerge: As in the 1970s, where the “socialist struggle” was not eventually intended to the proletarian emancipation but to a *physical power* in its brutal sense, in the 1980s, a *brutal rhetoric power* was sought after and established to hinder the challenges and interferences to the discourse. With the legacy of lack in theoretical argumentation, blaming the feminists in such a fierce manner seemed the easier way to maintain the socialist solidarity by the Turkish socialists. The “archetype of traitor” (or the rhetoric of the “enemy within”) and the aforementioned emphasis on the feminists’ being “divisive” served a special function at this point, to portray the feminists detrimental to the socialist struggle and block the ways of forming a dialogue with them. In this context, for example, The Women’s Congress held in 1989 became the peak in the tension between the Turkish feminists and the radical socialists and marked the definite end to the feminists’ hope of coming to terms with the socialists. Nonetheless, particularly for the case today, it can be said that the socialists seem more open to establish a fruitful dialogue with the feminists. Despite the disengagement of the feminists and the socialists in organizational terms, civil politics which has flourished within the last decade in Turkey is believed to allow more platforms to adjoin the two groups to be established. The socialists today seem more cognizant of the

requirement of being intimate with the feminists, and hopefully, this will build a better future for the socialist feminist politics.

This study attempted to describe and explore the approaches of the Turkish radical socialists against the feminists. With this, it was also an effort to serve as a reference for later studies on the situation of the Turkish radical socialism after 1980. There is, however, still a great need for both basic and advanced analyzes for the case of the Turkish socialist left. The experiences in Turkish socialism in the 1980s and 1990s, is believed to bear the core of its situation today. Hopefully, this study, not only with its content and emphases but also with the its deficiencies, will point at the need to look upon that social reality.

On the other side lies the shortage of studies on the Turkish feminism of the 1990s. Many aspects of the Turkish feminism in the 1980s (the history of the struggle, the motives, Turkish feminists' relations with other circles, the challenges to the state, etc.) seems as well delineated. Yet, what is known for the 1990s is limited with the concept and examples of the *institutionalization of the feminist movement*. Surely there are more aspects to look upon, like the development of the mass media in Turkey in the 1990s and its influences on feminism, what the state has (not) done for women in this decade, the progress in the civil organizational practice and the share of feminism/feminists in this. More studies in this line is also expected to emerge in the coming years.

REFERENCES

- Akal (Aslan), E. (2001) "Kadın ve siyaset, aykırı bir örnek: İKD", in *Yerli Bir Feminizme Doğru*, (ed) A. İlyasoğlu and N. Akgökçe, İstanbul: Sel.
- _____ (2003) *Kızıl feministler: Bir sözlü tarih çalışması*. İstanbul: Türkiye Sosyal Tarih araştırma Vakfı.
- Arat, Y. (2000) "From Emancipation To Liberation: The Changing Role of Women in Turkey's Public Realm", *Journal of International Affairs* 54 (1): 108-123.
- Arat, Z. F. (1994) "Kemalism and Turkish Women", *Women & Politics* 14 (4): 57-80.
- Ayşe (Düzkan) and Handan (Koç) (1989) "Kadınlar Vardır: Sıkıcı ama Bir Kurultay Değerlendirmesi Daha", *Feminist* (6): 5-6.
- Aytaç, Ş. (2005) "Türkiye'de Feminist Hareketin Oluşumu", in *Özgürlüğü Ararken: Kadın Hareketinde Mücadele Deneyimleri*, (ed) AMARGİ, İstanbul: AMARGİ.
- Başar, Z. (1990). "Sosyalistlerin Tartışmaları ve Varolanın Ötesindeki Sosyalizm", *Birikim* 11: 60-64.
- Başbuğu, A. (1991) "Türk Kadınının Toplumsal ve Yasal Statüsünün Dönüşmesi Sürecindeki Önemli Değişkenlerden Biri Olarak Kadın Örgütleri", *Marmara Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* VIII (1-2): 283-291.
- Belge, M. (1989) *Sosyalizm Türkiye ve Gelecek*, İstanbul: Birikim.
- BELGEnet. 12 Eylül Belgeleri – Sıkıyönetim Uygulaması. <http://www.belgenet.com/12eylul/12syonetim.html> ; accessed August 2005.

- Berktaş, F. (1990) "Türkiye Solu'nun Kadına Bakışı: Değişen Bir Şey Var Mı?", in *1980'ler Türkiye'sinde Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar*, (ed) Ş.Tekeli, İstanbul: İletişim.
- _____ (1994) "Türkiye'de Kadın Hareketi: Tarihsel Bir Deneyim", in *Kadın Hareketinin Kurumlaşması: Fırsatlar ve Riskler*, (ed) Kadın Eserleri Kütüphanesi ve Bilgi Merkezi Vakfı, İstanbul: Metis.
- Bryson, V. (1999) *Feminist Debates: Issues of Theory and Political Practice*, London: Macmillan.
- Çağatay, N., Soysal, Y.N. (1990) "Uluslaşma Süreci ve Feminizm Üzerine Karşılaştırmalı Düşünceler", in *1980'ler Türkiye'sinde Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar*, (ed) Ş.Tekeli, İstanbul: İletişim.
- Doltaş, D. (1992) "Batıdaki Feminist Kuramlar ve 1980 Sonrası Türk Feminizmi", in *Türkiye'de Kadın Olgusu: Kadın Gerçeğine Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, (ed) N. Arat, İstanbul: Say.
- Donovan, J. (2000) *Feminist Theory: The Intellectual Traditions*, New York: Continuum.
- Durakbaşı, A. (1997) "Kemalism as Identity Politics in Turkey", *Deconstructing Images of the 'Turkish Woman'*, (ed) Z.F. Arat, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Eisenstein, Z. (1979) "Developing a Theory of Capitalist Patriarchy and Socialist Feminism" in *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case For Socialist Feminism*, (ed) Z. Eisenstein, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Engels, F. (1992) *Ailenin Özel Mülkiyetin ve Devletin Kökeni*, Ankara: Sol-Onur.
- _____ (1993) "Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State" (excerpts), in *Feminist Frameworks: Alternative Theoretical Accounts of the*

- Relations Between Women and Men*, (ed) A.M. Jaggar, P.S. Rothenberg, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, London: Longman.
- Gill, R. (2000) "Discourse Analysis", in *Qualitative Research (With Text, Image and Sound): A Practical Handbook*, (ed) M.W. Bauer, G. Gashell, London: SAGE.
- Güneş, F. (1997) *The Sociology of Women: The Discourse in Radical Journals in Turkey*, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Sociology, Middle East Technical University.
- Hartmann, H. I. (1979) "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union", *Capital and Class* 8 (Summer): 1-33.
- İlerici Kadınlar Derneği (1996). ...*Ve Hep Birlikte Koştuk*.... İstanbul: Açı.
- İlkkaracan, P. (1997) "A Brief Overview of Women's Movement(s) in Turkey (and the Influence of Political Discourses)", *Women for women's rights reports no. 2*. Internet. Available from http://www.wwhr.org/images/womens_movements.pdf; accessed 17 April 2005.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1987) "Emancipated But Unliberated? Reflections on the Turkish Case", *Feminist Studies* 13 (2): 317-338.
- _____ (1990) "Ataerkil Örüntüler: Türk Toplumunda Trkek Egemenliğinin Çözümlemesine Yönelik Notlar", in *1980'ler Türkiye'sinde Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar*, (ed) Ş. Tekeli, İstanbul: İletişim.
- Koç, H. (1987) "Feminist Bir Bakış: R. Akkaya'ya Bir Yanıt", *Yeni Öncü* (8): 59.

- _____ (2005) "Feminist Dergisi Deneyimi", in *Özgürlüğü Ararken: Kadın Hareketinde Mücadele Deneyimleri*, (ed) AMARGİ, İstanbul: AMARGİ.
- Laçiner, Ö. (1998) "THKP-C: Bir Mecranın Başlangıcı", *Toplum ve Bilim* (78): 7-20.
- Lipovsky, I. P. (1992) *The Socialist Movement in Turkey 1960-1980*, Leiden: E.J.Brill.
- Ovadia, S. (1994) "Çok İmzalı ve Çok Öznel Bir Kronoloji Denemesi", *Birikim* (59): 55-57.
- _____ (2005) "Feminist Hareketin İlk Günleri (Örgütlenme Zorlukları, Özgün Örgütlenme Deneyimleri", in *Özgürlüğü Ararken: Kadın Hareketinde Mücadele Deneyimleri*, (ed) AMARGİ, İstanbul: AMARGİ.
- Öngen, T. (1996) "Türkiye'de Kadın Sorunu ve Kadın Hareketleri", *Marksizm ve Gelecek* (Summer): 136-150.
- Özkal, S. (2005) "İlerici Kadınlar Derneği", in *Özgürlüğü Ararken: Kadın Hareketinde Mücadele Deneyimleri*, (ed) AMARGİ, İstanbul: AMARGİ.
- Özman, A. (1998) "Mehmet Ali Aybar: Sosyalist solda 40'lardan 90'lara Bir Köprü", *Toplum ve Bilim* (78): 134-161.
- Özpalabıyıklar, S. (2001) "Tanzimattan Bugüne Türk Edebiyatında Takma Adlar, Mahlaslar, Rümuzlar Dizini", *Kitap-lık* (45): 248-253.
- Paker, B. (2005) "1989 Kadın Kurultayı", in *Özgürlüğü Ararken: Kadın Hareketinde Mücadele Deneyimleri*, (ed) AMARGİ, İstanbul: AMARGİ.
- Parker, I. (1992) *Discourse Dynamics: Critical Analysis for Social and Individual Psychology*, London: Routledge.
- Phillips, N., Hardy, C. (2002) *Discourse Analysis: Investigating Processes of Social Construction*, London: Sage.
- Reed, E. (1993) "Women: Caste, Class, or Oppressed Sex?" (excerpts), in *Feminist Frameworks: Alternative Theoretical Accounts of the Relations*

- Between Women and Men*, (ed) A.M. Jaggar, P.S. Rothenberg, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rowbotham, S. (1979) "The Women's Movement and Organizing for Socialism", in *Beyond The Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism*, London: Merlin Press.
- Rowbotham, S., Segal, L., Wainwright, H. (1979) *Beyond The Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism*, London: Merlin Press.
- Saktanber, A. (2001) "Kemalist Kadın Hakları Söylemi", in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, vol. 2, Kemalizm*, (ed) A. İnsel, İstanbul: İletişim.
- Samim, A. (1981) "The Tragedy of the Turkish left", *New Left Review* (126): 60-85.
- _____ (1987) "The Left", in *Turkey in Transition*, (ed) I.C. Schick, E.A. Tonak, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sargent, L. (1989) *The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: A Debate on Class and Patriarchy*. London: Pluto Press.
- Savran, G. (1988) "Marksizm ve Feminizm: Yöntem ve İdeoloji", in *Sosyalizm ve Siyasal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi. Vol. 5*, (ed) E. Kürkcü, İstanbul: İletişim.
- _____ (2005) "Kaktüs Dergisi Deneyimi", in *Özgürlüğü Ararken: Kadın Hareketinde Mücadele Deneyimleri*, (ed) AMARGİ, İstanbul: AMARGİ.
- Say, G. (1998) *Siyasal Değişimde Kadın Boyutu*. İstanbul: Kurtiş Matbaacılık.
- Segal, L. (1979) "A Local Experience", in *Beyond The Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism*, London: Merlin Press.
- Sirman, N. (1989) "Feminism in Turkey: A Short History", *New Perspectives on Turkey* 3 (1): 1-34.

- Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi* (1988) (ed) E. Kürkçü, İstanbul: İletişim.
- Sunderland, J. (2000) "Baby Entertainer, Bumbling Assistant and Line Manager: Discourses of Fatherhood in Parentcraft Texts", *Discourse & Society* 11 (2): 249-274.
- Şimşek, G. H. (2004) *The Conception of Development in the Turkish Left in the 1960s: The Case of TİP*, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Political Sciences and Public Administration, Middle East Technical University.
- Şimşek, S. (2004) "New Social Movements In Turkey Since 1980", *Turkish Studies* 5 (2): 111-139.
- Tekeli, Ş. (1981) "Women in Turkish Politics", in *Women in Turkish Society*, (ed) N. Abadan-Unat, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- _____ (1982) *Kadınlar ve Siyasal Toplumsal Hayat*, İstanbul: Birikim.
- _____ (1986) "Emergence of the Feminist Movement in Turkey", in *The New Women's Movement*, (ed) D. Dahlerup, London: SAGE.
- _____ (1989) "1. Kadın Kurultayı'nın Ardından", *Birikim* (2): 67-68.
- Toprak, B. (1990) "Emancipated But Unliberated Women in Turkey: The Impact of Islam", in *Women, Family and Social Change in Turkey*, (ed) F. Özbay, Bangkok: UNESCO.
- Vogel, L. (1990) "Marksizm Ve Feminizm: Mutsuz Evlilik, Deneme Ayrılığı Ya Da Başka Bir Şey", *Birikim* 11: 38-47.
- Wainwright, H. (1979) "Introduction", in *Beyond The Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism*, London: Merlin Press.
- Wetherell, M., Potter, J. (1988) "Discourse Analysis and the Identification of Interpretative Repertoires", in *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods*, (ed) C. Antaki, London: SAGE.

Yaraman-Başbuğu, A. (1992) "Metropolde Kadın Olmak: Yüzyıl Başında ve Sonunda İstanbul'da Kadınlık Durumu", Paper presented at the international colloquium "*Metropol: Yeni Hayat Tarzları, Yeni Sorunlar, Yeni Çözümler*" (The Metropol: New Life Styles, New Troubles, New Solutions), September 23-25, in Tarabya, İstanbul, Turkey.

Interviews

Ayşe Saktanber, May 27, 2003. Ankara.

Yıldız Ecevit, May 15 and 29, 2003. Ankara.

Nazik Işık, June 2, 2003. Ankara.

Emir Ali Türkmen, June 27, 2005. Ankara.

Handan Koç, November 10, 2005. İstanbul.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX - 1: LIST OF RESEARCHED ARTICLES

The corpus used in the study contains the following articles, listed according to the numerical codes they were given for ease in the analysis.

Code	Periodical	Year	Issue	Author	Title
1e	Teori	1992	eyl / 33	Gümüşoğlu Firdevs	Anaokulundan üniversiteye ders kitap
3e	Teori	1992	tmz / 31	Kalan İlknur	Adalet: kadına ne kadar?
5e	Toplumsal Kurtuluş	1992	ock / 51	Bayındır Nuray	21.yy'a girerken kadın ve aile
7e	Komün	1991	mys-hzn / 12	Medyalı Güney	"Cinsel işkence en geçerli yöntem"
9e	Devrimci Mücadele	1990	tmz-ağs / 4	<i>devrimci mücadele</i>	Kadınların kurtuluşu işçi sınıfının
14e	Hedef	1990	mrt / 7	Işık Zeynep	Niçin kadın örgütlenmesi
17e	Hedef	1990	mrt / 7	<i>hedef</i>	Sovyet iktidarı ve kadınların örgütlenmesi
18e	Saçak	1989	ekm / 68	Karaoğlu Sibel	Sosyalist parti ve kadın hareketi
21e	Saçak	1989	ekm / 68	Helvacıoğlu Ender	"Sanık" filminin düşündürdükleri: Erkek,
23e	10 Eylül	1990	şbt / 6	Aslan Emel, Gülbahar Hülya	1990'lara girerken ülkemiz kadın... (3)
27e	Çözüm	1989	mrt / 22	<i>çözüm</i>	Kadınların kurtuluşu kadın erkek mücad
28e	Çözüm	1989	ekm / 28	Göksu Handan	Kadın-erkek ilişkilerinde yanlışlar ve
31e	Yeni Açılım	1989	tmz / 15	Selek Yüksel	Küçük kadın ne oldu sana?
33e	Yeni Açılım	1990	ar1 / 20	Özkal Saadet	Erkek toplumun erkek partileri
36e	Emeğin Bayrağı	1989	mrt / 13	Demir A.	8 mart ücretli köleliğe karşı proleter kad
38e	Emeğin Bayrağı	1989	? / 20	<i>emeğin bayrağı</i>	Yüzyıllardır değişmeyen yasalar ve mede
40e	Emeğin Bayrağı	1989	? / 19	<i>emeğin bayrağı</i>	Ucuz bir işgücü ve çalışan kadınların
43e	Emeğin Bayrağı	1989	? / 20	<i>emeğin bayrağı</i>	Kadın işçilerin sendikal yaşama katılımı
45e	Emeğin Bayrağı	1989	eyl / 17	Oral Zeynep, Özgüvenirgin C.	12 eylül ve kadın (söyleşi)
46e	Emeğin Bayrağı	1988	ekm / 5	Demir A.	Kadın sorunu ve kadının kurtuluşu
48e	Emeğin Bayrağı	1988	mrt / 1	Gür Yalçın	Yaşasın 8 mart dünya emekçi kadınlar

ATL-15	İktidar Yolu	???	? / 5	Alankuş Hatice	Tarihsel olarak kadın sorunu
50e	Özgürlük Dünyası	1991	? / 31	<i>özgürlük dünyası</i>	Türkiye'de kadının statüsü 3
56e	Devrim	1992	mrt / 6	Tan Yıldız	8 mart dolayısıyla kadın sorununa ilişkin
58e	Devrim	1991	eyl / 1	Hastürk Mesut	ideoloji-politika ve kadın
59e	Sosyalist Birlik	1989	hzn / 4	Başar Zehra	Kadın kurultayında iki ayrı dünya
60e	Sosyalist Birlik	1989	eyl / 6	Atasü Erendiz	1. Kadın kurultayının ardından
61e	Komün	1991	ock / 9	Fidan Gül	Kadın devrimini arıyor
62e	Toplumsal Kurtuluş	1991	hzn-tmz / 44-45	Bayındır Nuray	Devrimci kadına bakış
63e	Toplumsal Kurtuluş	1990	ock-şbt / 29-30	Bayındır Nuray	Kadının özgürlük koşulu: sosyalist olmak
65e	Toplumsal Kurtuluş	1990	ağs-eyl / 34-35	Bayındır Nuray	Kadının kimlik sorunu
66e	Toplumsal Kurtuluş	1990	nsn / 32	Bayındır Nuray	Kadın ve erkek kimlikleri
67e-a	Toplumsal Kurtuluş	1992	ock / 51	Bayındır Nuray	21. yy'a girerken kadın ve aile
68e-a	Toplumsal Kurtuluş	1990	mrt / 31	Bayındır Nuray	8 mart dünya kadınlar günü
68e-b	Toplumsal Kurtuluş	1991	şbt / 40	Bayındır Nuray	Sosyalist kadın hareketi
70e	Toplumsal Kurtuluş	1989	ar1 / 28	Bayındır Nuray	Kadınların özgürleşme mücadelesinde
71e	Komün	1990	nsn / 6	Oruçoğlu Muzaffer	Kendi sırrına eren tanı insan!
73e	Devrimci Mücadele	1990	ksm-ar1 / 5	<i>devrimci mücadele</i>	Kadınların kurtuluşu işçi sınıfının
76e	Komün	1990	ksm / 8	Sezer Sibel	Yaşasın "milli aile" kahrolsun kadın!

77e	Saçak	1989	mrt / 61	Perinçek Şule	8 mart kadınlar günü: kadın ve estetik
80e	Saçak	1989	mys / 63	çeşitli	Müstehecen nedir?
ATL-16	Çözüm	1989	şbt / 21	çözüm	Kadınların örgütlenmesi: Anılae
81e	Çözüm	1989	nsn / 23	çözüm	Çarşafa bürünen gerici ve iktidarın iki
82e	Çözüm	1989	nsn / 23	çözüm	Dünya emekçi kadınları mücadele ve
83e	10 Eylül	1989	ksm / 3	Aslan Emel, Gülbahar Hülya	1990'lara girerken ülkemiz kadın hareketi
84e-a	Çağdaş Yol	1989	ock / 6	Demir Gökçe	12 Eylül ve kadın
101e-a	Yeni Açılım	1989	ağs / 16	Özkal Saadet	Feministler hedef mi şaşırtıyor?
ATL-9	Yeniyol	1992	mrt-nsn-mys / 9	Onursal Özlem	Kadın bakanlığı... Devletli feminizm
101e-b	Sosyalist Demokrasi İçin Yeniyol	1994	ock-şbt / ?	Gökçe Zeynep	Kadın emeği ve özelleştirme
ATL-10	Yeniyol	1992	ock-şbt / 8	Fellah Samira	Kadın hareketi ve islamcılık (Cezayir)
88e	Özgürlük Dünyası	1990	nsn / 18	özgürlük dünyası	Kadın ve hukuk
89e	Özgürlük Dünyası	1988	? / 1	Yüksel Yüksel	Kadın sorununa ilişkin bazı yaklaşımlar
90e	Özgürlük Dünyası	1989	? / 8	Sancar Nuray	Kadın mücadelesi ve ailenin "kurtuluşu"
92e-a	Özgürlük Dünyası	1989	? / 5	Matoglu Fadime	8 mart uluslar arası emekçi kadınlar
92e-b	Özgürlük Dünyası	1991	mrt / 29	özgürlük dünyası	Sendikalar ve kadın
92e-c	Özgürlük Dünyası	1991	? / 34	özgürlük dünyası	İşçi kadının özgürleşme olanakları sınıf
92e-d	Özgürlük Dünyası	1990	? / 21	özgürlük dünyası	Ücretli istihdam içinde kadının durumu
93e-a	Özgürlük Dünyası	1992	? / 39	Sancar Nuray	Dört fotoğrafta rosa
93e-b	Özgürlük Dünyası	1991	mrt / 29	özgürlük dünyası	Kürt kadını ve zonguldak grevindeki kadın

94e	Özgürlük Dünyası	1991	ar1 / 38	<i>özgürlük dünyası</i>	Özgürlükçü kadınlar cinsler eşitliğinin
ATL-1	Toplumsal Kurtuluş	1990	ağs-eyl / 34-35	Bilgin Çelik	Kadın
ATL-18	Yeni Toplum Sosyal Demokrat	1994	tmz-ağs / 75-76	Koray Meryem	Ekonomik sorunlar artarken kadın politik
106e	Sosyalist Birlik	1989	mys / 3	Başar Zehra	Feminizm, sosyalizm ve bir kongre raporu
ATL-2	Teori	1992	mrt / 27	<i>teori</i>	8 Mart dünya kadınlar günü: özgür kadın
96e-a	Teori	1991	ksm / 23	Varol Birsen	Özgür kadın özgür toplum
96e-b	Teori	1992	mrt / 27	Üzgeç Birsen	Emekçi kadınlar siyasal mücadelede ön
ATL-3	Teori	1990	mrt / 3	Perinçek Şule	Ataerkil ideolojinin sürdürülmesinde
ATL-4	Teori	1990	mrt / 3	Tankut Tülin Tınaz	Türkiye'de cinsel taciz ilk kez sorunsalla
97e	Teori	1990	nsn / 4	Kalan İlknur	Dünyada ve türkiye'de kadın
98e-a	Teori	1990	mrt / 3	Kalan İlknur	Dinci yükseliş ve kadın hareketi
ATL-5	Teori	1990	mrt / 3	Karaoğlu Sibel Pekşenlik	Çalışma yaşamında kadın
98e-b	Teori	1990	tmz / 7	Kalan İlknur	Toplumsal direnişlerde kadın örnekleri
ATL-6	Teori	1992	mrt / 27	Perinçek Şule	Yüzyıllar sonra utanmıyor musunuz?
99e	Teori	1991	nsn / 16	Şenoğlu Ruhsar	Zonguldak mücadelesinde kadınlar
100e-a	Teori	1991	mys-hzn / 17-18	Çiğdemal Mahmut	Kadına "yardım" mı?
102e-f	Deng	1990	ock / 2	Mert S.	Metropoldeki kürt kadınının bazı sorunları
102e-g	Deng	1991	? / 14	Zelal Ş.	12 Eylül 1980 sonrası kürt kadınının
102e-i	Deng	1990	? / 8	Ceylan Zeynep	Şu başbelası "kadın sorunu" (!) tıpkı
ATL-14	Deng	1991	? / 11	<i>deng</i>	8 mart kadın eylemlilikleri
ATL-13	Deng	1991	? / 11	Yağız G.	Kadının uusal ve toplumsal mücadeledeki

102e-h	Deng	1990	? / 2	Mukaddes	Türk kadının gözüyle kürt kadınlarının
ATL-11	Deng	1990	? / 4	<i>deng</i>	Kadın sorunu üzerine 1
102e-a	Deng	1990	? / 5	<i>deng</i>	Kadın sorunu üzerine 2
ATL-17	Yeni Demokrasi	1989	? / 20	<i>yeni demokrasi</i>	Kadınlar arasında çalışmanın yöntem ve
ATL-17	Yeni Demokrasi	1989	? / 20	Çetin Mehmet	Tarihin, 8 mart enternasyonal gülümseyişi
108e-a	Yeni Demokrasi	1990	? / 30	Mis Seza	Şan olsun 8 Mart'a
108e-b	Yeni Demokrasi	1991	? / 35	<i>yeni demokrasi</i>	Kadın
108e-c	Yeni Demokrasi	1991	? / 34	<i>yeni demokrasi</i>	8 mart'ı anmak, onu yaşamla bütünleştirm
84e-b	Özgürlük Dünyası	1991	? / 29	<i>özgürlük dünyası</i>	Türkiye'de kadının statüsü 1
85e	Özgürlük Dünyası	1991	mrt / 30	<i>özgürlük dünyası</i>	Türkiye'de kadının statüsü 2
ATL-7	Teori	1990	hzn / 6	Tankut Tülin Tınaz	Kapitalizme ana gibi yar olmaz
ATL-8	Teori	1990	mrt / 3	Bilgin Nihan	Kadın doğurganlığı üzerine
100e-b	Teori	1990	ksm-arl / 11-12	Karaoğlu Sibel Pekşenlik	Dikkat! Aile elden gidiyor
67e-b	Toplumsal Kurtuluş	1992	şbt-mrt / 52-53	Bayındır Nuray	"Devrimci evlilikler"
102e-b	Deng	1991	? / 13	Karahan F.	Kürt kadını olmak: sosyo-ekonomik yapı
ATL-12	Deng	1990	? / 7	Karahan F.	Kadınlara ilişkin kararnameler ve kürt
102e-c	Deng	1991	? / 11	Danış Meral	8 mart <i>Diğarbakır İHD konuşma metni</i>
102e-d	Deng	1990	? / 8	Karahan F.	Bağımsız kürt kadın örgütlenmesi
102e-e	Deng	1991	? / 9	Demir K.	Kavga sahibini buluyor
ATL-19	Zemin	1987	hzn / 7	Düzkan Ayşe	Zemin'in kadın (ve sosyalizm) dosyası

YÖ-1	Yeni Öncü	1987	tmz-ağs/5	Gül Necati	Evet erkek egemen düzen
YÖ-2	Yeni Öncü	1987	tmz-ağs/5	Sena Nedret	Sosyalizm mi? Feminizm mi?
YÖ-3	Yeni Öncü	1987	nsn / 2	Sena Nedret	Kadın sorunu sosyalist erkeklerin de
YÖ-4	Yeni Öncü	1987	ksm-ar1/8	Çağlar Nalan	Kadın hareketinin genel bir çerçevesi
YÖ-5	Yeni Öncü	1987	mys/3	Özbudun Sibel	"Erkek egemen düzen" mi?