

VIOLENCE AND LGBTIQ+ IN TURKEY: FROM LATENT VIOLENCE TO
MANIFEST VIOLENCE WITH DOUBLE-ARM

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE BOARD OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, NORTHERN CYPRUS CAMPUS

BY

NAGEHAN GÖKLER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN THE
POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS PROGRAM

SEPTEMBER 2022

Approval of the Board of Graduate Programs

Prof. Dr. Cumali Sabah
Chairperson

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

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hande SÖZER
Program Coordinator

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.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hande SÖZER
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Asst. Prof. Dr. Gökten DOĞANGÜN METU NCC/PSIR

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hande SÖZER METU NCC/PSIR

Asst. Prof. Dr. Gülay Umaner DUBA EMU/PSIR

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 : Nagehan Gökler

Signature :

ABSTRACT

VIOLENCE AND LGBTIAQ+ IN TURKEY: FROM LATENT VIOLENCE TO MANIFEST VIOLENCE WITH DOUBLE-ARM

Gökler, Nagehan
Master of Science, Political Science and International Relations Program
Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Hande Sözer

September 2022, 60 pages

In Turkey, the LGBTIAQ+ community has been a historically unrecognized community on the governmental and societal levels and subjected to various forms of violence. Historically, until the 2000s, primarily transsexuals or LGBTIAQ+ individuals with open and visible identities were targeted, and the violence targeting them was diversified: it was severe in some periods and remained relatively mild in other periods. By the 2000s, the violence against LGBTIAQ+ was not limited to transgender or “visibly” LGBTIAQ+ individuals, but LGBTIAQ+ standing for a holistic identity and a group became the target of violence. Theoretically, this study utilizes various conceptualizations of violence, such as Johan Galtung's, structural and cultural violence and Slavoj Žižek's symbolic violence. The thesis examines the forms of violence that LGBTIAQ+ are exposed to from 2002 to 2022 in two periods: first, 2002-2014 as the latent violence period and second, 2015-2022 as the manifest violence period with double-arm violence period. It argues that in the first period, i.e., the latent violence period, structural and symbolic violence were predominant, and that the latent violence period provides a ground for the increasing level and varying types of violence in the next, i.e., the manifest violence period with double-arm. In this second period, the violence manifests itself in the form of structural and symbolic violence as the first arm and in the form of physical violence as the second arm, making this period one of manifest violence period with double-arm. Violence against

LGBTIAQ+ during the last twenty-year period has been analyzed by qualitative data analysis and the case study method by examining various cases characterizing the two periods.

Keywords: LGBTIAQ+, Structural Violence, Symbolic Violence, Latent Violence, Manifest Violence.

ÖZ

TÜRKİYE’DE LGBTIAQ VE ŞİDDET +: GİZLİ ŞİDDETEN AÇIK ÇİFT KOLLU ŞİDDETE

Gökler, Nagehan
Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler
Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi. Hande Sözer

Eylül 2022, 60 sayfa

LGBTIAQ+ topluluğu Türkiye’de hükümet ve toplum düzeyinde tarihsel olarak tanınmayan ve çeşitli şiddet biçimlerine maruz kalan bir topluluk olmuştur. 2000’li yıllara kadar öncelikle transseksüeller ya da açık ve görünür kimliklere sahip LGBTIAQ+ bireyler hedeflenmiş, onlara yönelik şiddet bazı dönemlerde çeşitlenmiş, bazı dönemlerde ise görece hafif kalmıştır. 2000’li yıllara gelindiğinde ise LGBTIAQ+’ya yönelik şiddet sadece trans veya “görünür” kimlikli LGBTIAQ+ bireylerle sınırlı kalmamış, bütüncül bir kimliği ve bir grubu temsil eden LGBTIAQ+ şiddetin hedefi haline gelmiştir. Bu çalışma teorik olarak Johan Galtung’un yapısal ve kültürel şiddet kavramları, Slavoj Žižek’in sembolik şiddeti gibi çeşitli şiddet kavramsallaştırmalarından faydalanmaktadır. Tez spesifik olarak, 2002’den 2022’ye kadar LGBTIAQ+’ın maruz kaldığı şiddet biçimlerini incelemektedir. Buna göre, bu tezde bu yıllar arasındaki şiddet iki dönem olarak kavramsallaştırılmıştır. Birincisi, 2002-2014 gizli şiddet dönemi, ikincisi 2015-2022 çift kollu şiddet dönemi. Tez ilk dönem olan gizli şiddet döneminde sembolik ve yapısal şiddetin baskın olduğu ve bu dönemin ikinci dönem olan çift kollu şiddet döneminde artan şiddet çeşit ve düzeyi için bir arka plan oluşturduğunu tespit etmektedir. İkinci dönemde ise, birinci kol ilk dönemde de kendini gösteren yapısal ve sembolik şiddet olarak ortaya çıkar; ikinci kol ise fiziksel şiddet olarak kendini gösterir. Son yirmi yıllık dönemde LGBTIAQ+’ya

yönelik şiddet, nitel veri analizi ve vaka çalışması yöntemiyle iki dönemi karakterize eden çeşitli vakalar incelenerek analiz edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: LGBTIAQ+, Yapısal Şiddet, Sembolik Şiddet, Gizli Şiddet, Açık Şiddet.

Dedicated to all the survivors of violence

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Hande Sözer and for her guidance, advice, criticism, encouragement, and insight throughout the research.

I would also like to thank Huriye Gökten Doğangün and Gülay Umaner Duba for their suggestions and comments.

I thank my classmates, Kübra Falay and Büşra Falay, who supported and survived with me every time my psychological resilience weakened throughout the thesis project. I also thank my dear friend Tayfun Can Onuk for his technical and psychological support.

I must express my profound gratitude to my wonderful and loving family; my parents, Hüseyin Gökler and Günay Gökler, my brother Mehmetali Gökler and my partner for life Koray Gürkaya.

Last but not least, I am really thankful for my friends for cheering me up and supporting me during the most difficult time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	x
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiv
CHAPTERS	
1.INTRODUCTION	1
2. THEORETICAL ACCOUNTS OF TYPES OF VIOLENCE AND LGBTIAQ+ IN TURKEY	8
2.1 Violence Types and LGBTIAQ+: How do they Relate in a theoretical framework?	10
2.1.1 Latent and Manifested Violence	12
2.1.2 Structural Violence.....	13
2.1.3 Physical Violence.....	14
2.1.4 Cultural Violence	15
2.1.5 Symbolic Violence	16
3.TRANSFORMATION OF LGBTIAQ+ POLITICS IN TURKEY: FORMS OF VIOLENCE BEFORE 2002	19
3.1.1 Pre- 1970s as the Indifference Period	19
3.1.2 The 1970s as the Sprouting Violence Period	20
3.1.3 The 1980s as the Double-Armed Violence Period: Military Coup Version	21
3.1.4 The 1990s as the Double-Armed Violence in the Rise of LGBTIAQ+ Movement	23

4.CASE ANALYSIS IN TWO CONCEPTUAL PERIODS: FROM LATENT PERIOD TO MANIFEST PERIOD WITH DOUBLE-ARM	25
4.1 Latent and Structural Violence Period	28
4.1.1 The Process Regarding the Closure of Lambda Istanbul Association .	28
4.1.2 Inclusion of LGBTIAQ+ Identities in the List of Prohibited Words for Use as Website Names	31
4.1.3 The Process for Inclusion of LGBTIAQ+ Rights in the Constitution .	34
4.2 Manifest Violence Period with Double-arm	37
4.2.1 Cases Group of Pride Parades	37
5.CONCLUSION	44
REFERENCES.....	49

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABBREVIATIONS

AFP	Agence France Presse
CRT	Constitution of the Republic of Turkey
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
IGPDA	Istanbul Governorship Provincial Directorate of Associations
LMD	Law on Meetings and Demonstrations
MIAD	Ministry of Interior Associations Department
PRA	Presidency of Religious Affairs
TCC	Turkish Civil Code
TCP	Turkey's Telecommunication Presidency
TLA	Turkish Language Association
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
WHO	World Health Organization

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

LGBTIAQ+ has never been fully recognized in modern Turkey. The community is differently discriminated against in different periods on societal and governmental levels. Some governments just ignored them and while others used direct, open, physical violence against them, but LGBTIAQ+ has never been recognized in Turkey. Although each period contains indifference and various types of violence in its own way, 2002-2022 differs from all other periods. From 2002 to 2022: the community became targets of discriminatory discourses and practices even more under rising political and societal transformation into conservatism especially after 2015. In this thesis, violence against LGBTIAQ+ between 2002-2022 is examined in two periods that I name as the latent violence period and the manifest violence with double-arm period, considering different patterns, forms, and levels of violence. As I argue, the latent violence period, the first period in 2002-2014, bears structural and symbolic violence only. The second period, i.e., the manifest violence period with double-arm 2015-2022, consists of two paths or “arms” of violence: structural violence and physical violence. Simply the second period is marked by the rise of physical violence directly against LGBTQIA+ in Turkey.

The LGBTIAQ+'s exposure to violence is based on LGBTIAQ+'s rendering outside of the socially accepted sex and gender roles in line with hegemonic view on sex and gender. An example for such view is the definition of the World Health Organization; accordingly, sex refers to the biological and physiological differences, including reproductive organs, chromosomes, and hormones; gender is a set of socially constructed characteristics that are shared by women and men – such as norms, roles, and relationships between them (WHO, 2019:1). Furthermore, academic works also reproduce such hegemonic view. In such studies, people with designated male identity at birth are expected to identify as a man and be masculine, whereas people assigned female identity at birth are expected to identify as women and be feminine (see Davis, 2017: 1). This hegemonic view on sex and gender, is called sex and gender binary

system, which reduces the sex and gender diversities into merely two categories, i.e., man and women or masculinity and femininity, and excludes any group misfitting into its assumptions, including LGBTIAQ+, i.e., Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transexual, Intersex, Asexual, Queer and the people with gender diversity, whom the concepts in the abbreviation LGBTIAQ+ are insufficient to cover. The exclusion of people misfitting into the hegemonic sex, gender binary system operates not only by prejudice but also by discrimination, and violence on the societal and institutional levels.

While thousands of research questions could be asked about LGBTIAQ+ and their exclusion, this thesis focuses on LGBTIAQ+ and violence and asks the following question: How is LGBTIAQ+ exposed to different forms of violence at different periods in Turkey? To ask this question, the thesis asks the following questions about the violence faced by LGBTIAQ+: Is there permanency of violence against LGBTIAQ+ in Turkey? If there is, how does the violence against LGBTIAQ+ transform over time and how do forms of violence relate to each other in the process?

The thesis addresses these questions through a periodization since it seeks to analyze the transformation of periods containing violence and the characteristics of those periods. While all periods are demonstrated in the thesis, the study focuses on analyzing and conceptualizing the violence faced by LGBTIAQ+s between 2002-2022, as the way LGBTIAQ+s were treated and the forms of violence they encountered shifted from indifference to aggressive attacks especially after 2015. Through this study, I aim to demonstrate an alternative interpretation of violence against LGBTIAQ+ in the Turkish literature through the periodization and conceptualization of violence against LGBTIAQ+ and the changes in violence faced by LGBTIAQ+s during the periods.

The concept of violence is not easily defined because violence can occur in many different forms. Some scholars see behaviors related to violence as violating the law, harming the person, insulting, humiliating, breaking the peace, violating someone's rights, battering, hurting, and using force (see Erten and Ardalı, 1996: 143). Other scholars categorize violence according to the exposed actor (LGBTIAQ+, woman,

child, elderly) or the type of violent action (emotional, physical, psychological, sexual, economic...) (see Polat, 2016: 17). In this thesis, violence against LGBTIAQ+ as an exposed actor is examined via structural, physical, cultural, latent and manifest violence concepts as the violent actions of Johan Galtung's theoretical perspective, and symbolic violence of Slavoj Žižek because, the comprehensiveness of these violence forms allows me to analyze and indicate the violence even in the so-called non-violent periods and the transformation of the violence forms to each other.

Conceptually, structural violence constitutes a large part of the violence analyzed in this thesis and it refers to a context when those at the bottom of the social hierarchy are harmed or hurt, meaning that their basic needs are unmet by a structure that excludes them (Galtung, 1969: 173). LGBTIAQ+ as a minority are deprived of fundamental human rights and freedoms such as having and utilizing constitutional rights. To illustrate, while language, race, colour, gender, political opinion, philosophical belief, religion, and sect are specified as non-discriminatory variables in Article 10 of the Constitution, the expression of sexual orientation covering LGBTIAQ+ rights is not included in this article (Şahin,2016: 17) and in the rewriting process of the constitution, LGBTIAQ+ 's request to include sexual orientation was also rejected (Depeli, 2013: 46). The thesis argues that between 2002 and 2022, structural violence continues even when physical violence against LGBTIAQ+ is least visible in the first period by focusing on the cases such as the attempts to close the Lambda Istanbul association in 2007 and the to ban pride marches since 2015.

Alternative to structural violence, physical violence, as the second primary type of violence covered in this thesis, is defined as an action in which humans are physically hurt or killed (Galtung, 1969: 170). LGBTIAQ+ is subjected to physical violence by being imprisoned and battered. In this thesis, I will discuss physical violence by focusing on the intervention to Pride Parades from 2015 to 2022.

The third essential violence is cultural violence defined by Johan Galtung and Dietrich Fischer, as intellectual justification for direct or structural violence through ideologies of nationalism, racism, sexism and other forms of discrimination and prejudice

(Galtung, and Fischer, 2013: 12). The violence that LGBTIAQ+, who have been subjected to physical and structural violence as a result of not meeting the expectation that the sex and gender roles should comply with each other, is justified by the family structure and public morality. Violence is used against LGBTIAQ+ on the grounds that they violate and harm concepts such as family, culture, and religion and exemplify cultural violence. The thesis examines cultural violence in justifying Lambda İstanbul's closure, prohibition of LGBTIAQ+ identities as word in website names, inclusion of LGBTIAQ+ rights during the rewriting of Constitution and prohibiting the Pride Parades.

Another violence type used in this thesis is symbolic violence by Slavoj Žižek. According to Žižek, symbolic violence is embedded in the language (Žižek, 2009: 171). According to him, our customary language use includes domination and violence (Žižek:2009: 1). In the thesis, anticipating that the hierarchy of communication between advantaged and disadvantaged groups will also lead to violence; Žižek's symbolic violence was used in the analysis and interpretation of the authorities' statements on LGBTIAQ+.

The thesis focusses on a research question regarding the transformation of forms of violence and therefore it is worth noting that these forms of violence can be separated only analytically, and they are actually interrelated and may transform into one another. For instance, physical violence plays a role simultaneously with structural violence. Due to this differentiation, it is crucial to show the change in violence forms via analyzing the violence's transformation during different periods.

In addition to structural, physical, cultural, symbolic violence typologies, the thesis examines two other forms: latent and manifested violence to characterize the periods. Manifest violence is open, visible witnessed violence. However, latent violence is the background condition where the situation is unstable even when there is no actual violence, and the actual realization is likely to drop at any time. That is, there is visible violence that can occur at any time, and the manifest violence is the visible violence itself (Galtung, 1969: 172).

This thesis answers its research question on the transformations in the forms of violence by making the following argument: The violence against LGBTIAQ+ in Turkey in 2002-2022 can be characterized in two periods considering the patterns of violence. The first period, in 2002-2014 is the latent violence period, forms the background of the second period, in 2015-2022, when the level and variety of violence increased. Furthermore, I argue that the first period is primarily characterized by structural violence as a precursor to the manifest violence that emerged in the second period in the form of manifest violence with double-arm period, when physical violence comes into the scene in addition to already existing structural violence.

This thesis has such an attempt for periodization of politics regarding LGBTIAQ+ in Turkey based on various typologies of violence and this attempt is for pointing out that the literature presents a rather static depiction of the politics about LGBTIAQ+ in Turkey. Simply, there is no study in which violence against LGBTIAQ+ is conceptualized by periodizing. This thesis aims to examine the politics of violence against LGBTIAQ+ in Turkey by indicating different violence types corresponding to two different periods from 2002 to 2022.

The thesis is based on qualitative research design where I used case analysis with process tracing method. In process-tracing, causal mechanisms are identified through detailed, within-case analyses of how a causal process occurs (Beach, 2017: 3). A process-tracing study can be used to study the causal dynamics of a particular historical case to gain a deeper understanding of its outcomes, as well as to shed light on generalizable causal mechanisms linking causes to outcomes within a population of similar cases. (Beach, 2017: 3). According to Beach, in process tracing theory testing, the researcher knows the case A and case B and also the outcome, but tries to understand the process and the link between cases (2017: 3), as I intended for in this thesis.

During the analysis, I had the information that LGBTIAQ+ was underrecognized and was subject to ongoing violence. In order to analyze this ongoing violence, I choose the 2002-2022 period due to the particular patterns of violence in this period although

without ignoring the pre-2002 violence forms. At this point, while examining the process historically, I found the relationship and transformations via an understanding of change in violence forms with case analysis by applying the process tracing theory testing method. The basic questions I asked while analyzing the types of violence in the cases I selected were as follows: Where is the violence? For instance, is violence seen at language, in the structure, on the body? What is the severity of violence in a particular case compared to other cases? Is violence justified, and if so, how? As a result of revealing the forms of violence and the severity of this violence in each case, I characterize the periods of violence in different patterns.

While I selected my cases among many others, the criterion was examining the capacity to represent different forms of violence. In characterizing the periods, it became important to demonstrate the diversity and similarity of the forms of violence so the cases. I selected my cases in line with the variety of the representation of the forms of violence they involve and the explain ability of their interrelationships as follows: the dissolution process of the Lambda Istanbul Association Dissolution Process, the inclusion of LGBTIAQ+ identities in the list of prohibited words for use as website names, the process for inclusion of LGBTIAQ+ rights in the Constitution, and furthermore a series of Pride Parades between 2015 and 2022. In gathering data, I examined secondary sources such as academic articles, newspapers, formal notifications, the Turkish Civil Code (TCC), the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR), the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), and the Law on Meetings and Demonstrations (LMD). At this point, I gathered the detailed information about the cases mostly from electronic newspaper archives, such as BBC News Turkish, BiaHabermerkezi, Bianet, Birgün, Cumhuriyet, Deutschewelle, Diken, Habersol, Habertürk, Hukukihaber, Haberglobal, KaosGl, Odatv, Sputnik, T24 and Yeniakit.

In terms of its organization of the thesis, the next chapter, is the theoretical chapter which explains and exemplifies violence types, namely the latent, manifest, structural, physical, and symbolic forms of violence. I discuss that these forms of violence could be separated only analytically while they are in relation to each other, and they have

transformed periodically. It is important to note that these forms of violence illustrate an essential aspect of violence against LGBTIAQ+, even in times that seemed nonviolent although there was structural violence. In such times the groundwork was being laid for physical violence.

The third chapter examines the politics of LGBTIAQ and LGBTIAQ+'s position in time periods under different governments in Turkey during pre-2002 period. The chapter argues that the history of Turkey shows LGBTIAQ+ were neither welcomed nor given their constitutional rights and they faced permanent state of exclusion. However, they are treated more negatively during specific periods, such as during the 1980 coup.

Prior to the conclusion, the fourth chapter examines how these various forms of violence and transformation of one form of violence into the other in different contexts is helping understand the politics of violence against LGBTIAQ+ in Turkey. Specifically in this chapter, I focus on cases in two periods in 2002-2022. The first period displays structural violence while the second period displays physical violence as well as structural violence. Physical violence directly against LGBTIAQ+ emerged most prominently in Pride Parade of 2015 and increased its level a little more each year until 2022. In the first period, the latent violence period includes three cases. The first case is the closure attempts of Lambda İstanbul Association which is an LGBTIAQ+ association and attempted to close by the Istanbul Provincial Directorate of Associations via filing a lawsuit. The second is the inclusion of the LGBTIAQ+ identities as words into the forbidden words list from the website names by the Turkish Communication Presidency. The third includes the rewriting process of the constitution, which contains the initiatives and efforts of LGBTIAQ+ to include fundamental rights and freedoms in the constitution. In the second period, Pride Parade Bans are examined separately from 2015 to 2022 for seven years to show the progression of violence.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL ACCOUNTS OF TYPES OF VIOLENCE AND LGBTIAQ+IN TURKEY

This thesis examines the transformations in the forms of violence that LGBTIAQ+ have been exposed to between 2002 and 2022. This period will be examined through case studies in terms of two different periods, mainly the latent violence period from 2002-2015 and the manifest violence with double-arm period after 2015. In discussing forms of violence in these two periods against LGBTIAQ+, the thesis uses Johan Galtung's theoretical perspective on forms of violence such as direct, indirect, structural, and cultural violence. While among the theories on violence, the theory that most closely meets the research question of this thesis is Johan Galtung's theory, the thesis utilizes other literature on forms of violence. For instance, Slavoj Žižek's 's conceptualization of symbolic violence is used in some case analyses in comparison with Pierre Bourdieu's theory of symbolic violence, which goes beyond the assumed perception of violence and offers a new perspective on symbolic violence.

Moreover, the violence and discrimination faced by LGBTIAQ+ can be explained by utilizing the biopower framework by Michel Foucault. In Foucault's view, power relationships are modes of action that act on others. (Foucault, 2014, p. 73) As a particular form of power among many other forms, biopower directly intervenes in daily life by categorizing the individual, determining one's individuality, attaching it to one's identity, and imposing a law of truth that both themselves and others must recognize (Foucault, 2014, s. 63). As a result, there is a connection between LGBTIAQ+ and the ill treatment that they faced by the power. According to Foucault, keeping sex and gender roles under control, ensuring that sexuality is permissible only for productive married couples, and ingraining the necessity of experiencing sexuality covertly are examples of biopolitics implemented by the power (2007, p.13).

Biopower, which determines and dominates how people establish relationships and what kinds of identities they can declare about themselves, is also closely related to LGBTIAQ+. For instance, one statement of the Minister of Health matters since the

minister stated that “the healthiest relationship is the relationship between a monogamous man and a woman”, indicating a deliberate attempt to distance homosexuality from a “normal” relationship (Bianet, 2015). The Turkish governments’ biopolitical actions can be explained as one reason of violence against LGBTIAQ+ in Turkey among many other reasons and factors. However, this thesis focuses on the variety and continuity of violence rather than the causes or factors leading to violence even though the thesis discusses the particular historical context informing the violence forms. Due to this, although the concept of biopower cannot be ignored in studying violence against LGBTIAQ+, it has not been discussed in detail as one of the main theories.

As the main theory, Galtung divides violence into two main titles, personal and structural, and into different dimensions: psychological or physical violence, violence with and without object, manifest or latent violence, and intended or not intended violence (Galtung, 1969: 173). In addition to two main violence types, he conceptualizes the term cultural violence which emerges to justify the structural and physical violence by evoking “cultural” norms (Galtung, 1969: 173). This variety provided by Galtung’s theory allows analyzing cases in a broader scope. Galtung explains the difference in detecting personal and structural violence as follows: The relationship between subject and object in personal violence is clear. Generally speaking, structural violence is not easily detectable, and if a man beats his wife in a society, it is referred to as personal violence, whereas if a million men ignore and beat their wives and see them as second-class citizens, there is structural violence (Galtung, 1969: 171).

Furthermore, the concept “symbolic violence” is relevant as used by Slavoj Žižek who defines symbolic violence as a concrete type of violence which occurs via language, a primary symbolic tool in any culture (Žižek, 2009: 1). The thesis adopts Žižek’s perspective because it enables analyzing and understanding the violence of and behind the statements expressed against LGBTIAQ+, consciously or unconsciously. In other words, Žižek’s conceptualization removes the affiliation of the symbolic violence notion with the collective unconsciousness of the perpetrator and the “victim” (as

Bourdieu does); it points out how the language of the “perpetrator” consciously or unconsciously causes systemic and structural violence at the end. The following section of this chapter discusses the violence types and how they relate to each other.

2.1 Violence Types and LGBTIAQ+: How do they Relate in a theoretical framework?

Johan Galtung and Dietrich Fischer define violence as any abuse to basic human needs that can be avoided (2013: 35). Accordingly, any living being, actor, individual or collective can be the object of violence, and any actor or structure can be the subject of violence (Galtung and Fischer, 2013: 35). Therefore, the typologies of violence should be diverse enough to be inclusive of varying forms and specific enough to define concrete action of violence (Galtung, 1969: 168).

The central component of Galtung's definitions of various forms of violence is the following: violence is the under-realization of one's mental and physical potential due to external influences (1969: 168). Essentially, violence is about the distance between the potential and actual reality of individuals or groups, and as the distance increases then violence becomes more prevalent (Galtung, 1969: 168). More specifically, if the potential of any human is higher than his, her or their actual experience and human beings cannot fulfill their potential; especially when such distance could have been avoidable, then there is violence (Galtung, 1990: 169). Such gap between actual and potential or the gap of unfulfilled potential, can be seen examine in the processes of LGBTIAQ+ in forming organizations, being visible, developing solidarity, benefitting from fundamental rights and utilizing freedoms. A more specific example can be the following: the resolution called the Discriminatory Laws and Practices and Acts of Violence Against Individuals is on their sexual orientation and gender identity and it is against all kinds of human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity, as brought to the attention of the UN Human Rights Council on November 17, 2011 (Habersol, 2011). The resolution was discussed on March 22, 2011 and signed by 84 states yet it was not signed by Turkey (KAOSGL, 2011). The presence

of the Declaration indicates violating LGBTIQA+'s fundamental human rights would be avoidable if Turkey signed it, but in reality, such rights are ignored and rejected by not signing the declaration. Therefore, LGBTIAQ+ in Turkey have been prevented from reaching their potential by enjoying the equal treatment with the rest of the population in the society and LGBTIAQ+ in the world. Following Galtung's perspective, the more the LGBTIAQ+ is deprived of utilizing their fundamental human rights and freedoms due to external interventions, the higher the level of violence they have faced due to the increasing gap between fulfilling their potential and their actual experience.

The prevention of a group or people reaching its potential can emerge in several ways, which brings several types of violence contextually. When violence is present in the system, i.e., it is systemic, a group can monopolize resources or use them for other purposes to prevent fulfillment of the individuals' and groups' potential, and when violence is absent in the system, any possibility for the realization of such potential is destroyed by using concrete tools (Galtung, 1969: 169). Within the scope of this thesis, the violence in the system or systemic violence is seen as the unequal treatment of LGBTIAQ+ compared to other segments of the same society on issues such as freedom of association, freedom of expression by using the pretexts of protecting "public order," "family structure," and "general morality" in the law while these notions are open to interpretation. On the one hand, it is not aimed to directly target LGBTIAQ+ for their destruction as a group but to render the group dysfunctional and reduce its visibility. On the other hand, violence aimed at harming LGBTIAQ+ as a group or as individuals occurs in the form of physical interventions. In addition to these, the thesis discusses structural violence, latent violence, manifest violence, physical violence, biological violence, cultural violence and symbolic violence. Among those, structural, latent, cultural, and symbolic forms of violence is about societal inequality, simply how governments treat different groups despite applying the same law, while manifest violence and physical violence are about physical intervention or force.

2.1.1 Latent and Manifested Violence

This thesis argues for a shift in the types of violence against LGBTIAQ+ in 2002-2022 and to characterize these shifts if one set of concepts is structural vs double armed violence, the other set of concepts is the manifest violence vs latent violence. A manifest violent act, whether personal or structural, is observable and concrete, visible to the targets of the violence as well as to the bystanders and witnesses (Galtung, 1969: 172). On the other hand, latent violence is often the moment of tension and invisible violence between the subject and object of violence before it transforms into visible, open, manifest violence. (Galtung, 1969: 172). Thus, latent violence occurs when the structure is jeopardized by the top dogs, i.e. those privileged who profited from structural violence for the persistence of the structure as is (Galtung, 1969: 179). Yet, latent structural violence often implies and even transforms into manifest personal violence (Galtung, 1969: 179). Simply the latent violence may be the period just before the eruption of the manifest violence. Thus, it can be said that latent violence is the silent background and manifest violence is the concrete and visible type of violence.

For instance, regarding violence against LGBTIAQ+, one can see visible, observable, open, direct and physical violence such as police intervention to public events, but such visible violence is possible only due to the available structural background that enables violence by generating expectations independent from the real intentions of the actual police force members (Galtung, 1969: 179). In Turkey, latent violence has always been on the scene regarding various forms of exclusion of LGBTIAQ+ topics. To illustrate, in some political Islamist newspapers, LGBTIAQ+ is presented as “deviants [who] broke out in May 1 celebrations in Maltepe.” (Yeni Akit, 2022). The use of such labels as deviants without any legal liability or sanction is an example of latent violence and such latent violence makes manifest violence possible at any time. Furthermore, it does not only alienate LGBTIAQ+ but also bring them to a point where it can be attacked. For example, a large group of people living in Kayseri asked a young man walking with his friend, “Are you LGBT?” and attacked him (Haberglobal, 2021). This anecdote reveals that anyone sees no harm in inflicting physical violence

on an LGBTIAQ+ individual owing to media enabling such negative portrayal of LGBTIAQ+.

This thesis indicates that the first period from 2002-2015 is the latent violence period when non-physical violence against LGBTIAQ+ actually prepared the conditions for physical violence, which emerged as one arm of THE manifest violence period with double-arm after 2015 against LGBTIAQ+. It examines various other categories of violence during the first and second periods of latent and manifest violence, such as structural violence, physical violence, and symbolic violence.

2.1.2 Structural Violence

First, structural violence as a type of violence built within a structure that harms people (Galtung, 1969: 170-171), is the most widely experienced form of violence by LGBTIAQ+ in Turkey. As such, structural violence is characterized by creating systematic inequalities among human groups when some groups have access to opportunities while others face roadblocks on the systematic, inter-personal and everyday levels.

Galtung and Fischer discuss two versions of structural violence, one is “exploitation,” which means that the top dogs [advantaged groups] gain far more from the structure than the underdogs [disadvantaged groups], resulting in an “unequal exchange” (2013: 37), and “exploitation” also has two versions as “type A” and “type B.” In “type A exploitation,” “as a deadly form of structural violence, the underdog is subjected to violence that may lead to death, such as ethnic cleansing or genocide, while in “type B exploitation,” the underdog is left in a permanent state of misery (Galtung and Fischer, 2013: 37). Furthermore, they state four dimensions of “type B exploitation”: “penetration” as ingraining top dog’s mindset to the underdog; “segmentation” as delivering the underdog only a very partial picture of reality; “fragmentation” as maintaining the underdogs away from each other; “marginalization” as holding the underdogs on the outside (Galtung, 1990: 294).

This thesis focuses primarily on the “marginalization” version of type B exploitation considering the cases. Marginalization can occur in various fields such as the interpretation of legal articles against LGBTIAQ+, the placement of LGBTIAQ+ in the pornographic category as socially unacceptable and attributed as taboo. In addition, at the individual level, individuals may be deprived of employment as LGBTIAQ+ individuals. Specifically, marginalization can be seen when Kağıthane Municipality dismissed without compensation three garbage truck workers because they had a homosexual relationship in April 2018 (Bianet, 2019). In this case, the workers are marginalized for their sexual identity. In addition to marginalization of individuals, marginalization of groups has its own examples such as ignoring the constitutional demands of LGBTIAQ+ in the rewriting process of the constitution; filing a lawsuit against Lambda Istanbul as an LGBTIAQ+ association; banning the use of LGBTIAQ+ identities in website names by the telecommunication presidency; banning the pride parade.

2.1.3 Physical Violence

Physical violence is a critical component of this thesis on forms of violence in addition to structural violence since it constitutes the second arm in the manifest violence period with double-arm. The thesis argues that violence against LGBTIAQ+ in Turkey faced physical violence started in 2015-2022, while the former period is more of structural violence in the form of exploitation, including marginalization. Physical violence is the type of violence in which people are physically hurt (Galtung, 1969:169). It can be done directly or indirectly from the subject of the violence (i.e., the perpetrator) to the object of violence (i.e., the target). It is a visible form of violence evident not only to the target of violence but also to bystanders of violence.

Galtung examines physical violence under two headings: physical violence and biological violence. Physical violence reduces the movement ability of the object of violence as individuals or groups (Galtung, 1969: 169). Imprisonment of a person is an example of physical violence as it limits the physical movement area of the person (Galtung, 1969: 169). On the other hand, biological violence, like all forms of violence,

reduces capability below what is potentially possible, but as a difference, it works on anatomy to reduce somatic capability, and it does so by use of force against the body of the object of the violence to harm him, her or them (Galtung, 1969:169). Biological violence relies on the use of force and is probably the most widely used violence concept (Galtung, 1965: 233).

Despite the distinction between physiological and biological violence as forms of physical violence, it is common to see them coexisting even in the same case. To illustrate, Agence France Presse (AFP) reporter Bülent Kılıç, who followed the Pride Week March in Taksim in 2021, was detained after being suffocated by his throat (Cumhuriyet, 2021). According to Galtung's exemplification of biological violence, the suffocation to the reporter's throat is the biological violence which works on anatomy, such as crushing, tearing, piercing and burning (Galtung, 1969: 174). Also, he is detained by the police after being 'eaten, which indicates physical violence, as Galtung exemplifies when a person is imprisoned or put in chains (Galtung, 1969: 169). Thus, the detainment of the reporter constrains his movement ability by being handcuffed and put in a detention center indicates physical violence in this example. The chapter on data analysis investigates the physical and biological violence targeting LGBTIAQ+s during the Pride Parades.

2.1.4 Cultural Violence

The thesis focuses on a third primary violence type: cultural violence. Cultural violence uses "cultural" excuses i.e., excuses related to the symbolic areas of our existence, such as religion and ideology, to justify direct or structural violence (Galtung, 1990: 291). It is obvious that the use of violence and its justification are two different things (Galtung, 1990: 291) yet the justification of violence may exacerbate the impact of already used violence and may become a second-level violence itself.

Cultural violence operates by making an unacceptable event acceptable via manipulating ethical codes for a group of people (Galtung, 1990: 291). Galtung's example for "making something normally unacceptable acceptable" is how the idea of

killing a person is wrong while killing a person for the country's sake is not taken as so bad under nationalist frameworks (1990: 291).

In this thesis, cases of how an incident transforms from unacceptable into socially “acceptable” are numerous. For example, on November 18, 2017, the Ankara Governor's Office banned the events from being organized by LGBTIAQ+ associations because they would openly incite hatred and hostility from a segment of the public with different characteristics in terms of social class, race, religion, sect or region against another segment (Ankara Governorship, 2017). This structural violence by the prohibition of LGBTIAQ+ events indicate another level of violence, namely cultural violence since the structural violence is justified by using the pretext of “disrupting the public order by triggering hatred of various other sections of the population.” “Cultural” in this form of violence derives not only from justifying the structural violence but also by using multiple aspects of this contemporary culture, such as unquestionable value attributed to the ambiguous notion of “the public order.”

2.1.5 Symbolic Violence

A complementary to Galtung's framework of violence is the “symbolic violence” concept. Slavoj Žižek mentions that “symbolic” violence is the violence embodied in language and its forms (2009: 1). Therefore, expressions against LGBTIAQ+ and causing their structural marginalization are sources of symbolic violence.

On the one hand, according to Bourdieu, symbolic violence is a form of power that is carried out on the body without any intermediary and any physical force, but this power is realized with the help of the predispositions hidden inside the people (Bourdieu, 2015: 54-55). Getting help from these predispositions takes place with little trigger (Bourdieu, 2015: 54-55). This action is more powerful because it takes place over an extended period in the implicitly symbolic physical world, with interactions endowed with the unconscious acceptance of the action and the formations of domination (Bourdieu, 2015: 54-55). Strikingly such acceptance of domination is not the case merely for the dominating groups but also the dominated ones, often on the level of subconscious. Therefore, while the concept is often attributed to Pierre

Bourdieu, another conceptualization of symbolic violence by Slavoj Žižek seems to fit better into the case study. The violence model described by Pierre Bourdieu does not match the perception and awareness level of the LGBTIAQ+ community, as it suggests that the victim of violence also adopts symbolic violence and is often unaware of it when LGBTIAQ+ in Turkey seems to be fully aware of what oppresses them and act reactionarily against such oppression.

On the contrary, for Žižek, symbolic violence is a distinct form of violence in the symbolic field mainly language, instead of exerting physical violence on each other, in language, we are meant to debate and exchange words that still causes violence (Žižek, 2009: 60). In the case of LGBTIAQ+, language is an essential factor because authorities also express their opinions publicly via language, which feeds the cultural violence in terms of justifying the negative perception and even stereotypes on LGBTIAQ+.

Specifically, symbolic violence based on language may and may not need to use aggressive words. Using aggressive words against others is obviously violent; yet, even if exchanging aggressive words is violent, it presupposes a minimal recognition of the other party (Žižek, 2009: 60). In the symbolic violence without words of aggression, such recognition is not visible at all. The case of LGBTIAQ indicates such complexity: authorities recognize LGBTIAQ+ to contact them (via aggressive words) even if they do not accept LGBTIAQ+ as a sexual identity. Thus, LGBTIAQ+ is recognized, treated negatively, and yet ignored simultaneously.

To be more precise, Žižek mentions that language is the greatest divider that allows us and our neighbors to live in two different worlds even if we live in the same neighborhood (Žižek, 2009: 66). Therefore, verbal violence is not a secondary distortion but the ultimate manifestation of any specifically human act of violence (Žižek, 2009: 66). At this point, statements of the authorities with symbolic violence may cause the segregation in the society via changing their perception about their LGBTIAQ+ neighbor. The expression that “[t]here is no LGBTI, there is no such thing, this country is national, it’s moral” by Recep Tayyip Erdoğan (Euronews, 2021)

includes a disregard for the LGBTIAQ+ yet while targeting LGBTIAQ+ at the same time by being “amoral” and “un-national” at best. It recognizes LGBTIAQ+ in this expression that it expresses by showing it. In addition, it contains symbolic violence that marginalizes LGBTIAQ+; that is, it positions two neighbors in different worlds through the language of LGBTIAQ+.

To conclude, all these varying violence types can be separated only analytically; they are related; they reinforce and justify each other. The thesis underlines few theoretical points on violence: First, Galtung talks about the “triangle of violence” to note that direct structural-cultural violence can begin in any corner of the triangle and spread effortlessly to the different corners of the same triangle (Galtung, 1990: 302). Symbolic violence concept of Žižek could also be added to these relationship patterns, to convert Galtung’s triangle into a square of violence, in the context of this thesis. Secondly, latent violence in the form of structural, symbolic or cultural violence may operate as background forms of violence while they may also convert into manifest violence. Third, cultural violence can be the main justifier of all sorts of violence and may normalize structural, symbolic, and even physical violence. In the light of these, the thesis considers how these forms of violence can also support each other by appearing in different cases simultaneously, for example, when a hate speech makes space for manifest violence or have simultaneity in one case, in discussing case studies about violence targeting LGBTIAQ+ in the following chapters.

CHAPTER 3

TRANSFORMATION OF LGBTIAQ+ POLITICS IN TURKEY: FORMS OF VIOLENCE BEFORE 2002

LGBTIAQ+ has not been recognized socially and politically in the society and official discourses in Turkey. This thesis examines the permanent and continuous yet historically transforming forms of exclusion and violence targeting LGBTIAQ+. To show such continuity and transformation, this chapter conceptually examines the chronologically organized official attitudes LGBTIAQ+ in the Republic of Turkey. This chapter demonstrates that the politics of LGBTIAQ+ was a period of indifference before 1970s, a period of sprouting violence in 1970s, a period of first, the coup version of double-armed violence in 1980s, and the second double-armed period in 1990s with the rise of LGBTIAQ+ movement.

3.1 Pre- 1970s as the Indifference Period

The period until 1970s is the period of indifference, as I name it, due to that the LGBTIAQ+ was not "an issue" in the official accounts and LGBTIAQ+ community and individuals were ignored.

The 1970s, governments have not imposed positive or negative sanctions regarding LGBTIAQ+ rights and visibility in Turkey (Çetin, 2016: 7). In other words, neither any steps were taken to recognize LGBTIAQ+ rights nor any pressure or violence was explicitly targeting LGBTIAQ+. Due to its goal of establishing a modern, secular, Turkish nationalist society with a gender policy based on equality between men and women, Turkey did not define homosexuality as a crime, instead choose to ignore them until the 1960s (Çetin, 2016: 7). Until the 1970s, people outside the binary gender system could be publicly visible by taking the stage in theatres and nightclubs (Çetin, 2016: 7). Also, they could work as sex workers without state intervention (Çetin, 2016: 7). There was no direct intervention against the sex- work of LGBTIAQ+ people and brothels, but LGBTIAQ+ sex-workers existence was still ignored. In this period, an

indifferent attitude towards LGBTIAQ+ is observed (Çetin, 2015: 3). This period, therefore, can be seen as the absence of physical violence but the presence of structural violence period, when LGBTIAQ+ individuals faced structural inequalities compared to binary-compliant individuals and groups.

3.2 The 1970s as the Sprouting Violence Period

In the 1970s, with the entry of the conservative National Salvation Party into the power scene, LGBTIAQ+ and especially transgender people began visibly exposed to violence, therefore, I named this period as the sprouting violence period.

By the 1974 elections, individuals who did not perform behaviors and displayed appearance compliant with heteronormative rules and remained outside the binary gender system were excluded (Çetin, 2015: 3). After the coalition of the Republican People's Party and the National Salvation Party in 1974, the pressure and initiatives of the National Salvation Party caused the closure of brothels where especially transsexual sex workers were subjected to intense police violence (Çetin, 2016: 7). Because transgender sex workers could not live and work without disclosing their gender identity at the time, they became a direct target of the state, social pressure, exclusion, and police violence (Çetin, 2015: 3).

The period was characterized by the sprouting of physical violence particularly the visibly marked LGBTIAQ+ while the those who are invisible continued to face structural violence. Therefore, the rise of conservatism in the 1970s, put brothels, homosexuals, and especially transgender sex workers on the radar while the rest of the LGBTIAQ+ could not be visible by declaring their identities in the public realm until the 1980 coup. This invisible group of LGBTIAQ+ became members or sympathizers of various communist organizations as a political outlet although they could not focus on gender identity politics even there (Erdoğan and Köten, 2014: 102).

The politics of visibility of LGBTIAQ+ become paradoxical: while neither homosexuals nor transgender people could reveal their identity openly, as I claim,

those LGBTIAQ+ who live without disclosing their identity became more ignorable to the governments and therefore they avoided from being targeted by physical violence. In this period, no intervention was made regarding “the invisible” LGBTIAQ+s. Government interventions of this period were aimed at trans individuals, trans sex workers, and trans artists rather than LGBTIAQ+ as a whole. Thus, this period is marked by physical violence by targeting only the visible members of LGBTIAQ+ while the rest faced structural violence due to that they could not express their identity.

3.3 The 1980s as the Double-Armed Violence Period: Military Coup Version

In the 1980s, along with many groups seeking rights, LGBTIAQ+ was also exposed to oppression and violence after the coup. The amount of violence that sprouted in the 1970s increased, and it took the form of physical and structural violence, which I call as the first wave of double-armed violence, the operation of physical and structural violence together. The most important feature that makes this period different from the later form of manifest violence period with double-arm in 2002-2022 period is that even in the oppressive political environment created by the military government, LGBTIAQ+ was not a community that politicians and the government targeted by mentioning them directly.

The military coup of September 12, 1980 constitutes one of the most crucial turning points in discrimination against LGBTIAQ+ individuals; the military government has set itself the task of not only putting an end to the increasing violence in the country but also redesigning public morality (Erdoğan and Köten, 2014: 102). The military government's decisions and actions to regulate morality have also negatively affected LGBTIAQ+ (Çetin, 2016: 10).

Following the 1980 military coup, interventions were made against transgender individuals to physically segregate them from society (Çetin, 2015: 4): specifically, transvestites, transgender people, and homosexuals were exiled from Istanbul to other

cities after their long hair was shaved (Oz, 2009). In 1981, 50-60 transsexual sex workers were driven out of the town, and some were arrested and tortured (Yıldız, 2007). Since they are physically forced and deported from their homes by a government agency, these interventions are strong examples of the physical violence arm of double-armed violence working together in tandem. Trans people were subjected to structural and physical torture when detained in the police station, indicating direct physical violence and they were segregated from the society and deprived of from equal life chances indicating structural violence.

Although LGBTIAQ+ remained unrecognized as a legitimate community, some political parties expressed that they did not find it appropriate to exclude individuals from society. Among the center-right political parties of the period, the Motherland Party emphasized that homosexuals should be treated well and adapted to society while at the same time, the True Path Party called homosexuality a heresy (Çetin, 2015: 8). The Democratic Left Party, on the other hand, argued that homosexuals should not be discriminated against on it is a disease. At the same time, the Social Democratic Populist Party took a neutral stance on the issue and emphasized that the Constitution gave equal rights to all citizens (Çetin, 2015: 8). In other words, the eighties were a variation of today with different dynamics with its political parties who are more moderate to LGBTIAQ+ and the ones totally against it.

After the 1980 coup, the oppressive and dominant regime of the military administration neutralized the right and left movements (Erdoğan and Köten, 2014: 105). In this political environment where the oppositional movements were eliminated, the Radical Democratic Party was established in 1987 with some homosexuals and individuals from the left (Yalçın, 2014). During the structuring process of the Party, four gays and transsexuals from the party group made a press statement in Gezi Park on April 27, 1987 and started a hunger strike in response to increased state and police repression; later, this number increased to thirty-seven, the action was supported by many different social groups, artists and foreign communities (Baykan, 2020: 434). This strike has great importance for the visibility of LGBTIAQ+ individuals in the public sphere in Turkey (Çetin, 2015: 4). While after the coup, the military

government's Ministry of Interior banned men from performing in women's clothes, and Bülent Ersoy, one of the artists of the period, was also victimized by this ban; the ban was lifted for Bülent Ersoy by Turgut Özal in 1988, and regulations were made regarding the gender reassignment procedure in the same period. (Çetin, 2016: 9). Compared to the past, this official response was a big step forward regarding LGBTIAQ+ rights, visibility, and recognition. Transgender individuals have gained legal rights, although the gender reassignment procedure has some missing or divisive points, such as getting approval by the medical commission for a person to enter the gender adjustment process or if the person is married, including the spouse in the jury process (Çetin, 2016: 10). Then while the coup period in the 1980s was characterized by direct, open violence together with ongoing structural violence against LGBTIAQ+, the post-coup end of the 1980s, environment the politics of violence resorted back to structural violence more.

3.4 The 1990s as the Double-Armed Violence in the Rise of LGBTIAQ+ Movement

The 1990s was a period in which the solidarity and organization initiatives of the LGBTIAQ+ Turkey movement increased rapidly. The increase in these solidarity initiatives does not mean that the 1990s was a nonviolent decade for LGBTIAQ+. This period is the enlightenment period of LGBTIAQ+ in terms of organization and solidarity, but this enlightenment and rise could not prevent interventions and prohibitions involving structural and physical violence. Therefore, this period was named as double-armed violence in the rise of LGBTIAQ+ movement.

The 1990s was the decade of the LGBTIAQ+ movement gaining visibility and institutionalization in the public sphere. For instance, the number of LGBTIAQ+ organizations increased, including Lambda Istanbul, Kaos GL, Gacı Magazine, Venus' Sisters, Sappho's Daughters, Spartakus, Biz GL, Turkey Bears, Efeminelere, as well as university-based student organizations. (Yildiz, 2007). Moreover, LGBTIAQ+ formed

international connections and, joined in many communication and solidarity networks with European organizations (Arat and Nunez, 2016: 2).

However, the period includes physical violence against LGBTIAQ+ simultaneously with these organizations coming together and making association initiatives. Deniz Yıldız mentions that the first Pride Parade was held in 1993, and the governor's office banned it on the grounds that it was “against society's values;” and these bans caused LGBTIAQ+ to organize and react for developing mechanisms to protect themselves (2007). The Beyoglu Cinema, the opening site of the Pride, was besieged by the police on the day of the procession, and anyone suspected of being gay was held (İnce,2014). The delegation, which included MPs and citizens of England and Turkey who had travelled overseas to participate in the activities, was deported to Germany without meeting with officials (İnce,2014). In the scope of this study, the physical intervention and enforcement of the police include physical violence, and the prohibition of the Pride Parade indicates structural violence. In 1996, operations were organized under the name of "cleansing operations" during the United Nations (UN) summit on human settlements (Çetin, 2016: 12). In these operations targeting the Ülker street where trans sex workers live, sexually marginalized people and trans sex workers were also removed from the city center, along with people deemed dangerous due to their ethnic origin, peddlers, homeless people and drug addicts (Selek, 2014: 190) which is a demonstration of marginalization type structural violence. Therefore, LGBTIAQ+ is exposed to structural and physical violence in this period as well. By the end of the 1990s, LGBTIAQ+ attempts to organize and develop solidarity increased following such obstacles and pressures (Çetin 2016: 11).

CHAPTER 4

CASE ANALYSIS IN TWO CONCEPTUAL PERIODS: FROM LATENT PERIOD TO MANIFEST PERIOD WITH DOUBLE-ARM

This thesis claims that violence against LGBTIAQ+ between 2002 and 2022 can be separated into two periods: the latent period and the manifest violence period with double-arm . It is claimed that in the first period, violence was less visible and was not carried out as a mass physical intervention against LGBTIAQ+, and the resulting violence can be described as structural violence. The distinctive feature of the second period is the coexistence of two types of violence: physical and structural violence. Although indirect violence is still on the scene, direct violence has also become visible in the second period.

The first period of the 2000s, the Period of Visibility and Latent Violence, was a relatively comfortable period for LGBTIAQ+. Thanks to the area recognized by the harmony packages, which are the regulations and improvements made by the government during the European Union entrance process (Sipahioğlu,2012: 59). LGBTIAQ+ organization and visibility that started to rise in 1990s gained momentum at the beginning of the 2000s period.

Many sources claim and examine that the ruling process of the Justice and Development Party post-2000s can be discussed in two different periods. In this thesis, 2000s will also be analyzed in two parts in correspondence with the periods regarding violence types. The politic environment in the first period as follows.The JDP won national elections in 2002 and 2007 and local elections in 2004 and 2008, and its presidential candidate Abdullah Gül was elected one month after the general elections in 2007 (Boyras, 2011: 155). The founders defined themselves as "conservative democrats" by describing the JDP as a "moderately religious" and "neoliberal" party (Ersoy and Karakoç, 2021: 207). The JDP declares at the outset that the nation's will, the rule of law, reason, science, experience, democracy, fundamental rights and freedoms, and morality are the primary references in its view of government.

(Özbudun, 2006: 548). The Party sought collaborations with diverse social groups to demonstrate that, raising hopes for a more liberal political climate (Ersoy and Karakoç, 2021: 2013). However, even in this relatively mild political environment, it can be seen that LGBTIAQ+ does not belong to the socially diverse groups with which the government interacts because JDP's aspiration of a conservative liberal synthesis is greatly challenged by LGBTIAQ+ individuals' demands for recognition and protection (Birdal, 2015: 124). To illustrate, the JDP made legal improvements based on the recognition of crimes against spousal equality and sexual inviolability for the demands of the feminist movement (Recent Turkey History Working Group, 2018), but the constitutional demands of LGBTIAQ+ were rejected.

Accordingly, in the first period, symbolic violence and structural violence come forward. Due to this feature, the period is called the latent-violence period following Galtung to refer to violence that is not present yet, although the political and cultural conditions for such violence are brewing and which might cause the emergence of “manifest violence” quickly (Galtung, 1990: 172). The latent period, as this thesis suggests, is a period that prepares the political and cultural conditions and background for the the physical violence that occurred in the second period.

In order to analyze the first period, three cases were selected. The first of these includes attempts to close one of the most well-known LGBTIAQ+ associations, namely Lambda Istanbul, for preventing LGBTIAQ+ from being organized using the law despite the constitutional right to form associations. Secondly, the Turkish Telecommunications Presidency prohibited words containing LGBTIAQ+ identities in website names, thereby marginalizing LGBTIAQ+ in society. The third case includes rejecting LGBTIAQ+'s constitutional rights claims in the constitutional process, ignoring LGBTIAQ+ and depriving them of legal recognition and protection.

As the government's political attitude and perception on gender roles changed in the second period, the political environment started to become more restrictive under authoritarian premises. "Some argue that authoritarianism has been on the rise since 2010 (Ozdemir 2020: 2), while others point to the 2011 general elections (Akkoyunlu

and Öktem 2016: 506) or the Gezi Park protests in mid-2013 (Çelik and Balta 2020: 163) as the beginning point. Öniş explains at this point that rather than pinpointing a single turning moment, these occurrences might be viewed as a sequence of turning points. (2015: 5). In this thesis, the first ban on LGBTIAQ+ Pride Parade is considered a turning point based on the topic of this thesis which is violence against LGBTIAQ+. In this process, the perception and practices of the government on gender roles have also changed. To illustrate, in the 2010s, the government implemented policies and practices that interfered directly with the lifestyles and bodies of women, strengthened the family rather than the woman, and attempted to reverse the gains women had made through the struggle for women's equality (Berber, 2017). In this political environment, the forms of violence faced by LGBTIAQ+, who were already ignored in a more moderate environment, and the intensity of the violence has increased and the forms of violence have become varied.

The second period is when violence manifests itself concretely, and physical interventions are more visible. At this point, structural violence continues. The severity of structural violence has also increased, and LGBTIAQ+ has been openly declared and marginalized as a group that the authorities are openly claimed to be “dubious” about. During this period, the forms of violence began to show diversity. What is claimed in this thesis is that the violence now continues in two arms. For this reason, this period was called the manifest violence period with double-arm period. The first of these arms is structural violence, which also exists in the first latent violence period. The second arm is direct violence that includes physical and biological violence. The second period have its highlight events such as the statements of the Presidency of Religious Affairs (PRA), which includes calling the society to take action against LGBTIAQ+ (Tar, 2018) and the Turkish Republics President's statement that there is no such thing as LGBTIAQ+ (Bianet, 2021). The PRA's statement invites society to take precautions against LGBTIAQ+, paving the way for physical violence. Moreover, the President's statement shows that the existence of LGBTIAQ+ is visible but ignored, indicating the two types of violence in the manifest violence period with double-arm.

These cases exemplify the rise in the level of violence in the second period in structural and symbolic violence too.

A collection of cases involving banning Pride Parades was selected to examine the second period since the annual Pride Parades and changing responses to them every year shows the direct and indirect violence by both prohibitions and interventions of the parades together. The second reason is that it can be shown that the level of violence committed in two arms transforms and, in fact, increases a little more every year.

4.1 Latent and Structural Violence Period

4.1.1 The Process Regarding the Closure of Lambda Istanbul Association

The struggle of Lambda İstanbul indicates two levels of structural violence the first, its establishment and the second, its closure considering the use of law for allowing or hindering the LGBTIAQ+ presence in Turkey. Lambda Istanbul LGBTIAQ+ Solidarity Association, or Lambda İstanbul for short, is an LGBTIAQ+ solidarity association established in Istanbul in 1993 and became official in May 2006 (Atalay and Doan, 2019: 108).

First, the establishment and formalization process of the Association includes its fierce struggle with the Istanbul Governorship Provincial Directorate of Associations (IGPDA), the official unit responsible for processing the application for the establishment of the associations. IGPDA has the authority to decide the exercise of the constitutional right to associate with all citizens and groups in Turkey (Söyle, 2009). After receiving the application from Lambda with its statute, IGPDA asked for consultation from the Ministry of Interior Associations Department (MIAD) which is a standard procedure in accordance with article 60 of the civil law (Gülmez, 2009: 211). The MIAD responded that LAMBDA Istanbul's regulation violates Article 56 of the Turkish Civil Code (TCC), which prevents the Association on the grounds of "non-conformity with the laws or ethics" (TCC: 1936; Gülmez, 2009: 211). This response

of the MIAD is an example of the first level of structural violence, which is a type of violence conducted by using the law. Particularly the structural violence here is that in the TCC Article 56, immoral and unlawful activities are not defined clearly. The ambiguity of the term “immoral and unlawful activities” incited the interpretation of these articles, and this interpretation is left to the discretion of the authorities, which brings “exceptionalism” in the application of the law. As Galtung says, “exceptionalism” is the opposite of equality and is about treating different groups exceptionally, unequally (Galtung, 2012: 153). Consequently, Lambda İstanbul Association's regulation is deemed “immoral” and “unlawful” by the MIAD and the IGPDA. This decision is about distributing the resources across groups, and, in this case, the decision resulted in monopolizing the resource distribution by these authorities and depriving LGBTIAQ+ of from sources, as an instance of structural violence. It is quite clear that the right to organize and form an association is a constitutional right for all citizens according to the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey (CRT) (CRT, art.33). Therefore, as a part of the structural violence, the LGBTIAQ+ was prevented from fulfilling its potential, i.e., the potential for solidarity, organizing themselves, and advocacy for their rights by organizing various activities.

According to the Ministry, Lambda İstanbul's statute violates Article 41 of the Turkish Republic Constitution since the family is the of Turkish society and is based on equality between spouses (CRT, Art. 41; Gülmez, 2009: 204). This violation fulfills the requirement that the freedom of association specified in Article 33 can be restricted (Söyle, 2009). Thus, the Lambda İstanbul Association and its supporters were marginalized; by emphasizing they do not belong to the sacralized family structure in Turkey. This opinion by the decision-makers is used for the prevention of the Association's gaining a legal identity and it caused the marginalization of the Association, once again, indicating the structural violence against LGBTIAQ+.

The dissolution of the Lambda İstanbul Association is the second dimension of structural violence as the Association was dissolved despite the contrary view in the expert report. The Chief Public Prosecutor's Office suggested applying for a third-

party opinion of a legal expert due to its disagreement with the court (Gülmez, 2019: 212). Then, the Beyoğlu 3rd Court of First Instance decided on the dissolution of the Lambda after IGPD objected to the decision that there was no room for action for dissolution and despite the Public Prosecutor stated that the Association should not be dissolved (Gülmez, 2019: 212). The decision was justified as follows:

Although there is no concrete case as to whether the establishment of the respondent association is contrary to the general morality of our society fact that the patriarchal family structure is strongly present in our society, the sanctity attributed to the notion of family, the ties of kin, religion, the scarcity of men and women relationship, are evaluated together, it can be said that it is a structure that is not approved by almost all of our society, accepted and characterized as a violation of morality and ethics (Supreme Court, May 28 20028, D 2008/5196; Gülmez, 2009: 207).

At this point, the standard procedure was not applied; the court interpreted the law by exploiting its ambiguities. The expert report was ignored, bringing in the second level of structural violence for this case. According to Galtung, structural violence is a type of violence built within the structure that harms the underdog (Galtung, 1969: 171). To support Galtung's view, in this case, the dissolution of the Association as a result of the functioning of the institutional structure of the IGPDA and the 3rd Civil Court of First Instance harmed LGBTIAQ+ by preventing them from using their constitutional rights.

Furthermore, in addition to the structural violence, the justification of the dissolution resulted in the cultural violence for the Lambda İstanbul Case since the above-mentioned structural violence has been legitimized by asserting "social values. "The decision to dissolve the Association was based on the dominance of the "patriarchal family structure" in the society, "the sanctity of family ties," and LGBTIAQ+'s violation of these, without the need for any "concrete justification" (Supreme Court, May 28 20028, D 2008/5196; Gülmez, 2009: 207). It has been stated that "almost all society disapprove of LGBTIAQ+" (Supreme Court, May 28 20028, D 2008/5196; Gülmez, 2009: 207). As Galtung argues, "cultural violence," a reflection of our cultural existence and its symbolic sphere, is exemplified in religion and ideology that is used

to justify or legitimize, or normalize direct or structural violence (Galtung, 1990: 291). In this case, as well, the fact that a group was prevented from realizing its potential through the allocation and use of resources was justified by cultural referents. For this reason, structural violence was fortified by cultural violence. Using such rationalization by attributing an oppositionary perspective to the society by means of utilizing an ambiguous notion of societal values and by means of utilizing it arbitrarily, served justifying the Association's dissolution and is cultural violence against LGBTIAQ+.

This case, i.e., the Lambda İstanbul's formation and attempts for its closure, belongs to the first period for two reasons. First, LGBTIAQ+ is tried to be prevented from being visible, expressing and organizing themselves, and building solidarity. Although these preventions have not yet become more visible to the public, they prepared for an environment of visible violence at any moment. Therefore, the case is categorized under the latent period. Secondly, the case does not include physical or biological action against LGBTIAQ+ but structural, as another characteristic of the first period.

4.1.2 Inclusion of LGBTIAQ+ Identities in the List of Prohibited Words for Use as Website Names

On April 28, 2011, Turkey's Telecommunication Presidency (TCP) notified Internet service providers and web hosting companies that 138 words were forbidden for website namespaces (Habertürk, 2011). The notification included the prohibition of many terms used in daily life in a list, which includes those terms directly referring to LGBTIAQ+ sexual identities such as “lesbian” (in Turkish and in English), “gay”, “bisexual”, “transvestic”, and “homosexual” (in Turkish and in English) (Bianet, 2011). CRT based the list of the prohibited words on the Law on Regulation of Publications on the Internet and Combating Crimes Committed employing such Publications (Hukuki Haber, 2011). In the first paragraph of the eighth article, this law presents using these banned words as a crime of "obscenity" of this law, which is taken from the 26th article of the Turkish Penal Code (TCP Notification, 2011).

In this case, the violence against LGBTIAQ+ shows itself in two different forms: structural violence and symbolic violence. The structural violence is first indicated in the marginalization of LGBTIAQ+ identities by being included in the list of prohibited words on the grounds that they are “obscene.” In Galtung's view, marginalization is a subtopic of structural violence and maintains the underdogs' outsider status (disadvantaged group) in society (Galtung, 1990, p. 294). According to the Turkish Language Association (TLA), the word "obscenity" means being racy, vulgar, and inappropriate (TLA, n.d). -The list consists of words non-exclusive to the LGBTIAQ+ identity and includes ordinary words used in daily life. Still, no word is included in the list representing the heteronormative gender identity system. This means that LGBTIAQ+ identities are excluded from accepted sexual identities, by being included among forbidden words in a list of “pornographic” words, which suggests that LGBTIAQ+ identities are separated from the accepted sexual identities and ignored. Therefore, LGBTIAQ+ is marginalized by being considered outside of society's assumed normative sexual identities.

The structural violence in the case also has a second dimension. Prohibited word list notification includes that in case of not fulfilling the obligations and using these words, hosting firms and internet service providers may be faced with related penalties and sanctions (TCP Notification, 2011). This causes a lowering of the LGBTIAQ+'s digital visibility as the group is prohibited from launching a website using words neutrally indicating sexual identities such as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transsexual; therefore, it indicates the second level of structural violence. As aforementioned, Galtung defines marginalization, as a form of structural violence, as leaving people perpetually in an undesirable state of distress (Galtung, 1990, p 293). In this case, since LGBTIAQ+ could not open a website using these names openly, their access to individuals and communities outside their internal organization was restricted. This situation limited the visibility of LGBTIAQ+ who aim to gain their fundamental rights and freedoms and put them in a miserable condition for self-expression. One of the essential points that turn this restriction into structural violence is that it does not restrict heteronormative individuals and groups on the grounds that this restriction that

LGBTIAQ+ is exposed to is “obscene,” which brings the inequality of treatment between the people with various sexual identities.

The second type of violence is symbolic violence, as used by Slavoj Žižek. Žižek argues that verbal violence is not a secondary distortion but the supreme manifestation of all explicitly human violence, and he gives this example about Jew pogroms, what people react to, is not the immediate reality of Jews but the created image and figure of the "Jew" through language (Žižek, 2009, p.66). Similar to the Jewish example, LGBTIAQ+ is considered “obscene,” ordinary subgroups of LGBTIAQ identity are put on a list as prohibited words, and this categorization reinforces the pornographic portrayal of LGBTIAQ+ sexual identities rather than recognizing them as a regular sexual identity like heterosexual identity. As Žižek mentions, this is a supreme type of violence that brings inequality to how LGBTIAQ+ is perceived by society.

In this case, the inequality in perception and treatment of LGBTIAQ+ brings in the restriction to freedom of expression of LGBTIAQ+. The laws that protect the freedom of expression and to which the Republic of Turkey is subjected are as follows: The Constitution of the Turkish Republic article 26 states that "everyone has the right to express and disseminate his/her thoughts and opinions by speech, in writing or pictures or through other media" (CTR, 2001); European Convention on Human Rights states that "everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers (ECHR, 1950). This point is fortified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article 19 (UDHR, 1948). Considering the laws, the right of LGBTIAQ+ individuals to express and disseminate their ideas about their rights claims is restricted.

This case is categorized in the latent and structural violence period for two reasons. The first one is the same reason as the prior case: preventing visibility and freedom of expression is structural violence which does not include direct violence but severe forms of inequality at the basic human rights level. Secondly, the positioning and marginalization of LGBTIAQ+ as “obscene” negatively shapes the societal perception

of LGBTIAQ+, creating an infrastructure to normalize the direct violence that emerged in the second period.

4.1.3 The Process for Inclusion of LGBTIAQ+ Rights in the Constitution

After the JDP was elected to power for the second time on July 22, 2007, the party called for a transition from the coup constitution to a civil constitution which was supposed to make an inclusive change for claiming all the diversity in the country (Depeli, 2013: 43). Thus, LGBTIAQ+ movements were organized to bring their constitutional demands from authorities for the discussions for the new Constitution (Depeli, 2013: 43). As a result, at the Constitutional Commission meeting on September 13, 2012, the demands of LGBTIAQ+ organizations to include the terms "sexual orientation" and "gender identity" in the Constitution were rejected (Depeli, 2013: 46). In this process of drafting the new Constitution, there were three types of violence: symbolic violence in language via the statements of the politicians, structural violence as the process itself and the consequences of the process of the drafting, and cultural violence in the legitimization of the rejection of LGBTIAQ+'s constitutional demands afterwards.

The process started when LGBTIAQ+ associations came together and gathered their demands under three items. Organizations gathered their requests under the following headings: 1) The phrases "gender identity" and "sexual orientation" should be added to the article on equality before the law (Article 10) of the Constitution. 2) The ambiguous and relative expressions such as "general morality," "public order," "adaptation," and "national value" in the Constitution should be removed. 3) International conventions should be taken as the basis of fundamental rights and freedoms (SPoD 2012: 25-27; Depeli: 43)

During the drafting of the constitution, the LGBTIAQ+ organizations took various actions to announce the demands mentioned above to the Commission, and some statements in return for these actions revealed symbolic violence in language. Žižek claims that language constructs and imposes a particular symbolic space (Žižek, 2009:

60). In this case, symbolic space is built based on the hierarchy between LGBTIAQ+ and the authorized Commission in rewriting the Constitution. First, the LGBTIAQ+ organizations sent cards with the inscription "I demand the inclusion of sexual orientation and gender identity in the Constitution" to the President of the Constitutional Commission, Burhan Kuzu, on February 16, 2008, to express their demands (Öz, 2010: 9). Burhan Kuzu made these demands public on a mainstream TV channel in the following way:

Gays also want equality; will we give it? Of course, we will not; they have a different problem too. Society is not ready for this, maybe in the 22nd century (Kuzu in Depeli, 2012: 43).

Žižek asserts that in asymmetrical contexts, the influential group's language determines the weak group's symbolic-social identity and makes the latter group become and remain inferior (Žižek, 2009: 71). Then, Burhan Kuzu's statement positions LGBTIAQ+ identities as inferior not only to the Commission itself but also to the rest of the other social identities that are included in the process of drafting the new Constitution. Therefore, the LGBTIAQ+ community was presented as a community that is not remarkable enough to be given equal rights with other communities. Consequently, this statement is the expression of the hierarchy in the society, which makes LGBTIAQ+ inferior by ignoring them as an identity and indicates symbolic violence through language.

Meanwhile, when the rights of LGBTIAQ+ were on the agenda after the cabinet members were reassigned in 2009, Aliye Kavaf, the Minister for Women and Family, explicitly stated that "homosexuality is a disease" (Keniş 2011). With this statement, Aliye Kavaf has abnormalized LGBTIAQ+ identities, an example of symbolic violence embodied in the language by categorizing an identity outside of the normal. The dictionary definition of the word "disease" underlines it as the state of deterioration of health due to the emergence of some changes in the organism, discomfort, trouble, sickness, or ill health, the word against well-being (TLA, n.d). The statement that "LGBTIAQ+ is a disease" has been not only excluding LGBTIAQ+

by not counting them as socially accepted identities or marginalizing LGBTIAQ+ by separating them from socially accepted sexual identities but also pathologizing LGBTIAQ+ existence by deploying medicalized terminology. Considering contextually, the statement is a response to the LGBTIAQ+'s demands to be legally protected and not discriminated against and paradoxically caused the LGBTIAQ+'s marginalization, underrepresentation with indifference or representation as socially inferior and therefore exemplifies symbolic violence.

At the Commission meeting, which included the inclusion of LGBTIAQ+ rights in the Constitution, JDP members said, "There is no such concept in general morality. We cannot justify such mistakes. We cannot put a statement contrary to family structure and social values into the constitution" (Yılmaz,2012; Depeli: 44). Essentially, this statement and Burhan Kuzu's statement mentioned above that "the society isn't ready for LGBTIAQ+ rights" are pieces of evidence of the justifications and pretexts used for the rejection of LGBTIAQ+'s constitutional rights claims and indicate cultural violence. Society's attributed "values" and the open-ended, ambiguous term "public morality," which can be interpreted differently by each segment, is the way of explaining violence with ingrained culture to the society's collective thought patterns. One-way cultural violence works is by changing an act's moral colour from red ("wrong") to green ("right") light or at least to yellow ("acceptable") (Galtung, 1969: 292). For example, ignoring existing identities and not giving them the constitutional rights, they deserve is turning an unacceptable injustice into a standard point of view through "public morality" and "society's unpreparedness".

This case on the involvement of LGBTIAQ+ in drafting the new Constitution, including the statements reviewed above, indicates structural violence. Galtung states that violence is the cause of the difference between the potential and the actual (Galtung, 1969: 168). Therefore, the rejection of the constitutional recognition and guarantee of LGBTIAQ+'s rights means that LGBTIAQ+ is chosen not to be protected when it can be protected by law, and this leads to a widening of the distance between potential and actual for them. In other words, although the violence and

marginalization against LGBTIAQ+ could be avoidable, it was not avoided. This situation is an example of structural violence because, following Galtung's conceptualization, structural violence is built into the structure and shows up as unequal power, therefore as unequal life chances for segments of the society (Galtung, 1969: 171). The process of drafting the Constitution is part of the political structure. In this political structure, the fact that LGBTIAQ+ cannot have equal rights in the constitutional sense due to unequal power distribution shows structural violence.

This case includes three types of indirect violence and is categorized under the latent period. The rejection of the constitutional demands regarding the protection of LGBTIAQ+ rights has been an essential factor that has left LGBTIAQ+ legally vulnerable in the face of direct violence that emerged in the second period. In this case, symbolic violence and the cultural violence mentioned above contribute to normalizing violence against LGBTIAQ+ in the latent violence and manifest violence period with double-arm.

4.2 Manifest Violence Period with Double-arm

4.2.1 Cases Group of Pride Parades

From 2015 till the current date, 2022, the annual Pride Parades were banned, and the participants were subjected to police intervention and detention on the grounds that they did not comply with the legal prohibitions. These marches were not permanently prohibited at once but banned each and every year during the Pride Parade period. Every year common excuses were used as the reason for the ban and the police intervention although there are differences in variety and severity in interventions to each Pride Parade. Participants gather yearly and hold the march, even though the events and parade are banned. When the prohibitions and interventions are examined in terms of violence, direct and indirect forms of violence are indicated. This part first examines the Pride processes between 2015-2022 and second analyzes the forms of violence regarding the common points and divergences of each year's experience.

In 2015, Pride Parade, which has been held with permission every year since 2003, was banned by the Governor's Office on the grounds that it "touched people's sensitivities due to the month of Ramadan" (Pişkin andGördü, 2015: 2). Police attacked people with tear gas, rubber bullets, and water cannons and banned all entrances and exits to Istiklal Avenue during the march (BBC, 2015). One person was detained during the police intervention (Odatv, 2015).

In 2016, Grey wolves, including nationalists and Muslim Anatolian Youth, announced that "their reaction will be apparent and harsh" if the march regarding the 2016 Pride Parade is held, even if it is held with the government's permission (t24, 2016). Following these threats, the following statement was made on the website of the Governorship: "A meeting and demonstration march in this direction will not be allowed to be held on the 19th and 26th June, taking into account the safety of our citizens and public order" (Diken, 2016). Trans Pride Parade on June 19 was held, and police intervened with tear gas and rubber bullets (BBCTürk,2016) and detained 11 people (Bianet,2016). Following the police attack on the Trans Pride Parade, the Istanbul LGBTIAQ+ Pride Parade Action Committee followed the police's call to "disperse and let life return to its normal course," saying "we are dispersing," in many streets of Istiklal Street and other districts of Istanbul (Bianet, 2017). Even after the march evolved into the concept of "we are dispersing," many people standing on the street carrying the rainbow flag were detained, which is 29 people in total, and also many people were subjected to verbal, psychological, and/or physical violence by the police and the civilian population (Tar, 2016)

In 2017, Pride Parade was banned on the grounds of "security and public order," which was also cited as a reason in 2016 (Sputnik, 2017). The Trans Pride Parade was also banned due to similar reasons and failure to apply duly (Association for Monitoring for Equal Rights, 2019: 5). In the pride parade, which was tried to be held despite the ban; the police attacked the participants with wolfhounds (Birgün, 2017); While 22 people were detained, interventions with tear gas and rubber bullets were also applied to the participants (BBC News, 2017). A lawsuit was filed against 24 people who were

detained in the 2017 Istanbul LGBTIAQ+ Pride Parade on the charge of "Organizing, Directing, Participating in Unlawful Meetings and Demonstrations," and ended with the acquittal of 24 people in 2019 (Association for Monitoring for Equal Rights, 2019: 5).

In 2018, the Istanbul Governor's Office banned the 16th Istanbul LGBTI+ Pride Parade on the grounds of "possible adverse events" and "security" (Bianet, 2018). Before the march, the roads leading to Taksim and Istiklal Street were closed, extensive security measures were taken, and in addition to the arbitrary search, the crowd who wanted to march on Istiklal Street was intervened with tear gas and rubber bullets, and 11 people were detained (Association for Monitoring for Equal Rights, 2019: 8).

For the 2019 Pride Parade, the Istanbul Governor's Office stated that they did not welcome the march for all open space actions to take place in Istanbul because LGBTIAQ+ was a group that the authorities are "suspicious" about (Deutsche Welle Turkish, 2019). Following the statement in the prior sentence, the action in Bakırköy is banned, which is among the areas where the application for the Pride parade where the meeting and demonstration parade will be held and justified as "protecting the peace and security of the people, personal immunity, the safety of disposition, general health and morals, rights and freedoms of others, possible prohibited on the grounds of "prevention of acts of violence and terrorism, avoidance of provocative acts and incidents"(KAOS GL, 2019). While the police intervened with tear gas and rubber bullets, the group that made a press statement, at least six people were detained after the statement (BBC Türk, 2019).

Due to the Covid-19 Pandemic in 2020, there is no intervention or gathering ban, as the pride week events are held online. The pride parade, which was applied to be held in 2021, was rejected by the Governorship for the same reasons stated in 2019: "to protect general morality, public order, peace, and security of the people" (Cumhuriyet, 2021). Despite the ban, people gathered, and the police intervened harshly on those who gathered for the march, and the intervention resulted in more than 20 detentions;

also, a reporter who was there to follow the event was detained for stepping on his throat (Diken, 2021).

Pride week events planned to be held in 2022 and the pride parade have been banned for seven days indoors and outdoors on the grounds of “protection of security” and well-being” and “the prevention of crime,” as stated by the Beyoğlu and Kadıköy District Governorates same as the last years (Diken, 2022). In order to prevent a possible march, the police intervened and detained people, including journalists and those sitting in cafes before the parade (Deutsche Welle, 2022), and more than 300 people were detained during the protests in different parts of the Beyoğlu district (Cumhuriyet 2022).

The prohibition of the Pride Parade by the Governor's Office and Kadıköy- Beyoğlu – Bakırköy District Governorate includes structural violence in two dimensions. The first one is the structural violence resulting from the non-implementation of the third article of the Law on Meetings and Demonstrations (LMD), No. 2911 which includes the right to march and freedom by presenting the Parade as a potential threat to the social order. The second is the structural violence that occurs when LGBTIAQ+ is labelled as a group that the authorities are hesitant about and thus marginalized. On the one hand, according to the LMD, No. 2911 and Article 34 of the Constitution, "everyone has the right to hold unarmed and peaceful meetings and demonstration marches without prior permission." (LMD, 1983 and Turkish Republic Constitution, 1982). Pride parade organized by LGBTIAQ+, which is not an armed or aggressive community, is prohibited despite the law. For all seven years, the justification has continuously been based on the CRT article 34, which states that 'the right to hold meetings and demonstration marches shall be restricted only by law on the grounds of national security, public order, prevention of commission of a crime, protection of public health and public morals or the rights and freedoms of others.' (CRT, 1982 Article 34). Since the terms left ambiguous in the law can be interpreted by individuals and institutions, the Istanbul Governorship and District Governorships, the authorized institutions for the Pride Parade, restrict the LGBTIAQ+'s right to march and

demonstrate, which brings structural violence. In the first dimension, this ban interferes with the freedom of LGBTIAQ+ gatherings and demonstrations and ultimately with their freedom of expression. At this point, LGBTIAQ+ citizens of the Republic of Turkey are deprived of their fundamental rights, namely freedom of expression and demonstration, when these rights are constitutionally granted to all citizens indiscriminately. It is unfair for LGBTIAQ+ to be denied equal access. There is violence in a system if resources are monopolized by one group or class for other purposes or are used for other purposes than intended (Galtung, 1969: 169). Since the authorities have banned the Parades and events, they monopolize the resources to the detriment of LGBTIAQ+ with their interpretation of the vague terms in the law. As a result, LGBTIAQ+ is prevented from freedom to gather, hold parades, and express themselves.

On the other hand, LGBTIAQ+ has been labelled as a group that the authorities are hesitant or “suspicious” about and thus marginalized. Such marginalization is grounded on two levels: "public order," "prevention of crime," and "protection of public health and morals" in the second paragraph of the 34th article in CTR on the right to meeting and demonstration, which are the law of the Turkish Constitution grounds on which these prohibitions are based, cause the marginalization of LGBTIAQ+. According to Galtung's theoretical perspective, this marginalization indicates that LGBTIAQ+ has been subjected to” Type B exploitation,” which stands for continuous suffering in one party (Galtung, 1990: 293) because these bans and the justification limit LGBTIAQ+'s freedom needs by putting them outside of society which is one of the consequences of the marginalization. Indeed, in 2019 LGBTIAQ+ was defined by the governor's office as a group that the authorities are hesitant about which is the second level of marginalization because by naming LGBTIAQ+ as a hesitant group for the authorities, it became apparent that LGBTIAQ+ was not included in the public which wanted to be protected. In 2016, the second year of the ban and the first year of the public security justification, it was claimed that LGBTIAQ+ were also included in the group to be protected against Grey Wolves. Still, this 2019 statement indicates that LGBTIAQ+ is a marginalized group, and they

do not benefit from the Constitution's protection with article 34. At this point, this expression means that it is not aimed to protect LGBTIQ+ from the reaction of the public or opposing groups but to protect the public from LGBTIAQ+.

The second type of violence is indicated as direct violence, which is examined in the interventions. Despite being banned every year between 2015 and 2022, the pride parades were held and subjected to police intervention. For seven years, detention, pepper spray, rubber bullets, battery, and water cannons have been the intervention methods every year. While prohibitions constitute the structural violence part of the process, interventions include the direct violence part. Direct violence involves doing bodily harm or intervention to others, and someone is unrestricted to do so (Galtung, 1990: 174). In all these cases formed by the pride marches, direct violence is indicated in biological and physical forms.

The biological, which is the first direct violence is defined by Galtung as violence that decreases a person's ability to perform physiological functions (Galtung, 1990: 169). In this case, biological violence can be observed by using pepper spray and rubber bullets to be beaten by the police. These acts are biological violence because the interventions are carried out directly on the participants' bodies and restrict their mobility by damaging their bodily integrity. The second in this group of cases as direct violence is physical violence. As a result of physical violence, human movement becomes increasingly restricted (Galtung, 1990: 169). For this reason, the detention of the participants and preventing their demonstrations and marches are physical violence, according to Galtung's theoretical definition.

Although the reasons and interventions remain constant, the severity of these interventions and prohibitions increases yearly, which can be illustrated in six points. First, in the 2016 interventions, police attacked with wolfhounds in addition to the battery, rubber bullets, pepper spray, and water cannons, making the intervention more severe than the prior year in biological violence. Second, in 2017, 24 detained people were prosecuted for violating the Constitution. For the first time, the legal process was moved one step further, indicating the intensity of structural violence compared to

previous years. In 2019, LGBTIAQ+ was not disclosed as the group that the authorities are hesitant about. Still, practices related to this were implicitly conducted, random body searches for people in the area where the march will be held were an example of these practices, and this is an example of the increase in violence in marginalization. Lastly, in 2022, the Governorship prohibited outdoor marches and indoor events for the first time, indicating the change in the scope of bans and the structural violence mentioned above. Moreover, the number of people detained rose sharply in 2022 to more than 300, exceeding the sum of the previous six years. This indicates the sharp increase in the severity of the physical violence against LGBTIAQ+ Pride Parades.

The prohibition of the Pride Parades described above, and the interventions still made in the marches is an exemplary narrative of the second period, called manifest violence period with double-arm. Prohibitions and justification of prohibitions constitute the first arm. This form of violence, indirect violence, has shown itself in different cases since the latent period, which is the first period. The form of violence that distinguishes the second period from the first period is direct violence, which is the second arm. Direct violence manifested itself biologically and physically, together with detention and physical interventions. Based on the above analysis of the prohibitions and interventions in the Pride Parades, it has been deduced that LGBTIAQ+ is exposed to more visible, diverse, and intense violence during the manifest violence period with double-arm.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This thesis examined how is LGBTIAQ+ exposed to different forms of violence during different periods in Turkey by focusing 2002-2022 period. The continuity of the violence the LGBTIAQ+ community together with how the forms of violence have changed and how these forms of violence related with each other are examined. The contribution of this thesis for general literature is the following: violence can transform even when it is permanent, so the continuous violence against the same group should not be considered the same violence form and an academic analysis should say beyond stating the permanent exclusion but understand its variations. At this point, examining the types of violence that LGBTIAQ+ is exposed to makes a contribution to the literature. In particular, this thesis allows us to demonstrate the diversity of violence that causes exclusion and discrimination, rather than assuming superficially that violence against LGBTIAQ+ is uniform. This thesis has divided the violence against LGBTIAQ+ in Turkey into its types and periodized it. Doing this division on violence against the LGBTIAQ+ in Turkey, which is already known, provides the violence against LGBTIAQ+ is put on the theoretical ground.

In this thesis, the history of violence against LGBTIAQ+ in modern Turkey has been periodized and defined over separating decades. Before the 1970s, LGBTIAQ+ was ignored, and no positive or negative action was taken regarding LGBTIAQ+. In the 1970s, LGBTIAQ+ started to be exposed to violence gradually. In the 1980s, double-armed violence consisted of two types of violence spontaneously, which are structural and physical, and will be explained in the following paragraphs. However, it was a coup period, and LGBTIAQ+ were not the only targets. In the 1990s, double-armed violence continued and simultaneously the LGBTIAQ+ movement also started to be more organized and establish associations and the relationships with the European LGBTIAQ+ movements are established. However, although, visibility increased, and

organizations had enlightenment physical violences and structural violences against LGBTIAQ+ was also proceeded. The 2000s, on the other hand, contain much more variety of violence period than in the past. The point that makes the 2000s period worth examining in this thesis is the following: in the pre-2000s period, the individuals who were the main target of violence were gay people or transgender people with an open identity until the end of the 1900s. However, the violence after the first decade of the 2000s targets LGBTIAQ+ with all their identities. Moreover, the fact that the period of double-armed violence in the 1990s was followed by the period of latent violence, in which physical violence was relatively invisible, ensures that the period of the 2000s begins with a demonstration of continuity and change in violence forms at the same time.

In this thesis, I suggested that LGBTIAQ+ violence in the 2000s can be divided into two different periods. The first of these periods was the period of latent violence. The period of latent violence is named after Galtung's latent violence. It is the first period that includes structural violence and forms the background of more visible and violent violence. The second period is the period of manifest violence period with double-arm. This period has two arms. Its first arm is structural violence, which also existed in the first period. The second arm is physical violence, including visible and severe intervention against LGBTIAQ+.

The structural and physical violence mentioned above were derived from Johan Galtung's theoretical perspective. Additionally, the symbolic violence of Slavoj Žižek and cultural violence from Galtung is also used in the analysis. To briefly describe the mentioned violence types, structural violence occurs within the structure, where the violence is not visible, and the distribution of resources is unequal (Galtung, 1969: 171). Physical violence is grouped under two headings: the first one is violence that involves a direct intervention to harm the person's bodily integrity as biological violence, and the second is aimed at rendering the person dysfunctional by lowering the person's bodily functions as physiological violence (Galtung, 1969: 175). Cultural violence is used to bring structural and physical violence to an acceptable, normalized

and internalize appearance by using cultural codes such as religion and nationality (Galtung, 1990: 291-292). On the other hand, symbolic violence is processed in the language that determines our thinking and communication skills and is a form of violence that reproduces the relations of social domination (Žižek, 2009: 1-52).

Considering the research question of this thesis, how LGBTIAQ+ is exposed to different forms of violence in Turkey between 2002-2022, I had the foresight that violence types are differentiated and varied, which brings the periodization. As a result of examining the cases and news related to LGBTIAQ+, I came to the conclusion that there is a rupture in violence related to LGBTIAQ+. The first situation in which this rupture manifests itself is the ban on the Pride Parade in 2015 and the physical violence perpetrated by the police regarding the LGBTIAQ+ who came together. Accordingly, I concluded that violence against LGBTIAQ+ between 2002-2022 can be analyzed as two periods following this rupture.

The first of these two periods is the latent violence period. In Galtung's theory, latent violence means an unstable situation which may become visible violence immediately, which is the background of manifested violence (Galtung, 1969: 172). I used three different cases to examine the first period. The first of these deals with the litigation process regarding the closure of the Lambda Istanbul association. In the process, an attempt was made to close the LGBTIAQ+ and Lambda Istanbul association through legal methods, taking advantage of the system and legal ambiguities. In my second case, the words lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transvestite were added to TPC's list of prohibited words when obtaining internet names. The third case involves the unanswered constitutional rights demands of LGBTIAQ+ during the rewriting process of the constitution. These three cases have the following common features of the period: 1) In all three cases, no physical intervention is made regarding LGBTIAQ+. 2) Even though there is no physical intervention, LGBTIAQ+ has been deprived of rights such as establishing associations, freedom of expression and fundamental constitutional rights by using the laws and deficits existing in the system's structure. 3) In these three cases, LGBTIAQ+ is perpetrating violence against LGBTIAQ+ as a

whole group/movement, without aiming at individual targeting or separating LGBTIAQ+ identities. 4) Although these three cases do not involve physical violence, they provide space to normalize physical or more violent violence and reduce the possibility of objection/self-defence for LGBTIAQ+, thanks to the rights that LGBTIAQ+ deprived or attempts to deprive. At this point, these three cases have consistency within themselves and prove the concept of the latent violence period, which is the first period, by indicating examples of symbolic, cultural and structural violence.

The first period, which I call the latent violence period, is an unstable period, as defined in Galtung's theory. As shown in the common characteristics of the cases above, LGBTIAQ+ has not been exposed to mass physical violence during the latent violence period. However, during this period, LGBTIAQ+ was rendered dysfunctional by trying to prevent the establishment of associations, marginalized by being included in the list of prohibited words, and left defenceless by not granting its constitutional rights. At this point, even if there is no physical intervention, LGBTIAQ+ has been removed from its potential capability of being visible and cooperating, marginalized and exposed to a physical attack, and deprived of the constitutional support that would allow it to be protected by law if exposed to these attacks. The violence that LGBTIAQ+ has been exposed to constitutes the characteristic features of the latent violence period because all these features prepare the background of the manifest violence period with double-arm, which is called the second period.

The second period is the period of manifest violence period with double-arm. One of the two arms includes structural violence, and the other includes physical violence. As a result of the latent violence period, manifest violence appears in the second period with the physical violence occurrences. Manifest violence, by Galtung's definition, is observable violence, which can be structural or personal (Galtung, 1969:172). According to Galtung, latent and manifest violence can presuppose each other (Galtung, 1969: 172). The examination of the second period was provided by a group of cases that took place during the Pride Parades that were banned between 2015-2022,

and each year's ban was processed separately. With the first ban on Pride in 2015, mass-targeting LGBTIAQ+ physical violence emerged. Structural violence, the primary violence that defines the prohibitions, also accompanied this physical violence. In the process, from 2014 to 2022, physical violence has increased in dose every year with the severity of biological violence and an increase in detentions. In the manifest violence period with double-arm, manifest violence in personal appears as detentions, battery, and intervention during and after pride march gatherings.

The first ban that emerged due to the month of Ramadan was followed by the justification of public safety in the following years, and in 2019, the authorities made a statement about LGBTIAQ+ as the group we hesitated about and expressed this as one of the reasons for the ban. The bans include not only cultural violence but also the manifesting of structural violence by using the interpretable vulnerabilities of the system. Clearly stating LGBTIAQ+ as the group authorities are suspicious about reinforces that structural violence is manifested through prohibitions. At this point, as shown by the pride cases, forms of violence have hardened and diversified since 2015. Therefore, the publicly observable declaration of structural and physical violence constitutes a manifest violence period with double-arm.

One might ask whether I have reduced the violence against LGBTIAQ+ in Turkey by restricting the research into a number of cases. Through this thesis, I attempted to reflect on the scheme of the violence that occasionally exists regarding LGBTIAQ+ via case analysis. Therefore, structural, physical and cultural violence are general concepts and may manifest differently in different cases. As a limitation, it is impossible to include all these cases in this thesis. Although variousness is a criterion when selecting cases, it is impossible to include all varieties.

On the other hand, it can be argued that the types of violence I have periodized are not separated with a sharp line, and examples of manifest violence with double-arm can be shown in the period of latent violence. Although this is seen as a limitation, it is the forms of violence perpetrated against the perceived LGBTIAQ+ identity in Turkey rather than individual violence examined in this thesis. When the forms of violence

that individuals are exposed to individually are examined, it will be possible to show examples of the intertwined types and periods of violence. However, as stated above, this thesis evaluated violence perpetrated against LGBTIAQ+ through a holistic identity rather than individual cases.

Further studies on the subject of this thesis, in which violence against LGBTIAQ+ is examined in two periods between 2002-2022, can be carried out by including different types of violence, such as psychological violence, by increasing the variety of cases at this point. It would be appropriate to conclude this thesis with the hope that it is understood that violence is much more than just beating someone so that a sanction may emerge regarding existing violence before physical violence occurs.

REFERENCES

- Ankara Valiliđi. (2017, November 19). Yasaklama Kararına İlişkin Basın Duyurusu. T.C. ANKARA VALİLİĐİ @ Kurumsal İnternet Sitesi. Retrieved September 5, 2022, from <http://www.ankara.gov.tr/yasaklama-kararina-iliskin-basin-duyurusu-19112017>
- Akkoyunlu, K., and K. Öktem. 2016. Existential İnsecurity And The Making Of A Weak Authoritarian Regime İn Turkey. *Southeast European And Black Sea Studies* 16 (4): 505–527
- Arat, Z. F. K., and Nuñez, C. (2017). Advancing LGBT rights in Turkey: Tolerance or protection?. *Human Rights Review*, 18(1), 1-19.
- Atalay, O., and Doan, P. L. (2019). Reading The Lgbt Movement Through İts Spatiality İn Istanbul, Turkey. In *Geography Research Forum* (Vol. 39, Pp. 106-126).
- Baykan, B. G. (2020). Radikal Demokrat Yeşiller: 80’ler Türkiyesi’nden Alternatif Bir Koalisyon. *Mülkiye Dergisi*, 44(3), 487-513.
- BBC News Türkçe, and Atabay, B. (2021, February 3). Boğaziçi Üniversitesi protestoları: Hedef gösterilen LGBTİ+ topluluđu artan nefret söylemi hakkında ne düşünüyor? BBC News Türkçe. Retrieved May 20, 2021, from <https://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler-dunya-55916638>
- BBC News Türkçe. (2016, June 19). İstanbul’daki Trans Onur Yürüyüşü’ne polis müdahalesi. BBC News Türkçe. Retrieved July 9, 2021, from https://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler/2016/06/160619_istanbul_lgbti_mudahale
- BBC News Türkçe. (2017, June 25). İstanbul’da Onur Yürüyüşü’ne polis müdahalesi sonrası gözaltılar. BBC News Türkçe. Retrieved August 7, 2021, from <https://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler-turkiye-40398917>

- BBC News Türkçe. (2019, July 1). Onur Yürüyüşü: İstanbul'da LGBTİ+ Onur Yürüyüşü'ne polis müdahalesi. BBC News Türkçe. Retrieved June 7, 2021, from <https://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler-turkiye-48819416>
- BBC. (2015, July 28). İstanbul'da Onur Yürüyüşü'ne Polis Müdahalesi. Bbc News Türkçe. Retrieved March 22, 2022, From
- Berber, N. (n.d.). 2010'Lar: Neoliberalizmin ve Muhafazkarlığın Kışkacındaki Yıllar ve Derin Bir Nefes "Gezi": Heinrich Böll stiftung: Niwêneriya Tirkiyeyê. Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung. Retrieved September 12, 2022, from <https://tr.boell.org/tr/2017/09/18/2010lar-neoliberalizmin-ve-muhafazkarligin-kiskacindaki-yillar-ve-derin-bir-nefes-gezi>
- BİA Haber Merkezi. (2018, June 29). Valilik'ten Onur Yürüyüşüne Yasak Kararı; Yürüyüş Komitesi'nden Çağrı. Bianet - Bağımsız İletişim Ağı. Retrieved August 7, 2021, from <https://bianet.org/bianet/lgbti/198764-valilik-ten-onur-yuruyusune-yasak-karari-yuruyus-komitesi-nden-cagri>
- BİA Haber Merkezi. (2019, January 30). Eşcinsel İlişki Yüzünden İşten Atılan İşçi Belediyeye Açtığı Davayı Kazandı. Bianet - Bağımsız İletişim Ağı. Retrieved June 17, 2021, from <https://bianet.org/bianet/toplumsal-cinsiyet/204995-escinsel-iliski-yuzunden-isten-atilan-isci-belediyeye-actigi-davayi-kazandi>
- BİA Haber Merkezi. (N.D.). Erdoğan: Lgbt, Yok Öyle Bir Şey. Bianet. Retrieved March 21, 2022, From <https://Bianet.Org/Bianet/Siyaset/238667-Erdogan-Lgbt-Yok-Oyle-Bir-Sey>
- Bianet. (2011, May 5). "İnternette 'Yasak' Kelimeler LGBT Sitelerini de Yasaklıyor." Bianet - Bağımsız İletişim Ağı. Retrieved June 9, 2021, from <https://bianet.org/bianet/bianet/129765-internette-yasak-kelimeler-lgbt-sitelerini-de-yasakliyor>

- Bianet. (2017, June 25). Bianet : Onur Yürüyüşüne Polis Engeli. Bianet.Org.
Retrieved June 9, 2021, from <https://m.bianet.org/bianet/print/187757-onur-yuruyusune-polis-engeli>
- Birdal, M. S. (2015). Between The Universal And The Particular: The Politics Of Recognition Of Lgbt Rights İn Turkey. *Sexualities İn World Politics*, 124-138.
- Birgün Gazetesi, andKuray, Z. (2017, June 25). LGBTİ+ Onur Yürüyüşünde polisten köpekli saldırı. *Birgun.Net*. Retrieved August 7, 2021, from <https://www.birgun.net/haber/lgbti-onur-yuruyusu-nde-polisten-kopekli-saldiri-166664>
- Bourdieu, Pierre (2015), *Devlet Üzerine*, (Çev.Aslı Sümer), İletişim Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- Boyraz, C. (2011). The Justice And Development Party İn Turkish Politics: Islam, Democracy And State. *Turkish Studies*, 12(1), 149-164.
- Butler, J. (1988). Performative Acts And Gender Constitution: An Essay İn Phenomenology And Feminist Theory. *Theatre Journal*, 40(4), 519-531.
- Council of Europe., andCouncil of Europe. (1952). *The European convention on human rights*. Strasbourg: Directorate of Information.
- Cumhuriyet. (2021, June 26). Taksim’de polisin sert müdahalesiyle gözaltına alınan muhabir: cumhuriyet.com.tr. Retrieved June 9, 2022, from <https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/haber/taksimde-polisin-sert-mudahalesiyle-gozaltina-alinan-muhabir-nefes-alamiyorum-1847606>
- Çelik, A. B., and Balta, E. (2020). Explaining the micro dynamics of the populist cleavage in the ‘new Turkey’. *Mediterranean Politics*, 25(2), 160-181.

- Çetin, Z. (2015). The dynamics of the queer movement in Turkey. Heinrich Böll Stiftung.
- Çetin, Z. (2016). The Dynamics Of The Queer Movement İn Turkey Before And During The Conservative Akp Government. Berlin: Swb (1).
https://www.swpberlin.org/fileadmin/Contents/Products/Arbeitspapiere/Wp_rg_europe_2016_01.pdf, İndirilme Tarihi, 5, 2021
- Davis, D. A. (2017). The Normativity Of Recognition: Non-Binary Gender Markers İn Australian Law And Policy. In Gender Panic, Gender Policy. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Depeli, G. (2013). Anayasa Yazım Sürecine Lgbt Müdahillığının Merkez Medyadaki Görünümü. Galatasaray Üniversitesi İletişim Dergisi, (18).
- Deutsche Welle. (2019, June 18). İstanbul Valiliğinden Onur Yürüyüşü'ne ret. Deutsche Welle. Retrieved July 8, 2021, from <https://archive.ph/ldx16#selection-1057.0-1057.42>
- Deutsche Welle. (2022, June 26). İstanbul'da Onur Yürüyüşü için toplananlara polis müdahalesi. Deutsche Welle. Retrieved July 1, 2022, from <https://www.dw.com/tr/i%CC%87istanbulda-onur-y%C3%BCr%C3%BCy%C3%BC%C5%9F%C3%BC-i%C3%A7in-toplananlara-polis-m%C3%BCdahalesi/a-62268459>
- Diken. (2016, June 18). LGBTİ+ Onur Yürüyüşü İstanbul'da da yasak: Bahane kamu güvenliği - Diken. Diken. Retrieved August 7, 2021, from <https://www.diken.com.tr/lgbti-onur-yuruyusu-istanbulda-da-yasak-bahane-kamu-guvenligi/>
- Diken. (2021, June 27). Onur Yürüyüşü'ne polis müdahalesi: 20'den fazla gözaltı - Diken. Diken. Retrieved August 8, 2021, from

<https://www.diken.com.tr/lubunyasokakta-onur-yuruyusune-polis-mudahalesi/>

Diken. (2022, June 21). İstanbul'da 'beklenen' yasak geldi: Onur Haftası etkinliklerine izin yok - Diken. Diken. Retrieved June 30, 2022, from <https://www.diken.com.tr/istanbulda-beklenen-yasak-geldi-onur-haftasi-etkinliklerine-izin-yok/>

Erdoğan, B., and Köten, E. (2014). Yeni Toplumsal Hareketlerin Sınıf Dinamiği: Türkiye Lgbt Hareketi. Marmara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilimler Dergisi, 2(1), 93-113.

Ersoy, D., and Karakoç, J. (2021). Political Science In The Age Of Populism: Perspectives From Turkey. European Political Science, 20(1), 204-217.

Erten, Y., and Ardalı, C. (1996). Saldırganlık, şiddet ve terörün psikososyal yapıları. Cogito, 6.

Eşit Haklar İçin İzleme Derneği, Taştan, N., Tüysüz, N., and Oral, P. (2018). Toplantı ve Gösteri Hakkı İzleme Raporu. Ceylan Matbaası.

Euronews. (2021, February 3). Erdoğan: LGBT, yok öyle bir şey, bu ülke millidir, manevidir. Euronews. Retrieved August 6, 2021, from <https://tr.euronews.com/2021/02/03/erdogan-lgbt-yok-oyle-bir-sey-bu-ulke-millidir-manevidir>

Foucault, M. (2007). Cinselliğin tarihi (H. U. Tanrıöver, Çev.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları

Foucault, M. (2014). Özne ve iktidar: Seçme yazılar 2 (I. Ergüden and O. Akınhay, Çev.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı yayınları.

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. Journal of peace research, 6(3), 167-191.

- Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural violence. *Journal of peace research*, 27(3), 291-305.
- Galtung, J., Aroua, A., Degortes, E., Fischer, D., Hayford, N. G., and Weber, K. (2012). *The Muslim Diaspora in Europe and the USA*. Transcend International. Transcend.
- Galtung, J., Fischer, D., and Fischer, D. (2013). *Johan Galtung: Pioneer of peace research (Vol. 5)*. New York: Springer.
- Gülmez, M., (2009). Karar İncelemesi: “Dernek Özgürlüğü ve Cinsel Yönelime Dayalı Ayrımcılık Sorunu: Lambda İstanbul Davası Kararları”. *Labour and Society (Vol 22- 2009/3)*
- Güzel, D. (2022). Yerel Yönetimlerde LGBTI+ Politikaları ve Faaliyetlerin Seyri. In KAOS
- Haber Global. (2021, July 8). LGBT misin sen? diyerek saldırdı, delikanlı değilim; diye özür diledi. Haber Global. Retrieved August 7, 2021, from <https://haberglobal.com.tr/gundem/kayseri-de-lgbt-misin-sen-diyerek-saldiran-genc-delikanli-degilim-diye-ozur-diledi-video-119880>
- Habersol. (2011, March 24). AKP “LGBT’ler öldürülmesin” demedi. HaberSol. Retrieved May 14, 2022, from <https://haber.sol.org.tr/devlet-ve-siyaset/akp-lgbtler-oldurulmesin-demedi-haberi-40644>
- Habertürk. (2011, April 28). 138 kelimeye yasak! www.haberturk.com. Retrieved June 7, 2021, from <https://www.haberturk.com/polemik/haber/625491-138-kelimeye-yasak>
- Hukukihaber. (2011, April 28). TİB’den Yasaklı Kelimeler Listesi | Hukuki Haber. Hukuki haber. Retrieved June 8, 2021, from <https://www.hukuki.net/haber/tibden-yasakli-kelimeler-listesi/>

Ince Yenilmez, M. (2021). LGBTQIs in Turkey: The challenges and resilience of this marginalized group. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 18(2), 440-449.

İnce, E. (2014, December 8). Lgbti: Kaldırımın Altından Gökkuşuğu Çıkıyor. *Bianet*. Retrieved March 22, 2022, From <https://bianet.org/bianet/Print/160544-Lgbti-Kaldirimin-Altindan-Gokkusagi-Cikiyor>

İstanbul'da LGBTİ+ Onur Yürüyüşü düzenlenmesi başvurusuna valilikten ret. (2021, June 24). İstanbul'da LGBTİ+ Onur Yürüyüşü düzenlenmesi başvurusuna valilikten ret. *Cumhuriyet*. Retrieved July 8, 2021, from <https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/?asperrorpath=/haber/istanbulda-lgbti-onur-yuruyusu-duzenlenmesi-basvurusuna-valilikten-ret-1847164>

KAOS GL - Lgbti+ Haber Portalı. (2021). Erdoğan'dan "Lgbt Gençliği" İfadeleri. *Kaos Gl - Lgbti+ Haber Portalı*, Retrieved From <https://kaosgl.org/Haber/Erdogan-Dan-Lgbt-Gencligi-İfadeleri>

KAOS GL. (2011, March 22). TC Hükümeti, BM'nin. *KAOSGL.org*. Retrieved June 7, 2021, from <https://kaosgl.org/haber/tc-hukumeti-bmnin-lgbtler-oldurulmesin-bildirisini-imzalamadi->

KAOS GL. (2019, June 21). Taksim bahaneymiş: İstanbul Valiliği, Bakırköy'de Onur Yürüyüşü'nü yasakladı. *KAOSGL.org*. Retrieved June 7, 2021, from <https://kaosgl.org/haber/taksim-bahaneymis-istanbul-valiligi-bakirkoyde-onur-yuruyusunu-yasakladi>

KAOSGL (Ed.), *LGBTI+ Hakları ve Yerel Yönetimler* (1st ed., Vol. 1, pp. 63–69). KAOS GL.

Kenîş,Ş., (2011) "Eşcinsellik, İslam ve İfade Özgürlüğünün Sınırları"
<http://bianet.org/biamag/toplumsal-cinsiyet/127509-escinsellik-islam-ve-ifadeozgurlugunun-sinirlari>,

Law on Meetings and Demonstrations, 1983, No.2911

- Lgbtt Bireylerin İnsan Haklarını İzleme Ve Hukuk Komisyonu (Ed.). (2007). İnsan Hakları Raporu 2007 - Kaos Gl. Kaos Gl. Retrieved March 22, 2022, From <https://KaosglDernegi.Org/Images/Library/2008lgbtt-İh-Raporu-2007.Pdf>
- Odatv4.com. (2015, June 28). LGBTİ yürüyüşüne polis müdahalesi. Odatv. Retrieved August 7, 2021, from <https://www.odatv4.com/siyaset/lgbt-yuruyusune-polis-mudahalesi-2806151200-77917>
- Öniş, Z. (2015). Monopolising the centre: The AKP and the uncertain path of Turkish democracy. *The International Spectator*, 50(2), 22-41.
- Öz, Y. (2009). Lgbt Bireyler Açısından Mevzuat Taraması. Ayrıntı.
- Öz, Yasemin (2010), “Ayrımcılık Ve Eşitsizliğin Kanıtı: Anayasa Taslağı”, [Http://www.kaosgl.com/sayfa.php?id=5365](http://www.kaosgl.com/sayfa.php?id=5365), 13.09.2012.
- Özbudun, E. (2006). From Political Islam To Conservative Democracy: The Case Of The Justice And Development Party In Turkey. *South European Society and Politics*, 11(3-4), 543-557.
- Özdemir, Y. (2020). AKP’s neoliberal populism and contradictions of new social policies in Turkey. *Contemporary Politics*, 26(3), 245-267.
- Pişkin., Cand Görgü., E., (2015,06.28) Onur Yürüyüşü ‘ramazan Yasağı’ nı Deldi !. [Evrensel.Net](https://www.evrensel.net). Retrieved From:<https://www.evrensel.net/haber/254719/onur-yuruyusu-ramazan-yasagini-deldi>
- Polat, O. (2016). Şiddet. *Marmara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Hukuk Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 22(1), 15-34.
- Police İntervention İn Pride Parade İn Istanbul. (2015, 06.28). [Bbc.Com](https://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler/2015/06/150628_istanbul_onur_yuruyusu) Retrieved From:https://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler/2015/06/150628_istanbul_onur_yuruyusu

Republic of Turkey Constitution, 1982 Art. 33

Republic of Turkey Constitution, 1982, amended on October 3, 2001; Act No. 4709
Art.26

Republic of Turkey Constitution, 1982, Art. 34

Sipahiođlu, B. Ö. (2017). Shifting from Europeanization to de-Europeanization in
Turkey: How AKP instrumentalized EU negotiations. The Turkish
Yearbook of International Relations, (48), 51-67.

Söyle, F., (2009, 04.29)., Lambdaistanbul'a Karşı Kapatma Davası Kronolojisi.
Bianet.Org Retrieved From: [https://Bianet.Org/Biamag/Bianet/114196-
Lambdaistanbul-A-Karsi-Kapatma-Davasi-Kronolojisi](https://Bianet.Org/Biamag/Bianet/114196-Lambdaistanbul-A-Karsi-Kapatma-Davasi-Kronolojisi)

Sputnik. (2017, June 24). İstanbul Valiliđi, Onur Yürüyüşü'ne izin vermedi:
Toplumun farklı kesimlerinden ciddi tepki var. Sputnik. Retrieved July 6,
2021, from <https://archive.ph/k4p5Z>

Şahin, B. (2013). Farklılık, Hoşgörü Ve Ak Parti İktidarı: Gezi Parkı Sürecinin
Düşündürdükleri. Liberal Düşünce Dergisi, (71), 161-169.

Şahin, S. (2016). Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı için LGBT Hakları El Kitabı.

T24. (2016, June 14). LGBTİ dernekleri kararlı; tehditlere rağmen İstanbul'daki onur
yürüyüşleri yapılacak. T24. Retrieved August 7, 2021,
from <https://t24.com.tr/konular/lgbtilere-tehdit-serbest-yuruyus-yasak,167>

Tar, Y. (2016, July 6). Yalnız güzel dağıldık. . . KAOSGL.org. Retrieved June 8,
2021, from <https://kaosgl.org/haber/yalniz-guzel-dagildik8230>

Tar, Y. (2018.). Diyanet: "Eşcinsellik, Lezbiyenlik Vb. Cinsel İlişkiler Haddi
Aşmaktır". Kaos Gl - Lgbti+ Haber Portalı. Retrieved March 21, 2022,
From [https://Kaosgl.Org/Haber/Diyanet-Escinsellik-Lezbiyenlik-Vb-Cinsel-
İliskiler-Haddi-Asmaktır](https://Kaosgl.Org/Haber/Diyanet-Escinsellik-Lezbiyenlik-Vb-Cinsel-İliskiler-Haddi-Asmaktır)

Telekomünikasyon İletişim Başkanlığı, “İnternet Ortamında Yapılan Yayınların Düzenlenmesi”, April 2011, Mailer-Telekomünikasyon İletişim Başkanlığı

Türk Dil Kurumu (n.d). Müstehcen. in Türk Dil Kurumu Sözlük. Retrived 21,05,2022, from <https://sozluk.gov.tr/>

Türk Dil Kurumu (n.d).Hastalık. in Türk Dil Kurumu Sözlük. Retrived 21,05,2022, from <https://sozluk.gov.tr/>

UN General Assembly, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 10 December 1948,19 A available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3712c.html> [accessed 27 July 2022]

Ünan, A. D. (2015). Gezi protests and the LGBT rights movement: A relation in motion. In Creativity and Humour in Occupy Movements: Intellectual disobedience in Turkey and beyond (pp. 75-94). Palgrave Pivot, London.

Ünsal, A. (1996). Genişletilmiş bir şiddet tipolojisi. Cogito, 6.

Webel, C., and Galtung, J. (Eds.). (2007). Handbook of peace and conflict studies (Vol. 7). London: Routledge.

World Health Organization. (2019, June 19). Gender and health. Retrieved July 15, 2022, from https://www.who.int/health-topics/gender#tab=tab_1

Yakın Dönem Türkiye Tarihi Çalışma Grubu. (2018, March 30). AKP iktidarları Döneminde Cinsiyet Eşitliği ve Kadın Hakları. artizan. Retrieved September 12, 2022, from <https://www.art-izan.org/toplum-siyaset/akp-iktidarlari-doneminde-cinsiyet-esitligi-ve-kadin-haklari/>

Yalçın, S. (2014), “Siyasetin ‘o Biçimi’: Lgbti Hareketinin Anaakım Siyasetle İmtihanı”, Birikim, S.308, S.6-10.

Yeni Akit. (2022, May 1). Siz neyin işçisisiniz! LGBT’li sapkınlar taşkınlık çıkardı. Yeniakit. Retrieved July 7, 2022, from

<https://www.yeniakit.com.tr/haber/siz-neyin-iscisisiniz-lgbtli-sapkinlar-taskinlik-cikardi-1652364.html>

Yildiz, D. (2007). Turkiye Tarihinde Escinselliğin İzinde Escinsellik Hareketinin Tarihinden Satir Baslari-2: 90'lar [Milestones Of The Lgbt Movement İn Turkey-2: 90s.]. Kaos Gl, 93, 46-49.

Yüksel, N. A. (1999). Toplumsal cinsiyet olgusu ve Türkiye'deki toplumsal cinsiyet kalıplarının televizyon dizilerindeki yansımaları. Kurgu Anadolu Üniversitesi İletişim Bilimleri Fakültesi Uluslararası Hakemli İletişim Dergisi, 16(16), 67-81.

Žižek, Slavoj. 2009. Violence. Big Ideas. London, England

TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

PROGRAM / PROGRAM

- Sürdürülebilir Çevre ve Enerji Sistemleri / Sustainable Environment and Energy Systems
- Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler / Political Science and International Relations
- İngilizce Öğretmenliği / English Language Teaching
- Elektrik Elektronik Mühendisliği / Electrical and Electronics Engineering
- Bilgisayar Mühendisliği / Computer Engineering
- Makina Mühendisliği / Mechanical Engineering

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : ..GÖKLER.....

Adı / Name : ..Nagehan.....

Programı / Program : ..Political Science and International Relations.....

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) :VIOLENCE AND LGBTIAQ+ IN TURKEY:
.....FROM LATENT VIOLENCE TO MANIFEST VIOLENCE WITH DOUBLE-ARM.....

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: **Yüksek Lisans / Master** **Doktora / PhD**

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.**

2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of two years.** *

3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of six months.** *

Yazarın imzası / Author Signature **Tarih / Date** ..28.09.2021.

Tez Danışmanı / Thesis Advisor Full Name: Asst. Prof. Dr. Hande Sözer

Tez Danışmanı İmzası / Thesis Advisor Signature:

Eş Danışmanı / Co-Advisor Full Name:

Eş Danışmanı İmzası / Co-Advisor Signature:

Program Koordinatörü / Program Coordinator Full Name:Asst. Prof. Dr. Hande Sözer

Program Koordinatörü İmzası / Program Coordinator Signature: