The Making of a *Makbul* Father: A Socio-Political Exploration of Heteronormative Fatherhood in Turkey

Mürüvet Esra Yıldırım

A dissertation presented to the

Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
at Boğaziçi University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

06 2022

Approvals

"Making of a *Makbul* Father: A Socio-Political Exploration of Heteronormative Fatherhood in Turkey," a dissertation prepared by Mürüvet Esra Yıldırım in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History at Boğaziçi University, has been approved on 16.06.2022 by:

DISSERTATION ADVISOR

Associate Professor Berna Yazıcı-Tepeyurt _____
Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
Boğaziçi University

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Assistant Professor Seda Altuğ-Bulut _____
Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
Boğaziçi University

Professor Ayşe Gül Altınay _____
Cultural Studies
Sabancı University

Associate Professor Ayşe Naz Bulamur-Baypınar _____
Western Languages and Literatures
Boğaziçi University

Assistant Professor Berna Ekal-Şimşek _____
Social Work Department
Altınbaş University

Declaration of Originality

The intellectual content of this dissertation, which has been written by me and for which I take full responsibility, is my own, original work, and it has not been previously or concurrently submitted elsewhere for any other examination or degree of higher education. The sources of all paraphrased and quoted materials, concepts, and ideas are fully cited, and the admissible contributions and assistance of others with respect to the conception of the work as well as to linguistic expression are explicitly acknowledged herein.

Copyright © 2022 Mürüvet Esra Yıldırım
Some rights reserved.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

To view a copy of this license, visit
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/

Abstract

The Making of a *Makbul* Father: A Socio-Political Exploration of Heteronormative Fatherhood in Turkey

Mürüvet Esra Yıldırım, Doctoral Candidate at the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History at Boğaziçi University, 2022

Associate Professor Berna Yazıcı, Dissertation Advisor

This dissertation critically analyzes the notion of heteronormative fatherhood within the context of nationalism. Drawing upon thirty-six formal, semi-structured, and tape-recorded interviews with lower-middle class men who identify themselves as Turkish-Sunni-Muslim and have children between the ages of eighteen to forty, in six cities in the Marmara, Central Anatolia and the Black Sea Regions, it examines the relationship between *makbul* citizenship and the construction and experiences of heteronormative fatherhood.

For the interviewees, the social meaning of fatherhood goes beyond having children. It is the ability to shoulder financial responsibilities and differentiate *makbul* from non-*makbul* on behalf of their dependents, namely, their spouses, siblings, and children. Men ground their fatherly authority over their dependents on some of their qualities, such as being nationalistic and religious, that enable them to be included in formal and informal networks of solidarity. However, the difficulties they endured as a child motivated them to prevent their children from being socially and economically vulnerable in life as they were. Thus, they have created an environment for their children to dare to be demanding from their family in many senses. They invented new mild methods to sustain fatherly authority. But they also complain about being unappreciated. In this sense, they are fathers in-between.

92.461 words

Özet

Makbul Baba: Türkiye'deki Heteronormatif Babalığa Dair Sosyo-Politik Bir İnceleme

Mürüvet Esra Yıldırım, Doktora Adayı, 2022
Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü

Doçent Berna Yazıcı, Tez Danışmanı

Bu tez Türkiye'deki heteronormatif babalık kavramını milliyetçilik bağlamında eleştirel bir yaklaşımla incelemektedir. Marmara, İç Anadolu ve Karadeniz Bölgelerinde yer alan altı ilde, on sekiz ile kırk yaşları arasında çocuğu olan otuz altı alt ve alt orta sınıfa mensup, kendini Türk-Sünni-Müslüman olarak niteleyen erkekle yapılan yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmelere dayanan araştırma, makbul vatandaşlığın heteronormatif babalık deneyimleri ve inşasıyla ilişkisini analiz etmektedir.

Görüşmeciler için babalığın toplumsal anlamı ekonomik olarak kendilerine bağımlı olan kişilerin, eşlerinin, kardeşlerinin ve çocuklarının adına makbul olanı makbul olmayandan ayırmaktır. Kendilerine bağımlı olan insanlar üstündeki bu otoritelerini, resmi ve gayriresmi dayanışma ağlarına dahil olabilmelerini sağlayan milliyetçi ve inançlı olmak gibi bazı ahlâki nitelikleriyle meşrulaştırmaktadırlar. Ancak, kendilerinin çocukken ve gençken yaşamış oldukları sıkıntıları çocuklarının yaşamasını istememektedirler. Bu nedenle çocuklarının birçok anlamda talepkâr olabilecekleri bir ortam yaratmış ve babalık otoritelerini sürdürebilmek için yeni yumuşak yollar icat etmişlerdir. Fakat aynı zamanda yeterince saygı ve takdir görmediklerinden de şikayetçilerdir. Bu anlamda onlara arada kalmış babalar diyebiliriz.

92.461 kelime

Curriculum Vitæ

MÜRÜVET ESRA YILDIRIM

EDUCATION

Ph.D.	Ataturk Institute for Modern Turkish History Boğaziçi University 2022
M.A.	Critical and Cultural Studies Boğaziçi University 2015
B.A.	History Boğaziçi University 2012

PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS/EMPLOYMENT

- Researcher in Humanities Institute.
- Writer in Beta Kids Publishing House, the authorized publishing house by National Geographic Kids in Turkey.
- Instructor in Majole Education and Travel, 2016.
- Proofreader and translator in ABA Education, 2014-2015.
- Customer Relations Staff in Provus Informatics, 2010-2011.

PUBLICATIONS

- Yıldırım, Mürüvet Esra. *Yeni Bir Hayat Kurmak/ Kadınlar Anlatıyor: Babalık, Evlilik ve Boşanma*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2017.

AWARDS AND HONORS

- Young Social Scientist Award granted by the Turkish Social Sciences Association, 2019.

- Success scholarship granted by The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey on the basis of university entrance exam, 2006-2011.

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

- Research assistantships, Boğaziçi University Scientific Research Projects, 2/2022-still.
- Research assistantship, Boğaziçi University Scientific Research Projects, 2/2020- 9/2020.
- Research assistantship, Boğaziçi University Scientific Research Projects, 2013-2016.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

- Guided Autobiography Instructor
- Playwright
- Content consultant

LANGUAGES

- Turkish – Native Speaker
- English – Advanced
- French – Intermediate
- Ottoman Turkish – Beginner



To my father

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements *xix*

1 INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Understanding the Socio-Political Context 6
1.2 The Study's Contribution to Literature 9
1.3 The Sample 10
1.4 The Outline and Main Arguments 12

2 A CEREBRAL AND CORPOREAL REFLECTION ON RESEARCHING MEN AS A WOMAN AND GUIDED AUTOBIOGRAPHY INSTRUCTOR 17

2.1 My Angled Obscene Presence 20
2.2 A Question That Fits a Woman Researcher 35
2.3 On the Interviews 36

3 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND 39

3.1 Fatherhood in International Literature 43
3.1.1 The Course of Masculinity Studies in Turkey 50
3.1.2 Intellectual Location of Heteronormative Fatherhood in Turkey 58

4 THE SOCIAL MEANING OF FATHERHOOD 79

4.1 Fathering the Wife 82
4.2 Fathering the Siblings 89
4.3 Negotiating Fatherhood and Sonhood 91
4.4 Extending Fatherhood 95
4.5 Having a Child 97
4.6 The Dynamics of Paternal Bond: Despair and Grandiosity 101
4.7 Other Stories 111
4.8 Conclusion 114

5 THE BUILDING BLOCKS OF PATERNAL AUTHORITY 116

5.1 The Protector 120
5.1.1 Acting as a Father 122

5.2 The Cynical Citizen-Soldier: Internalizing Politics of Paternity 126
5.3 The Patriotic or Nationalist Citizen: Building Networks of Solidarity 136
5.4 The Deceived: An Honorable Man in a Perfidious World 145
5.5 What about Women? 149
5.5 Conclusion 150

6 FATHERS IN-BETWEEN 153

6.1 A Denied Childhood 156
6.2 The In-Between Fathers 167
6.2.2 A Generation That Dares to be Demanding 177
6.3 The Mores and Fatherly Authority 182
6.3.1 The Way of Sons 187
6.3.2 Keeping Assertive Daughters within Limits 188
6.3.3 Daughters-In-Law Testing Fatherly Authority 193
6.4 Conclusion 195

7 CONCLUSION 197

APPENDICES

A Information on the Interviewees 203
B Interview Questions 209
C Quotations in Turkish 211

BIBLIOGRAPHY 253

Acknowledgements
The PhD journey might open a wound which has already been there. I thank all my professors and friends for not letting me get fixated on the awareness of my existing wound.

I thank my esteemed advisor, Berna Yazıcı for letting me discover, meticulously reading my manuscript, and giving valuable feedbacks. She is the professor who helped me understand my country, by introducing me to qualitative research on Turkey. I thank Naz Bulamur for accepting me as her assistant. During my graduate studies, I was her apprentice –she was my master. She was the one who taught me research skills. I thank the committee members, Ayşe Gül Altınay, Seda Altuğ, and Berna Ekal I feel far from describing how inspirational and encouraging their presence and comments have been for me.

The dissertation could not have been possible without the help of my gatekeepers; Ayşe Kaya, Büşra Şengün, Hatice Arslan, Hüseyin Yüksel, Kübra Şengün, Melike Savaş, Pınar Süt, Resul Arslan, Sema Torun, and Tuğba Öcek. I am grateful for their guidance in the field. I am also grateful to all interviewees for their time and hospitality.

I would like to thank my dearest friend Zeynep Nur Ayanoğlu for curiously reading and giving feedbacks to my drafts. I am thankful to my beloved friend Eylem Nazlı Taşdemir for supporting me. I am also thankful to my friend Sinan Kaya for always encouraging and supporting me.

I would like to thank my partner, Denizhan, who always finds a way to make me laugh, and our friends Erman Harun Karaduman and Metin Koca for the inspiration and support they have always offered.

And I would like to thank my mother and father for encouraging me to keep going.

NOTE: The in-house editor of the Atatürk Institute has made detailed recommendations with regard to the format, grammar, spelling, usage, syntax, and style of this dissertation.

Your children are not your children.
They are the sons and daughters of Life's longing for itself.
They come through you but not from you,
And though they are with you yet they belong not to you.
You may give them your love but not your thoughts,
For they have their own thoughts.
You may house their bodies but not their souls,
For their souls dwell in the house of tomorrow, which you cannot visit, not even in your dreams.
You may strive to be like them, but seek not to make them like you.
For life goes not backward nor tarries with yesterday.
You are the bows from which your children as living arrows are sent forth.
The archer sees the mark upon the path of the infinite, and He bends you with His might that His arrows may go swift and far.
Let your bending in the archer's hand be for gladness;
For even as He loves the arrow that flies, so He loves also the bow that is stable.

– Khalil Gibran, The Prophet

1

Introduction

Modern nationalism and state-making involve, first, designing women's reproductive capacities in accordance with national interests; second, monitoring whether children are socialized "appropriately;" third, equating women to nation and appointing them representatives of "cultural authenticity;" fourth, combining nationalism, militarism, and heterosexist masculinism; fifth, denying homosexual relationships.[1]In the same manner, heteronormativity is "the organizing principle" of Turkish "heteropatriarchal-nationalist governmentality." This form of governmentality aims to produce "both heterosexual and nationalistic" citizens hand in hand with "media, family, religion, education, medicine, law, people, places, things, and other institutions."[2] Since the beginning of the twentieth century, civic instruction textbooks have designated the rights and responsibilities of family members in order to qualify *makbul* citizens.[3] *Makbul* is a culturally charged word with Arabic origin meaning legally, socially, and religiously

---

1 V. Spike Peterson, "The Intended and Unintended Queering of States/Nations," *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 13, no. 1 (2013): 61-63.

2 Paul Gordon Kramer, *Turkish Governmentality: A Genealogy of Heteropatriarchal Nationalism* (Bristol: Bristol University Press, 2022), 22-23.

3 Füsun Üstel, *Makbul Vatandaşın Peşinde: II Meşrutiyetten Bugüne Vatandaşlık Eğitimi*, (Istanbul: İletişim, 2019), 23-24.

acceptable. However, Ottoman Turkish has two forms of "k;" ق (qāf) and ك (kāf), which the Alphabet Reform in 1928 amalgamated into one. Since then, the words originating from the roots of ق ب ل (q b l) and ك ب ل (k b l) have merged. Consequently, مکبول (*mekbul*), which meant "pinioned" and "prisoned,"[4] is registered under مقبول (*makbul*).[5] I would like to preserve, as well as to remind and open to discussion this added meaning so that *makbul* evokes both being accepted and being a burden in terms of limitedness of mobility for men striving to perform *makbul* citizenship and fatherhood.

Makbul citizenship requires individuals to identify themselves as Turkish-Sunni-Muslim to be entitled to particular legal, economic, and symbolic privileges.[6] However, the *makbul* citizen entitled to particular privileges is not only identified as Turkish-Sunni-Muslim but also as masculine and heteronormative.[7] Therefore, "men are expected to bond politically (homosocially) with other men of the state/nation," as "women are linked to the state through their fathers/husbands and are expected to bond only through and with 'their men.'"[8] Indeed, the nation-state eliminated patrimonial relations of the Ottoman Empire and granted men equal opportunity in being head of a household as citizens of the newly established nation-state.[9] In this man-

---

4 LexiQamus, "مکبول," accessed June 21, 2022, https://www.lexiqamus.com/tr?search_type=box&_word=%D9%85%D9%83%D8%A8%D9%88%D9%84. I am grateful to Hüsniye Ayanoğlu for helping me search through the dictionaries of Ottoman Turkish. When I was aware of the second meaning of *makbul,* I sought further explanation but could not find any and then asked for her help. She showed me the word, *mekbul*. After that, I figured out that it had to do with the letter "k."

5 Buyuk Lugat, "Makbul," accessed June 19, 2022, https://www.buyuklugat.com/osmanlica-turkce/makbul

6 Barış Ünlü, *Türklük Sözleşmesi: Oluşumu, İşleyişi ve Krizi* (Ankara: Dipnot, 2018), 15.

7 Dilara Çalışkan, "Queer Postmemory," *European Journal of Women Studies* 26, no. 3 (2019): 263. Cenk Özbay and Maral Erol, "Vatandaşlık Rejimi, Cinsellikler ve Beden Siyaseti," *Cogito*, 90 (2018): 201-204.

8 Peterson, "The Intended," 61-63.

9 Nükhet Sirman, "Constituting the Modern Family as the Social in the Transition from Empire to Nation-State," in *Ways to Modernity in Greece and Turkey: Encounter with Europe, 1850-1950*, eds. Anna Frangoudaki and Caglar Keyder (London; New York: Taurus, 2007), 178-182.

ner, kinship relations serve to ensure the continuity of heteronormative gender identities.[10] In order to shed light upon the role of men as the main political agent within the heteropatriarchal family, I examine the construction and experiences of *makbul* fatherhood.

Drawing upon thirty-six formal, semi-structured, and tape-recorded interviews with lower-middle class men who have children between the ages of eighteen to forty, which is early adulthood period,[11] in six cities in the Marmara, Central Anatolia and the Black Sea Regions, I argue that the greatest fragility of lower-middle class men, who are well prepared by all the institutions of "the heteropatriarchal-nationalist governmentality" to be the stern observer and guarantor of Turkish-Sunni-Muslim heteropatriarchal society is ironically their role of fatherhood.

"'The holy trinity' of Sunni-Muslim-Turk"[12] does not provide men with an undifferentiated identity. It is mediated and divided by social class. And social class is implicated in men's construction and experiences of fatherhood. The interviewees represent the mainstream. They set their heart on complying with the norms but struggle realizing their desire because of their socio-economic limitations. State positions them in the provider role and has an unwavering trust in their ability to provide for their family as a man. Thus, it refrains from issuing social policies supporting men's provider and care-giving roles.[13] Furthermore, because of familialism, social problems are de-politicized by getting dragged into the realm of intimate relations.[14]

---

10 Gayle Rubin, "Sexual Traffic," by Judith Butler, *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 6 (1994): 66.

11 Léonie Sugarman, *Life-span Development: Frameworks, Accounts and Strategies* (Hove: Psychology Press, 2001), 59-60.

12 Ayhan Kaya, *Europeanization and Tolerance in Turkey: The Myth of Toleration* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 3.

13 Gökhan Topçu, "Varsayılan Aile Kıskancında Babalık: Türkiye'de Farklı Babalık Algıları ve Sosyal Politika İlişkisi," *Toplum ve Bilim* 145 (2018): 56.

14 Berna Yazıcı, "The Return to the Family: Welfare, State, and Politics of Family in Turkey," *Anthropological Quarterly* 85, no.1 (2012): 103-140. Saniye Dedeoğlu, "Veiled Europeanisation of Welfare State in Turkey: Gender and Social Policy in the 2000s," *Women's Studies International Forum* 41 (2013): 7-13. Zafer Yılmaz,"'Strengthtening the

Hence, the family is the only social security "card" for citizens.[15] In this context, although the interviewees have always struggled to be included in the patriarchal Turkish-Sunni-Muslim solidarity network, they have taken a more conciliatory tone regarding their children's non-*makbul* demands. Since they aspire to prevent their children from being socially and economically vulnerable in life, as they were before, they, as the guardian of the *makbul*, negotiate *makbul* limits without disrupting the organizing principles of the society. And what motivate them to do so are their difficult childhood experiences qualified by abject poverty, lovelessness, and being fathered by an emotionally unavailable father.

Although bell hooks is an African-American folklorist, I believe that her remarks are meaningful for men living in other social contexts, too. She draws attention to the fact that men do not always gain "privileges from their blind obedience to patriarchy," as patriarchy demands them to "become and remain emotional cripples."[16] In that sense, men, being emotionally reflective on their childhood experiences and open to negotiation with their children, break the "unspoken rule" to "keep the secrets of patriarchy, thereby protecting the rule of the father."[17]

That is not something expected from the narratives of a generation of men who are thought to fall under the category of "old fatherhood." By this term, I understand lesser paternal involvement at home and greater engage-

---

Family' Policies in Turkey: Managing the Social Question and Armoring Conservative-Neoliberal Populism," *Turkish Studies* 15, no.3 (2015): 371-390. Dilek Cindoglu and Didem Unal, "Gender and Sexuality in the Authoritarian Discursive Strategies of 'New Turkey,'" *European Journal of Women's Studies* 24, no. 1 (2017): 39-54. Başak Akkan, "The Politics of Care in Turkey: Sacred Familialism in a Changing Political Context," *Social Politics* 0 (2017): 1-20. Simten Coşar and İnci Özkan Kerestecioğlu," Feminist Politics in Contemporary Turkey: Neoliberal Attacks, Feminist Claims to the Public," *Journal of Women, Politics & Society* 38, no. 2 (2017): 151-174.

15 Aksu Bora, "Aile: En Güçlü İşsizlik Sigortası,"in *Boşuna mı Okuduk? Türkiye'de Beyaz Yakalı İşsizliği,* eds. Tanıl Bora et al. (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2011), 185-187.

16 bell hooks, *The Will to Change: Men, Masculinity, and Love* (New York: Atria Books, 2004), 36-40.

17 Ibid., 35.

ment in paid labor outside of it, and unequal division of care work within the household, in stark contradiction with "new fatherhood" which refers to "greater paternal involvement at home and lesser engagement in paid work outside the home, and a shift toward a more egalitarian sharing of caring responsibilities within the household." The difference between the two types is the result of "generational change in gender attitudes" and an increase in women's participation in the labor market.[18] Thus, "old fatherhood" belongs to an era when the ideal of the husband-father as the main provider and the wife-mother as the primary caretaker was unchallenged.

For the last two decades, researchers have tended to diagnose this generation of men with "a crisis of masculinity," which is used in literature "to denote men's existential state of fear and rage about having their rightful place questioned and challenged."[19] However, hooks annotates that the crisis is not "the crisis of masculinity, it is the crisis of patriarchal masculinity."[20] I can corroborate her by referring to Gayle Rubin. She, pointing out that "capitalism" is a powerful word as it implies other forms of production, warns us not to mistake "the human capacity and necessity to create a sexual world, and the empirically oppressive ways in which sexual worlds have been organized." Namely, "sex/gender system" and "patriarchy" do not mean the same thing. The former is "a neutral term which refers to the domain and indicates that oppression is not inevitable in that domain." As the aim of the terms is to differentiate "economic systems" from "sexual systems," the latter is autonomous to a certain extent. It is not "simply the reproductive moment of a 'mode of production.'" Sexual systems design "the biological

---

18 Abigail Gregory and Susan Milner, "What is 'New' about Fatherhood?: The Social Construction of Fatherhood in France and the UK," *Men and Masculinities* 145 (2011): 589-601.

19 Deniz Kandiyoti, "Mainstreaming Men and Masculinities: Technical Fix or Political Struggle?" *Masculinities* 12, (2019): 32.

20 hooks, *The Will to Change,* 40.

raw material of human sex and procreation" in an "egalitarian" or a "gender-stratified" way, and that is an example of production in this domain.[21]

In that sense, for the interviewees, "the crisis of patriarchal masculinity" seems to have served as a means for redefinition and reinterpretation of fatherhood. However, as "men are expected to bond politically (homosocially) with other men of the state/nation," it is fundamental to understand the socio-political context, in which they dare to break the "unspoken rule" to protect the rule of the father.

§ 1.1 Understanding the Socio-Political Context

Crisis has not been peculiar to men in Turkey. "The heteropatriarchal-nationalist" state institutions have had "existential state of fear and rage about having their rightful place questioned and challenged," too. Barış Ünlü, the first scholar to consider Turkishness a contract enacted with the establishment of the Republic of Turkey as a nation-state in 1924-1925,[22] shows that the contract is composed of three articles. First, only individuals who identify as Turkish-Sunni-Muslim are entitled to particular legal, economic, and symbolic privileges in Turkey. Second, it is strictly forbidden to have sympathy for and pursue political causes with non-Muslim groups. The third follows the sentiment of the second article and relates to Muslim groups who object to Turkification.[23]

In the 1970s, Kurdish socialists began to challenge the tacit contract, arguing that "Kurdistan was an international colony, divided and shared by Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Syria." Mobilized by this new understanding, the

---

21 Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex," in *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, ed. Rayna R. Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), 167-168.

22 In the Early Republican Period, the legacy of the millet system, the organization of the Ottoman Empire into ethnoreligious compartments, was still in force. The new Republican state thus viewed Islam (orthodox Sunni Islam, to be precise) an indispensable component of Turkishness: "All Muslims in Turkey were potential Turks." This is why the state considers all Muslims in the country to be Turkish**.** (Cagaptay, 2006, 159-162).

23 Ünlü, *Türklük Sözleşmesi*, 15.

Kurdistan Workers' Party endorsed and embarked on an armed struggle in 1984. With the armed struggle, the intellectual debate turned into a nationwide actuality in the 1990s. Kurdish people, who were forced to leave their villages, migrated to the metropolitan cities, which resulted in various confrontational scenes between Kurdish and Turkish populations. Consequently, the privileged groups were no longer able to maintain their "impenetrable ignorance" to the ostracism experienced by oppressed groups. They had to check and balance their attitude toward the dominant historical narrative of Turkey as a vulnerable but proud combatant country founded against greedy and brutal imperial powers. That has shaken the construction of Turkishness, causing an identity crisis.[24]

However, there were other social realities leading to the crisis. The 1980 Turkish coup was the beginning of "liberal awakenings" in the form of feminism and Islamism. Since the foundation of the republic, women had been formally granted "public and legal equality," whereas their exploitation in the private sphere had largely been ignored. As the military regime oppressed the left in the 1980s, women "found a niche to express their feminist concerns." They started calling attention to "domestic violence, sexual harassment, control over women's bodies, and the like."[25] Now, the dominant historical narrative needed to be revisited regarding women's place in national history, too. Women, instead of showing gratitude to the early republic, asked whether they were "actors or pawns" in the Turkish modernity project.[26] They passionately demonstrated that women were no "full-fledged citizens," they were just "members of religious/ethnic collectivities, whose control is relinquished by the state to the patriarchal interests of their com-

---

24 Barış Ünlü, "The Kurdish Struggle and the Crisis of the Turkishness Contract," *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 42, no. 4-5 (2016): 401-403.

25 Ayşe Güneş-Ayata and Fatma Tütüncü, "Party Politics of the AKP (2002-2007) and the Predicaments of Women at the Intersection of the Westernist, Islamist and Feminist Discourses in Turkey," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 35, no. 3 (2008): 368.

26 Deniz Kandiyoti, "Women and the Turkish State: Political Actors or Symbolic Pawns?" in *Woman-Nation State*, edited by N. Yuval-Davis N. and F. Anthias (London, Macmillan Press, 1988), 126-150.

munities."[27] Indeed, as mothers, they were considered the symbolic bearers of Turkey's westernization. They were "occupied and defined, given content and value,"[28] by the newly established heteropatriarchal state. This critical feminist reading of the national history constituted the second challenge to the Turkish state and its national ideology.

The third front was opened by the representatives of Islamism, who were trying to raise their voice in the modern political arena since the 1950s. The Motherland Party, the winner of the 1983 elections, devoted itself to neoliberal restructuring of the economy to gain the confidence of the IMF, World Bank, and OECD and ultimately to being the recipient of credits unlike the previous governments.[29] The party also liberalized Islamic organizations to make the youth resistant to communism and other leftist ideals as part of its Turkish-Islamic synthesis policy. The basic principle of the policy is to stress a natural continuity between Turkishness and Sunni Islam. Turkey, as a soldier-nation coming from Central Asia reaches its culmination in the Ottoman Empire fighting for Islam.[30] Paradoxically, these practices coincided with the college headscarf ban, initiated in 1981 to maintain "the neutrality principle of public services in a secular state modelled on the French framework. Thus, since 1980s, the headscarf issue has been a hot topic in Turkish politics: "Is it an individual right, or an expression of freedom of religion and conscience?"[31]

A crisis requires redefining and reinterpreting things differently. The 2000s has been the period of redefinition and reinterpretation in Turkish socio-political world. In the 2000s, the Justice and Development Party,

---

27 Deniz Kandiyoti, "Women, Islam, and the State: A Comparative Approach." In *Comparing Muslim Societies: Knowledge and the State in a World Civilization*, ed. by Juan Cole (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), 256.

28 Martha L. Fineman, "Images of Mothers in Poverty Discourses," *Duke Law Journal* 274 (1991): 289.

29 Erik Jan Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2004) 278-312.

30 Jenny White, *Muslim Nationalism and the New Turks*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 35-45.

31 Güneş-Ayata and Tütüncü, "Party Politics of the AKP," 368.

which came to power in 2002, started a Peace Process,[32] emulating a romanticized "flexible and inclusive Ottoman past." Now, non-Muslim and Alawite minorities were free to open their institutions, the status of divided Cyprus was negotiable, Kurdish people could use their language in the public sphere, and Iraqi Kurdistan arose as a diplomatic interlocutor.[33] Jenny White calls this new Turkish identity "Muslim nationalism." Muslim nationalists base their subjectivities and expectations from the future on an imperial Ottoman past. For them, "everything from lifestyle to public and foreign policy are up for reinterpretation […] according to a distinctively Turkish post-imperial sensibility."[34] Yet the JDP modeled its policies on an ahistorical and romanticized Ottoman past. The Ottoman Empire was organized by ethnoreligious compartments, known as *millet* system. "The new Turks" rationalized the integration of non-Muslim subjects by referring to the system but without addressing the supremacy of Muslim subjects in the empire. Thus, their lack of acknowledgement caused "inconsistent policies and false starts."[35]

This is the context in which men, who strive to be successful in performing a combination of *makbul* citizenship and fatherhood in Turkey, dare to be emotionally reflective, opposing patriarchy that demands them to "become and remain emotional cripples."

§ 1.2 The Study's Contribution to Literature

Differently from the existing literature on fatherhood, this dissertation reveals how redefining or reinterpreting things differently in political, social, and private realms have infiltrated into the construction and experiences of *makbul* fatherhood by lower-middle class men. For the existing field research in Turkey predominantly deals with fatherhood as a matter of divi-

---

32 For a chronology of the process see: https://hakikatadalethafiza.org/en/chronology-of-peace-process-in-turkey/

33 White, *Muslim Nationalism*, 50.

34 Ibid., 9.

35 Ibid., 13.

sion of labor since their participants are mostly fathers with underage children,[36] and limited intergenerational research with adult children includes fathers and sons, excluding daughters.[37] Other studies either focus on the political views of fathers' of underage children[38] or social policy issues.[39] Therefore, in addition to providing a new perspective on studying fatherhood by including a generation of men; the existing literature tends to exclude, this research illuminates the intertwined relationship between childhood, manhood, fatherhood, and nationhood.

§ 1.3 The Sample

The men whose narratives of fatherhood constitute the basis for the analysis offered in this study are over fifty years old men, who identify as Sunni-

---

36 Cressida Evans, "Turkish Fathers' Attitudes to and Involvement in Their Fathering Role: A Low Socio-economic Example," (master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, 1997); Deniz Dogruoz and Debbie Rogow, "And How Will You Remember Me, My Child? Redefining Fatherhood in Turkey," *Quality/Calidad/Qualité* 19 (2009); Zeynep Tecik, "Fatherhood Experience of Lower-Middle Class Men: The Case of Eskişehir," (master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, 2012); Sezai Ozan Zeybek, "'Bu Bebeğin Annesi Nerede?:' Cinsiyet, Babalık ve Armağan İlişkileri," *Toplum ve Bilim* 126 (2013): 120-143; Fatma Umut Beşpınar, "Between Ideals and Enactments: The Experience of 'New Fatherhood' Among Middle-Class Men in Turkey," in *Gender and Sexuality in Muslim Cultures*, ed. Gül Özyeğin (Surrey: Ashgate, 2015), 95-113; Atilla Barutçu and Naz Hıdır, "Türkiye'de Babalığın Değişen Rolleri," *Fe Journal: Feminist Critiquel* 8, no.2 (2016): 27-45; Mother Child Education Foundation, *Involved Fatherhood and Its Determinants in Turkey*, 2017. Accessed July 14, 2018. http://www.en.acev.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/1_involved-fatherhood-and-its-determinants-in-turkey.pdf.

37 Mustafa Sever, Toplumsal-Kültürel Bağlamda Babalık Kurgu ve Pratiklerinin Çocuk Eğitimine Etkileri: Üç Kuşak Babalar Üzerine Karşılaştırmalı Bir Araştırma," (master's thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi, 2002); Büşra Yalçınöz, "From Being a Son to Being a Father: An Intergenerational Comparison of Fatherhood in Turkey," (master's thesis, Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2011).

38 Fatma Umut Beşpınar and L. Zeynep Beşpınar, "Türkiye'de Orta Üst Sınıf Laik ve Muhafazakar Kimliklerin Babalık Deneyimleri Üzerinden İrdelenmesi: Benzerlikler, Farklılıklar, Önyargılar ve Mesafeler," *Toplum ve Bilim* 143 (2018): 5-38.

39 Topçu, "Varsayılan Aile Kıskancında Babalık," 95-97.

Muslim-Turkish, whose work experience is predominantly in manual labor. Except four, all of them have a rural background. They are predominantly the children of not-yet urbanized Turkey aiming an "agriculture-led growth" and "import-substituting industrialization" respectively in the 1950s and 1960s.[40] Thus, they were born to the harsh conditions of village life, and some had to struggle with abject poverty too. Work was the defining feature of their childhood experience. The physical and psychological absence of their fathers was also overwhelming since they had to substitute him as a boy. Some migrated to cities in solitude to join the workforce at a very early age. In doing so, they both parented themselves and took care of their mothers and siblings. As a result, they have a common orientation toward lack of certain things in childhood, be it a feeling of security or basic needs. They portray men of a particular generation and social class, who shared a similar "lack" in life. Differently from their fathers, most of them started their own breadwinner-homemaker family and raised children in urban areas. However, starting their family coincided with the country's neoliberal transition. Therefore, they raised their children under the influence of new policies that "focused on identity, locality, consumerism, and a celebratory rhetoric of free choice."[41]

Sixteen of them are primary school graduates; two are primary school dropouts. One is a high school dropout, four have a high school degree, two are graduates of a junior college, and one continued his education in distance learning after he graduated from high school. Five other interviewees do not represent a normative standard in terms of political stance, marital status, ethnicity, and religion. Three men, one of whom is Kurdish, are primary school graduate workers or retired workers. One is a high-school graduate Armenian goldsmith while one is a grocer with a bachelor degree.

---

40 Şevket Pamuk, *Uneven Centuries: Economic Development of Turkey Since 1820* (Princeton University Press: Princeton, 2018), 207-220.

41 Fikret Senses, "Turkey's Exprience with Neoliberal Policies Since 1980 in Retrospect and Prospect," in *The Making of Neoliberal Turkey* eds. Cenk Ozbay, Maral Erol, Aysecan Terzioglu, and Z. Umut Turem (Farnham/Rochester: Ashgate, 2016), 15.

Interviewing them was englightening to clarify against whom normativity is constructed.

Building on the interviews conducted with this this sample of men, and drawing upon constructivist grounded theory methodology,[42] this dissertation theorizes the interviewees' interpretations, without ignoring that a constructivist approach "not only theorizes the interpretive work that research participants do, but also acknowledges that the resulting theory is an interpretation."[43]

§ 1.4 The Outline and Main Arguments

The dissertation first explains the research process in the next chapter. Then, Chapter 3 presents an overview of Masculinity Studies and fatherhood literature within the field and gives an outline of the field along with research on fatherhood in Turkey. After the review, I begin to generate data drawing upon constructivist grounded theory.

First, I problematize the social meaning of fatherhood in Chapter 4. Each man I interviewed having conditioned himself as a considerate male member of their natal family and a decent head of household, acted as a father to his wife and siblings. It is their ability to lead their dependents, their wives and siblings. Thus, in the case of siblings, their paternal role overlaps with being a good son. They prefer to act without harming their father's paternal image. In that regard, the interviewees' children were born into a house where there was an already established pattern of fatherhood, and the social meaning of fatherhood goes beyond having children for the interviewees. For them, it is the ability to shoulder financial responsibilities

---

42 Grounded theory is a research method developed by Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss as they studied dying in hospitals, which was a taboo subject for even hospital staff in the 1960s. As they observed how professionals and terminal patients dealt with death, they developed theories "from research grounded in data rather than *deducing* testable hypotheses from existing theories." Jennifer Mason, *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*, (London: Sage, 2006), 4.

43 Kathy Charmaz, *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*, (London: Sage, 2006), 130.

and differentiate *makbul* from non-*makbul* on behalf of their dependents. In this context, having a child is a requirement in life like marriage and most of the time it is another occasion to perform the role of the primary decision-maker in the family. Accordingly, most of the interviewees did not have much to say about paternal bond. Some shared stories of illness and accident that their children or they, for the sake of their children, had suffered a long time ago to express their tenderheartedness toward their children. However, they linked these stories to the divine power that rewards or punishes their family according to their correct or incorrect actions as the head of household.

In Chapter 5, I demonstrate that the rationale behind men's fatherly authority over their wives, siblings, and children are some male-specific experiences that had prepared them to be a patriarch with networks of solidarity. Using Erving Goffman's term, "moral career," together with Louis Althusser's definition of ideology as a conceptual basis, I identify stages through which the interviewees acquired a classifying system in line with the dominant ideology, nationalism in this case. Men constructed the social meaning of fatherhood within a nationalist paradigm, aligning social and political mechanisms to be included in formal and informal networks of solidarity.

Except for a few of them, the interviewees' life journey began by leaving their village either for the sake of paid work in cities at an early age or for military service. However, regardless of the reason, their departure marks the beginning of their "moral career" as an individual. First, they comprehended the terms and conditions of positioning themselves in a world of paternalistic solidarity. Men, who left their hometown for work at an early age either sought a fatherly protector or acted as a one. Either way, they demonstrate that society or nation has some criteria to assess a man as to whether he is qualified to father or to be protected by a father-like authority. People acknowledge a man's paternal authority over another man upon having some qualifications. Thus, the interviewees tried to prove that they had these qualities.

Second, through military service, men intuitively gained the knowledge of politics of paternity. That is how manhood and fatherhood are constructed differently from womanhood and motherhood. By that, they learned to posi-

tion themselves and other men as the citizens whose actions have political bearings as opposed to women citizens. Thus, they express alienation from the military by referring to its unintelligible nature, but at the same time hold on tightly to military service as a patriotic duty in order to be known as a man capable of defending his nation and honor. Third, they met politics through different experiences. Their stories uncover the uneasy relationship between normative manhood, patriotism, xenophobia, and violence. Fourth, they learned how to deal with the injustice done to them within their community by staying loyal to their community despite experiences of being deceived and betrayed. Through these stages, men acquired a classifying system according to the dominant ideology, nationalism in this case.

Finally, in Chapter 6, I examine two intertwined aspects of fatherhood: First is the men's narratives of being fathered and the role of such narratives in shaping their performance of fatherhood. Second is the men's evaluation of fatherhood in relation to their adult children's position within society and the new mild methods they invented to sustain fatherly authority.

Men's narratives oscillate between a desire to prevent their children from suffering in life and complaining about a lack of appreciation of their fatherhood. They, as children of deprivation, did not embarrass their fathers for lack of paternal love or basic needs. They did not dare to be demanding from their fathers. They acted as children, who always live indebted to their fathers and mothers. When they became a father, they did not give up on this responsible identity.

This being the case, they have a strong desire to be appreciated by both their natal family as a son and their own children as a father. Yet to be appreciated by children is a more challenging task. They found new mild methods to sustain their paternal authority. Although they were referred by my gatekeepers within the framework of *makbul* fatherhood, they are the ones who redefine the limits of *makbul* fatherhood. However, they feel unappreciated.

Since they have not built their own terminology, such as "new fatherhood," to define their paternal practices, they seem to have developed another strategy to describe their positionality. They tell stories glorifying patriarchal authority of the past to manifest what they waive. Their portrayal

of their father as a stern authority before their helpless childhood selves serves to express their stark contrast with them: They are fathers who have acknowledged that a father is never to be properly respected and appreciated even if he seems to duly accomplish all responsibilities attributed to the burdening task of fatherhood, which never ends.

2

A Cerebral and Corporeal Reflection on Researching Men as a Woman and Guided Autobiography Instructor

I was looking attentively at Cemil's deep blue eyes when he supported my curiosity about fatherhood saying, "You are on the right track!" He was sure of that; life experiences of fathers are instructive for anyone. I responded, "Yes, I know!" like an enthusiastic child preparing to listen to exciting stories.

Our culture teaches us "who is charged with remembering and what kinds of memories they are charged with keeping. And we learn the cultural uses of remembering, how certain ways of remembering are elicited, acknowledged, valued."[1] The dialog between me and Cemil, who was one of the preliminary interviewees, was an indication for how I was to be positioned during the research process; as a young woman researcher, I inhabited a position that is less charged with remembering. So, I was there listening, they were there talking.

As the listener and researcher, I acknowledge that no data is uncontaminated by researchers, and no research is carried out outside a broader socie-

[1] Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson, *Reading Autobiography: A Guide For Interpreting Life Narratives* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), 22.

tal context; the researcher's biography and social mechanisms influence research. More simply, a person is not only a researcher in the field.[2] Whenever someone asked me about my motivation to research fatherhood I referred to my M.A. research I did with women who have had a divorce experience,[3] saying that I came to realize that the category of fathership carries a huge emotional burden, which I did not realize before." During the interviews I conducted for this research, some women burst into tears or were barely able to speak when their father was at stake. Interestingly enough, whereas I was expecting that a storm of emotions would break in mentioning the ex-husband, women mainly were either at ease with the memory of ex-husband or they were simply angry. Their sorrow was congested with the father. Some women were deeply saddened because their father believed their daughter had married to an irresponsible and incompetent man. On the other hand, some other women were choleric because their father was the first man in their life, incapable of offering affection. Then the denomination for fatherhood resonated as misandry. Such an emphasis on masculine parenting made me realize that the meaning of fatherhood should be examined extensively to uncover what is beneath. That was my explanation when asked. Yet, I am aware that growing up with a divorced mother in a conservative country also influenced my sensitivity to the subject. Another researcher might have paid no attention to the father figure in women's stories at all. But now, at the end of the whole process, I feel, in two separate research projects I have acted according to the idiom; "better the devil you know than the devil you don't."

Ayşe Gül Altınay quotes Ruth Behar who says, "When you write vulnerably, others respond vulnerably," arguing that undoing "methodological militarism" is possible by "ever-deepening understanding of our positionalities

---

2 Paul Atkinson and Martyn Hammersley, *Ethnography: Principles in Practice* (Routledge: London; New York, 2007), 15.

3 M. Esra Yıldırım, *Yeni Bir Hayat Kurmak/Kadınlar Anlatıyor: Babalık, Evlilik ve Boşanma*, (Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 2017).

and limitations."[4] Researchers make themselves vulnerable as they cover "their emotions, thoughts, research relationships, and their unstable interpretive decisions." However, for researchers, it is essential to understand themselves to understand how they interpret stories. In order for readers to understand narrators' stories they need to understand researchers' personal and intellectual relations with narrators as well as the cultural context they live in. That is against "the myth of the invisible omniscient author."[5] As Maria Mies says, value freedom as a methodological principle "drives women scholars into a schizophrenic situation" because "they have constantly to, repress, negate, or ignore their own experience of sexist oppression and have to strive to live up to the so-called 'rational,' standards of a highly competitive, male-dominated academic world."[6]

However, as Rebecca Hanson and Patricia Richards show in their recent work *Harassed*, although there has been a growing awareness of reflexivity, qualitative researchers still gloss over the embodied nature of their knowledge production as if it was only a cerebral undertaking.[7] Hanson and Richards, acknowledging the body as a historically situated product and gender as a performative endeavor, underline that performers are judged as to whether they "do gender" appropriately. That is a crucial part of fieldwork.[8] How the researcher feels in her own body affects the research. Indeed, the most distinguishable differences between initial and later interviews of the researcher are nonverbal suggestions like sitting posture and

---

4 Ayşe Gül Altınay, "Undoing Academic Cultures of Militarism," *Current Anthropology* 60 (2019): 23.

5 Susan E. Chase, "Narrative Inquiry: Multiple Lenses, Approaches, Voices," in *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, eds. Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2005), 666.

6 Maria Mies, *Towards a Methodology of Women's Studies* (The Hague : Institute of Social Studies, 1979), 4.

7 Rebecca Hanson and Patricia Richards, *Harassed: Gender, Bodies and Ethnographic Research* (California: California University Press, 2019), 154.

8 Ibid., 9-11.

gestures.[9] In that regard, an embodied reflection refers to a responsibility to explain how one's body, in addition to their class, age, and racial identities, may affect the research process.[10] However, it is not an invitation to the researchers to take a center stage. "Rather it is a call to think and write about how our bodies –the meanings, practices, and experiences that constitute them– are implicated in the research process."[11] In this framework, my reflections are corporeal as much as cerebral.

§ 2.1 My Angled Obscene Presence

I was at a cafe with my friends near the campus. My friend and I went downstairs together for the toilet and then saw that the two unisex toilets were busy. While we were waiting, a middle-aged man with a beard, who seemed a blue-collar employee, joined us. In a few seconds, he started to tell an "amusing" story to my friend, who was closer to him, and after finishing it he laughed, expecting the same reaction from my friend. But, my friend looked into his eyes and put on an expression indicating what he did was inappropriate. At that moment, I was relieved that he did not tell his story to me, because if I were the person he told his "amusing" story, I would not have been able to put on that criticizing expression of my friend and would have laughed at his story even if I did not understand anything at all. Each time I thought about that moment, I questioned why I would have laughed at his story instead of communicating him that what he did was inappropriate.

That is an excerpt from my autobiographical writings that I sometimes read to the participants while running small groups of women as a Guided Autobiography instructor. Guided Autobiography (GAB) is a technique for documenting and sharing life experiences developed by Professor James E.

---

9 Douglas Ezzy, "Qualitative Interviewing as an Embodied Emotional Performance," *Qualitative Inquiry* 16 (2010): 165-167.

10 Sonya Sharma, Sherly Reimer-Kirkham, and Marie Cochrane, "Practicing the Awareness of Embodiment in Qualitative Health Research: Methodological Reflections," *Qualitative Health Research* 19 (2009): 1643.

11 Hanson and Richards, *Harassed*, 9.

Birren, an American gerontologist.Since my mother was the second generation Georgian immigrant born in Turkey, she was not a product of the cult of domesticity in a Turkish fashion and never trained me to politely give superficial answers to personal questions. So, as a senior student, I took very seriously the request of Prof. Zafer Toprak, who was standing in for our chair of department, Prof. Edhem Eldem, who was then on sabbatical leave, to write an autobiography as a thesis. It was my first act of "writing vulnerably" because it had an audience, a professor. But it was therapeutic, too. Years later, after my book on women's experiences of divorce got published I started to organize autobiographical writing groups without knowing that it was already a method developed years ago. By some internet research about writing autobiography I came across the technique and became the first GAB instructor based in Turkey. As a GAB instructor, I am used to elicit the most related experience from my all life experiences for a defined theme. The two meanings of the word, *makbul*, which refer to both the comfort of being accepted and not being able to move freely, provide me a theme regarding my presence in the field. Thus, I would like to share the excerpt above as I believe it reveals my affective experience with men of a certain social background.

There is no single definition of affect theory, which brings together humanities, biology and neuroscience. However, various interpretations of it refer to timing. They are about "the self running ahead of itself." How quicker our brain than we consciously know it and how frequently we use our emotions as a basis for our actions before we identify them. We can have anger at or attraction toward another person unnoticing that our attitude toward the person has changed. In that, we experience affect unconsciously. Alternatively, we can acknowledge our anger or attraction and take it as some authentic information about the person and the way to approach them. That is "affect as an immediate awareness of reality," and what most theorists call emotion. Another third option is to accept our anger or attraction but focus on their movements within us instead of using them as some

authentic information about the person. That is "the self-conscious experience of affect as affect."[12]

Sara Ahmad writing on affect says, "emotions circulate and are distributed across a social as well as psychic field." Any object or sign does not have an intrinsic affective value, instead "the more they circulate, the more affective they become, and the more they appear to 'contain' affect."[13] We stick happiness to "certain objects that circulate as social goods." As the objects give us fulfillment "we are aligned" with them. Family, for example; we expect happiness from it since "we share an orientation toward the family as being good." Without this orientation, the family does not have an intrinsic quality to create happiness. When objects do not fulfill our expectation to be happy, we are alienated from them; we become "affect aliens."[14]

I am (was) an affectively alienated woman (girl) by the men with the same generation and social background of the interviewees. As White explains, individuals in Turkey are supposed to shape their "individual liberties" based on "a collective logic." They can follow "their personal choices and motivations within powerful collective frameworks provided by family, community, and nation." Otherwise, they risk being considered "dishonorable, impure, non-Turkish, and a threat to the morals and unity of society."[15] Undoubtedly, what White explains has a gender dimension, too. Thus, in my daily encounters with older men of the same background as the interviewees, my reaction is in line with what Deniz Kandiyoti means by "patriarchal bargain" to be regarded as a *makbul* woman deserving protection.[16] Meanings associated with the female body are passivity, helplessness, and vulnerability.[17] I do not prefer a modest style but can let people associate my body with these meanings so that they do not consider me a threat. Hence my

---

12 Marta Figlerowicz, "Affect Theory Dossier: An Introduction," *Qui Parle* 20 (2012): 3-5.

13 Sara Ahmad, "Affective Economies," *Social Text* 22 (2004): 120.

14 Sara Ahmad, "Happy Objects," in *The Affect Theory Reader*, eds. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, (Durham; London: Duke University Press, 2010), 37.

15 White, *Muslim Nationalism*, 16.

16 Deniz Kandiyoti, "Bargaining with Patriarchy," *Gender and Society* 2 (1988): 274-290.

17 Hanson and Richards, *Harassed*, 42.

readiness to be a passive receiver in the event at the cafe I quoted above. I was aware that what White says would be the internal machination of the field, too. When we enter a room we sense its atmosphere, "but what we may feel depends on the angle of our arrival. Or we might say that the atmosphere is already angled; it is always felt from a specific point."[18] In that sense, the rooms I conducted the interviews in were both rooms in the real architectural sense as well as being a miniature of the country, angled to its citizens in umpteen ways. Consequently, during the research process, I oscillated between considering my affective experience as some authentic information and as self-consciously experienced affect.

Jocelyn Crowley, as a woman researching fathers' rights groups, argues that interviewees tend to figure out whether the researcher is a "friend or foe."[19] However, the researcher might position the interviewees as a "friend" or "foe" based on her angled view, too. In my case, I did not consider men "friend" or "foe," but I certainly did not feel comfortable in their presence. There were two reasons for that.

First, I was not comfortable because of my personal experiences with men of the same age and social background. Second, James Spradley recommends that a good informant should meet the requirement of "thorough enculturation." That is to say, a good informant is a good implementer of the culture in which they live and perform everything automatically.[20] My initial access to the interviewees was made possible by acquaintances, and then both snowball sampling and different gatekeepers brought me to other interviewees. I did not refrain from going out of town because some interviewees live in two cities, in Istanbul and in their hometown depending on the season, and some preferred to live in their hometown after retirement, while some living in Istanbul at the moment dream of going back to their hometown. More importantly, mobility is one of their defining features. In other words, most of the interviewees had left their hometown to earn a liv-

---

18 Ahmad, "Happy Objects," 37.

19 Jocelyn Elise Crowley, " A Friend or Foe?: Self-Expansion, Stigmatized Groups, and the Resarcher- Participant Relationship," *Journal of Contemporary Etnography* 36 (2007): 606.

20 Spradley, *The Ethnographic*, 46-47.

ing in a different city, and their zeal to settle in wherever they could provide for their family is a constitutive part of their manhood. In that regard, I continued interviewing men that both my interviewees and gatekeepers referred until I started seeing some patterns. Men to whom I was referred were mainly those who had to endure many hardships throughout their lives. They intuitively sought for what Spradley recommended, men with "thorough enculturation." For the majority of the interviewees, fatherhood requires leading a life full of sufferings and struggling with them nobly. In other words, different ordeals beget fathers, and fathers beget children. They told their stories thinking that I would honor their sufferings in my writings. In fact, one interviewee said that if I write anything against him that would be betrayal. I was not comfortable with the idea of offending them. At the same time, I did not want to miss any detail that I believed would be useful for the analysis.

My first discontent was body related. I did not know how to bear my body as a woman in the field, but I knew I had to present "the relevant body," the relevant "cultural capital," and the relevant "interaction rituals."[21] By "relevant" I mean that I had to perform as a woman who was "pinioned" to the traditional features of femininity. I had to be like a hardworking student, whose womanhood is meticulously neglected. My appearance, speech, and mannerism had to be in line with this. At least, it was what my angle of arrival made me feel.The first reason for my bodily discomfort is that I was harassed by my close friend's maternal uncle at my home alone when I was fifteen years old, and the whole process, too complex to summarize, was ill-managed. That was my second experience of sexual harassment. The first one had happened when I was five years old at my caretaker's house. The thing is, the families of these harassers were those who taught me "the relevant body," the relevant "cultural capital," and the relevant "interaction rituals." For example, I learned from them how to hug women three times by holding their upper arms, which regular women attenders of religious gatherings perform in daily life. I performed this interaction ritual when neces-

[21] David Calvey, "The Art and Politics of Covert Research: Doing 'Situated Ethics' in the Field," *Sociology* 42, no. 5 (2008): 911.

sary in the field.The families of the harassers occupied a significant place in my life because I was like an unattended child. After my father had resigned from public service, he left the country and got a divorce from my mother. After the divorce, my mother started working at a sweatshop twelve hours a day. Each morning, I would open my eyes in her arms as she was striding through uphill. I would spend my days at the sweatshop, watching the workers work and tease each other. In time, the employer, who was always kind to me, turned his small business into a factory. I spent my years observing how the cheerful environment of the small sweatshop turned into a "professional" working place, rigid and dull. I understand one of the reasons for this was that my mother, as a woman in her late thirties, had been the oldest worker there. However, the factory was populated by men, who were peer to or older than my mother. Their presence, somehow, forced young workers to be more earnest and grumpy. So, my childhood was surrounded by circulating strangers, who would take me for granted as long as I was just a kid, who liked to read. Things changed when I was a teenager. I never forget the moment, my beloved worker, whom I had always seen as an older brother, zipped my coat in a brotherly manner to cover my teenage breasts. Here was the devil I know. During the interviews, I was unintentionally regressing to my child-self, trying to fade my womanhood.

To deal with this situation, I wrapped myself in the role of a hardworking student researching to take good grades. But, the role of a hardworking student has distinct undertones among which the conservative one is the most acceptable. Thus, at the beginning of the research, I thought that a knee-length skirt under a long-sleeved shirt would be a fine uniform for the interviews. However, I realized that a skirt seems too delicate for a young woman who meets and converses with strange men. A unisex style was much more convincing. Then, I decided that the pants were just fine. However, a long-sleeved shirt was a real necessity even if one wears it in 35 degree Celcius. To support this, I can describe a moment in a gatekeeper's house. My gatekeeper was my aunt, she would take me to the house of one of her old acquaintances to interview. I was sitting with a sleeveless outfit, waiting for her to get ready. When she told me it was time to go, I put on a crochet cardigan right away. Then, she looked at and approved me with her

eyes, murmuring "Good." She was happy that I could tell good from bad in the eyes of her acquaintance. Our mutual silence on this issue made me conclude that she, as a woman who has worked all throughout her life in large factories with men, had acted as I did in the field.

However, even though researchers "present themselves in one manner or another, as 'friend' or 'disinterested bystander' or 'novice," people "usually do reinterpret, transform, or sometimes altogether reject these presentations in favor of their own." Therefore, the roles researchers assume in the field are tentative and open to redefinition.[22] Accordingly, despite my intention to fade my womanhood, I was marked as a woman in the field. In other words, the interviewees knew where to position my body. Since I was a woman interviewing older men, almost all interviewees and gatekeepers tried to introduce me to "pure-minded" and "industrious" men, aiming to prevent me from contacting with "idle" men. Indeed, sometimes I had to struggle to reach some interviewees due to their notorious past as a violent husband. Secondly, most of the time gatekeepers and family members attended the interviews as active listeners. This was partly because houses were small and I could not demand other people to wait in the bedroom, but in essence, people tend to think that it is not appropriate for a young woman to stay alone with a strange man. A gatekeeper mentioned three potential interviewees, who sent a message to me that I could learn whatever I would like to learn about them from their wives. In other words, I could only interview women about their husbands' fatherhood. An interviewee explained why we should not stay alone by recalling his sister's neighbors, who gossiped about him and his sister without knowing that they are siblings. He said that a woman cannot get rid of a stain on her honor, so we should not be alone. In this manner, I was positioned both as a guest and novice person, who needs to listen to the life experiences of a worldly-wise man, thereby approving his authority in front of his wife, his children, friends, or relatives.

---

[22] Richard G. Mitchell, "Secrecy and Disclosure in Fieldwork," in *Experiencing Fieldwork: An Inside View of Qualitative Research,* eds. William B. Shaffir and Robert A. Stebbins (London: Sage, 1991), 101.

Indeed, "actors have 'moral careers': they pass through formal and informal stages and identity transformations –from novice to old hand, from outsider to insider."[23] The immediate context of the interviews, necessarily, encouraged fathers to present themselves at the apex of their "moral career," and at the same time, as a young woman, located me at the very beginning. Now, I am aware that I did let it happen because of the reasons I tried to express. But I also tried to cope with this situation. By asking questions about their childhood experiences, I made an effort to find their relatable side. As they shared their vulnerabilities with me, I had the impression that they thought of me as a young person, who has never faced any serious problems in life. In fact, deep down, I liked not being marked as "the poor girl."

However, the position I was assigned did not turn against me. I had a chance to interview alone, but I have come to realize that men are fond of speaking in the presence of a larger audience. They enjoy being taken seriously by a crowd of people, thereby speak more eagerly. It also occurred that upon finishing the interviews, someone from the audience who listened to the interviewee in silence approached me referring to the untold part of a story, and sometimes as soon as the interview ended, a discussion started between the interviewees and his children. During these discussions, I had a chance to observe the dynamics between the parties.Indeed, I did it trying to stay within the confines of "the relevant" or *makbul* body. Tim Edensor calls "our" designated manners informed by "class, gender and ethnicity and age" for particular contexts "embodied habits."[24] Thus, my performance of "embodied habits" was informative. After a few interviews, I got myself used to sitting with a slightly rounded hunch despite my obsession with good posture in daily life. That was because I had the impression that men find inappropriate expressive bodily actions of women, especially if young. I remember some occasions in which interviewees stared at my hand gestures since

---

23 Atkinson and Hammersley, *Ethnography*, 179.

24 Tim Edensor, *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life* (New York: Berg, 2002), 94.

it appeared so unusual to them, which I reminded myself constantly to suppress.

Researchers can make an effort to diminish the influence they impose with their presence on people, namely of reactivity, or just monitor it. However, they can make use of it as well; reactions to the researcher's presence provide useful information about different circumstances.[25] In this particular case, although I was marked as a woman, I was also getting infantilized. I conducted four interviews on Eid al-Adha. In one case, my gatekeeper and I were taken to the living room reserved for women visitors. While we were waiting for an appropriate time to meet the interviewee, headscarved women in formal dresses came and went with their children. As they were talking to each other, they sometimes mistook my gatekeeper and me for older visitors' daughters. Since they communicated only with the interviewee's wife, I could avoid explaining my reason for sitting there with them. I did not feel that I could express them why I was spending the Eid al-Adha in a stranger's house. Most of the interviewees seemed to understand why I took my dissertation so seriously and traveled to different cities. However, their talkative women relatives, who felt entitled to ask any questions to me by virtue of being the same gender as me, would disturb me. I knew that questions about my father's profession would lead to questions about my life preferences. So, I was distressed to reveal anything about myself. I only smiled at the visitors. As the interviewee's wife also refrained from explaining our reason to be there, they did not ask further questions not to disturb her. When everybody left, the interviewee came to the room and enjoyed to talk about his life. However, as new visitors started to come later, his wife took them to another room, where both men and women sat together. She was nervous because her husband was not spending his time with their "real" guests. Moreover, as she reminded him of their visitors waiting for him in another room, he scolded her in front of us. Yet when we finished the interview, she, referring to my gatekeeper and me, told her son-in-law that we were finally freed from her overtalkative husband. Similarly, another inter-

[25] Atkinson and Hammersley, *Ethnography*, 16.

viewee accepted us late at night, after their visitors left. Neither he nor his wife was concerned about my presence. My gatekeeper and I were only students, who worked hard to finish their "homework." I believe, the identity of my gatekeeper was also effective on the interviewees' perception of me. For example, when the gatekeeper was a former interviewee, who referred me to his friend, his friend considered me a researcher rather than a student. Then, I was elevated to the level of the second-person plural.

"Conservative," "baggy," "chaste," "no makeup," "drab," "hair pulled back," "serious," "desexualized," "defeminized" are the terms women researchers use to define their fieldwork appearance.[26] Indeed, appearance is a significant part of coping mechanisms against harassment because women researchers in the field are forced to negotiate between infantilization or sexualization "either by resisting it or allowing it to happen."[27]

At this point, I would like to broach the subject of harassment. I purposely created a style fit for infantilization in fear of being sexualized. However, after I completed interviews, I went to the tailor shop of an interviewee for a small alteration in a short, close-fitting dress thinking that it would be a nice gesture in return for his volunteering in my research –he had spent time speaking to me in his tailor shop although cloths were piled up waiting for him. Nevertheless, I disregarded that my action would pave the way for being sexualized, and unfortunately, that day ended up with harassment in the changing room. I always get my new dresses taken in or their necklines widened –ever since I had panic attacks in my early twenties, I have felt like suffocating by neck covering cloths. I wanted him to widen the neckline of my new dress. After he saw my dress, he first checked the outside of the shop through the shop window, saying that people living there were too conservative and tended to misunderstand anything. Then, he pushed me behind my back to the changing room in hurry, somewhat jokingly. While he was taking measure, his breathing quickened so much so that I thought he would have a heart attack, and for a moment, I felt him on my posterior. I knew it was harassment but could not say anything. A few

26 Hanson and Richards, *Harassed*, 112.

27 Ibid., 63.

minutes later, a friend of him showed up. While they were having a small talk, he fixed my dress and then asked me to try on it to see if it was okay. I wore the dress and said it was okay. My intention was to step out of the changing room, but he blocked my way and suddenly grabbed my belly, saying "I did not expect it to be so good." I got the impression that he did not want his friend see me in that dress. Maybe because he wanted people consider him a tailor fixing only conservative women's dresses and I did not fit that image. As I was leaving, he repeatedly said that I was at the age of his daughter and I was like his daughter. I am not sure he said these things because he knew what he did was wrong or to prevent his friend from thinking ill of him because of me.

Hanson and Richards argue that researchers do not know what to do with this kind of experience and cannot be sure if it counts as data. In order to explain such situations they apply the term "awkward surplus," which is used in "hard sciences" for defining findings that scientists prefer to ignore because the findings contradict their pre-determined assumptions. Accordingly, women interpret sexual harassment "as part of 'life,' not 'work,'" something that "just happens" and put it in the category of "awkward surplus." Otherwise, they risk being marked "unprofessional." That glosses over the fact that researchers act within the confines of power relations. Men also affect the research process with their social class, ethnicity, religious belief etc., but they hardly notice it because cisgender men are considered neutral producers of knowledge.[28]

"Because the project team was all female, it was decided that an experienced male social science researcher, also the head of the research company, should carry out the interviews in the field." This is the first sentence of the subtitle, "Data Collection," in the article, "Unpacking Masculinities," written by three women researchers; Hale Bolak-Boratav, Güler Okman-Fişek and Hande Ziya-Eslen.[29] The interviews, carried out by a man in seven cit-

[28] Hanson and Richards, *Harassed*, 155-156.

[29] Bolak-Boratav, et al., "Unpacking Masculinities," 304-305.

ies, form the basis of the aforementioned article, a book on masculinities in Turkish,[30] and an unpublished master's thesis on fatherhood.[31]

Researchers, irrespective of their gender, are capable of many things but not of fabricating "affectless identities,"[32] because they are persons with stories. Thus, I find Hanson and Richards' invitation to reflect on the embodied nature of our research experiences meaningful. In line with this, I admit that during the research process, I was marked as a woman, but I chose being infantilized as the dialogue between Cemil and me in the first paragraph shows. Yet this was not a contemplative choice. It was an emergent solution to an emergent problem in the field. For example, when I reminded myself of the necessity to control my bodily expressions, I was not manipulative; I was cringing before the interviewees. However, I know that power is not something static. As I asked some interviewees about their daughters' educational level, they felt threatened because they did not support their education. Nevertheless, I acknowledge what I experienced was *my* cost of access to older men's world, which is hierarchically structured based on age and gender.

My second discontent was about the writing process, finding a balance between my passion to write on anything crucial for the analysis and my desire not to offend the men who genuinely shared their stories with me. It was a predicament for me until I accepted the fact that I interviewed people whose worldviews and value judgments I had almost nothing in common with.

However, I did not reveal my positionality as it was a "social encounter" to be managed as well as a "sociologically useful encounter."[33] Since the beginning of the research, I have felt anxious as if I were an agent to be disclosed. In fact, this feeling was not new to me. Since my childhood, I have

---

30 Hale Bolak-Boratav, Güler Okman-Fişek, and Hande Eslen Ziya, *Erkekliğin Türkiye Halleri* (İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2017).

31 Büşra Yalçınöz, "From Being a Son to Being a Father."

32 Mitchell, "Secrecy and Disclosure," 99.

33 Peter Lugosi, "Between Overt and Covert Research: Concealment and Disclosure in an Ethnographic Study of Commercial Hospitality," *Qualitative Inquiry* 12, no. 3 (2006): 549.

been "interrogated" or subtly scorned by older family members of my close friends as I have an unconventional family story. My parents' first spouses burned to death in different accidents –my mother's first husband at home, my father's first wife in a car accident, exclaiming my father's name. As they met, my mother had a daughter and my father two sons and a daughter. When I was born my father named me after his deceased spouse, Mürüvet. But they got divorced when I was five, and my father moved to France with my siblings born by Mürüvet.

So, "How many siblings do you have?" or "Are you a single child?" have always been difficult questions for me. I tended to give long and complicated answers to simple questions. Whenever people ask these questions, I still feel confused.

Slavoj Žižek, by referring to Aron Bodenheimer, argues that asking questions is an obscene act with no regard to its content. "It is the form of the question as such which is obscene: the question lays open, exposes, denudes its addressee, it invades his sphere of intimacy." It incites "a sensation of guilt" which persists despite a true answer because "the guilt is already admitted on the level of desire; every answer is an excuse."[34] Accordingly, for years, getting simple questions like how many siblings I have has rendered my social presence "obscene" or non-*makbul* leading to more questions, and has made me feel as "a threat to the morals and unity of society."

However, that had helped me in my previous research on women's divorce experience fit into the context as the women somehow had felt deviant or non-*makbul*, too. In other words, we were angled to "the morals and unity of society" in a similar fashion. Yet, this time, I felt I was at the lion's den and tried not to draw attention to my personal life. Another important reason for my hesitancy in giving information about my personal life is that I am just the opposite of the interviewees' *makbul* daughter figure. I am an apostate, living with her boyfriend for more than ten years without planning to reproduce in the near future. I am a woman they do ask their wives and daughters not to befriend. In fact, this is not something I have not experi-

[34] Slavoj Žižek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (New York: Verso, 2008), 202.

enced. This was my most relevant experience to comprehend the limits of women's friendships in a patriarchal society.

In this context, I should admit to that both getting infantilized and marked as a woman eased fading my objectionable ideological stance as a woman. I could act as a young person who has not yet built a story for herself. Otherwise, I would have had to negotiate my lifestyle –why I am not married or how my parents permit me to live with my boyfriend, etc., which I do not prefer at all because it would probably be counterproductive. But, as Mitchell puts, "secrecy is present in all social actions but perfected in none of them."[35] So, I might involuntarily have leaked out something about myself, although I am not aware of anything of that sorts.

However, that causes a split in my perception of my own identity. The interviewer happened to be a person oscillating between a little girl and a woman, but the author is a grown-up woman with a certain ideological position in life. That is the scary element of the research process for me. In other words, beneath my desire not to offend the men lies my fear of getting disclosed as a woman. I feared that my pen would reveal my (ideologically situated) womanhood, which my cloths had meticulously covered. It has been no less than a nightmare for me to imagine publishing the research in Turkish, them seeing it.

Because of the nature of my affective burden, I emotionally resonate with ethnographers, who underline that "ethics are situationally accomplished."[36] Positivist morality, which is based on "the cognitive dimension" of relationships and considers all behaviors and attitudes to "be known, discovered, or controlled," denies that no researcher is capable of being "affectively neutered, as if they had no feelings toward subjects or their responses."[37] Objecting to the positivist ethical understanding does not mean "'anything goes'" or "'one size fits all'" but to view "ethics as contingent, dynamic, temporal, occasioned and situated affairs."[38] Moreover, that is

35 Mitchell, "Secrecy and Disclosure," 99.

36 Calvey, "The Art and Politics of Covert Research," 908.

37 Mitchell, "Secrecy and Disclosure," 99.

38 Calvey, "The Art and Politics of Covert Research," 912.

"arrogant" for researchers to regard their professional ethical standards as the best for the participants. A sociologist, for example, might harm the participants by just acting sociologically ethical.[39] What happened to Mario Brajuha in 1983 is an illustrative case in that sense. Brajuha, as a man who had worked for many years as a waiter in fancy restaurants, decided to study dining experience for his dissertation. In order to come up with a specific research problem he was observing and taking notes on both his colleagues and the customers. That changed overnight; the restaurant was burned down suspiciously. The insurance company began to investigate, suspecting arson. Since the employees told about Brajuha's notes, the detectives asked him to hand over his notes to them. Yet Brajuha refused it to protect his informants' privacy. Although he obsessively fought for their privacy, his bosses and colleagues strongly condemned him for preventing the conclusion of the investigation and repair of the restaurant with the insurance money for the sake of some "esoteric reasons." Then, the whole incident, which took his two years and led to many other problems, turned into his main problematic. That is his defiance of local ethics for the sake of academic ones.[40]

In my case, I was nothing but a researcher who prioritized the interviewees' preferences. Honestly, I felt I did not have another option since I was like visiting the old factory or my childhood friends' families. But now, I believe, it was the only way to communicate that I respected their limits and that I was not at their home as a source of aversion. In that manner, I respected their limits by getting dressed the way they are accustomed to seeing women at a *house*, not shaking hands if I got such vibes, and joining meals as a guest with relevant "interaction rituals." Still, I knew it was not enough for most of them since I was not a headscarved woman like their wives, daughters, and women relatives. Therefore, what I name the interviewees' preferences are, in fact, the impositions of a hegemonic patriarchal

---

39 Erich Goode, "The Ethics of Deception in Social Research: A Case Study," *Qualitative Sociology* 19, no.1 (1996): 20.

40 Mario Brajuha and Lyle Hallowell, "Legal Intrusion and the Politics of Fieldwork: The Impact of the Brajuha Case," *Urban Life* 14, no. 4 (1986): 454-478.

culture on women. Thus, I practiced some kind of "patriarchal bargain" in the field. I was an acceptable guest at their houses as I did not act as a person who is angled to life differently from them.

Erich Goode writes that "field workers, journalists, biographers, and other portrayers of social life almost inevitably find that the *very practice their craft* results in offense to their subjects."[41] Accordingly, I am convinced that my bargain has to end in my writing process, but not because it is the essence of my craft. I started to relate to the act of writing by writing an autobiography. Since then writing has been an act of self-authorization and given me a room to act more freely in the Virginia Woolfian sense; this is my room. Thanks to this, I feel trained for "writing vulnerably." So, I believe, by "writing vulnerably," I have paid my respect to the interviewees, who genuinely shared their vulnerabilities with me, a non-*makbul* woman.

§ 2.2 A Question That Fits a Woman Researcher

The site of a personal narrative qualifies "expectations about the kinds of stories that will be told and will be intelligible to others."[42] In this manner, the interviewees and gatekeepers determined the site of the interview, which then qualified the stories I, as a young woman was supposed to listen to and provided me with an indirect knowledge about being a good father and the place of women in Turkey. One of the interviewees, Yüksel, suggested that I should listen to "bad" fathers as well in order to understand the meaning of fatherhood in a deeper fashion. As a result of the dynamics of the research process to which my perceived identity as a woman researcher contributed, I formed the main research question about the construction and experience of *makbul* fatherhood among lower-class men and the rationale behind giving this symbolic recognition to some men within society. At first, although I was not willing to categorize their construction of fatherhood into "old" or "new" fatherhood, as I analyzed data I realized that it would be helpful to communicate their narratives with the existing literature and put them under

41 Goode, "The Ethics of Deception," 24.

42 Smith and Watson, *Reading Autobiography*, 69.

the category of "old fatherhood." Additionally, a misunderstanding in the field encouraged me to do so. Although I interviewed fathers of young adults, because of a miscommunication I found myself interviewing a man at the age of the interviewees' sons in a conservative city located in the Central Anatolia. He and his genial wife were very welcoming me so I preferred to go along. As a caring father to their six-year-old daughter, he angrily said that while he is taking care of his daughter, like taking her to toilet in front of older men, they look at him as if he does something *ahlâkdışı*, "immoral." Throughout the evening, both he and his wife complained about people's conservative perceptions about the role of fatherhood and motherhood. I understood I had to take generational difference more seriously and accept that the interviewees fall under the category of "old fatherhood" due to spirit of the time they became a father. As such, the research focused on the construction of *makbul* fatherhood within the habitus of "old fatherhood."

§ 2.3 On the Interviews

All interviews were formal, semi-structured, and I conducted them at the interviewee's house, or a relative's house, at the backyard, or the workplace from March to December 2019. Just two of them were in a café. Upon the request of a minority interviewee, I interviewed him at the office of a psychologist friend of mine. All interviews were tape-recorded, and I did not encounter any problems with that. Except for a few men, the rest of the interviewees said in a dignified manner that they have no fear from anybody and nothing to hide. One of the interviewees, Metin, explained it such: "We believe Allah does hear every word coming out of our mouth anyways" to show his easiness with the recorder. Yet another interviewee Ömer, a person with a leftist ideology said, "I know the system very well. My phone is spied on for twenty-four hours. So, there is nothing to hide." The reason may vary, but I observed that men were at ease with being recorded. Similarly, when I assured them that I would protect their anonymity and use pseudonyms, most of them said that I could use their full name openly. As a postscript, since there were two tailors among the interviewees, I prefer to call the one who harassed me X.

The cities where I conducted interviews are Ankara, Istanbul, Kayseri, Kocaeli, Sinop, and Tokat. They are not similar to each other in terms of size, sectorial diversity, and geography. According to socio-economic development level, Istanbul is the first out of 81 cities of the country. It is followed by Ankara (2nd), Kocaeli (4th), Kayseri (17th), Sinop (52nd), and Tokat (56th).[43] However, these cities constitute a representative sample in terms of political dispositions. The Justice and Development Party was the winner of the elections held in 2002, 2007, 2011, 2015, and 2018 in these six cities.[44]That means the interviewees, who left their hometown for wage labor, did not randomly choose a city to settle. They chose their city of residence so that they would fade into the crowd without being a marked identity. In this regard, the cities where I conducted interviews are the cities whose ethnic and religious identity is taken for granted. They perfectly represent the Turkish-Sunni-Muslim identity. Since I was interested in the mainstream, neither my gatekeepers nor the interviewees referred me to men in cities like Diyarbakır, a Kurdish city.As I wrote in the beginning, no researcher is a "neutral collector" of information. Research includes generating data rather than collecting it.[45] In this manner, I apply constructivist grounded theory methodology. That is "part of the interpretive tradition" studying "*how*–and sometimes *why*–participants construct meanings and actions in specific situation." However, a constructivist approach "not only theorizes the interpretive work that research participants do, but also acknowledges that the re-

---

43 T.C. Sanayi ve Teknoloji Bakanlığı Kalkınma Ajansları Genel Müdürlüğü, *İllerin ve Bölgelerin Sosyo-Ekonomik Gelişmişlik Sıralaması Araştırması SEGE-2017*, by Salih Acar, Mustafa Caner Meydan, Leyla Bilen-Kazancık, and Mustafa Işık https://www.bebka.org.tr/admin/datas/sayfas/89/sege-2017_1581687211.pdf. Ankara, 2019. (accessed June 21, 2022).

44 "Genel Seçim 2002," HaberTürk, accessed June 21, 2022. https://www.haberturk.com/secim2002;
"HTSeçim 2015," HaberTürk, accessed June 21, 2022. https://www.haberturk.com/secim/secim2015/genel-secim
"2018, 27. Dönem Milletvekili Seçimleri," HaberTürk, accessed June 21, 2022. https://www.haberturk.com/secim/secim2018/genel-secim/iller

45 Mason, *Qualitative*, 52, 173.

sulting theory is an interpretation."[46] That is "the construction of a perspective, an interpretation, or a line of reasoning or analysis,"[47] in which I cannot deny my authorial presence moving between experience, lay accounts and social science explanations. This iterative-inductive movement is fundamental for grounded theorizing in which theory emanates from data analysis.[48]

46 Charmaz, *Constructing Grounded Theory*, 130.

47 Mason, *Qualitative*, 173.

48 Atkinson and Hammersley, *Ethnography*, 158.

3

Theoretical Background

The academic endeavor in what is known today as Men's Studies or Masculinity Studies or Critical Studies of Masculinity emerged as an extension of Women's Studies in the 1970s. The feminist scholarship of the time used to frame its fundamental problematic by a functionalist approach of the 1950s. At the time, sociologists like Talcott Parsons, had maintained that society dichotomizes sexes in order to function more productively. Thus, the scholarship employed "the male sex role" and "the female sex role" theory to explain differences between men and women. However, questions arose regarding the sex role theory because unless sex is intertwined with other social divisions like class, ethnicity, and religion, it does not have real explanatory power for individual experiences.[1]

Some books emphasized the undesirable consequences of traditional gender roles and argued that the necessities of masculinity restricted men's lives. Some others had pointed out the physiological and psychological effects of the constraints of gender roles on men. The most influential book among others was *The Myth of Masculinity,* published in 1981. In this book, Pleck argued that the male sex role model does not explain men's experi-

[1] Harry Brod, "Men's Studies: A Retrospective View," *The Journal of Men's Studies* 21, no.1 (2013): 53-54.

ences, and his criticisms paved the way for more critiques of the theory.[2] The critiques turned into philosophical inquiries of human essence; if all life features were the result of roles, then we cannot speak of a core or essence in human. This new non-essentialist thinking was detrimental to feminist thought that objected to men's dominance based on an essential self: men's dominance prevented women's essential selves from realizing themselves. The theory of gender came into prominence amidst those criticisms. Gender allowed to speak of "a cultural formation on a biological base, without any prior commitment as to how much was base and how much was cultural formation" and rendered possible to revise "*all* canons of knowledge" through a critical eye. Studies on men found its place within gender theory by problematizing men just as women.[3]

Today, Raewyn Connell is a prominent figure in the field.[4] She came forward by criticizing the sex role theory. She argued that the terms "male role" and "female role" relate "a biological term to a dramaturgical one," implying "an invariant biological base and a malleable social superstructure." We do not talk about "class roles" or "race roles" since we are aware of power relations within them. However, we can talk about "sex roles" as if there were no power relations.[5] The sex role theory lacks the concept of resistance to power. It does not acknowledge that change comes from inside the person. It cannot explain "girls who become tomboys, the women who become lesbians, the shoppers who become shoplifters, the citizens who become revolutionaries." It resorts to the literature on deviance, which es-

---

2 Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner, "Introduction," in *Men's Lives*, eds. Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner, (Boston: Pearson, 2007), xix-xxi.

3 Harry Brod, "The New Men's Studies: From Feminist Theory to Gender Scholarship," *Hypatia* 2, no. 1 (1987): 181-186. Çimen Günay-Erkol argues that we can mark the research on male hysteria in 1800s as the starting point of studies on men. See: "İllet, Zillet, Erkeklik: Eleştirel Erkeklik Çalışmaları ve Türkiye'deki Seyri," *Toplum ve Bilim* 145 (2018): 6-31.

4 Andrea Waling, "Rethinking Masculinity Studies: Feminism, Masculinity, and Poststructural Accounts of Agency and Emotional Reflexivity," *Journal of Men's Studies* (2018): 5-8.

5 R.W. Connell, *Gender and Power* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989), 50-51.

tablishes a cause and effect relationship by "imperfect socialization" or "role conflicts."[6]

Now, the universal term in Masculinity Studies is her "hegemonic masculinity." She conceptualizes masculinity deriving the term "hegemony" from Antonio Gramsci's class analysis and draws attention to that at different times, "one form of masculinity rather than others is culturally exalted."[7] Hegemonic masculinity is a pattern of practice distinguished from other types of masculinities by its success to dominate women. The term does not refer to a statistical majority; only a small number of men might practice it. However, it is undoubtedly the most "honored way of being a man" and requires "all other men to position themselves in relation to it."[8] She argues that gender is where "biology does *not* determine the social." Thus, we should go beyond gender to grasp it fully. Gender relations are "a major component of social structure as a whole." Furthermore, gender is not "a special type of practice." It is "a *way* of structuring social practice in general."[9]

However, Connell's theorization has been critiqued by many other scholars in terms of being too modernist, structuralist, and deterministic.[10] Connell presumes the presence of an intrinsic self-agency positioned against external structures. However, in postmodern thinking, power is conceptualized as "competing discourses which are not externally imposed upon subjects." Instead, subjects are the products of those discourses. Therefore, social change comes from contesting discourses rather than self-agency.[11]

---

6 R.W. Connell, "The Concept of Role and What to Do With It?," *A.N.Z.J.S.* 15 (1979): 13.

7 R.W. Connell, *Masculinities* (California: University of California Press, 1995), 77.

8 R. W. Connell and James W. Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept," *Gender & Society* 19 (2005): 832.

9 Connell, *Masculinities*, 71-76. Emphasis added.

10 Waling, "Rethinking," 6.

11 Chris Beasley, "Problematizing Contemporary Men/Masculinities Theorizing: The Contribution of Raewyn Connell and Conceptual-Terminological Tensions Today," *The British Journal of Sociology* 63, no.4 (2012):756-757.

Notwithstanding, the tendency to name masculinity persists. In this sense, Jon Swain's "personalized masculinity,"[12] Tony Coles's "mosaic masculinities,"[13] Eric Anderson's "inclusive masculinity,"[14] Kalle Berggren's "sticky masculinity"[15] are well-known studies.

---

12 Jon Swain, "The Role of Sport in the Construction of Masculinities in an English Independent Junior School," *Sport, Education, and Society* 11 (2006): 327-328. His ethnographic work with boys in an upper-middle- class junior school in Greater London demonstrates that although school culture accepts sporty boys as perfect examples of the dominant form of masculinity, other boys experience a "personalized" form of masculinity with their alternative interests. These boys view themselves as "different" rather than "inferior" and explain no desire to be a domineering character. Instead, to be "helpful" and "kind" is what matters the most for them.

13 Tony Coles, "Finding Space in the Field of Masculinity: Lived Experiences of Men's Masculinities," *Journal of Sociology* 44, no.3 (2008): 238. His qualitative research in Australia manifests that some men accept hegemonic masculinity, but do not confirm the idea that they are subordinated or marginalized by it. Instead, they reformulate dominant qualities of masculinity in terms of the capital at hand –economic, social, cultural, and physical. In that, they use some features of hegemonic masculinity that they are capable of performing. They prefer the features privileging them and refuse the rest, defining masculinity in accordance with their capacity and capabilities. For example, if a man is physically weak he may rely on his mental power to meet the hegemonic masculine ideal of being strong. Thus it is similar to a mosaic with its inharmonious segments.

14 Eric Anderson, *Inclusive Masculinity: The Changing Nature of Masculinities* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 86-99. He makes a distinction between homohysteria and homophobia to develop the term "inclusive masculinity." He argues that homohysteria is present where people are aware of homosexuality, and even straight-looking people might be homosexuals. The masculinity studies emerged under such a homohysteric culture of the 1980s and early 1990s. Connell theorized distinct masculinity types by their relationship to hegemonic masculinity or in reverse thinking, to homosexuality. However, as homohysteria weakens, different kinds of social actions unfold: men embrace some behaviors and attitudes of the Other of manhood, gay men, in hypermasculine spaces. For example, men began to be sexualized "not through muscle, but the avoidance of fat." Anderson's "inclusive masculinity" refers to such inclusive attitudes in a culture in which different kinds of masculinities live together without striving to dominate one another. However, Tristan Bridges and C. J. Pascoe elaborate hybridity meticulously and show that research on hybrid masculinities oversees the fact that hybridity serves to reproduce power and inequality in historically new and mostly unrecognized ways. Some privileged white straight men put a discursive distance between themselves and "hegemonic masculinity" and borrow some qualities of

After all, scholars of masculinity studies depend on modernist theoretical framings even if they use poststructuralist vocabulary. They conceptualize power as structurally oppressive and assume that agency is the source of social change. However, Andrea Waling, referring to R.C. Gill's critique of fetishization of "choice," argues that "agency is a conditional possibility for negotiating discourse and subjectivity. It is produced through encounters with both discourse and subjectivity; it is not preexisting, but rather made possible as individuals interact with the social world." Waling, taking reflexivity both emotional and bodily, recommends that we endeavor to understand how men conceptualize and reflect on their practices, instead of detecting which type of masculinity they espouse.[16]

§ 3.1 Fatherhood in International Literature

As Lupton and Barclay argue, one has reason to assume that fatherhood is a significant part of the writing on masculinities; however, it is still not. It is hardly possible to write a book on femininity without elaborating on the role of motherhood. However, the literature on masculinity reveals that "issues dealing with sporting prowess, schooling, work and sexual activity are far more central to masculinities than the experience of fatherhood." Masculinities are just about "bodily power and action, physical strength and engagement in education and paid labour." This academic tendency reproduces the

---

"subordinated Others" to present "themselves as outside of existing systems of privilege and inequality." See; Tristan Bridges and C. J. Pascoe, "Hybrid Masculinities: New Directions in the Sociology of Men and Masculinities," *Sociology Compass* 3, no.3 (2014): 250.

15 Kalle Berggren, "Sticky Masculinity: Post-Structuralism, Phenomenology and Subjectivity in Critical Studies on Men," *Men and Masculinities* 17, no.3 (2014): 245-246. Kalle Berggren's "sticky masculinity" is different from the previous theories. Berggren, relying on post-structuralism and phenomenology, argues that theories deal with how masculinity, as a structure, configures men, but there is discrepancy between masculinity as a structure and men's real-life experiences. Sticking together certain bodies with certain signs creates masculinity, and this is a "contested" and "uncertain" process, because distinct discourses affect men in real life.

16 Waling, "Rethinking," 11-14.

notion "that men's lives and senses of self are centrally located in the 'public' rather than the 'domestic' or 'private' sphere." [17] That is an interesting observation because it shows that the literature on masculinity is on the track of *Fraternité*, which is the third article of the French Revolution's motto, and as Carol Pateman says is disregarded regulator of the social contract.[18] For brotherhood offers consanguinity only for people of the same generation.[19] However, a recent book, *Birthing Fathers* is an exceptional study, which introduces us to men who are willing to share the experience of birthing with their partners and babies.[20]

Historically, men's public face has been the major component of our knowledge of the past. Historians have kept themselves at bay with men's private roles as husbands and fathers. However, some scholars developed models to describe men at their home. Yet they "tended to either romanticize or demonize men's familial roles in the past, depicting the preindustrial era as a time when men were intensely and actively involved in family life, especially in childrearing, or conversely, as a period men were domestic patriarchs, who dominated their children and tyrannized their wives."[21]

The historical analysis of fatherhood shows that the normative of manhood and fatherhood is malleable based on social and economic conditions. Accordingly, sociological research focuses on the "new fatherhood" due to the changes in the socio-economic structures that demand more involvement in children from men. Anthropological studies refer to the ethnocentric nature of normative parenthood. The area of psychology deals with father in-

---

17 Deborah Lupton and Lesley Barclay, *Constructing Fatherhood* (London: Sage, 1997), 3-4.

18 Carole Pateman, *The Sexual Contract* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988).

19 Dieter Lenzen, *Vaterschaft* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1991), 175, quoted in Dieter Thoma, *Babalar*, trans. Fikret Doğan (İstanbul: İletişim, 2011), 56.

20 Richard K. Reed, *Birthing Fathers: The Transformation of Men in American Rites of Birth* (London: Rutgers University Press, 2005).

21 Steven Mintz, "From Patriarchy to Androgyny and other Myhts: Placing Men's Family Roles in Historical Perspective," in *Men in Families: When Do They Get Involved? What Difference Does It Make?*, eds. Alan Booth, Ann C. Crouter (Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1998), 4.

volvement in terms of its later impacts on adult life. Nevertheless, research is dominantly restricted to the USA.

Anthony Rotundo analyzes American fatherhood ideals since 1600s comparatively and suggests two dominant forms; the patriarchal fatherhood between 1620 and 1800 and modern fatherhood as of 1800s.[22] John Demos manifests how the primary parenthood was transferred from the father to the mother as the domestic and productive life ceased to be overlapping.[23] Pleck proposes that in the 18th and 19th centuries, fathers were responsible for the children's morality, and then they became the breadwinner and later the sex role model.[24] Elizabeth Pleck and Joseph Pleck analyze how the ideal patriarch of colonial America turned into "dad," a closer parent and breadwinner at the beginning of the 20th century. After the rise of feminism, he was expected to become a co-parent.[25] Stearns concludes that fatherhood was not a unitary experience in the past, and fathers have responded to the significant economic and concomitant family changes creating new fatherly behaviors. Moreover, the fathers of the modern era have merged cultural and emotional standards of the 20th century with the inclinations of the past.[26]

These scholars accept the industrial revolution, with its domestic ideology as the turning point in the organization of family life; men are away from home throughout the day while the woman is at home. However, history has its particulars as well as generalizations. Industrialization is the main story

---

22 Anthony Rotundo, "American Fatherhood: A Historical Perspective," *American Behavioral Scientist* 29, no.1 (1985): 7.

23 John Demos, "The Changing Faces of Fatherhood," in *Past, Present, and Personal: The Family and the Life Course in American History,* eds. Catt S. Gurwitt and J. M. Ross (New York: Oxford Press, 1986), 45-47.

24 Joseph H. Pleck, "American fathering in historical perspective," in *Changing men: New directions in research on men and masculinity* , ed. M. S. Kimmel (Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, 1987), 83-97.

25 Elizabeth H. Pleck and Joseph H. Pleck, "Fatherhood Ideals in the United States: Historical Dimensions," in *The Role of the Father in Child Development*, ed. M. E. Lamb (New York: Wiley, 1997), 33-48.

26 Peter N. Stearns, "*Fatherhood in Historical Perspective*: The role of social change," in *Fatherhood and families in cultural context, ed.* F. W. Bozett & S. M. H. Hanson (New York, NY, US: Springer Publishing Co., 1991), 49-50.

of Western powers during the 19th century, yet it varied even within the region itself, and large segments of the world experienced it very differently. Their practices distinguish colonial fathers from the colonized or vice versa. The homogenized, linear and progressive history of fatherhood from "stern moralists" in the pre-industrial era to "distant breadwinners, and occasional playmates to their children" in the industrial era depicts a global transformation in social life, but misses the multi-faceted nature of real life.[27] Having acknowledged this fact, Steven Mintz underlines the effects of specific economic features and such historical events as "mass immigration, depression, and war" on fatherhood. He opposes to the idea that fatherhood has passed the stages from patriarchy to androgyny and egalitarianism, tracing a linear direction. Instead, he proposes that fatherhood had never been a single role within the family. The normative fatherhood was distinguished by class, race, ethnicity, and religion.[28] Scott Coltrane and Justin Galt predicate Mintz by demonstrating that historical documents prove that men in the 18th century were engaged with what is called today "women's work."[29] However, most of the historical analysis of fatherhood is limited to the USA.[30]

---

27 Scott Coltrane and Justin Galt, "The History of Men's Caring," in *Care Work: Gender, Labor, and the Welfare State*, ed. Madonna Harrington Meyer (London: Routledge, 2000), 21-22.

28 Mintz, "From Patriarchy," 5-27.

29 Coltrane and Galt, "The History," 22-23.

30 For a history of American fatherhood see Robert Griswold, *Fatherhood in America: a History*, (New York: Basic Books, 1993); L. Wilson, *Ye Heart of a Man: The Domestic Life of Men in Colonial New England,* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999); S. Johansen, *Family Men: Middle-Class Fatherhood in Early Industrializing America.* (New York: Routledge, 2001); S. M. Frank, *Life with Father: Parenthood and Masculinity in the Nineteenth-Century American North.* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998); Lawrence R. Samuel, *American Fatherhood: A Cultural History* (London: The Rowman &Littlefield, 2015). Some of the exceptions are John Tosh, "*Authority* and *Nurture* in *Middle-Class Fatherhood*: The *Case* of *Early* and *Mid-Victorian England," Gender and History 8 (1996): 48-64. Joanne Bailey,* "'A Very Sensible Man' Imagining Fatherhood in England c. 1750–1830," *History* 95 (2010): 167-292. Harald Fuess, "A Golden Age of Fatherhood? Parent-Child Relations in Japanese Historiography," *Monumenta Nipponica* 97 (1997): 381-397. Saori Yasumoto and Ralph LaRossa, "The Culture of

The sociological quest has a variety of research interests in fatherhood. Studying representations of fathers is an essential focus detecting stereotypes, "people's perceptions of how typical fathers think, feel, and act" in addition to the ideals "how people think fathers should think, feel, and act." Analysis of the everyday experiences of fathers is another interest. Men's subjective interpretations of father role along with their other such roles as husband, worker, and son, is the main focus. Paternal involvement of resident and non-resident fathers and their impacts on children's well-being is another important part of the sociological inquiry about fatherhood.[31] As a consequence of the increase in women's employment and divorce rates, changing gender roles, and the acceptance of feminist demands, fathers have been expected to be more involved with their children.[32] However, "new fatherhood" is just an ideological transformation about the role of the father. Gender roles within the house have changed only slightly. Women still perform most of the diminutive responsibilities.[33]

Fatherhood in Japanese Comic Strips: A Historical Analysis," *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 41 (2010): 611-627. Jean Delumeau and Daniel Roche, eds., *L'Histoire des peres et de la paternite* (Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1990). Werner Schneider, *Die neuen Vdter-Chancen und Risiken: Zum Wandel der Vaterrolle in Familie und Gesellschaft* (Augsburg: AV-Verlag, 1989).

31 William Marsiglio, "Fatherhood Scholarship: An Overview and Agenda for the Future," in *Fatherhood: Contemporary Theory, Research, and Social Policy*, ed. William Marsiglio (London: Sage, 1995), 3-12.

32 L.L. Bumpass, "What is Happening to the family? Interactions Between Demographic and Institutional Change," Demography 27 (1990): 483-498. S. Coltrane, "The Future of Fatherhood: Social, Demographic, and Economic Influences on Men's Family Involvements," in *Fatherhood: Contemporary Theory, Research, and Social Policy*, ed. William Marsiglio (London: Sage, 1995), 255-301. G. Ranson, "Men at Work Change –or No Change?- in the Era of the New Father," *Men and Masculinities* 4 (2001): 3-26. G. Wall and S. Arnold, "How Involved is Involved Fathering? An Exploration of the Contemporary Culture of Fatherhood," *Gender & Society* 21 (2007): 508-527. C. Shows and N. Gerstel, "Fathering, Class, and Gender: A Comparison of Physicians and Emergency Medical Technicians," *Gender & Society* 23 (2009): 161-187.

33 L. Craig, "Does Father Care Mean Fathers Share? A Comparison of How Mothers and Fathers in Intact Families Spend Time with Children," *Gender & Society* 20, no.2 (2006): 259-281. F.F. Furstenberg, "Good Dads-Bad Dads: Two Faces of Fatherhood," in The

The topic is not very popular among anthropologists. Barry Hewlett refers to the absence and collects a few anthropological studies in order to interpret American fatherhood. He demonstrates that normative parenthood is ethnocentric. While parents make their children do things like eating something or going to bed in Western families, this culture sounds preventing the autonomy of children within some African cultures. Moreover, there are many cultures in which fathers contribute almost nothing to their children, but children are mentally and physically healthy. There are some cultures in which children attach to their fathers who do not endorse the quality-time approach but spend most of their time with children by just holding them. Intracultural and intercultural research shows that "close husband-wife relations, equal male and female contribution to the diet, lack of regular warfare, lack of material wealth (i.e., father involvement is higher in cultures that do not accumulate wealth, such as hunting-gathering societies like the Aka)" are the factors related to father involvement. More importantly, Hewlett shows that father involvement increases the likelihood of gender equality.[34]

The mainstream Western culture of fatherhood is mostly interested in the impacts of father involvement in infancy in terms of the social-emotional consequences in adult life. Indeed, the emphasis upon father-child dyad gained importance by the 1940s and 1950s as a result of the Second World War. Fatherless children, particularly boys were considered dangerous to society. They were considered potential homosexuals and delinquents. However, in the 1950s and 1960s, the focus shifted again to the mother-child dyad. After the 1970s psychologists began to pay attention to the fathers.[35] As the number of working women increased, fathers' ability to nurture and participate in routine tasks at home became central. By the 1990s

---

Changing American Family and Public Policy, ed. A. J. Cherlin (Washinton D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1988), 193-218. Ralph LaRossa, "Fatherhood and Social Change," *Family Relations* 37, no.4 (1988): 451-457.

34 Barry S. Hewlett, "Culture, History, and Sex: Anthropological Contributions to Conceptualizing Father Involvement," *Culture, History, and Sex* 29, no. 2-3 (2000): 63-71.

35 Lupton and Barclay, *Constructing*, 43-44.

the fragility of the marriage institution and women's more liberal lifestyle were in alarming degree for the conservatives. The founder and president of the Institute for American Values, David Blankenhorn, and his other supporters in the academic world, for example, related almost every social problem to the lack of a proper father role. They defended that fathers were not suitable for caring, but they have a natural inclination to assume leadership roles. The absence of a leader within the family was the root of all social problems in the USA.[36] However, the dominant three types of research design within the literature to study the impacts of father involvement in later life contradict what Blankenhorn and others argue. Correlational studies focused on the father as a male parent and measured the significance of the father's masculine traits for the masculinity of the sons. The research certifies that "the father as a parent" is more significant than "the father as a male adult" deeming paternal masculinity irrelevant. Studies of father absence research the children of divorced or separated parents and conclude that fathers' nonresidence is destructive not because a male parent is absent, but because all responsibilities are assumed only by one parent. Research on involved fathers analyzes the influence of enhanced father involvement on children and states that father involvement permits children to appropriate less stereotypical sex roles and increase their cognitive ability thanks to communicating two distinct persons. Moreover, enhanced father involvement helps fathers express their emotions more freely, and mothers pursuit their careers.[37] The future-oriented understanding of the research on fatherhood mentioned above leaves us with little knowledge on the dynamics of fatherhood in adult life. Another consequence of this understanding is to assume the relationship between fathers and children in a unidirectional influence. Scholars delve into how childrearing affects fathers in terms of

---

36 Coltrane and Galt, "The History," 18.

37 Michael E. Lamb, "How Do Fathers Influence Children's Development? Let me Count the Ways," in *The Role of the Father in Child Development*, 5th ed., Michael Lamb (Hoboken, NJ.: John Wiley & Sons, 2010): 4-8.

"learning to care for others," and sometimes position mothers in "a mentoring role"[38]

The aforementioned literature lacks a political dimension that connects the construction and experiences of fatherhood with the immediate sociopolitical context in which men live as members of a fraternal order, to which Pateman points. Therefore, the research is a contribution to the international literature by virtue of its political analysis of fatherhood.

3.1.1 *The Course of Masculinity Studies in Turkey*

The pioneer to recognize the variety of men's dominance within a non-Western context is Deniz Kandiyoti. She argues that different kinship systems form different ideal masculinity schemes in sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East. Consequently, how women cope with patriarchy, which she calls patriarchal bargains, differs.[39] She criticized research practice on gender in Turkey because it focused on just women and did not problematize masculine identities at all. She came up with new subjects like the relationship between the institutionalized tools of oppression and violence. Her questions suggested that researchers pay attention to the relationship between the ways of institutionalizing of power and how patriarchy works.[40] Later, she analyzed the internal contradictions of masculine identities in Muslim societies in different historical periods and geographical contexts.[41]

---

38 Alan J. Hawkins et al., "Rethinking Fathers' Involvement in Child Care," in *Fatherhood: Contemporary Theory, Research, and Social Policy,* ed. William Marsiglio (London: Sage, 1995): 44-52.

39 Kandiyoti, "Bargaining with Patriarchy," 274-290.

40 Deniz Kandiyoti, "Patterns of Patriarchy: Notes for An Analysis of Male Dominance in Turkish Society," in *Women in Modern Turkish Society: A Reader*, ed. Şirin Tekeli (London; Atlantic Heights, NJ: Zed Books, 1995), 306-307.

41 Deniz Kandiyoti, "The Paradoxes of Masculinity: Some Thoughts on Segregated Societies," in *Dislocating Masculinity*: *Comparative Ethnographies*, ed. Andrea Cornwall and Nancy Lindisfarne, (London: Routledge, 1994), 197-213.

The survey, conducted in 1998 on masculine attitudes in the city of Eskişehir, is one of the first surveys in the field.[42] Including men and women of different social backgrounds, it shed light on the fact that age and education level affect gender attitudes in favor of equality; however 95,6 percent of the participants defined the most important mission of a man as protecting family or becoming a proper head of a household.[43]

As manhood entered the literature as a problematic, distinct research topics emerged. The work of Ayşe Gül Altınay, published in 2004, might be marked as a qualified response to the previous suggestion by Kandiyoti to research the relationship between institutionalized power and patriarchy.[44] Altınay delved into the military and argued that the first citizens of the Turkish republic did not consider military service as a culturally and politically taken-for-granted phenomenon. However, in time, it has become a service to the state and a mechanism to produce a national masculine citizen. Now it is "a rite of passage to manhood and those men who have not been through it are made to experience a 'lack.'"[45] However, some interpretations in the book mistake masculinity for fatherhood. For example, there is a reference to an old story of a young peasant, Hüsmen, who is in the last day of his military service and very excited because he will have a chance to fascinate his beloved, Kezban, by what he learned during the military service upon returning to his village. He imagines that he will be a "commander" at home, and Kezban will obey him like a soldier after their wedding.[46] After

---

42 Çimen Günay-Erkol, "İllet, Zillet, Erkeklik: Eleştirel Erkeklik Çalışmaları ve Türkiye'deki Seyri," *Toplum ve Bilim* 145 (2018): 22.

43 Oğuz Onaran, Seçil Büker, Ali Atıf Bir, *Eskişehir'de Erkek Rol ve Tutumlarına İlişkin Alan Araştırması* (Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi, 1998), 47.

44 Nadire Mater's book *Mehmedin Kitabı: Güneydoğu'da Savaşmış Askerler Anlatıyor*, published in 1998, is a pioneer on the subject. It provided ex-soldiers who fought with Kurdish armed forces in Eastern and Southeastern of Turkey with a space to share their experiences with the public. However, it does not contain a theoretical analysis.

45 Ayşe Gül Altınay, *The Myth of the Military-Nation: Militarism, Gender, and Education in Turkey* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 82.

46 I thank Prof. Ayşe Gül Altınay, who reminded me of the story and encouraged me to criticize her interpretation of it.

enduring many masculine humiliations by commanders and assuming feminine docility towards seniors, military service promises a commandership in civil life for the sake of being a man.[47]

Another scholar Pınar Selek, who illuminates the distressing relationship between manhood and military service, defines four phases through which a man becomes a socially accepted man: circumcision, military service, profession, and marriage. All stages until marriage prepare him for fatherhood, because fatherhood is self-proving masculinity. A father means an inseminating husband, a protective and handy soldier at home and a decision-making mechanism for all kinds of family determinations.[48] The book interprets the abovementioned story of Hüsmen by a reference to his masculine identity guaranteed by military service; however, Hüsmen has the authority not because he is a man, but because he has the right to detach from his father's paternal authority to a certain extent and start his own. A man can be the head of household only after completing the fourth phase, marriage, and through marriage, he can construct his paternal authority as a "commander." However, a wife is not enough for a commander to lead, he needs children too.

In 2004, the periodical *Toplum ve Bilim* dedicated its 101th issue to manhood and gave scholars a chance to problematize manhood as a constructed, but self-destructive identity.[49] Some deciphered the function of socialization processes in forming hegemonic masculine identity based on the sex role theory.[50] Some shed light on the cultural codes of hegemonic masculinity,[51] and some criticized the fact that studies do miss men's experience in the private sphere.[52]

---

47 Altınay, *The Myth*, 77-78.

48 Pınar Selek, *Sürüne Sürüne Erkek Olmak* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2008), 19-23.

49 Tayfun Atay, "'Erkeklik' En Çok Erkeği Ezer," *Toplum ve Bilim* 101 (2004):11-30.

50 Hilal Onur and Berrin Koyuncu, "'Hegemonik' Erkekliğin Görünmeyen Yüzü: Sosyalizasyon Sürecinde Erkeklik Oluşumları ve Krizleri Üzerine Düşünceler," *Toplum ve Bilim* 101 (2004):31-49.

51 Kurtuluş Cengiz, Uğraş Ulaş Tol and Önder Küçükural, "Hegemonik Erkekliğin Peşinden," 50-70.

52 Cenk Özbay and İlkay Baliç, "Erkekliğin Ev Halleri!" *Toplum ve Bilim* 101 (2004): 89-103.

However, the relationship between nationalism, military service, and manhood is still one of the most attractive scholarly puzzles in masculinity studies. Thus, the studies focusing on men's military experiences are especially significant since they unearth new dimensions to scrutinize militarism.

Yet, the exclusive nature of the military makes it hard to study it comprehensively. Therefore, personal observations of male scholars appear as an enlightening source. Analysis of Ömer Turan, in example, bases on his own experience of military service and exemplifies how soldiers sneak out and pretend to follow orders. Without direct observation, it would be difficult to point out that an exalted conscript of a nation-state is sometimes a faker.[53]

Other scholars focus on the meaning of conscription for mothers and demonstrate that a proud mother is a woman who brings up an obedient citizen-son and ignores what his son has to endure during his military service.[54] This is a defining feature of the post-1980 Turkey in which fighting with terrorism has been one of the most prevalent discourses of institutional politics. Since the ongoing fight has been with the Kurdish armed forces in Eastern and Southeastern of Turkey, to draw a line between "us" and "them" is difficult, and individuals have been under constant pressure of proving patriotism. Thus, compulsory military service serves to tell real patriots from traitors, and martyrdom is the most precise position for a man to prove his true patriotism.[55] Indeed, apart from conscientious objectors, men avoid this military burden either by hiding from the officials until age limit or by

---

53 Ömer Turan, "'Esas Duruş:' Kışla Deneyimleri ya da Türkiye'de Zorunlu Askerliğin Antropolojisi," in *Asker Millet Erkek Millet: Türkiye'de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek(lik)ler*, ed. Nurseli Yeşim Sünbüloğlu (İstanbul: İletişim, 2013), 291-293.

54 Senem Kaptan, Çatlakların Gölgesinde Militarizm: Türkiye'de Askerlik, Annelik ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet," in *Asker Millet Erkek Millet: Türkiye'de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek(lik)ler*, ed. Nurseli Yeşim Sünbüloğlu (İstanbul: İletişim, 2013), 358.

55 Şafak Aykaç, "Şehitlik ve Türkiye'de Militarizmin Yeniden Üretimi: 1990: 1999," in *Asker Millet Erkek Millet: Türkiye'de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek(lik)ler*, ed. Nurseli Yeşim Sünbüloğlu (İstanbul: İletişim, 2013), 163.

taking a medical report known as "pink bill" to document their unsuitability.[56]

By the second half of the 2000s, research gained acceleration, and some prominent inquiries connected socio-economic transformations of the country to masculinities. Serpil Sancar's comprehensive fieldwork demonstrates that as urban capitalist production practices have replaced agricultural production, older men do not have much power on young male members of their family anymore. Therefore, young men in migrated families come forward as the main provider in the suburbs, but rural expectations from the main provider to act as a paternal protector continue. Consequently, young men resort to seeking other paternal figures in business life to deal with the chaotic situation caused by having lost their paternal protection. These discontinuities and transitions lead to a "crisis of masculinity."[57]

Kandiyoti draws attention to the fact that women demand educational, professional, and civic rights more and more now, which is concomitant with the fact that the male provider role does not function as previously. Men, who cannot provide even for themselves and cannot prevent women from permeating into public spaces, resort to violence to secure domination. At this point, many state apparatuses step in to restore masculine domination.[58] This is one of the most important reasons behind the increasing number of killings of women in Turkey. Masculinity with all toxic features comes forward. Approvingly, Eylem Ümit Atılgan's analysis on cases of killings of women in which male murderers openly defended their "right to kill" on account of women's unjust provocation reveals something very im-

---

56 Alp Biricik, "7. Ok-Militarizm: Vatandaşlık, Borçluluk ve Çürükleştirmek Üzerine," in *Asker Millet Erkek Millet: Türkiye'de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek(lik)ler*, ed. Nurseli Yeşim Sünbüloğlu (İstanbul: İletişim, 2013), 375.

57 Serpil Sancar, *Erkeklik: İmkansız İktidar: Ailede, Piyasada ve Sokakta Erkekler* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2008), 301-302.

58 Deniz Kandiyoti, "Fear and Fury: Women and Post-revolutionary Violence," *Open Democracy*, January 10, 2013. https://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/deniz-kandiyoti/fear-and-fury-women-and-post-revolutionary-violence. Also see; Zeynep Kurtuluş-Korkman, "Politics of Intimacy in Turkey: A Distraction from "Real" Politics," *Journal of Middle Eastern Women's Studies* 12, no. 1 (2016): 112-121.

portant. Although the penal code defines an unjust provocation as something "illegal," many male murderers are sentenced to a lesser punishment because the courts judge that women's defamations on men's sexual power, provider role, or manhood are deemed provocation. Atılgan argues that such questions make the gap between the discourse of ideal manhood and reality visible in such a level that men cannot shoulder the burden of proof.[59] Thus, Kandiyoti has a point in referring to state apparatuses as the protector of masculine domination.

Another research informs us that irrespective of socioeconomic background, men interpret the concept of man enough, or real man as a total adjective implying honesty, loyalty, respectfulness, and honor. They feel under pressure to be a real man, to be man enough.[60] Nevertheless, although men give utterance to that pressure and hardships, they accept that being man enough legitimates their hierarchical position at home at the same time.[61] Consequently, they do not seem willing to break away with the discourse of ideal manhood, even if it is impossible to realize it. As Cenk Özbay argues, nobody portrays hegemonic masculinity, and everybody has only some features of it. However, the large-scale political transformation of Turkey determines its most defining characteristics. It is obvious that a type of masculinity in favor of science, rationality, and modernity but against religion and tradition has been in decline. However, the most representative property behind all masculinities is a neoliberal ethos.[62]

The most influential source of difference among masculinities is the place of residence. Men in rural spaces are more sensitive to what other people think of them, while men in urban areas do not attach importance to it. Education is also influential, mainly, as men leave their hometown to

---

59 Eylem Ümit Atılgan, "Erkeklerin Öldürme Hakkı: Erkeklik İndirimi," *Toplum ve Bilim* 145 (2018): 173-174.

60 Bolak-Boratav, et al. *Erkekliğin*, 264-281.

61 Hale Bolak-Boratav, Güler Okman-Fişek, and Hande Eslen Ziya, "Unpacking Masculinities in the Context of Social Change: Internal Complexities of the Identities of Married Men in Turkey," *Men and Masculinities* 17, no.3 (2014): 310-312.

62 Cenk Özbay, "Türkiye'de Hegemonik Erkekligi Aramak," *Dogu Bati* 63 (2013): 201-203.

study at university in a different city. Urban life and education affect the level of individuation of men. In this sense, recent research detected five prototypes of masculinity facing socio-political changes in Turkey. For "the provincial-traditional," a man is like a "commander" or "coach," and hierarchical relations between generations and genders are very important in a family. "The poor-contradictory" represents poverty and desires conflicting with current socio-economic conditions and always need to be left behind for the sake of family, such as choosing a girl to marry. "The seeker of individuation" is a countryman who demands isolation from his wife and children to pursue his artistic interests. He oscillates between modern and traditional manhood. He claims to be the head of the household but accepts that his wife has a say on things because she contributes to livelihood with her income as well. "The traditional urban" has a country background and embraces city life. However, he is still in favor of paternalist protection in many sectors of life and argues that a man shows himself when he has his own family because a real man is a good provider, and a dictator at home. "The individualized urban" has an urban origin as well as a proud careerist with egalitarian attitudes toward his wife and children. The five prototypes' commonality is an emotional relationship with mother as opposed to a formal one with father. A relatively close relationship with a father is possible only in an urban setting.[63]

In a similar fashion, Osman Özarslan's field work examines how masculinity is constructed in rural entertainment venues and concludes that three types of men dominate the nightlife: the well-heeled, the hard-bitten, and the handsome.[64]

Differently from other scholars, Cenk Özbay and his colleagues have been identifying new research topics regarding masculinities. Based on their field research on masculinity, homosexuality, and aging, he and Maral Erol say that aging gay men, refuses andropause and use different strategies to

63 Bolak-Boratav et al., *Erkekliğin*, 286-297.

64 Osman Özarslan, *Hovarda Alemi: Taşrada Eğlence ve Erkeklik* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2016).

maintain their social and confident subjectivity.[65] In another research, he and Ozan Soybakis examine the relationship between the "ways of doing masculinity" and the ethea of the dominant political parties with which men are engaged.[66] In a piece of research that he conducted in 2021, he discloses that homonormative gay men prefer to align with "the state, its institutions, and heteronormativity, which retains its normative and hegemonic position, as long as it ensures and enables their existence within the perceived normativity."[67]

Similarly, Salih Can Açıksöz has been raising new research questions. He investigates how the disabled veterans, who are "valorized through the masculine ethos of nationalism, and violently expelled from the world of hegemonic masculinity," politicize in favor of jingoism in order to remasculinize.[68] He also discovers that the veterans prefer to be named ghazi, "an Islamic honorary title denoting a Muslim Champion," in order not to be mistaken for a street beggar, who "is one of the most readily available public images for the lower-class disabled male body in urban Turkey."[69] As is well seen, scholars take masculinities across different socio-economic backgrounds and evaluate them within Turkey's specific conditions. In this context, nationalism, militarism, transformations in the labor market, the crisis of masculinity, the interferences of state apparatuses with violence against women, and urbanization come forward as focal points in general.

---

65 Maral Erol and Cenk Özbay, "No Andropause for Gay Men? The Body, Aging and Sexuality in Turkey," *Journal of Gender Studies* 27, no. 7 (2018): 847-859.

66 Cenk Özbay and Ozan Soybakis, "Political Masculinities: Gender, Power, and Change in Turkey," *Social Politics* 27, no. 1 (2020): 27-50.

67 Cenk Özbay, "Living Like a Hetero: Southern Homonormativity in Istanbul," *Sexualities* 0, no. 0 (2021): 16.

68 Salih Can Açıksöz, "Sacrificial Limbs of Sovereignty: Disabled Veterans, Masculinity, and Nationalist Politics in Turkey," *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 26, no.1 (2012): 20.

69 Salih Can Açıksöz, "Ghazis and Beggars: The Double Life of Turkish Disabled Veterans," *Ethnologie Française* 44, no. 2 (2014): 247-255.

3.1.2 *The Intellectual Location of Heteronormative Fatherhood in Turkey*

Research with a specific focus on heteronormative fatherhood is either outnumbering investigations on fictional fathers or limited field research with real fathers in Turkey. As for fictional fathers, novels of the *Tanzimat* Period come forward for scholars like Jale Parla and Nükhet Sirman. Parla argues that when the sultan Abdulmecid was enthroned, he was 16 years old, and the old institutions and cultural practices were under the attack of Western norms and institutive practices. Within the solidly entrenched epistemological basis of the Ottoman absolutism, all texts, literary or not, were absolutist. The Quran was not questionable, deductive thinking was superior to any kind of thinking, good and bad were like black and white, and intellectuals were in favor of idealism based on mysticism. This epistemological basis was buttressed against the attacks of Western norms and practices. Intellectuals were in a normative vacuum during this epistemological transformation. An absolutist culture without a ruler was searching for a symbolic father in literary texts. The common analogy was between the *Tanzimat* period and a child, who is in need of protection. Therefore, then writers looked for *millet babalığı* (a father of the nation).[70] They assumed the role of the father, "the guarantor of the absolutist ruler"[71] as a guide for the society. Accordingly, the father, the son, and the home was the most appreciated triangle of the Tanzimat novels. Within this triangle, in the absence of the father, the son is left with no moral guide and destroys his family with his exorbitance all together. Then writers portrayed not only fatherless sons but also tyrannical fathers who do not deserve to be loved and respected.[72] The family came forward as the most appropriate locus of expressing the just rule.

---

70 Jale Parla, *Babalar ve Oğullar: Tanzimat Romanının Epistemolojik Temelleri* (Istanbul: Iletişim, 1990), 18.

71 Nükhet Sirman, "Gender Construction and Nationalist Discourse: Dethroning the Father in the Early Turkish Novel," in *Gender and Identity Construction: Women of Central Asia, the Caucasus and Turkey,* eds. Feride Acar and Ayşe Güneş Ayata (Boston: Brill, 2000), 168.

72 Ibid.

Nurdan Gürbilek reveals that the best examples of modern Turkish novels such as the Disconnected and Dangerous Games are under the impact of orphanhood that fostered early examples of modern literary works. While Western ideals displaced the traditional father figure, fathers lost their cultural power and turned into sketchy representatives of foreign causes. Novels display fictional fathers, who are underdeveloped in many ways and the most embarrassing traditional material for their more modern sons and daughters. Sons ridiculing their fathers before everyone else in order to build a barrier against everyone else's hostile harsh words live in an insurmountable orphanhood just like the East itself; sons both mature early and remain as a child, and the East stands like an emotional child facing the rational West. Gürbilek argues that this is why one of the most famous lines in Turkish melodrama was Can I call you father?, and that Turks called one of their presidents "father" for years.[73]

Some others also interpret uneasy relationships between fictional fathers and their sons in novels, plays, and movies.[74] In contrast, some others analyze the ideals of a father and son within centuries-old texts such as the *Book of Korkut Ata*, the most famous epic stories of Oghuz Turks or *Kutadgu Bilig*, a political text from the 11th century.[75] However, M. Bilgin

---

73 Nurdan Gürbilek, "Azgelişmiş Babalar," in *Kötü Çocuk Türk* (İstanbul: Metis, 2001), 57-63.

74 Ahmet Buran, "Metin-Bağlam İlgisi Bakımından *Ak Gemi*'de 'Babalık' Kavramı ve Baba-Çocuk İlişkisi," *Türk Dünyası Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi* 27 (2009): 49-59. Ayşe Senem Donatan, "Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Tiyatrosu'nda Baba Otoritesinin Temsili: Arafta Kalmış Babalar," *Tiyatro Eleştirmenliği ve Dramaturji* 20 (2012): 93-117. Hediye Özkan, "Ataerki Sadece Kadına mı Baskı Yapar? *Masculinities Journal* 2 (2014):135-148. Burçak Erdal, "Yarı Tanrı Babalar ve Onların Mahsun Oğulları," *Suret* 6 (2015): 73-94. Duygu Oylubaş Katfar, "Babanın Alfa Karakteri: Tarihi Romanlarda Oğlunu Öldüren Sultanlar," *Uluslararası Beşeri Bilimler ve Eğitim Dergisi* 4 (2018): 217-235.

75 Altan Çetin, "Kutadgu Bilig'de Türk Aile Kültüründe Bir Babanın Oğul İmajı ya da Süregiden Bellek/Kültür," *Milli Folklor* 85 (2010): 122-132. Fatoş Yalçınkaya, "Geleneği Geleceğe Taşıyan Oğullar: Dede Korkut Kitabı'nda Baba-Oğul İlişkisi," *Milli Folklor* 107 (2015): 60-71.

Saydam's book is out of type with a psychoanalytic reading of Turkish epic stories in terms of symbolic meanings of fatherhood and motherhood.[76]

As for field research, the pioneer could be an unpublished master's thesis in educational sciences at Boğaziçi University by Cressida Evans in 1997. The thesis is based on sixty interviews with fathers of lower socio-economic class with children aged three and eight and shows that the breadwinner role swallows much of fathers' time. Consequently, fathers are just distant figures and not involved in child care other than make decisions on a child's future and education.[77] Ensuing investigations were also unpublished master's theses. One was conducted with eighteen fathers of three generations in six lower-middle and middle-class families to decipher the impacts of construction and practices of fatherhood on child education. It found that first- generation was composed of rigid and authoritarian fathers who were afraid of emotional closeness on account that they would lose their authority; second generation fathers were also authoritarian but in a lesser degree; third generation fathers were not involved in housework and child care as previous generations, however, they were inclined to see their disinterest as a drawback. In all families, mothers came forward as primary figures in educational matters.[78] Another master's thesis in clinical psychology consisting of fifteen interviews with mostly university graduate fathers with adult or underage children focuses on the experience of being fathered and being a father according to dimensions of hierarchy, emotional sharing, guidance, and expectations. It concludes that second-generation fathers favor less hierarchical and emotionally more available relationships with their children compared to their own experiences of being fathered. Yet they empathize with their emotionally distant fathers on the grounds of life conditions and cultural norms. Accordingly, their breadwinner role prevents their involvement with children, but differently from first-generation fathers, their guidance and expectations rest on mutual understanding rather than obedi-

---

76 M. Bilgin Saydam, *Deli Dumrul'un Bilinci: Türk-İslam Ruhu Üzerine Bir Kültür Psikolojisi Denemesi* (Istanbul: Metis, 1997).

77 Evans, "Turkish Fathers' Attitudes to and Involvement in Their Fathering Role," 155-156.

78 Sever, Toplumsal-Kültürel Bağlamda Babalık," 90-91.

ence.[79] Another unpublished thesis, based on twenty interviews with predominantly primary-educated fathers with mostly adult children in Eskişehir, analyzes intergenerational experiences of fathers in terms of being fathered and being a father again and discovers two groups of fatherhood; "good" and "harsh." Appreciation of provider role was the common ground, but harsh fathers are generally decision-makers and sometimes physical abusers within the family while "good" fathers are more egalitarian men and have some features similar to "involved" fathers.[80]

Concerning published works, the field research deals with the issue from the perspective of care work *per se*: how much time a father spares for the child comparing to the mother. For instance, Beşpınar did research on "new fatherhood" experiences of middle-class men and showed that the so-called novelty is limited to discourse.[81] Barutçu and Hıdır inquired about profeminist fathers' attitudes and concluded that their differences from traditional fathers are also confined to discourse.[82] However, Zeybek relying on his personal experience as a new father, elaborated that fathers have to challenge against both cultural expectations regarding the limited role of a father in care work and non-child friendly cities.[83]

Dogruoz and Rogow studied the programs of AÇEV (Mother Child Education Foundation) targeting fathers and explained that fathers are open to new experiences; however, the pace and level of their change are dependent upon their social backgrounds.[84] AÇEV has its research on father involvement in Turkey. Their report presents five categories of fatherhood: traditional fatherhood; diligent fatherhood, which is less traditional; egalitarian fatherhood; new traditional fatherhood, which implies some changing attitudes towards daughters; exceptional fatherhood, which refers to men who

79 Yalçınöz, "From Being a Son to Being a Father," 183-185.

80 Tecik, "Fatherhood Experience of Lower-Middle Class Men," 118-120.

81 Beşpınar, "Between Ideals and Enactments," 95-113.

82 Barutçu and Hıdır, "Türkiye'de Babalığın Değişen Rolleri," 27-45.

83 Zeybek, "'Bu Bebeğin Annesi Nerede?,'" 122-130.

84 Dogruoz and Rogow, "And How Will You Remember Me, My Child?,"

assign great importance to fatherhood.[85] Beşpınar and Beşpınar compared fatherhood experiences of secular and religious-conservative men, and drew attention to that conservative men emphasize the continuity between their experience of being fathered and fathering. However, their attitudes toward their daughters are different from those of their fathers. In contrast, secular fathers stress dissimilarity between their experience of being fathered and fathering, and strive for educating their children as free individuals. An important result of the research is that both groups construct their fatherhood identity as opposed to each other. Conservative fathers disdain secular men's attitudes towards their children, while secular men complain about the emasculating conditions of the country for the seculars and try to prepare a safe future for their children abroad.[86] Gökhan Topçu shed light upon expectations of fathers of different socio-economic backgrounds from social policies in addition to their attitudes regarding manhood and fatherhood. Fathers of lower-class families, who are less likely to perform care work, expect economic support, while fathers of white-collar await educational programs on fatherhood and are more willing to assume responsibility in care work if their wives are in professional life. But fathers at executive positions are more prone to equal participation in care work and the most critical group about social policies. They are in favor of structural changes in a variety of areas such as tax and education system. The research differs from the previous literature because it underlines that deficiency of social policies is the result of the masculinist state's trust in male heads of the household to provide for their family.[87] However, fatherhood has been mostly a matter of inquiry in terms of care work *per se*.

Additionally, a survey on students' perception of the role of a father in Çukurova University concludes that the most traditional aspect of young people is a belief in natural differences between men and women, which deems mothers the most appropriate caretaker and excludes fathers from

85 Mother Child Education Foundation, Involved Fatherhood, 13.

86 Beşpınar and Beşpınar, "Türkiye'de Orta Üst Sınıf Laik ve Muhafazakar Kimliklerin Babalık Deneyimleri Üzerinden İrdelenmesi," 5-38.

87 Topçu, "Varsayılan Aile Kıskancında Babalık," 95-97.

care work. However, a father with a more democratic character is the most prevalent expectation.[88] Recent research with fifteen women on how mothers interpret their past experiences with their fathers in a city of the Black Sea region illuminates that women associate their fathers with playful engagements in the outer world while labeling their mothers as authoritarian. Some women tend to exalt their fathers as a protector although they did not have a close relationship. Accordingly, women differentiate their fathers' fatherhood from their husbands' who have emotional bonds with their children.[89]

In addition to research with a specific focus on heteronormative fatherhood, other sociological and anthropological works recognize fatherhood as a subject of analysis. In the first place, research of Carol Delaney attracts attention. In her ethnographic research, she demonstrates that paternity is a cultural construct as much as a physical reality. People code the contribution of men and women to procreation differently; while men provide the seed, the essence for the child, women just function as a container for the fetus."[90] She conceptualizes this understanding as "monogenetic procreation" which implies that "a child is originated from only one source," which is male.[91] An established statement when defining a child in Turkish *Babadan olma anadan dogma* (originating from the father, borne by the mother) points out the same phenomenon by referring to the father as the person who is the source of life.[92]

We can pursue the implications of the same conceptualization within different contexts. In case of divorce, women, who begin to live again with

---

88 Figen Karadayı, "Gençlerin Babalık Rolüne İlişkin Tutumları Kendi Babalarının Davranışı ve Sosyo Demografik Faktörlerle ilişkisi," *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 8 (2001): 184-185.

89 Büşra Kocatepe and Sabiha Bilgi, "Toplumsal Bir İnşa Olarak Babalık: Annelerin Yaşam Öykülerinde Baba İmgesi," *Fe Dergi* 10 (2018): 57.

90 Carol Delaney, *The seed and the Soil: Gender and Cosmology in Turkish Village Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 32.

91 Carol Delaney, "The Meaning Of Paternity and the Virgin Birth Debate," *Man* 21 (1986): 496-500.

92 Saydam, *Deli Dumrul'un Bilinci*, 105.

their parents, are forced by their parents not to take their children's custody because the child belongs to his father. [93] Children are considered both a symbol of the previous sexuality of women and an extension of their father. Carole Pateman also observes the same phenomena within the legal battles between men and the surrogate mothers, who are not willing to relinquish the baby. In 1987, the judge in the case of Baby M crystallized the point by stating that: "The biological father pays the surrogate for her willingness to be impregnated and carry his child to term. At birth, the father does not purchase the child. It is his own biologically genetically related child. He cannot purchase what is already his."[94]As Selek defines, fatherhood is a position to be earned by a man who is circumcised, did military service, and has a job and sexual experience. It is a multifaceted position; a father has a woman and children whom he governs and provides.[95] Failing to maintain a family is a disaster for men of lower class since their chance to prove their success as a man is restricted. Accordingly, Sancar makes firm that urban and rural background and social class position, strongly affect fatherhood; however, provider role comes forward as the most acceptable model of fatherhood for all classes.[96] Indeed, when women have higher income, husbands get jealous of wives' expenses on their children on account that as a boy, they did not get the same attention from their parents. They resort to different strategies such as extreme generosity towards their male friends to control their livelihood indirectly. They want their wives to become more frugal and as a result, change their priority in expenses.[97] The first field research on the interplay between industrialization and urban life, conducted in 1961, illuminated the same desire to control. Standing out of the results was that the father-son relationship was the most troubled relationship by urbanization within the family structure. The authority of fathers, who used to execute power over their sons until death, began to shrink. Fathers re-

93 Yıldırım, *Yeni Bir Hayat Kurmak/Kadınlar Anlatıyor*, 30.

94 Pateman, *The Sexual Contract* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988), 213.

95 Selek, *Sürüne Sürüne*, 19-20.

96 Sancar, *Erkeklik*, 124-126.

97 Kandiyoti, "The Paradoxes," 214-215.

garded their sons more rebellious since they demanded to choose with whom they would marry on their own and a separate house upon marriage, which occupation they would engage, and their avocation preferences. However, when fathers were directly questioned whether they were complaining of their sons or not, they did not accept they were because it would mean that they agreed with the idea that their power was fragile.[98] Recent research on masculine identities identifies that hierarchy defines the relationship between fathers and sons. Men with a background of traditional and lower-class families describe their relationship with their fathers by respect and fear while men of the lower-and lower-middle class define with distance. Prevention in decision making is the most common experience irrespective of socio-economic background. Especially men of the lower-class are supposed to be docile against their fathers. Their fathers take almost all vital decisions on behalf of their sons and converse with them only after their sons perform military service. Some of the men reproach these emotionally distant fathers while some create excuses and try to understand them. Particularly upper-class men in their forties accept having been exposed to physical abuse of their fathers as a means of discipline. However, most of the participants justify violence against them and develop empathy with their fathers. Moreover, at the end of the day, almost all of them agree that they learned how to be an honest man from their fathers. "This is how we were taught by our father" is a defensive sentence of for behaviors inherited from the father.[99] Accordingly, men, who complain about their own authoritarian and emotionally distant fathers and are emotionally more available to their children, are in favor of restrictive parenting, especially when daughters are involved.[100] However, in sharp contrast with men, another research with battered women and their adult daughters reveals that women, who were grown up amidst family violence do not assume any responsibility and blame only their fathers. Moreover, the only minor participant aged

98 Mübeccel Kıray, *Ağır Sanayiden Önce Bir Sahil Kasabası* (İstanbul: Bağlam, 2000), 137-142.

99 Bolak-Boratav et al., *Erkekliğin,* 95-128.

100 Bolak-Boratav, et al., "Unpacking Masculinities," 309-312.

15 expressed that the only remedy for violence is her father's suspension from home. Most of the daughters pointed out that they tried to convince their mothers to get a divorce for many years.[101] Indeed, accounts in another research on divorce affirm that children in violent families blame their fathers and help their mothers get divorced.[102]

The contrast between the emphatic sons and accusing daughters above is thought-provoking. Probably gender dimension pulls something afflictive out of a black hole at this point. Inside families is a "deep family" working with the violence of any kind without any sort of monitoring.[103] The comprehensive survey of Ayşe Gül Altınay and Yeşim Arat with 1800 women on violence demonstrates that violence is a cycle. Women, who were beaten up by their fathers in childhood and teenage years, and whose mothers were beaten up by their fathers, are more likely to be physically abused by their husbands.[104] In 2012, research on family violence showed that of 440 children aged between 11-17, 73,4 % witnessed family violence, and 67,9 % were exposed to psychological violence at least once. Parents defend their behavior on account of discipline and control.[105] In 2014, another research on violence towards children exhibited that 73,7 % of parents exercise psychological violence. Moreover, children witness physical and psychological violence within family members by 67,1 % and 67,5 % and against their parents by 53,7 % and 69,9 %, respectively.[106] However, statistics on sexual

---

101 Ural Nadir, *Nasıl Korunabilirdik? Şiddete Uğrayan Kadınlar ve Çocuklar* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2017), 146-180.

102 Yıldırım, *Yeni Bir Hayat*, 117-121.

103 Alanur Çavlin, Filiz Kardam and Hanife Aliefendioğlu, Giriş to *Ailenin Karanlık Yüzü Ensest,* edited by Alanur Çavlin, Filiz Kardam and Hanife Aliefendioğlu (İstanbul: Metis, 2018), 13.

104 Ayşe Gül Altınay and Yeşim Arat, *Türkiye'de Kadına Yönelik Şiddet* (İstanbul: Punto, 2007), 88. http://kasaum.ankara.edu.tr/files/2013/11/Ay%C5%9Fe-G%C3%BCl-Alt%C4%B1nay-Ye%C5%9Fim-Arat-turkiyede_kadina_yonelik_siddet_2007.pdf

105 Genç Hayat Vakfı, *Çocukların Ev İçinde Yaşadıkları Şiddet Araştırması* (İstanbul: Genç Hayat Yayınları, 2012), 26-29,40. http://www.cocukhaklariizleme.org/wp-content/uploads/evicisiddet-arastirma.pdf

106 Bernard van Leer Vakfı, *Türkiye'de 0-8 Yaş Arası Çocuğa Yönelik Aile İçi Şiddet Araştırması* (İstanbul, 2014), 36-40. http://www.ailecocuksiddet.info/RAPOR.pdf

violations of children rights is still a significant lack. From various presentations in different congresses and meetings, we know that of all sexual offenses in 2011, 47 % were against children, and in 2012, 112 thousand children were registered victims.[107]Ayşen Ufuk Sezgin researching sexual violence towards children within families in Turkey since 1993, declares that almost half of assailants in all cases in Turkey are fathers or other male family members holding a fatherly authority over children. She points out that extended families are prevalent in Turkey, and their dynamics should be deciphered.[108]

Obviously, the existing research with a specific focus on fatherhood presents some limited knowledge with a focus on care work and educational matters. However, two facts about Turkey are significant. First, families regard their children as their asset and prospective citizens instead of citizens whose well-being is under their responsibility.[109] Second, a social policy approach targeting youth is an important deficiency, and family is the only social security source for adults.[110] However, that does not mean that the state does not have any policy on youth. The government applies educational policies based on Turkishness and Muslimness and uses dichotomous rhetoric stigmatizing non-pious youth. Such an approach paved the way to the Gezi Protests by demonized young adults in 2013.[111]

Although masculinity studies scholars take nationalism as a theoretical framework, fatherhood has yet to be theoretically nationalized. By following the line of thought that the double meaning of *makbul* provide, I embark to show how fatherhood is constructed and experienced in the shadow of Turk-

---

107 Türkay Asma, "Yasalarda ve Uygulamada Cinsel İstismar: Tanıklıklar," in *Ailenin Karanlık Yüzü Ensest,* eds. Alanur Çavlin, Filiz Kardam and Hanife Aliefendioğlu (İstanbul: Metis, 2018), 227.

108 Ayşen Ufuk Sezgin, "Enseste Yakından Bakmak: Bir Klinik Psikoloğun Biriktirdikleri," in *Ailenin Karanlık Yüzü Ensest*, eds. Alanur Çavlin, Filiz Kardam and Hanife Aliefendioğlu (İstanbul: Metis, 2018), 96-105.

109 Çavlin, Kardam and Aliefendioğlu, Giriş to *Ailenin*, 19.

110 Bora, "Aile: En Güçlü İşsizlik Sigortası,"185-187.

111 Demet Lüküslü, "Creating a pious generation: youth and education policies of the AKP in Turkey," *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 16, no.4 (2016): 640-644.

ishness and how the privileges granted to the acceptable come with their limitations.

§ 3.2 Familial Society

The Foucauldian understanding of governmentality conceptualizes the state as a historically and contextually shaped unit aiming "'the conduct of conduct'" through a variety of means.[112] And the politics of intimacy refers to the policies and discourses targeting reproduction, sexuality, and family relations.[113]

Historically speaking, the structure of the relations in the Ottoman society was based on house rather than family. House means "people who live under one roof and make up a single unit of production and consumption," and Topkapı Palace was the largest house.[114] As an institution, it formed "smaller replicas of itself" all over the empire.[115] The bureaucrats of the empire had been recruited from Christian minorities. They had become the members of the big house by converting to Islam and marrying women from the *harem*. Later, men of Muslim origin were recruited too. Smaller houses of the members of the big house attracted promising young men to themselves from their districts. In the end, the structure produced "the houses as satellites of each other."[116] In this system, it was crucial to differentiate those who were to be subordinated from those who were to dominate. One used to answer "the question 'who are you?' by providing the name of the head of the house one belong[ed] to." But the question was followed by an-

---

112 Nikolas Rose, *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*, 2nd ed. (London; New York: Free Association Books, 1999), xxi.

113 Feride Acar and Gülbanu Altınok, "The Politics of 'Intimate' at the intersection of neoliberalism and neo-conservatism in Contemporary Turkey," *Women's Studies International Forum* 41 (2013): 17.

114 Nükhet Sirman, "Constituting," 178.

115 Nükhet Sirman, "The Making of Familial Citizenship in Turkey," in *Citizenship in a Global World: European Questions and Turkish Experiences*, eds. Fuat Keyman and Ahmet İçduygu (New York: Routledge, 2005), 155.

116 Ibid., 155.

other one, "which serve[d] to place the person more accurately: 'and what are you?'" The answer was to name the nature of the bond between the head of the household and the person in question.[117] Thus, all social relations were political as they designed the codes of belonging to the houses.

However, *fin de siècle* witnessed the rise of discontent with the political structure as a direct consequence of the westernizing *Tanzimat* reforms and the discovery of the social. Since there was no "physical or metaphoric space outside" the houses to organize social relations, men were concerned about how to become a proper man. Thus, books on manners came out to reduce the anxiety caused by getting involved with strangers. In this vacuum, the transformation of the house into the family was the panacea. After the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923, the nuclear family became the norm casting extended families and big houses as archaic. Now, love was the only source of bond both in private and public realms as the nation was the product of proper persons, who lived in a culture of intimacy. "It was through the forms of intimacy pertaining to the nuclear family that the morality of the proper citizen was to be produced and citizens turned into the subjects of the modern nation-state."[118] For the Turkish modernization project, the national nuclear family was not the institution reproducing the existing order. On the contrary, it was the institution which was responsible for transforming an already existing political transformation into a social one.

Accordingly, servitude was abolished. In this manner, by regulations of the population in 1913, the registry was based on paternal pedigree so that servants in the houses could be listed under their pedigree rather than under the masters of houses.' By this act, possession over men by other men was finally removed. Since then, children have been to be listed under their fathers while women have been added to their husbands' pedigree as long as they stay married.[119]

---

117 Ibid., 155.

118 Ibid., 149.

119 Ferhunde Özbay, "Ulus-Devlet, Gözetim ve Nüfus Bilgisi" in *Aile, Kent ve Nüfus* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2017), 294-295.

The state supported policies and campaigns to modernize child-rearing practices as a part of good governance. Women of middle and upper-middle class backgrounds were encouraged to ask for advice from a family doctor and ground on scientific principles in child-rearing practices. Popular magazines; pamphlets published by Children's Protection Society; child-care courses in urban neighborhoods, dispensaries and clinics, and public exhibitions provided different means to convey the importance of rearing a robust child for the robustness of children was the index of progress and civility.[120]

Kumari Jayawardena expresses, because "the status of women in society was the popular barometer of 'civilization,' many reformers agitated for social legislation that would improve their situation." Subsequently, reformers were involved in what Şirin Tekeli considers "state feminism."[121] On the social side, they introduced a civil code based on the Swiss model. Polygamy and marriage by proxy were forbidden. Women were granted equal rights on divorce, custody of children, and inheritance. Muslim women were allowed to marry non-Muslim men. Nevertheless, the husband was the head of the family, and women had to ask for permission to work outside the home. Thus, even on the political side, women were granted enfranchisement in local elections in 1930 and in national elections in 1934, the husband-father was considered the only interlocutor to be addressed by the nation-state.[122] That is to say, women were supposed to exchange the rule of the father with the rule of the husband so that men could be equal.[123]

As is well established by feminist writers, the emphasis upon women is part of the project of having a seat as a nation-state within the modern European democracies. However, this is only one aspect of the issue if we consider the relationship between colonialism and colonial masculinity. Cynthia

---

120 Kathryn Kibal, "Realizing Modernity Through the Robust Turkish Child, 1923-1938," in *Symbolic Childhood*, ed. Daniel Thomas Cook (New York: Peter Lang, 2002)

121 Şirin Tekeli, "Emergence of the Women's Movement in Turkey," in *The New Women's Movement*, ed. Drude Dahlerup (London: Sage, 1986), 193.

122 Kumari Jayawardena, *Feminism and Nationalism in the third World* (London: Zed Books, 1986), 12-38.

123 Sirman, "The Making," 164.

Enloe points out that to be nationalist is to resist the colonizer's abuse of his women for a man. Moreover, she describes the gendered nature of nationalism in her much-quoted phrase *par excellence*: "nationalism typically has sprung from masculinized memory, masculinized humiliation and masculinized hope." Colonial men legitimized their actions by referring to the ideology of masculinity of the colonized societies; "if men's sense of manliness was such that it didn't include reverence toward women, then they couldn't expect to be allowed to govern their own societies."[124] For example, Bengali men, were ridiculed because they were effeminate and not manly enough to revere and protect women. The difference between men and women was to "symbolically define the *national* difference and power between *men*."[125] Therefore, the modernization of women and the stress upon a robust child after the War of Independence were to safeguard the indigenous masculinity against the colonial men's masculinity. For sportsmanship and respect for the respectable women were the bases of the colonial masculinity. The colonial man was superior to the colonized because he "had learned how to fight tooth decay, walk without slouching and properly carry his rucksack, but also because he had learned the importance of revering women, especially mothers and 'the right girl.'"[126] Thus the nation-state directed the same amount of effort to modernize and restrict the modernized women to perpetuate the notion of "the right girl."

Indeed, the modernization project was family-oriented in which modernized women were responsible for modern families while reformist men for a modern nation-state.[127] A hegemonic family model with a head of a household governing a wife and children was instrumental for naturalizing political power. For family provides an indispensible figure for sanctioning social

---

124 Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases* (London: University of California Press, 1989), 44-48.

125 Anne McClintock, "Family Feuds: Gender, Nationalism and the Family," *Feminist Review*, 44, no.24 (1993): 62.

126 Enloe, *Bananas*, 51.

127 Serpil Sancar, *Türk Modernleşmesinin Cinsiyeti: Erkekler Devlet, Kadınlar Aile Kurar* (Istanbul: İletişim, 2017), 191-192.

hierarchy within a putative organic unity of interests. Because the subordination of woman to man and child to adult were deemed natural facts, other forms of social hierarchy could be depicted in familial terms to guarantee social *difference* as a category of nature […] The metaphoric depiction of social hierarchy as natural and familial thus depended on the prior naturalizing of the social subordination of women and children.[128]

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk used this familiar imagery to reconfigure both the state and the land. At the time of the Ottoman Empire's surrender to the Allied forces, he came forward in the Battle of Gallipoli and refused to demobilize his troops. Then he rallied people in different cities "to resist the partition and claim the country as their own. The appeal was made to their sense of honor; they must come to the defense of the *Motherland* that, he claimed, had been prostituted under the capitulations and was about to be mutilated by the partition." His biographers argue that the way that he identified his mother with the motherland was the reason of his strong influence over people. "Peasants did not have to understand the idea of a nation-state to be motivated to protect their own threatened soil if it was understood as their mother who was being raped and sold into captivity." After the War of Independence, the boundaries of the country were fixed, and the new capital was established in Anatolia. In Turkish *Anadolu* means "filled with mothers" or "mother filled." All those born upon the land were *vatandaş*, "fellow of the motherland," similar to the word *kardeş*, "fellow of the womb."[129] The physicality of the fellows is from the mother, while the identity is from the father.

In her ethnographic research that she conducted in a Turkish village, Carol Delaney demonstrates that paternity is a cultural construct as much as a physical reality. People code the contribution of men and women to procreation differently; while men provide the seed, the essence for the child,

---

128 Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather*: *Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 45.

129 Carol Delaney, "Father State, Motherland, and the Birth of Modern Turkey," in *Naturalizing Power: Essays in Feminist Cultural Analysis*, ed. by Sylvia Yanagisako and Carol Delaney (London: Routledge, 1995), 186.

women just function as a container for the fetus."[130] She conceptualizes this understanding as "monogenetic procreation" which implies that "a child is originated from only one source," which is male.[131] So, man is the generative part who bestows the identity of the child, while the woman is just a nurturer, like the earth, irrespective of her identity.[132] Indeed, the nation-state was a projection of the biologic monogenetic procreation onto a political procreation. That the surname Atatürk (father of the Turks) was given to Mustafa Kemal by law forbidding taking the same name as either a surname or name in November 1934 reinforces the analogy.[133] The constitution of 1982 predicates the same idea declaring that a child with a Turkish father is a Turkish citizen, while a child with a Turkish mother and a foreign father is not. Obviously, the *vatandaş* was just a function of brotherhood for women's *vatandaşlık* or citizenship was to be mediated through relation to a man within the family.[134]

Nükhet Sirman explains, "In cultural terms, the relation between the family and the state is cast as an analogy. The nation is understood as the family writ large."[135] Accordingly, Berna Ekal, referring to Sirman and White, argues that in Turkey "the state appears as an anthropomorphic entity that provides for the needy." As a paternalistic provider, it functions "on the basis of state benevolence –Father State (*Devlet Baba*) as opposed to a rights discourse."[136] Thus, "the relation among citizens as well as between citizens and the state is cast in familial terms."[137] Sirman maintains that "a national sovereign state" is produced by the discourses on the identity of the nation, which "simultaneously construct the identity of the proper citizen." In this way, "the citizen is endowed with a particular package of rights and

130 Delaney, *The seed and the Soil,* 32.

131 Delaney, "The Meaning," 496-500.

132 Delaney, *The seed and the Soil,* 32.

133 Meltem Türköz, "Fathering the Nation," *Traditiones* 43 (2014): 56.

134 McClintock, "Family," 63-65.

135 Sirman, "The Making," 164.

136 Berna Ekal, "Collaboration Gone Awry: The Formation of Women's Shelters as Public Institutions in Turkey," *Mediterranean Politics,* 24, no. 3 (2017): 12-15.

137 Sirman, "The Making," 164.

duties, made the subject of specific operations of power and of a particular moral subjectivity that differs according to these constitutive discourses." She calls the citizenship that is the result of the discourses in effect in Turkey "familial citizenship."[138] That merely refers to "relations of hierarchy" between individuals.[139] The use of kinship idioms among strangers is a strong manifestation of the citizenship ideology. It is typical for men of the same generation to call each other *kardeş* (brother), or for younger men to address to older men as *abi* (older brother) or for older men to a boy *oğlum* (my son) within the same class position. In the presence of class differences, older men of lower-class are more likely to use *abi* when speaking to younger men of upper-class. In sex differences, other kinship terms referring to the non-sexual nature of a relationship are put in usage between strangers. These idioms invoke socially acceptable behaviors based on age or gender hierarchy in the absence of codes of conduct to govern a public sphere.[140] In this context, family is the only ideological and moral referential point for all kinds of political and social relations. Governance rests on a paternalist authority; individuals do not conflict with their leaders and derive their behaviors from emotionality rather than rationality.[141] The morality of relations excludes calculations. Therefore, people relate with each other in terms of "sharing," "hospitality," or "generosity."[142]

Recent research of Pelin Kılınçlarslan and Özlem Altan-Olcay on familial discourses deployed in two textile factories makes the manifestations of this comprehension visible in daily life experiences. Family discourses function differently in those two factories. In the factory, where recruitment practices depend on informal ties, a boss-father positions workers based on a hierarchy of age and gender, using "a language of familial reciprocity and

138 Ibid., 148.

139 Ibid., 164.

140 Alan Duben, "The Significance of Family and Kinship in Urban Turkey," in *Sex Roles, Family, & Community in Turkey*, ed. Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1982), 92.

141 Ahmet Murat Aytaç, *Ailenin Serencamı* (Istanbul: Dipnot, 2007), 121.

142 Duben," The Significance," 90.

responsibility" in demanding his dependent-workers to be obedient despite harsh working conditions, as long as he provides them with access to certain kinds of facilities "out of familial relations of care and altruism" rather than out of right. However, in another factory with formal recruitment practices workers use a familial discourse to make demands by reminding them of their familial responsibilities towards their own families.[143] Under the impact of such a strong familial discourse, it is both easy and common to blame a worker, a universally accepted vindicatory, for betrayal to the family by a father-boss.[144]

Especially after the 2011 elections, granting Justice and Development Party a third term to rule, the state's patriarchal discourse has intensified, and many social problems have been re-articulated in familial terms, emphasizing religion and nationalism.[145] Elif Babül argues that a moral economy of gratitude, in which state officials let their moral inclinations determine who is worthy or unworthy of human rights, operates in Turkey. Certain groups, such as politicized Kurdish children or women who are not in compliance with social norms, are excluded, while those performing the ideal innocent and victim are granted protection in return for gratitude. Otherwise, human rights might turn into "rights for criminals."[146] We can consider these "criminals" unacceptable citizens, who are not "pinioned" to "a particular moral subjectivity."

---

143 Pelin Kılınçarslan and Özlem Altan-Olcay, "We are Family: Women's Labor Mobilization and Gender Norms in Turkey," *Women's Studies International Forum* 72 (2019): 13.

144 Hasan Güler, *Patron Baba ve İşçileri: İşçi Sınıfı, Köylülük ve Paternalizm* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2014), 132.

145 Yazıcı, "The Return to the Family," 103-140. Dedeoğlu, "Veiled Europeanisation of Welfare State in Turkey," 7-13. Acar and Altınok, "The Politics of 'Intimate,'" 14-23. Ece Öztan, "Türkiye'de Ailecilik, Biyosiyaset ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rejimi," *Toplum ve Bilim* 130 (2014): 176-188. Yılmaz,"'Strengthtening the Family' Policies in Turkey," 371-390. Zeynep Kurtuluş-Korkman, "Politics of Intimacy in Turkey: A Distraction from 'Real' Politics," *Journal of Middle Eastern Women's Studies* 12, no. 1 (2016): 112-121. Cindoglu and Unal, "Gender and Sexuality," 39-54. Akkan, "The Politics of Care in Turkey," 1-20. Coşar and Özkan-Kerestecioğlu," Feminist Politics in Contemporary Turkey," 151-174.

146 Elif Babül, "The Paradox of Protection: Human Rights, Masculinist State, and the Moral Economy of Gratitude in Turkey," *American Ethnologist* 42, no.1 (2015): 117-118.

Carole Pateman, pointing out the patriarchal undercurrents of the new civil society, uncovers the fact that although all individuals are assumed to have the same civil status and imitate "the original contract when, for example, they enter into the employment contract or the marriage contract," only men have "the attributes and capacities necessary to enter into contracts, the most important of which is ownership of property in the person."[147] Likewise, Ünlü borrows the contract as a useful theoretical tool and theorizes Turkishness (and also any other nationality) as a contract. However, differently from Pateman, he argues that people sign the Turkishness contract without intending to do so. The contract, accordingly, functions on an unconscious level. All knowledge and ignorance, interests and indifferences, feelings and apathy are shaped in the shadow of Turkishness.[148] This is consistent with what Sirman maintains, who argues that "nation and power are inscribed in the subject" and to understand how, we need to analyze "the process of the production of subjectivities that are gendered and national at the same time."[149]

Both Pateman and Ünlü refer to particular legal, economic, and symbolic privileges granted by a contract to certain people, in Pateman's case, to men, in Ünlü's case, to individuals who identify as Turkish-Sunni-Muslim. The concept of contract being a convenient tool, I understand that we can talk about "a contract of fatherhood"[150] between heteronormative men and the nation-state (the biggest father), which provide men with certain privileges, as long as they accept that only men are politically engaged individuals and all their actions are politically loaded in favor of or against the state. At this point, we should remember what bell hooks says about patriarchal burden on men. She says, men do not always gain "privileges from their blind obedience to patriarchy," as patriarchy demands them to "become and remain emotional cripples,"[151] which means, if men accept that all their ac-

147 Pateman, *The Sexual*, 2-6.

148 Ünlü, *Türklük Sözleşmesi*, 9.

149 Sirman, "The Making," 152.

150 I would like to thank Ayşe Gül Altınay for this suggestion.

151 bell hooks, *The Will to Change*, 36-40.

tions are politically loaded in favor of, or against the nation-state, they also have to agree with that paternal affection is a conscious decision rather than an emotional outcome based on their children's ability to represent the *makbul*. The fathers of the conscientious objectors or the LGBTQ+ individuals are evaluated differently from the fathers of the martyrs. Therefore, *makbul* fatherhood requires men to be "pinioned" to "a particular moral subjectivity," which may require them to deny their paternal affection toward their children for the sake of the nation-state. That makes fatherhood the most fragile role for the lower-class men, who strive to prevent their children from suffering in life as they did.

As I mentioned before, Waling argues that "agency is a conditional possibility for negotiating discourse and subjectivity. It is produced through encounters with both discourse and subjectivity; it is not preexisting, but rather made possible as individuals interact with the social world."[152] In this manner, by revealing the relationship between "the heteropatriarchal nationalist governmentality" and "'the conduct of conduct'" of the husband-father, the only interlocutor to be addressed by the nation-state, I politicize fatherhood and endeavor to grasp how *makbul* fathers produce agency in a familial society.

[152] Waling, "Rethinking," 11-14.

4

The Social Meaning of Fatherhood

> *Few men brutally abused as boys in the name of patriarchal maleness courageously resist the brainwashing and remain true to themselves. Most males conform to patriarchy in one way or another.*
>
> – bell hooks, The Will to Change

The culture of fatherhood is "the norms, values, beliefs and expressive symbols pertaining to fatherhood" while the conduct of fatherhood is "the routine activities of men when they are trying to act 'fatherly.'" Any given society has distinct cultures and conducts of fatherhood.[1] We might refer to contesting cultures and conducts of fatherhood shaped by different class, racial, ethnic, and religious positions.[2] Biological relationship with the

---

1 Ralph LaRossa, "Historical Study of Fatherhood: Theoretical and Methodological Considerations," in *Fatherhood in Late Modernity: Cultural Images, Social Practices, Structural Frames,* ed. Mechtild Oechsle (Germany: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 2012), 39-40.

2 Ralph LaRossa, *The Modernization of Fatherhood: A Social and Political History* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1997), 31.

child, the quality of relationship with the mother, both parents' view of gender issues, to be a non-resident parent as in the case of divorce, and supportive social policies or lack thereof cause permutations of fatherhood.[3] However, Alexandra Macht argues that as the research on fatherhood expands the terms, fathering and fatherhood should not be used interchangeably. She clarifies that the father is a biological or social parent while fathering is a bunch of childcare practices. As for fatherhood, it is "the public meaning of fathering, the social discourse and cultural beliefs regarding fathers."[4] However, "in the absence of the private sphere" it is not possible to understand "the public."[5] If fatherhood is "an unspoken social problem,"[6] as Jeff Hearn puts it, I problematize it by not glossing over the private.

Each man I interviewed having conditioned himself as a considerate male member of their natal family and a decent head of household, acted as a father to his wife and siblings. Hence, a *makbul* father is also a *makbul* son helping his father perform fatherhood. In that regard, the interviewees' children were born into a house where there was an already established pattern of fatherhood, and the social meaning of fatherhood goes beyond having children for the interviewees. For them, it is the ability to shoulder financial responsibilities and differentiate *makbul* from non-*makbul* on behalf of their dependents.

I draw upon Mary Douglas's conceptualization of "dirt" to grasp the role of fatherhood in policing the boundaries. For Douglas "dirt is essentially disorder. There is no such thing as absolute dirt: it exists in the eye of the beholder." Where there is dirt, there is a system to classify things and discredit ill-suited components. In other words, it is just a matter of place; shoes are dirty on a dining table while are not by themselves. Any contra-

---

3 William, Marsiglio. "Contemporary Scholarship on Fatherhood: Culture, Identity, and Conduct," *Journal of Family Issues* 14, no.4 (1993): 490-504.

4 Alexandra Macht, *Fatherhood and Love: The Social Construction of Masculine Emotions* (Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), 5.

5 Pateman, *The Sexual*, 4.

6 Jeff Hearn, "Theorizing Men, Masculinities and Fatherhood," in *Making Men into Fathers*, ed. Barbara Hobson (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2002), 254.

vention of embraced classifications results in dirt.[7] That "The most important personal virtue" in the Ottoman Empire was to know one's place[8] is not unrelated to this line of reasoning. Indeed, any social and religious objection was called *fitne*.[9] The Arabic word means disorder, mischief, rebellion, sin, perversity, exam, trouble, and even madness. In the Quran it is written "Your wealth and your children are only a Fitnah." That adds seduction to its meanings. However, its widespread usage in Turkey is to express disorder and mischief.[10] Thus, *fitne* might be equivalent to dirt, the quality of being out of place.

The fatherhood contract that I assume to exist between heteronormative men and the nation-state determines men's place in society. It requires men to act as politically engaged individuals whose all actions are politically loaded in favor of, or against the polity. In this context, if paternal affection is a conscious decision rather than an emotional outcome based on the interviewees' adult children's ability to represent the *makbul*, men relate to their children when they are mature enough to construct a moral subjectivity. Thus, having a child is a requirement in life like marriage and most of the time it is another occasion to perform the role of the primary decision-maker in the family. Accordingly, most of the interviewees did not have much to say about paternal bond. Some shared stories of illness and accident that their children or they, for the sake of their children, had suffered a long time ago to express their tenderheartedness toward their children. However, they related these stories to the divine power that rewards or punishes their families according to their correct or incorrect actions as the head of household.

---

7 Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge, 2001), 2-37.

8 Sirman, "The Making," 155.

9 Zürcher, *Turkey*, 13.

10 Tanıl Bora, "Fitne," *Birikim*, March 15, 2017 https://www.birikimdergisi.com/haftalik/8217/fitne#.XZLhPtIzbMw.

§ 4.1 Fathering the Wife

> *Even when she wants to see a doctor, I have to get the day off and take her.*
> – Nusret, Interviewee

"When does fatherhood begin for you?" is one of the questions that I asked the interviewees. Erkan replied, "Fatherhood begins when you get married. [You father] your wife first. You watch over her. I mean protecting. Fatherhood means a sense of trust. You call someone father if he is trustworthy." When I ask how he fathered his wife, he described it as "Showing her who is bad, who is good. I was the one who [said her] 'Talk to this person, but not to that one. You will make better decisions in future.' I helped her that way, and she carried on as I said."

In *The Social Construction of Reality*, Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann argue that we cannot talk about human nature "in the sense of a biologically fixed substratum determining the variability of socio-cultural formations." They say there are "anthropological constants (for example, world-openness and plasticity of instinctual structure) that delimit and permit man's socio-cultural formations." So, we can talk about myriad ways of being human:

> The character of the self as a social product is not limited to the particular configuration the individual identifies as himself (for instance, as "a man," in the particular way in which this identity is defined and formed in the culture in question), but to the comprehensive psychological equipment that serves as an appendage to the particular configuration (for instance, "manly" emotions, attitudes and even somatic reactions). It goes without saying, then, that the organism and, even more, the self cannot be adequately understood apart from the particular social context in which they were shaped.

In this manner, all forms of human action are habitualized by repeating, and habitualization keeps a person from making a decision. Although there are many ways to do something, it reduces them to one. So, institutionalization

occurs when the confusion about carrying something out turns into "This is how these things are done." From now on, an institutional world is experienced "as existing over and beyond the individuals who 'happen to' embody them at the moment."[11]

In this sense, Erkan defined what other men in another research in Turkey defined as "man enough," the most "honored way of being a man."[12] Being man enough indicates honesty, loyalty, respectfulness, and honor.[13] Of these qualities respectfulness and honor are related to deciding what is right and wrong so that the acts of women under a man's supervision do not cause dirtiness or *fitne*. Indeed, as Delaney states, for those who uphold the monogenetic theory of procreation, women are the ones who are inclined to "oscillate and shift."[14] So, "the public meaning of fathering, the social discourse and cultural beliefs regarding fathers" refer to the qualities of men, who are able to be man enough, assuming the responsibility of indoctrinating women into "This is how things are done."

However, Erkan was the only interviewee, who named what I listened to almost in all interviews but mistakenly considered irrelevant. For most of them gave similar accounts and made comments infantilizing their wives under their fatherly authority. For example, Iskender's wife moved to a different city by marriage as well, and he described the day as if she was a child taken from one place to another. However, she was happy because she found their home furnished with small portable furniture instead of big and showy things and she saw an armchair and bedroom set for the first time in her life since she had lived in a slum and slept on a sofa bed before. In general, men considered their guidance necessary because their wives moved to a new place after marriage.

---

11 Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York: Penguin Books, 1991), 67-78.

12 Connell and Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity," 832.

13 Bolak-Boratav, et al. *Erkekliğin*, 264-281.

14 Delaney, "The Meaning," 499.

Marriage is the last phase preceded by circumcision, military service, and profession in Selek's conceptualization of an acceptable man.[15] So, the interviewees conceptualize the social meaning of fatherhood in accordance with chrononormativity, "the use of time to organize individual human bodies toward maximum productivity"[16] and chronobiopolitics, "the sexual arrangement of the time of life."[17] Fatherhood begins when men get married because they, as politically engaged individuals, whose all actions are politically loaded in favor of, or against the polity, are now "socioeconomically 'productive'"[18] and responsible for preventing *fitne* in their nuclear family; their nation writ large. For doing this, they are expected to show leadership when necessary and "pinion" their dependents to "a particular moral subjectivity."

Recai recounted the evenings he, as a young man in his early twenties, carried his sixteen-year-old wife to bed after she fell asleep in front of their guests. A merciful expression covered both his face and voice as he was speaking about her. Later on, he detailed a dispute between his mother and wife in such a way that verifies what Pateman argues: "A man's power as a father comes after he has exercised the patriarchal right of a man (a husband) over a woman (a wife):"[19]

> I used to host folks from my village at our home. I did not let them go. I was so. They came from my homeland. […] The woman was a thief, we did not know. She had stolen my mother's underwear. The woman said to my wife, "You stole it." My wife said, "I have no mother, no relatives [to give the stolen garments]." […] The sugar was stolen. Then my mother asked my wife, "Did you give the sugar to someone else?" She said, "No, I did not." They began to fight. I came home. One is my

---

15 Selek, *Sürüne Sürüne*, 19-23.

16 Elizabeth Freeman, *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2010), 3.

17 Dana Luciano, *Arranging Grief: Sacred Time and the Body in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: New York University Press, 2007), 9.

18 Freeman, *The Binds*, 5.

19 Pateman, *The Sexual*, 3.

> mother; one is my *aile* [family]. I take pity on her, my wife. I cannot say anything to her, [she is] an orphan. But on the other side, there is my mother, I cannot go against her. I went to my brother's, he is older than me I asked him to pacify them. I spent one or two hours in a coffeehouse then returned home. It was silent. I asked him about what happened, he said, "I could not." I opened up the discussion again. My wife said, "What am I gonna do with your underwear mother?" My mother said, "You gave it to somebody else." My wife said, "To whom? Am I an enemy at your house? I am your daughter; do not consider me a *gelin* [daughter-in-law]." They both talked tough to each other. Then, when I hit my wife's face with the back of my hand, her tooth was broken. Her mouth bled. I said, "Go!" Then I asked my mother to be calm. My wife went inside then my brother followed her. I heard a noise. I went and saw that my brother laid my wife down with a knife in his hand. He said, "I will cut you. Do not diss my mother!" I kicked him out saying "You will never come to this house again!" I gathered my sisters together and told them "Sit here, listen to me. Mother, you have to choose. If my wife goes, I will go with her. Or you go and live with your sons." I was not her only son. […] Afterward, my wife figured it out and showed my mother. The woman had come to our house with an empty bag but her bag was full. My wife opened the bag and saw that the sugar and other things were inside it. (Recai)

His definition of his wife as both his family and an orphan, and his wife's remarks about her presence at the house confirm Delaney's explanation regarding gender and family in Turkey. In Turkish, marriage means, "the entrance into the husband's household of a gelin [one who comes in] and the formation of a new conjugal unit (an aile)."[20] In this framework, the husband owns the house. Delaney sheds light upon that *aile* has different meanings for men and women. Because *aile* refers to wife and children, only a man can have an *aile*:

---

[20] Alan Duben, "Turkish Families and Households in Historical Perspective," *Journal of Family History*, 10 (1985): 82.

> When I asked a woman about her aile, there would be a moment of confusion and hesitation and then she would begin to speak about her mother and siblings, that is, the aile of her father. Aile for a woman is her natal family, her family of origin, which she regards with a backward glance and a feeling of nostalgia. A man often continues to live with his natal family, which incorporates his aile, his family of procreation. His orientation is forward-looking; his family is a matter of pride as well as honor.[21]

A house, *ev* is necessary to get married. The equivalent of the word marriage in Turkish language is *evlilik*. It means the state of being with a house. To marry (*evlenmek*) means to become enhoused. A man can continue to live with his parents and his family while the woman is enhoused by marriage.

In my previous research on women's experiences of divorce, house was described as a place of secrets that should not be disclosed.[22] Since the modernization project did not aim to empower women "as individuals independent of the family," their honor was not considered independent of family honor. In this manner, violence against women has been interpreted as a characteristic of "native, timeless, and unchanging" tradition, which has yet to be replaced by modern institutions. However, as is well seen, including the institution of marriage, all modern institutions function in comply with tradition.[23] Sirman says that "It is this discursive construction of the traditional that constitutes the secret of Turkish citizenship;" "all citizens can turn into the abject at any moment."[24] Michael Herzfeld's term, "cultural intimacy" refers to "those aspects of a cultural identity that are considered a source of external embarrassment but that nevertheless provide insiders with their assurance of common sociality."[25] In explaining the term, Sirman re-

---

21 Delaney, *The seed and the Soil*, 113.

22 Yıldırım, *Yeni Bir Hayat*, 103.

23 Dicle Koğacıoğlu, "The Tradition Effect: Framing Honor Crimes in Turkey," *differences* 15, no. 2 (2004):120-128.

24 Sirman. "The Making," 149-167.

25 Michael Herzfeld, *Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics and the Real Life of States, Societies, and Institutions* (London: Routledge, 1996), 3.

fers to a Turkish saying: "the broken arm must remain within the sleeve." The saying indicates that "certain things can only be shared among those who really belong." [26] So, violence is intrinsic to the intimate culture of families in the name of preventing *fitne* as Recai's story demonstrates. That means, "This is how these things are done" in a family of a "man enough."

Nevertheless, men's protective role is not confined to the first years of their marriage. For example, another interviewee Mehmet was boasting because as a baker in a small town he tries to teach his wife, who is also a graduate of primary school like him, how to deal with people in life:

> I make her work now. She cannot accept things. People can lie, for example, but she cannot accept it, complains about it. She shouts at people. I tell her, "When you shout at people, you lose. People are like this. […] Today they say this, tomorrow that." Because she, like my children, never saw I do such things, when she sees other people do, she hates people. I tell her, "This is life."

He positions himself as both his wife's guide and the only example she can compare with other people. Therefore, Altınay's reiteration of an old story of a young peasant, Hüsmen, who is on the last day of his military service and very excited because he would have a chance to fascinate his beloved Kezban by what he had learned during the military service, was helpful to understand what the interviewees tried to convey to me. His imagination of himself as a "commander" at home and of his wife obeying him like a soldier after the wedding fascinates him because he has gained the right to detach from his father's paternal authority by starting his own. A man can construct his paternal authority as a commander by enhousing his family.

However, their leadership is not always well received. When Muhittin described the time when he brought his wife to Istanbul he said, "She had some issues. She would think deeply, get angry and clench her fists. She had an illness back then. We [referring to himself] stood up to everything." As a janitor at a college, he demanded his wife to work with him at the same

[26] Sirman, "The Making," 165-169.

place so that she could be retired, but his wife refused. In that sense, he was critical of her because she was not docile enough:

> I had a manager in the dormitory. He said, "Your wife could come and work here. She will be tenured after three months. […] My wife said, "Why did you marry a woman you could not make a living for?" Now, she regrets, but it is too late. [She says] "Why did not you force me to?" I mean, I am the guilty one! I am a proud person, I mean, when I get angry I do not let anybody make me do anything. I did not make any payments to Social Security on behalf of her not even for three months. Because I am angry [with her…] you have to listen to your lord. She did not. She went against me. Then everything went against her. […] Now, we pay to Social Security on behalf of her but she will be retired fifteen years later. You should not let down a person who cares for you. She did not listen to me; she lost. She has always lost throughout her life [because of that]. (Muhittin)

In line with this, the interviewees assumed the role of a second father considering their attitude toward their wives a test for their manhood. They tried to show me that they acted like a "commander" toward their wives while surviving troubles under their leadership. Accordingly, when X talked about the early days of his marriage he said, "We went through a lot of troubles. […] We had a small cooker: when she cooked tea, meat got cold, when she cooked meat, tea got cold." However, he closed the topic by explaining his more than ten-year younger wife's successes in distance education and said, "We [referring to himself] have turned sixty. We still help the wife study, we help the daughter study, though."

Elizabeth Freeman explains chrononormativity as "a mode of implantation, a technique by which institutional forces come to seem like somatic facts." In this way, "Manipulations of time convert historically specific regimes of asymmetrical power into seemingly ordinary bodily tempos and routines, which in turn organize the value and meaning of time."[27] In "Women's Time" Julia Kristeva quotes James Joyce's expression, "Father's

[27] Freeman, *Time Binds*, 3.

time, mother's species" to refer to "two dimensions that human beings have occupied." "Father's time" suggests "the linear time that men have inhabited, with its sense of history, destiny, and progress," while the latter points out "the realm that women have traditionally occupied: a space that generates the human species." In the household "time moves in a circle. Nothing new really is created –that would be production– instead the old is recreated or reproduced."[28] This performance is blessed by a discourse of domesticity that designates the domestic world as an ahistorical safe haven shaped by "love, security, harmony, peace, romance, sexual satisfaction, motherly instincts."[29] In such manner, women are "pinioned" to a different temporal reality associated with "native, timeless, and unchanging" tradition with which violence provides its "assurance of common sociality." So, when Mehmet says "This is life" to his wife, he reiterates the fact that he, as a political animal, has turned his time into history by organizing it "into a series of discrete units linked by cause and effect."[30] He has a different temporal experience from his wife. Motherhood does not begin as soon as she gets married, but fatherhood does begin for him. He is the inhabitant of the linear historical time, in which he has built up his identity as a man enough step by step through circumcision, military service, profession, and marriage. By virtue of that, he is the one entitled to categorize things into dirt or otherwise.

---

28 Noelle McAfee, *Julia Kristeva* (Oxon, Routledge, 2004), 94.

29 Freeman, *Time Binds*, 5.

30 Ibid., 6.

§ 4.2 Fathering the Siblings

> *Since my father was away, the whole responsibility of our home was on my shoulders. […] He would go to work in the construction industry in May and come back in the tenth or eleventh month of the year. During the time, I was responsible for running errands at home. My father would send us some pocket money. I would buy anything we needed. Our life was like that. Since I took the responsibility at an early age, I still feel responsible for my siblings like a father. One of my seven siblings died, six are left; four are girls, two are boys. As their brother, I still feel responsible for them.*
>
> – Cavit, Interviewee

Men's paternal protection is not only for their wives but also for their siblings. Recai's account perfectly exemplifies a *makbul* man's attitude toward his dependent siblings when needed. Having lost her husband at the age of twenty-four, his sister with two children and too many debts was helpless. He began to narrate this by explaining his opinion on women's employment:

> I did not let my children work, not my sisters neither my daughters. They begged me, but I did not let them. I do not want girls to be oppressed. I had learned this in my own work life. They [his sisters and daughters] are ignorant children they were going to be oppressed. My older daughter said, "I will live with my aunt and take care of her kids." I let her go. […] She went there and began to work. […] One day she called me and said, "Come here immediately." I went there. The aunt came too [with her family]. They were going to take children to social services. [They said] we cannot look after them. They had said to my sister, "Either come with us or go and get married." I had said this is bullshit. […] I said to [their aunt and grandmother] "I do not let you take

them." […] I had a gun I kicked them out with that gun. […] Then I said [to children], "I will look after you until my death."

After that day, he helped his sister find a job in a factory through his connections with Nationalist Action Party. The manager of the factory was the wife of the owner and she was pregnant. She offered a job to Recai's sister at their home after the birth, but Recai's sister said that she could not say anything without asking permission from her brother. Recai was sure that the owner and his wife did appreciate his sister because of her response. With Recai's permission, she began to work at their home. According to Recai that was because he had helped her study in nursing school irrespective of humiliating remarks of other men about him just because he let his sister study. Having mentioned his father's advice about helping his sisters study, he added, "The older one [older sister] said, 'I will not study.' I said okay. I sent her to Quran courses, and then married her off."

Accordingly, Cemil did not hesitate to change his younger brother's life course by his paternal role. His brother left his boarding school in their hometown to come to Istanbul. In the evening, when Cemil came home from work, he saw his brother at home while his wife was preparing dinner. Cemil thought that his brother just wanted to see Istanbul but later realized that he was planning to quit school. As soon as he figured this out, he forced his brother to leave home first, and then followed him down the road to slap him on the face. Having recounted this, he said, "That slap made him study. He finished high school, thanks to that slap. Now, he is an officer in the public hospital."

In this regard, the resources that the head of household has are divided between his other dependents and children. I should add that some of the challenging voices that I heard after the interviews were about the interviewees' prioritizing their siblings over their children, and I believe that this might be another research subject about the economical dynamics of extended families in Turkey.

§ 4.3 Negotiating Fatherhood and Sonhood

> *We [meaning him] could not get the sense of fatherhood yet, because I always had a father before me. We [meaning him] could not be a father while the father was alive, because you were a child to him. You had a father and you were a child, too.*
>
> – Erdinç, Interviewee

The family has always been used as a socio-political metaphor to represent the nation as an "affective community" by the early republican elites and then conservative politicians. Different governments regulated family life in order to regulate "gender roles, sexuality, and reproduction," since the family has been responsible for policing society "in the direction of Westernization, modernization, and later on conservative principles."[31] Moreover, because of the family's central role in welfare provision, the state started to operate as the guardian of the traditional family.[32] Thus, the social question was turned into a moral question or "a question of solidarity in family life."[33]

In accordance with this, being accountable to father is a virtue for men. They, as the most able sons, help their fathers perform fatherhood. Hence, a *makbul* father is a *makbul* son, too. Some performed this role by withdrawing all together, like Erdinç. Some learned to manage both his authority as a man and his father's paternal image. Salim's story explains the phenomenon concisely:

> My wife was overwhelmed because of living in the same apartment [with my family]. Rumors were escalating. [Their wives criticized my brothers saying things like] he works hard, why don't you work

31 Yılmaz, "'Strengthtening the Family' Policies in Turkey," 374.

32 Yazıcı, "The Return to the Family," 112.

33 Yılmaz, , "'Strengthtening the Family' Policies in Turkey," 375.

> hard? He has this and that, why don't we have them? When they had no money to see a doctor, my mother used to ask me. I never kept money from them. I could not make any investments until the year of 95. I spent all my money on my brothers. […] There was a contractor from my town, I asked him about a good neighborhood to live in. […] Then, it was Sunday, […] my wife and I saw a house, it was like a palace. […] My wife fell in love with the house […] I felt ashamed, I could not tell anybody, [because] my brother did not have a house […] we bought a house but how could we say it? We came home I said, "Let's find a house for my brother too." […] Then we found a ground-floor house. It was very beautiful. […] My sister-in-law did not like it. […] We came near our new house to see another house. When my brother saw that the man [the contractor] knew my name, he asked from where we knew each other. I said, "We came here to see a house." […] We saw a house and asked the man about its price. The man said, "I sell it with the same price, like yours." My brother said, "You bought a house here?" I said, "Yes, brother we did… […] Please do not say anything to my father. He will be upset because I did not ask him." […] In the morning, I took my father, mother, my wife and children [to our new house…] I said, "Father, there is a house, let's have a look." […] We got inside there was a curtain maker. I said, "Father, this is not the house. It's downstairs. We do not have the keys. We came here because a curtain maker works here, so the door is open. But the houses are the same." Actually, we were in the right house I was just making the reality softer for my father. My father said, "It is a palace! Could you afford it? I wish I had money to help you." I said, "If I could afford it you would be happy, right?" He said, "Yes, of course! Do something and buy the house!" I said, "I've already bought it. These curtains are ours." Then my father gave me a hug and said, "Go with God."

The story portrays a perfect example of a *makbul* man who fascinates both his wife and natal family as a humble "commander" at home who cares both for his siblings and father's paternal image. Having excelled in establishing his authority as a man and protecting his father's paternal

image at the same time, Salim acted as a father toward his wife's natal family, too, in return for his wife's good treatment to his parents:

> I brought my brothers-in-law and sister-in-law from their homeland to live and work here. I helped all of them marry. […] I bought a house near ours, I was about to rent it for 550 liras, but my wife was upset because her parents lived in their village. […] One day, I said, "I have an offer to you." She asked, "What is it?" "Let's bring your parents here to stay at our house. […] I do not charge them for us but four our three kids. They pay 150 or 300 liras." She cried because I acted as a father to them. I gave the house to them. They stayed at the house for seven years. […] My father-in-law said, "We are older in terms of age, but you acted as a father toward all of us, toward my children." […] His children do not call me brother-in-law they call me brother. If I need anything, they will help me. My wife's father would say, "Their father and mother are Salim and Ayşe." My mother-in-law is alive, […] when my daughters get married I will say, "My house is big, this room is yours." […] I will give her a key and say, "You can some whenever you wish because your daughter took care of my parents so well."

Salim and other interviewees act according to "a collective logic." They follow "their personal choices and motivations within powerful collective frameworks provided by family, community, and nation." Otherwise, they know that they have to risk being considered "dishonorable, impure, non-Turkish, and a threat to the morals and unity of society."[34] Indeed, in a familial society, the morality of relations excludes calculations. People are expected to relate with each other in terms of "sharing," "hospitality," or "generosity."[35] The primary reason for that is the state's tendency to moralize the social question. The state has always protected the family, but the Justice and Development Party transformed the familial ideology "as part of its conservative and neoliberal project." It relies on "a model of the idealized three generational family, in con-

34 White, *Muslim Nationalism,* 16.

35 Duben," The Significance," 90.

trast to the nuclear family promoted in the official nationalist discourse" and puts its discourse into practice through social policies. For the JDP "'social policy' is equal to 'family policy,'" encouraging younger generations to take care and live together with their elderly and children in need of protection to live with their biological or foster family.[36] In this sense, the interviewees provide a masculine interpretation of the lack of a systematic social support system. They, as representatives of "man enough," have never attempted to see the social question lying beneath the moral question. They help their fathers and brothers sustain their paternal image because they are aware that they are also the inhabitants of the linear historical time. They are "pinioned" to progression, too. On the contrary, they expect their wives to take care of their parents because institutionalizing their elderly is both "non-Turkish" and disruptive to gender roles.

§ 4.4 Extending Fatherhood

> *We [referring to himself] suffered so much before being a father that I thought fatherhood is something like this. […] We [referring to himself] love people like a father.*
>
> – Metin, Interviewee

Ahmad says that "the skin of the community" is formed by the subjects' alignment with "some others and against other others." It positions some bodies as "the host" or "the body at-home" "who receive others" and some as strangers. The host can lower strangers to "dirt" or "the body out of place" through asymmetrical power relations. Referring to Kristeva, she points out that "matter" is lowered to abject as long as it stands in for "something else, which comes from somewhere else." The "somewhere

[36] Yazıcı, "The Return to the Family," 116-117

else" is identified with the negation of I: "the not." That means something is abject inasmuch as it is a threat to "who I am" or "who we are." It signifies that "'I' might become the 'not.'" Ahmad invites us to think the relationship between things and maintains that something is designated as "disgusting" because of its relations with other things that have already been designated as "disgusting." Anything can be dirty, disgusting or abject through a "metonymic contact between objects" which operate as "stand ins" for the threat of becoming "the not" of "who I am" or "who we are."[37]

Salim hesitates to cause *fitne* in family because he believes that to have a house while his brother does not is not "pure." Cemil does not hesitate to slap his brother thinking that the slap makes way for his "purer" future as a public servant. Recai, while abusing his wife, did not even guess that his kin was the source of trouble. He both fights the gendered norms concerning girls' education and believes that a job at a house is "purer" for his sister. Erkan and other interviewees are sure of their way of reasoning about what and who is "pure" and "dirty" for their wives.

"Market relations involve relations of competition, negotiation and contract which Western society views as separate from and opposed to the relations of intimacy and nurturance which are associated with the family and the home."[38] However, in Turkey love is expected to define the way people relate with each other in the public sphere too.[39] Thus, once the interviewees determine what is "pure" and "dirty" on behalf of their dependents, they confidently extend this role to cover other unrelated people too. That reminds of what Delaney points out: All those born upon the land are *vatandaş*, "fellow of the motherland," similar to the word *kardeş*, "fellow of the womb."[40] One of the most articulate interviewees, Metin, for example, defined a good man as someone who values "Allah, the prophet, the state, the flag and is someone who worries about his family, neighborhood, nation,

37 Ahmad, "The Skin of the Community," 95-103.

38 Henrietta L. Moore, *Feminism and Anthropology* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995), 23.

39 Sirman, "The Making," 164-165.

40 Delaney, "Father State," 186.

and state." Adem is not as articulate as Metin, but exemplified what Metin said. He described his former workplace, a kebab restaurant on well-known Istiklâl Avenue, Istanbul, like a watchtower from where he could monitor any extraordinary action and warn people if need be. He said he observed flirting girls and boys in the restaurant and warned girls against some boys as occasion serves:

> I used to ask girls "Come here, girl, your friend cannot afford a cup of coffee. You paid for it. How can he be a good husband? He will eventually leave you, if not, marry you then prostitute you in Tarlabaşı [Istanbul's infamous slum]." The boss saw me a few times [then told me] "You [disrupt] people." I said, "The girl is your fellow countrywoman, from Rize [a coastal city in the Black Sea region], [but] the boy from Diyarbakır! [a city in southeastern Turkey]. How come she falls in love with a boy from Diyarbakır?"[…] I knew what the boy does, he [and other boys like him] burgle on the streets. We saw them running away [from the restaurant]. We do not want Kurds to marry girls from Rize, I mean the Black Sea […] Because, I know what the boys do, they are all purse-snatchers.

He said one girl thanked him attempting to kiss his hand for "acting like a father" to her. Sara Ahmad underlines that some bodies are defined more "dirty" or "hateful" as a consequence of their specific histories, and bodies align with each other against some others through "affecting of movement." We move toward or away from others as we recognize them as familiar or stranger.[41] Adem forced the Kurdish boy to stand in for the negation of "who we are" and re-forms social and bodily space as an act of fatherhood. Indeed, in order for men "to trespass on the borders of a woman's privacy, they must first access the position of a presumed family member."[42]

---

41 Ahmad, "The Skin of the Community," 106.

42 Sertaç Sehlikoglu, "Intimate Publics, Public Intimacies: Natural Limits, Creation and the Culture of Mahremiyet in Turkey," *The Cambridge Journal of Anthropology* 33, no. 2 (2015): 81.

§ 4.5 Having a Child

Having a child is a requirement in life like marriage and does not mark the point in their lives they began to perform fatherhood as in their understanding. Once they shouldered financial responsibilities and established their paternal authority over their wives or siblings, having a child became another occasion for them to perform the role of the primary decision-maker in the family. They make the ultimate decision as to how many pregnancies their wives can have, and under what conditions their children are born. However, in some cases, their authority is tested either by officials at the hospital or other men with religious authority. For example, X told how he decided the way his wife gave birth to their daughter:

> There was a private hospital. There a doctor did many cesarean sections, and sixteen or seventeen children were dug up in the garden of the hospital […] I took my wife to that hospital for examination. The doctor running the hospital was my friend, he said to me that if he [his wife's doctor] suggests cesarean delivery do not accept it. I said okay, […] but the doctor prefers cesarean delivery […] and when he acted like a know-it-all I punched him.

In the end, his wife delivered their baby with the help of a midwife at home. He told the story without any reference to his wife's experiences or any kind of involvement in the decision. Yet, not every man is proud to have such power. For example, Ömer, a man with non-*makbul* political and religious beliefs, emphasized the birth of his third daughter:

> It does not matter to me whether I have a daughter or a son but my sisters living in the village were asking me why I did not have a son. Then, by accident, the third one came out. I said to my wife, we can barely make ends meet, life is expensive; you should get an abortion. My wife is a religious person because of her family […] she said, "I won't get an abortion. You should have thought of that before. I cannot commit a sin." […] Then, after the birth, the doctor asked me whether we would have a child again or not. I said no, we would not. He asked me to sign [a paper]. That time they finished making a child thing. […] Probably,

> they had asked my wife, she told them to ask me thinking I might want to have a boy because the third child was a girl too.

In his story, his wife refused to have an abortion by fear of going against the will of God, but in the end referred him to decide whether she will give birth to a child again or not in the future. In other words, he could not exercise his power over the will of God –his wife's pregnancy– but after the birth, his wife delivered his authority back to him on the future of her uterus, even if he did not seek that authority.

In fact, men's entitlement to make decisions about the birth of children is reserved until the birth of a boy. When I asked about the meaning of having a child, all of the interviewees without exception mentioned one emotion: excitement. However, excitement is usually interrupted by the birth of a girl. In that regard, the meaning of having a child depends on the gender of the child. For example, Erkan said, "Every man desires to have a son so that his surname persists. […] I said to my wife half-joking half-serious 'It does not matter how many babies you'll give birth to we'll continue till having a son.'" Yet, Acar critically reflected on the days of birth of his two daughters:

> We did not have ultrasounds. You did not know whether it was a boy or a girl. We [referring to himself] are Anatolian, we want a boy. […] We were waiting in front of the door a nurse came and said, "Congratulations, you have a son." We immediately got in the mood. My wife was inside they did not let us in. I went to buy flowers and came back. Then my mother approached me and said that we have a girl. I said that it was a mistake because the nurse said that. […] Later, we investigated and it was our daughter. My wife told me that it was our daughter. […] My second child was born on 20th March, 87. […] When you had a girl, you expected a boy in the second birth because we live in a patriarchal society. She gave birth in a nursing home. […] As I arrived at the place, my mother was going down the stairs smiling at me. Because she smiled, I got that it was a girl too. She said, "Don't be sad." But you reacted to it at that moment. Then she said, "It's God's will. Your wife is sick, she is puerperal don't hurt her." Then we [referring to himself] went to buy flowers for our wife.

He also expressed the pressure his mother put on him to have a son:

> They named the child of our uncle my father's name. My father's name is Riza. A few months later, they changed it to Murat. We are three brothers. […] Our wives were pregnant. We, half-joking half-serious said that we would name the first-born child our father's name. My wife was the first to give birth; it was a girl. My second brother's wife gave birth to two girls, twin girls. My third brother lives in Germany, his wife gave birth [to a girl]; four girls. We could not name any child my father's name. […] My mother told us, "Son, continue your bloodline. Why do not you make another child? We will take care of him." I said, "No, let it go. I have children. My bloodline will continue with them."

In this sense, the gender of the child serves to grade masculine qualities of the father. However, Muhsin's account shows that having a child might be an occasion to test the father's financial power and earnestness toward God:

> She was looking through the window, she was crying. I said, "I will not go anywhere, I am here." […] Then I heard things like "The owners of that patient, your child was born." We spent two or three days but I heard nothing about her. She had given birth one day ago but she was registered with the name Mukerrem [instead of Munevver]. The guardians did not let me in. They were tough back then. [They said] "There is no such person here." […] Somehow, I could pass through that door. I looked for her, asked around about her. I went into the delivery room. A woman held my arm and asked what I was doing there. I said we left the wife here three days ago, now she is lost. She asked her name. I said Münevver. She said, "She is in the room downstairs. She gave birth yesterday. Follow me." I followed her. She held the baby but did not let me see him. She wanted money to show his face. I had 250 liras, but that was my whole money. I gave that money to her. She took it immediately. She did not care whether you had money or not. […] They said you could go with your wife. We would leave the hospital but when we entered the hospital, they had said that she had high blood pressure and might die giving birth. That time, I made a wow that if I could bring my wife and child home safely I would not let them in without sacrificing an animal. […] I asked hodjas, they said that I could not bring them home [without sacrificing an animal]. […] Hence, I took them her sister's

> house. I went to my homeland, Adapazarı. When I was leaving the military other people had collected money for me to go back home because I was penniless. That time I had made a wow too. I promised that if I finish military service safely I would sacrifice an animal. I went to our village. There were animals. […] The hodja in the village said that I could sacrifice animal there for my previous wow that I made leaving the military and then asked about my second wow. I said that I promised that if I get my wife and child out of the hospital safely, I would not let them into the house without sacrificing an animal. He said I couldn't do it there because I must perform it in front of my house. I begged him, saying I can't take the animal with me. But he said I should have thought of that when making a wow. We put it into the trunk of a bus and brought here. I found someone to slaughter it in front of our home. As the blood was leaking into the street, we put a bloodstain on their foreheads. Then they went inside. I said, "I will not let the meat in," I gave it to my neighbors to eat.

The account exemplifies the fact that having a baby is more than an emotional experience shared by couples. It is another occasion for men to be tested either by officials at the hospital or other men with religious authority. After succeeding on this-worldly and otherworldly tests, he could construct his paternal authority over his wife and child.

In sum, what the interviewees socially understand from fatherhood goes beyond having a child. It is their ability to lead their dependents, their wives and siblings along with the fellows of the motherland. In the case of siblings, their paternal role overlaps with being a good son because they prefer to act without harming their father's paternal image. Their stories are to demonstrate their ability to discern what is "pure" or "dirty." Therefore, their children were born into a house where there was an already established pattern of fatherhood. Consequently, the interviewees interpret having a child by the emotional and intellectual tools that their established pattern of fatherhood has been providing them for years.

§ 4.6 The Dynamics of Paternal Bond: Despair and Grandiosity

Erkan differentiated the role of the father from the mother as he was describing the very first moments he saw their baby. “When you hold your baby for the first time you tremble, you kiss and smell it. As you kiss on its cheeks, it mistakes your lips for breasts [because] it is just hungry.” He implied that a baby just needs its mother. I also heard remarks from other interviewees that they were afraid of holding their babies not to hurt them. Accordingly, they waited for a period to get closer with their children. Except a few, I did not hear any stories related to paternal bond, and I saw men with a frozen look searching for a story when I asked.

As the social world is objectified, “it confronts man as something outside of himself.” But when it is forgotten that “the social world was made by men –and, therefore, can be remade by them,” the objectivated world loses its comprehensibility as a human enterprise and becomes fixated as non-human, non-humanizable, inert facticity.” Critical theorists Berger and Luckmann call it “reification:”

> Reification is the apprehension of human phenomena as if they were things, that is, in non-human or possibly suprahuman terms. Another way of saying this is that reification is the apprehension of the products of human activity as if they were something other than human products –such as facts of nature, results of cosmic laws, or manifestations of divine will. Reification implies that man is capable of forgetting his own authorship of the human world, and, further, that the dialectic between man, the producer, and his products is lost to consciousness. The reified world is, by definition, a dehumanized world.

In this reified world, institutions dictating how things are done appear as natural, and roles can be reified too:

> The sector of self-consciousness that has been objectified in the role is then also apprehended as an inevitable fate, for which the individual may disclaim responsibility. The paradigmatic formula for this kind of reification is the statement “I have no choice in the matter, I have to act

> this way because of my position" –as husband, father, general, archbishop, chairman of the board, gangster or hangman, as the case may be.[43]

The interviewees, as the husband-father, reifies fatherhood by "bestow[ing] on it an ontological status independent of human activity and signification."[44] However, fatherhood is a social construct as well as a physical reality.[45] Delaney criticizes anthropologists for focusing on kinship systems instead of "procreation beliefs." She argues that procreation is considered "a fact of nature or biology," while kinship terms are believed to be "the social recognition and structuring of these 'real' true biological relations." However, these terms are the products of "a conventional system of address" which is not always biologically binding. For "procreation beliefs" and kinship systems "are not separate from the cultures in which they are found and the meanings that are given to them." They are "embedded in and integrated with an entire system of beliefs about the world." She mentions the Australian Aborigines and Trobriand Islanders, for whom there is no something "out there" "that can be called 'father.'" They have "no concept of paternity." For them, their matrilineal ancestors reincarnate as new members of their community:

> These ancestors, *baloma*, live on an island, Tuma, not far away. […] When a *baloma* tires of existence on Tuma, s/he decides to re-enter the substantial world to live again among the people ofhis or her *dala. In* order to do that, the *baloma-spirit* must first regress from its aged spirit-

---

43 Berger and Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality,* 106-108.

44 Ibid., 107.

45 However, the physical reality is not independent from the effect of a specific view of reproduction. Emily Martin, in her noteworthy article on how science constructs the difference between the egg and the sperm, sheds light upon the ways reproductive biology projects gender roles on the functions of the male and female reproductive mechanisms. Traditional accounts of conception attribute a more active role to the sperm than the egg; while the egg stays in its place, the sperm comes to fertilize it. However, new explorations provide new accounts that approve the egg's active participation in conception, but these revisionist accounts portray the egg as a femme fatale. See, Emily Martin, "The Egg and the Sperm: How Science Has Constructed a Romance Based on Stereotypical Male-Female Roles," *Signs* 16 (1991): 485-501.

> body to that of a tiny spirit-foetus, small and light enough to float on the foam of the waves or driftwood to arrive at the shores of Kiriwina where it will: I) directly enter a woman who is bathing in the sea; 2) be carried in a bucket of water to the home of the woman it will enter; or 3) be carried by another *baloma* spirit and deposited with the woman. Sometimes the *baloma* enter vaginally, but more often via the head where they descend on a tide of blood into the womb. […]The man's role is to "open the way" for the spirit child as well as to shape and mould and nourish it, both *in utero* by repeated intercourse, and after birth by holding it and feeding it mashed yams.[46]

So, the meaning of paternity is connected with all kinds of beliefs and practices that shape every aspect of life. However, for the interviewees, there is something out there to call father, and they act based on the statement "I have no choice in the matter, I have to act this way because of my position."

Some put forward stories illustrating their tenderheartedness toward their children. They exemplified their contrast to their distant fathers by vivid memories of accidents or illnesses that either their children or they for the sake of their children had suffered a long time ago. In doing so, they suggested that their children's suffering was the condition in which they were able to disclose their paternal bond more freely. However, through these stories they exemplified how they attribute a determinative power to their deeds over the fortune of their family. They believe that the divine power rewards or punishes their family according to their "pure" or "dirty," or *makbul* or non-*makbul* actions as the head of household.

Muhsin gave a genuine account of the skin problem that his daughter had when she was a baby, which overwhelmed him in many senses:

> She was fat and developed rashes. I could not find a solution. It was impossible. I was about to go crazy. There was no cure. When she wet her bottom, it was the end of the world. It was bleeding. It was that bad. I couldn't focus on my work. I checked each pharmacy to seek for a cure. I went to the doctor too, he suggested a medicine which the government

[46] Delaney, "The Meaning," 504-507.

> had withdrawn. There was no other cure. You had to check each pharmacy to find it. If you could not your child would suffer. I asked around maybe for months. In the end, […] I went to a pharmacy there was a woman in there. She said, "[…] my child has the same problem but there is no medicine, I have to check the stock room." I said, "God bless you. Please do it for the sake of God! I do not have much money, the baby is in a bad shape, and I cannot find peace in life."[…] She said, "It is not something that I can find in a minute. There are thousands of boxes of medicine. […] Come again in the afternoon." I dropped by before midday but she said, "I am still searching for it." At four o'clock, I went to there again and saw a small box of medicine. It was like my little finger. [It was] an ointment. […] If she had said, "Give me your whole salary," I would have given it. She said, "I found two boxes. One is mine, one is yours." God bless her. […] We used it just once, it was not necessary to reuse. [My daughter] recovered immediately.

Having just finished the story, he jumped into another one about a bankrupt company, where he worked before. At first, it seemed to have nothing to do with the context but as he kept telling it, I realized that he connected the story with an accident his son got involved as a kid:

> I was working in Tuborg, […] one day my friends called me and asked, "Do you want to earn more money?" I said, "Is it something that I can do?" They said, "The same job, beer job." […] I went to the place and filled a form. […] My friend was close to the manager. He asked the manager about my form, but he said that there is no such thing. "Nobody came here. There is a new man working here but he is not the man you sent." I realized that another employee who helped his friend get hired instead of me hid my form. My friend said, "I sent my friend to the factory, he filled the form." […] The manager asked the secretary about my application, she could not find it. Then they asked the accounting manager. He hid it. Later he gave up and showed my application. […] I quit my job and began working there. It was Marmara Beer. […] The workers were organizing against the employer […] I did not understand what they wanted. […] One of them said to the employer, "Syndicate is my right." Two days later, our company was for sale. […] It was sold on the

> condition that no worker be hired by the new owner. […] In the meantime, one of my colleagues had collected debts of the company. He had 700 liras, he got it from somewhere he did not remember. Our company did not accept it because there was no voucher. […] We received our compensation payments. We were on the road back home and we decided to split the money. […] Before that, I had bought a bicycle for my son. […] He fell on his head. I came home with my compensation payment in my pocket. It was hell. Half of my son's head was gone; it was dark. We rushed into the hospital. […] He was just breathing. He did not speak. For three days, we went regularly to the hospital but we got nothing. They gave an appointment for six months later. It was urgent! […] The doctor said that there was nothing visible. We came home. He did not eat or drink. […] One night, he fainted. There was a friend, who had a car. We got in the car and went to the hospital. They examined him and said, "We can say nothing. If he vomits, bring him back." […] In the car, he began to vomit. It was green, like poison. The car stank. We screamed because the car got dirty. The driver said, "Do not scream." We said, "It got dirty." He said, "It does no matter. Let him vomit." […] Then my son got relaxed and said, "Mother, I am hungry." […] I thought that we could save him. […] The driver got his car cleaned. That money that I took from the Marmara Beer, the compensation payment finished in those three or four days. That was because I mixed the halal with the haram [forbidden by Allah]. The haram wiped away the halal.

He started his story by telling the dishonesty of the accounting manager and ended implying that he committed the same sin. Out of all dirty details of his story, the real dirty thing is the money of the bankrupt beer company that he took from his friend. Its dirt caused trouble for his family. Therefore, a father, who gains authority from his ability to discern the difference between "pure" and "dirt," evaluates his fatherhood with the same criteria that grants him authority. The area Muhsin feels tested as a father is his ability to make a living in a pure way. Thus, the thing that makes a man *makbul* hegemon over his wife and siblings is not that he always keeps away from "dirt," it is his ability to perceive the consequences of his contact with "dirt" and accept the atonement for his sin.

Similarly, Bayram was proud because he did whatever he could to save the life of her wife's cancer patient son from her first marriage. Since Bayram was not the father of the son, they could not benefit from insurance. They had to pay for each treatment. At first, Bayram asked his employer for support, and he helped them. Then his employer solved the problem by registering the sick son as an employee so that he could benefit from insurance. While Bayram was telling the story, he concluded that he could manage the things because he knows how to behave:

> I know how to speak, when to sit, when to stand up. There are some men from our village. They are marauders. They come to the mosque, I see them, but none of them is a real man. If they had been in my shoes, they would have died on the roads. Thank God. […] I am an honest person toward everyone.

Again, he concluded that the head of household's honesty determines the fortune of the family. However, he said that he is a successful head of household despite his father's curses:

> My father said to me "May your two collars not come together." I replied, "I won't bother to button them." He said, "May you fail to add one bread to another." I replied, "I will have one in the morning and one in the evening." He said, "May you not find a horse to ride on." I said, "I will ride on a donkey." His words functioned like good wishes [because of my honesty].

He expressed that his honesty helped him overcome the curses. He implied the common belief that a father's curse affects his child only if the father is a good man. Another interviewee, Cemil showed that the belief is still present by comparing the impact of a father's curse with that of a mother's:

> Fatherhood is something glorious. Think about it. A child calls you father, when in need asks you to do something, you are the father. You have to do it. They cannot say you "I want money for gambling or debauchery." They can say, "I need money for this and that." What will you do? You will give it because you are the father. Your rank is high. […] If a father says, "Damn you!" let alone cursing, that word will stick to the child. [A father's] curse infects the child immediately. If, for example, a child misbehaves and you curse him, that child's two collars

> will not come together. It is over. He is over. You got it? I always suggest, "Even if your son, your child points a gun at you should never ever curse him, your son or your daughter." You can see it too during the research, ask [the participants] as to whether they have ever cursed their children then ask about the condition of their children. You got it? This is fatherhood; it is different from motherhood. Let me tell you this, a mother has more rights over the children, but her curse does not infect her children. It does not matter how much she curses her children. Yet let alone cursing, if a father says, "Damn you!" just because his child is naughty at home that word sticks to the child. God does not punish the child immediately but makes the word stick to the child so that the child's two collars will not come together in the future. [Moreover] the child's own child misbehaves too. [God] will make them misbehave. It goes on like this. […] A father has this kind of responsibility, and everybody should consider it.

He portrays a father's curse like an infectious disease and a responsible father as someone who is aware of the damages he may cause if he uses his extraordinary power. In that regard, a responsible father relates to his children like a patriarch because he acts like a powerful commander who is expected to make fair decisions on behalf of his dependents. Yet as Bayram exemplified, a father's curse is deactivated by honesty.

However, all of them recognize fatherhood "as an inevitable fate" for men who are "man enough." They reify it by "bestow[ing] on it an ontological status independent of human activity and signification." In doing so, they erase the distance between themselves and their role. Consequently, they consider the meanings they produce the products of the 'nature of things.'"[47] Thus, they can act like a superhuman. Recai, for example, as a father of four daughters described an accident he and his daughter had like a battleground. He claimed that he would have supported his daughters if all of them had wanted to study, but only one was willing to go to college. Thus, he did whatever he could to support her:

---

47 Ibid., 107.

> My wife was sick, I took her [my daughter] to Çankırı for enrollment. We had an accident in Bolu, Gerede. Our car was overturned. It was our friend's car. My ribs were broken. […] I was in a very bad shape. Five minutes ago, there had been another accident and five people had died there. The prosecutor was still there. […] The governor […] said to me "I will get your daughter enrolled. You go to Ankara." I said, "No, I will do it myself." I went [to Çankırı with my daughter] in that state. I woke a truck driver up. […] He got scared when he saw me. My head was bleeding. I told what happened and said, "I will take my daughter to Çankırı. I will get her enrolled." He said, "Okay brother." […] We got off the truck near Çankırı, I had to search for a taxi but I could not stand the pain. My ribs hurt. In the meantime, a van heading from Kastamonu to Çankırı came, I stopped it, [the driver said] "There is no place." I said, "We will get on, we had an accident. We will get on." I took my daughter [to Çankırı] in that state and got her enrolled in college. What was the aim? I was going to get her enrolled [in college].

Interestingly, he did not mention his daughter's preference not to receive his support under such conditions as if she was an inanimate being. Instead, he kept describing how bad his condition was when he was hospitalized eventually. He acted as a soldier entrusted with ammunition and performed his duty without accepting any help. Acar shared a similar story in a self-critical manner:

> Even if a boy was younger than his sister, he would be sent to buy bread, the girl would not be sent. This is a striking example of this. It is like a wound inside me. […] We went to school to pay the college tuition. We got the documents, then I told my daughter, "Sit here and wait for me, I will pay and return." The vice-principal objected to me saying "Brother! Let her do it. You will let this child go out of town. Let her do it by herself. Why do you pay? Give the money to her, she will do it." He was damn right.

In this context, having a girl is a more challenging task because it assigns responsibilities on the father that require coping with new situations.

Gökhan Topçu argues that the government in Turkey has always positioned fathers in the provider role and had an unwavering trust in their abil-

ity to provide for their family as a man. Accordingly, it has refrained from issuing comprehensive social policies supporting their provider and care-giving roles.[48] Thus, just like the secret of modern Turkish citizenship is the fact that by being traditional, "all citizens can turn into the abject at any moment,"[49] the secret of fatherhood is that all fathers can turn into a source of shame when they cannot take care of their family. In this context, the media outlets are used to covering the suicide of fathers who are unable to earn a living for the family. For example, in 2018, a father committed suicide because he could not buy trousers for his son.[50] In 2020, a father burned himself to death in front of the governorship of his hometown because he could not take care of his children.[51] Many other reports expose the fact that men, as heads of household, do not demand social policies, they commit suicide when they are unable to bring home the bread.[52] That is the flip side of the coin.

The social policies, or lack thereof, require one to have "an exaggerated sense of one's greatness, importance, or ability"[53] to be a proper head of household. In response, men reify fatherhood by "bestow[ing] on it an ontological status independent of human activity and signification."[54] That might be one of the reasons why fatherhood is "an unspoken social problem."[55] The stories of illnesses and accidents are manifestations of despair as well as grandiosity. Through the stories, men explained their lack of means and at

48 Topçu, "Varsayılan Aile Kıskancında Babalık," 56.

49 Sirman. "The Making," 149-167.

50 Uğur Enç, "Çocuğuna Okul Kıyafeti Alamayan Baba İntihar Etti," *Sözcü*, September 22, 2018,https://www.sozcu.com.tr/2018/gundem/cocuguna-okul-kiyafeti-alamayan-baba-intihar-etti-2639574/.

51 "'Çocuklarım Aç' Diyerek Valilik Önünde Kendini Yaktı," *Sözcü*, February 7, 2020, https://www.birgun.net/haber/cocuklarim-ac-diyerek-valilik-onunde-kendini-yakti-287039

52 "AKP'nin 20 Yıldaki İntihar Bilançosu Ortaya Çıktı" *Cumhuriyet*, February 24, 2021. https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/haber/akpnin-20-yildaki-intihar-bilancosu-ortaya-cikti-1816146

53 American Psychological Association, "Grandiosity," accessed July 12, 2022 https://dictionary.apa.org/grandiosity

54 Berger and Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality*, 107.

55 Hearn, "Theorizing Men," 254.

the same time attributed a determinative power to their deeds over the fate of their families. Although I did not hear similar stories from other interviewees, I can state that the same line of reasoning was present in almost all of them.

§ 4.7 Other Stories

Although minority experiences are beyond the scope of the research, their stories show how being outside the normative influences their experience of fatherhood. Differently from other interviewees, fatherhood is a new journey for them, and protectiveness toward home and family is related to managing risks against their ethnic identity.

The Armenian interviewee, Arman said, "I did not feel like a father until my daughter called me father," and stated how he was puzzled by having a child:

> A new individual came to the family, she is made of nothing, I do not feel as a father, when she is born. Am I a father? She is from me but I watch her at night, look at her, [then ask myself] what is fatherhood? What should I do?

He openheartedly explained that the birth of his daughter transformed his marriage, making him estranged from his wife because of her indifference to him, and criticized his wife because of her overprotective attitude toward their daughter. He was the only interviewee who stated that he had to discover what fatherhood meant to him and mentioned how having a child transformed his intimate relationship with his wife. He told that although he wanted to get a divorce when his daughter was sixteen, he did not for the sake of his daughter, and added, "We are a family now, but do you know what kind of a family? We are not a family of a mother, father, and child. We are a family of a big brother, a big sister, and a little sister." He constructs his fatherhood on sacrifice for his daughter. Indeed, he said, "Maybe I destroyed my own life but I assume that I saved my daughter's. I assume. I will stay [in her life] until I got her married." In that regard, his definition of fatherhood is not exempt from a protective role:

> You have to protect the family. I liken a family to this; there is a minister of internal affairs and a minister of external affairs. They have some duties. What does a minister of external affairs do? He protects his country. Minister of external affairs has to protect his family, wife, child, daughter, and their honor. […] But how can you protect in such an environment? How? You are minority here. Let's narrow it down, you are an Armenian. What do I mean by Armenian? Armenian means that you are always an enemy in this country. You are the first to be attacked. When a soldier dies, he dies because of Armenians. PKK attacks, it is because of Armenians. Everything happens because of Armenians. Your house is marked, you get threat messages, mails. When Hrant Dink died, I got many messages, although I am not such a person. I mean I'm not political. […] How can you bring up a child in such an atmosphere? […] I had a child but I wanted to have a boy too […] but how can you make the second child? […] How can you make a child with such a pushed and shoved identity? You trust what? How can I offer a future to him? If I had had a son, I would have sent him to the military [as a conscript soldier.] He would have faced so many injustices. I [would have] name[d] him Murat [a Turkish name] or something else. Is it fair? Is it right? Is it ethical? […] You look at the obituary notes, ten or twenty people from our community die in a week, but you see no newborn. We are destined to end.

South African sociologist Melissa Steyn argues that existing inequalities are based on an "ignorance contract" in which ignorance "is not experienced as a lack." Instead, the person is carefully educated to be ignorant of particular "other people's struggles, pain, joy, and accomplishments, of their common human worth."[56] Similarly, while criticizing "white ignorance," Charles Mills says that blacks have had to perform as "lay anthropologists, studying the strange culture, customs, and mind-set of

[56] Melissa Steyn, "The Ignorance Contract: Recollections of Apartheid Childhoods and the Construction of Epistemologies of Ignorance," *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 19 (2012): 16.

the 'white tribe' that has such frightening power over them, that in certain time periods can even determine their life or death on a whim."[57] Within the boundaries of Turkey, the "white tribe" composes of people who identify as Sunni-Muslim-Turkish, whose privileges are secured by the Turkishness contract in return for not establishing shared affectivity with non-Muslim and non-Turkish communities. Arman's remarks reveal that protectiveness toward home and family is not a free-flowing concept for minority men. The socio-political environment interrupts their protective affection. They have to protect themselves in the first place.

However, another minority man, Ilhami, presented a somewhat more daring personality, maybe because of the privilege of being attached to a branch of Islam. Although his anecdote is not directly related to his experience of fatherhood, I would like to share it to show the different degrees of privileges and marginalization. He was forced to marry his maternal cousin, while he flirted with many other girls in his village in Kars, located in the northeastern part of Turkey. One of the girls was an Azeri girl. The girl's family asked Ilhami's father to be their son's *kirve*, a man who acts as a sort of godfather to a boy at his circumcision. The girl's family tried to prevent Ilhami's relationship with their daughter because children of the *kirve* were considered siblings of the circumcised child. Ilhami did whatever was necessary to stop his father from being his girlfriend's brother's *kirve*, but could not achieve. Although his girlfriend was considered his sister, he eloped with her to marry. He sarcastically explained his reason for marriage, "Because I like the *gâvur* [the infidel], the stranger," referring to that she comes from a Shi'i family. As he was giving this account, his niece listened to him in a great shock and said that she has never heard of the story. She continuously interrupted his speech to say that marriage is forbidden between children of the *kirve* and siblings of the circumcised child by referring to Hazrat Ali. Yet Ilhami fiercely refused that and said, "No such thing is written

[57] Charles W. Mills, "White Ignorance," in *Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance,* eds. S. Sullivan and N. Tauna (Albany: SUNY, 2007), 17-18.

on the book!" Throughout the day, he told religious stories about the cause of sectarianism in Islam which he fiercely decried. His interpretation shows his awareness of the arbitrariness of rules that assign purity and dirt to things. In this manner, their different attitudes, as two different minority men, are engrossing in terms of degrees of privileges and marginalization. That is something needs further examination within the context of minority masculinities.

§ 4.8 Conclusion

The interviewees, pointing out the difference between having a child and performing fatherhood, expose the fact that fatherhood is a social construct as well as a physical reality. The former is a requirement in life like marriage and does not mark the point they began to perform fatherhood. Once they shouldered financial responsibilities and established their paternal authority over their wives or siblings, they began to perform it. They have a different temporal experience from their wives, for whom motherhood does not begin as soon as they get married. As the inhabitants of the linear historical time, they know the burden of being "pinioned" to manly progression. Thus, a *makbul* father is also a *makbul* son, too. Men learned to negotiate their paternal authority not to harm their father's paternal image. In that sense, the social meaning of fatherhood is the ability to make a living in a pure way and differentiate the good or "pure" from the bad or "dirty" as a moral guide. Thus, having a child became another occasion to perform the role of the primary decision-maker in the family. In that manner, their children were born into a house where there was an already established pattern of fatherhood. Accordingly, except for a few, I did not hear stories related to paternal bond. Some gave accounts of accidents or illnesses that either their children or they for the sake of their children had suffered a long time ago to demonstrate tenderheartedness toward their children. However, these stories of despair and grandiosity reveal how a man is stuck between an unwavering trust in his ability to provide for his family and lack of means.

Thus, exposing "the public meaning of fathering, the social discourse and cultural beliefs regarding fathers,"[58] qualified by social class, allows us to politicize it because in postmodern thinking, power is conceptualized as "competing discourses which are not externally imposed upon subjects." Instead, subjects are the products of those discourses.[59] So, individuals produce agency by "negotiating discourse and subjectivity."[60]

58 Macht, *Fatherhood and Love*, 5.

59 Chris Beasley, "Problematizing Contemporary Men/Masculinities Theorizing: The Contribution of Raewyn Connell and Conceptual-Terminological Tensions Today," *The British Journal of Sociology* 63, no.4 (2012):756-757.

60 Waling, "Rethinking," 11-14.

5

The Building Blocks of Paternal Authority

> *Our so-called struggle for existence is no less than a struggle for food and love, a struggle to kill the mass within ourselves.*
>
> – Elias Canetti, The Blinding

> *We [referring to himself] are not a college graduate, but we are a graduate of life faculty. Now, I am fifty-five years old, we [referring to himself] have seen many things until fifty-five years old, so many things.*
>
> – Cemil, Interviewee

The interviewees grounded their fatherly authority over their wives, siblings, and children on their male-specific experiences related to the outside world. Thus, they put forward various life experiences, which helped them align with social and political mechanisms, to justify their fatherly authority. Mehmet told off-the-record that when his daughters say who their father is people respect and help them if necessary. In that sense,

the rationale behind men's fatherly authority over their wives, siblings, and children are some male-specific experiences that had prepared them to be a patriarch with networks of solidarity.

I will use Erving Goffman's term, "moral career" to deconstruct these formative male-specific experiences serving as justification of fatherly authority. Goffman defines career as "any social strand of any person's course through life" while its moral feature is "the regular sequence of changes that career entails in the person's self and his framework of imagery for judging himself and others."[1] Using the term as a conceptual basis, I identify stages through which the interviewees acquired the social meaning of fatherhood, aligning social and political mechanisms to be included in formal and informal networks of solidarity.

While analyzing these stages, thinking of the conceptual basis of "moral career" together with Louis Althusser's definition of ideology illuminates how men learned to form their "framework of imagery" to evaluate themselves and others within the framework of nationalism. Althusser defines ideology as a representation of "individuals' imaginary relation to the real relations in which they live." [2] The stages of a "moral career" demonstrate a person's relation with the dominant ideology, nationalism in this case. Indeed, he argues that ideology operates by "interpellation;" ideological state apparatuses like religion, school or family interpellate individuals into specific roles.[3] These roles are supposed to perform in a nation-state context in which "the state provides a regulatory apparatus which informs many quotidian actions." Edensor conceptualizes these activities as "popular competencies" informed by "class, ethnicity and gender as well as by national identity" in order to show that there are techniques of eating, washing, moving, working, and playing routines shaped by common sense.[4]

---

1 Erving Goffman, "The Moral Career of the Mental Patient," *Interpersonal and Biological Processes* 22 (1959): 123.

2 Louis Althusser, *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*, trans. G. M. Goshgarian (New York; London: Verso, 2014), 183.

3 Ibid., 265.

4 Edensor, *National Identity,* 89-93.

Accordingly, the interviewees have constructed their "moral career" through different stages, in which they were "pinioned" to the "popular competencies." Some of them made small changes in their "framework of imagery" to evaluate themselves and others. However, upholding a classifying system according to the dominant ideology lies at the heart of all stages.

Except those who were students in a boarding school after having completed primary education in their village, the interviewees' life journey began by leaving their village either for the sake of a paid work in cities at an early age or for military service. However, regardless of the reason, their departure marks the beginning of their "moral career" as an individual. First, they comprehended the terms and conditions of positioning themselves in a world of paternalistic solidarity. Men, who left their hometown for work at an early age either sought a fatherly protector or acted as a one. Either way, they demonstrate that society or nation has some criteria to assess a man as to whether he is qualified to father or to be protected by a father-like authority. People acknowledge a man's paternal authority over another man upon having some qualifications such as being diligent, discreet, clean, just, religious, and attentive to his social environment. Thus, the interviewees tried to prove that they had these qualities. Second, through military service, they intuitively gained the knowledge of politics of paternity. That is how manhood and fatherhood are constructed differently from womanhood and motherhood. Third, they met politics through different experiences; however, their point of destination was the same. They went to the point where they situated themselves as the "host" of the country as performers of Turkishness. Their stories uncover the uneasy relationship between normative manhood, patriotism, xenophobia, and violence. Fourth, they learned how to deal with the injustice done to them within their Turkish community by staying loyal to their community despite the deceiving and betrayal they experienced. Through these stages, they acquired a cynical personality who knows with whom to reconcile in order to sustain their networks of solidarity as a head of household.

§ 5.1 The Protector

As the political economy of the late 1970s and 1980s worked against agriculture and small peasant economy in Turkey, indigent peasant families, disproportionately to wealthy families, began to export labor to cities.[5] This human flow resulted in a mutual uneasiness between the members of urban middle-class families and rural-to-urban migrants, who were mostly male. However, the uneasiness of the migrant masses found its expression in an arabesque culture which is associated with a lack of harmony with urban life and symbolized by arabesque music which is also considered a symbol of vulgar taste by the urban middle-classes and used to be marked as dirt, in Douglas's terms.[6] However, being the source of income along with various unfamiliar stimuli, city was an anomaly for the migrants. In order to explain the anomaly, Douglas refers to Sartre's example of a child, whose hands meet viscosity, neither solid nor liquid, in a jar of honey.[7] Sartre's explanation reveals its relation to us in a genius way:

> If an object which I hold in my hands is solid, I can let go when I please; its inertia symbolizes for me my total power […]Yet here is the slimy reversing the terms […] I open my hands, I want to let go of the slimy and it sticks to me, it draws me, it sucks at me. Its mode of being is neither the reassuring inertia of the solid nor a dynamism like that in water which is exhausted in fleeing from me. […] In one sense it *is* like the supreme docility of the possessed, the fidelity of a dog who *gives himself* even when one does not want him any longer, and in another sense there is underneath this docility a surreptitious appropriation of the possessor by the possessed.[8]

---

5 Korkut Boratav, *İstanbul ve Anadolu'dan Sınıf Profilleri*, (İstanbul: İmge, 2004), 110-113.

6 Ayşe Öncü, "Küreselcilik Çağında Orta Sınıf Olmanın Kültürel Kozmolojisi," in *İstanbul: Küresel ile Yerel Arasında*, ed. Çağlar Keyder (İstanbul: Metis, 2013), 128-129.

7 Douglas, *Purity*, 39.

8 Jean Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*: *An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*, trans. Hazel E. Barnes (London: Methuen, 1966), 609.

The anomaly is frightening and threatening by that it does not fit by nature to any of the respected categories, thereby entails reconfiguration of reality.[9] When I heard Hakkı confidently say, "Beşiktaş was our dwelling" I was surprised because Beşiktaş has always been a middle-class neighborhood in Istanbul. Nevertheless, he and other male migrants like him working in the construction industry used to share houses in different parts of Istanbul because their labor power was in demand, although their manner of consumption of urban life was despised. In order to survive the "viscosity" of urban life the migrants took shelter in "recognizable shapes" of their past. Indeed, our interaction with the outer world is guided by our "pattern-making tendency" which constructs a secure universe with elements of "recognizable shapes" and pretends to have unified the ambiguous ones with the rest.[10] In that way, they either got to meet an older protective man and embraced him as a father or assumed the protective role of a son in other people's lives.

The portrait of a serious-looking man on the wall of Salim's tailor shop manifests such a relationship. Whenever Salim looked at his master's stern face, his face lightens as a cat in front of a heat source, and he gratefully mentioned his deceased master, who taught him how to be a tailor in his hometown. When Salim's parents stopped to use him as a drudge after he underwent surgery for hernias at the age of ten, he began to watch over his father with amulets since his father was believed to be struck by evil spirits and sometimes lost his consciousness because of that. His older brother living in downtown interpreted this monitoring job as idleness and took Salim to his hardware store as a constructer. That was the first time Salim stayed at his different relatives' houses as a guest because he did not want to bother his brother and his wife and witnessed other children's lifestyle decorated with bicycles, clean garments, shiny shoes, and parental affection in public. He could not imagine himself as a magnet of that kind of attention but promised that he would be an affectionate father in future. Indeed, "a clean job" in a warm environment was his immediate desire:

---

9 Douglas, *Purity*, 39.

10 Ibid., 37.

> It was Wednesday; I never forget. My brother said, "I have pants to give a tailor. In the evening, after work, we need to handle it." I said, "Okay." [Then] we got out of work, it was cold, in Kayseri winter was hard, my fingers were freezing. How old was I? Twelve years old. I was working on the fifth floor in the construction […] We came to the tailor shop, it was cozy, there was a stove inside, two men and my master were working. My brother was trying on pants. I sat on the chair beside the stove and looked at my master, journeymen. They were working. They were well-dressed, clean. I said to myself, "If only my father had moved here, I would have been a craftsman like them." In the meantime, [I felt] a hand on my shoulder. [My master asked] "Did you like our works?" I said, "You work in a cozy environment; it is not like construction work." [Then] he said [to my brother] "Hasan, give this child to me. He seems handy; I will make him a tailor. Otherwise, he gets wasted." My brother said, "Well, take him […] We have a job to do until Monday, and then I will bring him." I was anxious about whether my brother would forget this or not. I prayed to God […] On Saturday we finished our work, my brother said, "Go home, get cleaned, you begin to work in the tailor shop on Monday." He did not forget […] On Monday, he took me to the tailor shop. […] It was like a resurrection. All my problems were solved. God closed all the doors but opened a better one. [It was like] eternity. […] After I met such a man, I said to myself that it is the first opportunity and the only chance of my life.

In a parental vacuum, a male guide is likely to be the critical decision-maker and protector. In Salim's case, his master directed him to a different life from his father and brothers' who were working in the construction industry. He gratefully said that whatever he achieved in life is thanks to his master, who acted as a father to him.

5.1.1 *Acting as a Father*

Acting as a father is not related to age as Salim exemplified in the previous chapter. In that sense, Tahsin's story is characteristic of its type. As a twelve-year-old boy, he migrated to Istanbul alone and started working on lathe machine, but since it was "a dirty work," he resigned and preferred to work

in the textile industry. At seventeen years old, an old and infertile man with two wives and an adopted son, one of his countrymen, found him for help with a textile machine that he bought to work at home. At first, Tahsin refused to help because the man wanted him to stay in his home in which there were eight housemates, who have migrated to Istanbul from different cities. Nevertheless, in the end, he accepted and moved to the man's house. However, in time he began to feel disturbed by housemates:

> They [the man and his wife] earned some money and were happy. [But] I was uncomfortable. Those eight people could not keep up with the manners of the householder. Let alone walk around half-naked; I did not wear pajamas in front of my parents. We used to dress up before seeing them. We had such manners. [The eight people] had foot odor. This is the most disturbing thing for me. I have been performing the ritual prayers since the fourth grade. I never quit. [These dirty things] were not appropriate for me […] I said, "Uncle Ibrahim, I am disturbed […] How much money do you get from these people?" He said, "I pay one hundred fifty liras rent for the house; I take seventy five liras from them." I said "I will set rules here […] If they do not follow them, I will give you that money, kick them out of the house […] Everybody will wash their hands and feet. Nobody will walk around without pajamas at home. On Saturdays, everyone will go to hammam and take a bath. If they do not, they cannot go to bed without washing their feet […] If you do not follow the rules, I will leave." In the morning, I saw the man cry, he said, "I will do whatever you want." I said, "Okay, then I give you seventy-five *lira*s, and everyone will find himself a home." Before their death, the woman, [the first wife of the man] praised me very much. She said, "We will always be indebted to him."

As a seventeen-year-old boy, Tahsin brought order to an old and weak man's house who could not enjoy being the head of household because of his procreational and economic impotence. Indeed, this is the other side of the coin; if you have no one to look after you, you become someone who looks after someone in need of protection. In fact, young men perpetuate the father's protective and decision-making role in social relations either as an obedient novice or as a responsible young man enforcing obedience.

Iris Marion Young highlights the separation between the chivalrous man facing dangers in the outer world to protect his subordinates and the selfish aggressor seeking for more personal power to argue that masculinist protection resembles pastoral power, which by its benign character Michel Foucault positions against repressive power. She uses the logic of masculinist protection to explain a state's relation to its citizens, particularly as it spreads fear among them and expects full obedience in return for protection against internal and external threats. She says that the security state submits its every move aiming at an external threat as "the defendant rather than the aggressor" even if it attacks firstly and internally mobilizes its officials to suppress any disagreeing interlocutors because only state has "prerogative to determine the objectives of protective action."[11]

In this manner, what becomes evident is that they maintain an ideal version of paternal authority, which befits strangers or themselves due to specific qualifications. Berger and Luckmann say that "Institutions are embodied in individual experience by means of roles." Different forms of action have an objective sense as a result of being typified.

> In principle, then, an action and its sense can be apprehended apart from individual performances of it and the variable subjective processes associated with them. Both self and other can be apprehended as performers of objective, generally known actions, which are recurrent and repeatable by any actor of the appropriate type. […] By virtue of the roles he plays the individual is inducted into specific areas of socially objectivated knowledge, not only in the narrower cognitive sense but also in the sense of the "knowledge" of norms, values and even emotions. […] To learn a role it is not enough to acquire the routines immediately necessary for its "outward" performance. One must also be initiated into the various cognitive and even affective layers of the body of knowledge that is directly and indirectly appropriate to this role.[12]

---

11 Iris Marion Young, "The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflections of the Current Security State," *Signs* 29 (2003): 4-9.

12 Berger and Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality*, 90-94.

In this manner, a man might acknowledge another man's paternal authority over himself, or claim the right to impersonate the father upon having suitable qualifications such as diligent, discreet, clean, just, religious, and attentive to his social environment.

However, accounts demonstrate that the interviewees' families placed reliance to their teenage sons' ability to secure masculinist protection in a world of strangers. Contrarily, when Ilhami was a teenager willing to leave his hometown for paid work in Istanbul, he was continuously prevented by his father and relatives. He praised his father's hardworking personality saying, "He used to say 'If Allah won't reward my work, I will take it by force!' and he really did," then said that he was not happy under his authority. He told different scenic stories of traps his father and relatives set up to prevent him from living in Istanbul or a different city for paid work. However, having managed to escape his hometown, he started a new life working at a bakery in Eskişehir. As a young person interested in poetry, while he was working he wrote a poem that likens the walls of the bakery to the walls of a prison. In post-coup years, publication was under strict control, and he was detained for interrogation about which prison he was in when writing the poem. His account is meaningful to see the terms and conditions of masculinist protection. The range of masculinist protection covers people with *makbul* affiliations. That is why his father and other male relatives had always prevented him from leaving town.

In that regard, "the moral economy of gratitude," which situates "governmental agents" as "protectors rather than violators" despite many documentations of abuses of human rights by officers and grants protection in return for gratitude to only those who successfully perform the innocent and the victim, is at work.[13] This macro reality shapes the micro reality governing daily life in which "the *makbul* innocent" and "the *makbul* victim" has more resources to find masculinist protection. Anyone attempting to protect the socially or nationally acceptable can impersonate the father because a

[13] Babül, "The Paradox of Protection," 117-118.

father is positioned as a protector rather than a violator as long as he uses his paternal authority to protect the socially or nationally acceptable.

§ 5.2 The Cynical Citizen-Soldier: Internalizing Politics of Paternity

Military service was a station that could not be passed without stopping during the interviews. The accounts on military service were to demonstrate that during military service men, as male citizens, begin to discover that they are politically engaged individuals, and all their actions and thoughts are politically loaded in favor of, or against the state. In that regard, they begin to internalize politics of paternity as a conscript.

Nationalist projects have always a gendered agenda constructing a "gender difference that was defined and administered by the state." The first article of the conscription law in effect since 1927, declares "every man who is a citizen of the Turkish Republic, is hereby, given the obligation to perform military service." In that, military service is not only the operation for national defense but also the procedure setting the boundaries between masculinity with the right of "first class citizenship" and femininity.[14] Thus, citizens are supposed to identify with the state through "a gendered discourse in which the ideal citizen is inscribed as a sovereign husband and his dependent wife/mother rather than an individual, with the result that position within familial discourse provides the person with status within the polity."[15] For women can involve in nation-state building through five ways. As biological reproducers of members of ethnic collectivities; reproducers of the boundaries of ethnic/national groups; ideological reproducers of collectivity and transmitters of its culture; signifiers of ethnic/national differences —as a focus and symbol in ideological discourses used in the construction, repro-

14 Altınay, *The Myth of the Military-Nation,* 33-34.

15 Sirman, "The Making ,"148-164.

duction and transformation of ethnic/national categories; participants in national, economic, political and military struggles.[16]

Men have dominated military and state institutions, and most state actions like "nation-building, the fight for independence, the creation of a political and legal order, the exclusion or inclusion of various categories of members, the relations with other nations" are legitimized by "beliefs about the nation."[17] In that, the most "honored way of being a man" or "hegemonic masculinity"[18] acts in concert with hegemonic nationalism. Accordingly, "Every Turk is born a soldier" is a well-recognized foundational myth of Turkish nationalism.[19]Although the first citizens of the Turkish republic did not consider compulsory military service as a culturally and politically taken for granted phenomena, in time it has become not only a service to the state but also a mechanism which produces proper masculinity. It has been "a rite of passage to manhood and those men who have not been through it are made to experience a 'lack.'"[20] The equivocal message within proper masculinity is

> … don't accept who you are. Conceal your weakness, your tears, your fear of death, your love for others. Conceal your impotence. Conceal your potency. Disparage women, since they remind you too much of your own feminine side. Disparage gay men since that's too near the bone as well. Fake your behaviour. Dominate others, then you can fool everyone, especially yourself, that you feel powerful.[21]

It is hard to distinguish whether the terms, like "honour, patriotism, cowardice, bravery and duty" are nationalistic or masculinist. The "microculture of

---

16 Nira Yuval-Davis and Floya Anthias, Introduction to *Woman-Nation-State*, eds. Nira Yuval-Davis and Floya Anthias, (London: Macmillan, 1989), 7.

17 Joane Nagel, "Masculinity and Nationalism: Gender and Sexuality in the Making of Nations," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21 (1998): 248.

18 Raewyn Connell and James W. Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity," Gender & Society 19, no. 6 (2005): 832.

19 Altınay, *The Myth of the Military-Nation,* 13.

20 Ibid., 82.

21 Roger Horrocks, *Masculinity in Crisis: Myths, Fantasies, and Realities* (New York: St. Martin's Press), 25.

masculinity" in daily life is in strict relation with nationalism.[22] In that, the rationale behind a father's authority is the fact that he is the only interlocutor within family addressed by state. The concrete mutual recognition between men and state is established during military service.

Circumcision, military service, profession, and marriage are four phases through which a man becomes socially (and nationally) acceptable. All stages until marriage prepare him for fatherhood because fatherhood is self-proving masculinity. A father means an inseminating husband, a protective and handy soldier at home and a decision-making mechanism for all kinds of decisions within the family.[23]

"A man who has not completed his military service does not appreciate his mother, father, [and his] woman." Cemil's sentence crystallizes a strong belief in the necessity of military service. None of the interviewees opposed to that. However, particularly when the tape was no longer recording, I got to give an ear to explanations on a mutually exclusive relationship between logic and military service. Iskender expressed it succinctly: "When you are called up, you leave your logic behind the door." Other interviewees' narratives also approved of Iskender's words. Cemil, for example, gave many examples of commanders who used to send two or three soldiers to fetch a remote or an egg. Muhittin told how he was forced by his commanders to slap his unsuccessful companions when he was successful in training. I heard other weird experiences regarding military service approving Selek's evaluation that military service teaches men how to be careful and avoid risks in fragile situations by obeying a capricious authority.[24]

In her ethnographic research on statecraft in Turkey, Yael Navaro-Yashin following Žižek argues that cynicism defines the everyday political experience of people in Turkey. In that, people envisage statecraft as a series of cunning actions but keep the routine going as if they did not think in that

22 Nagel, "Masculinity," 252.

23 Selek, *Sürüne Sürüne,* 19-23.

24 Ibid., 202.

way.[25] In explaining cynicism, Žižek refers to Peter Sloterdijk, who describes cynical reason as "enlightened false consciousness," whose bearers can work "in spite of anything that might happen, and especially, after anything that might happen," because "the force of circumstances and the instinct for self-preservation are speaking the same language, and they are telling them that it has to be so."[26] Thus, Žižek opposes classic Marxist false consciousness and maintains that in contemporary societies people are aware of the contradiction between the social reality and its ideologically distorted representation, but still prefer the latter to lead their activities. He formulates Sloterdijk's thesis as such: "they know very well what they are doing, but still, they are doing it." Since cynical reason is not falsely conscious it is "no longer naïve, but is a paradox of an enlightened false consciousness," which is "more like a morality itself put in the service of immorality."[27]

Most of the interviewees shared memories of military service in a cynical manner. They interpreted the military experience as irrational, but at the same time did not show any hesitation to exalt it. Cemil, for example, told a military memoir in which he and his companion fell asleep one morning and were beaten up by the commander later because soldiers should be battle-ready. He remembers his relief for getting a beat-up because he could have been taken to martial court, he imagined. However, physical punishment in the army is not to be ashamed of. On the contrary, it is proof of the high quality of the Turkish army as displayed by a tale:

> The devil says, "I deceive everyone except the [Turkish] military." How so? One day while a commander marches his troop, the devil decides to destroy the bridge the troop heading toward. [But] when the troop is close to the bridge the commander commands "Soldier! Stop! Turn left!"

---

25 Yael Navaro-Yashin, *Faces of the State: Secularism and Public Life in Turkey* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002), 159-171.

26 Peter Sloterdijk, *Critique of Cynical Reason*, trans. Michael Eldred (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 5.

27 Slavoj Žižek, *The Sublime*, 24-26.

> He rotates them. Then the devil says, "I just can't understand the [Turkish] military!" (Cemil)

The fact that the Republic of Turkey was established as a result of an independence war and that the sole organized power of the times was the military indicates a belief that the armed forces were the only guardian of the gradual transformation from an Eastern empire to a Western-inspired republic. However, if militarism is the organization of "society" from top to toe based on militaristic rules, it was after the first *coup d'état* on May 27, 1960 that militaristic legal arrangements began to dominate the whole country while military service was designed to inculcate a militaristic worldview.[28] In that, one cannot understand the machinations of the military is not someone who bears witness to a commander making at least two soldiers fetch something, but the devil. Taking into account that the exclusive relationship between logic and the military is almost unexceptionally rationalized, men, having completed military service, might do with complaining about the unintelligible nature of the military, which is the devil's job: to complain. However, loud opposition to militaristic criteria results in delegitimization or demonization of any opponent considering him equal with the devil. Cemil told how one of his companions during military service murdered a civilian, who accidentally entered the military zone in a village of Cyprus, and was not punished thereof. That is because if a man is armed in the military zone he is either a soldier or just an intruder. Either way, it is believed that the act of trigger pulling is collective rather than personal.

Recai's distressing military memoir lays bare the fact leaving no doubt about the implicit function of military service in men's lives. One day during his military service, he was told that because of his success in training he was given a right to visit his family and then brought to his home by his companions. But as he entered his home, he realized that his family is receiving condolences on the death of his father. At that moment, he found out why he was brought to his home. After the funeral, he returned to the mili-

---

[28] Murat Belge, "Askerin Önemini Öğretmek ya da Türkiye'de Profesyonel Ordunun İmkânsızlığı Üzerine," in *Erkek Millet Asker Millet: Türkiye'de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek(lik)ler*, ed. Nurseli Yeşim Sünbüloğlu (İstanbul: İletişim, 2013), 183-185.

tary post and became one of the soldiers preparing to take part in the operation in Cyprus in 1974. As the troops were embarking on the ship, his mind was preoccupied with his family. His pensive stance attracted the attention of a lieutenant colonel on the ship who then scorned him. As soon as Recai understood that the lieutenant colonel was yelling at him, he pointed his gun towards him, yelling back "My father is dead!" Thanks to the safety of his gun, he did not do anything worse, but his next conscious moment was in a hospital waiting with tied hands. Later on, as he continued his military service, he waited for being court-martialed thinking he was either going to be executed or acquitted. However, a woman lieutenant colonel lawyer brought him his salvation:

> Just like you, she came and listened to me, then said, "You have only one salvation. You either go to the court-martial or Bakırköy" [an abbreviation used for a historic psychiatric hospital in Bakırköy, Istanbul]. I have stayed in the hospital for one month […] Then I went to the military court, [but just before the court] the woman lieutenant colonel said "When you go there, there will be senior military men, they will yell at you, do not pay attention to them. There will be a glass of water in front of them, go and drink it. Then get out. Do not be afraid even if they say 'Shoot him!' because there is no shoot order." I went to there, but I was terrified, as I entered, they were yelling at me, aggressively asking, "Are you traitor!" in the end I said, "I had enough!" then drunk the water and went to the door. [They yelled], "Shoot him!" [but I did not return] then they were convinced that I was mad. I got a military paper certifying my madness, which I still haven't received from the civilian hospital.

Recai's story is interesting because the military directed him to a military hospital to determine whether he is mad or not, but the hospital referred him to the most famous psychiatric institution in the country. As soon as he was admitted to the institution, he was asked to wear a red ribbon signifying his level of danger. Within one month, he carefully observed other patients with red ribbon and did whatever necessary to qualify wearing it, i.e. examining his footbed to see his shoe size when his age was asked. Actually, the red ribbon rendered him invisible rather than alarmingly eye-catching. When delving into the relation between madness and confinement, Foucault refers

to the fact that even in the late eighteenth-century people defended confinement to avoid of dishonor and scandal. For the defenders, individuals who defame their families were supposed to be confined until they were no longer able to involve in any scandalous act.[29] Taking into consideration that the scandalous act happened during the operation in Cyprus, Recai's red ribbon signifies the price of his degrading act to the armed forces rather than his mental state. Interestingly, the two parties know that he is not mentally ill, but the military agrees to let go of its claim as long as he pretends to be so.

This example displays how men internalize the politics of paternity through military service. Motherhood is a more embodied form of parenthood because pregnancy transforms bodily boundaries. In that, the woman loses her sense of wholeness by the development of another body inside her body.[30] For this reason, the bond between mother and child is believed to be the result of maternal instinct manifesting itself in all circumstances without exception. In that sense, woman is conditioned as a politically unengaged person living under the control of her chemical messengers. In contrast, paternal affection is considered a conscious decision rather than an automatic biological outcome. A child is automatically added to the lineage of the biological father as Pateman revealed,[31] but paternal affection is not expected to come into existence automatically. The institution that indirectly teaches men nationally "recognizable shapes" of sexuality and politics through which they legitimize or delegitimize their children is the military. Paternal affection is considered as much a conscious political decision as maternal instinct is natural and apolitical. That becomes evident particularly when paternal affection is directed toward a person who is delegitimized by governmental forces. A group of mostly Kurdish mothers called "Saturday Mothers" who, since 1995, have been gathering every Saturday in Istanbul

---

29 Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Vintage Books, 1988), 66-68.

30 Iris Marion Young, "Pregnant Embodiment: Subjectivity and Alienation," in *On Female Body Experience: "Throwing Like A Girl" and Other Essays* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 50.

31 Pateman, *The Sexual*, 213.

for half an hour to call the government to account for their disappeared children under custody, display it *par excellence*. A similar group of fathers called "Saturday Fathers" could not have existed because men get easily stigmatized and punished for turning unequivocally against their right to "first class citizenship," granted by the Turkish state after completing their military service. In other words, they are "pinioned" to "first class citizenship." A subsequent event after the killing of a relative of a deputy from pro-Kurdish People's Democratic Party by police officers is a manifestation of the ideology. In 2015, twenty-four-year-old Hacı Lokman Birlik was killed by police officers with twenty-eight bullets, and his corpse was dragged by police vehicle through the city of Şırnak, in the Southeastern part of Turkey. Five years later, the judiciary seeks to convict his father Hasan Birlik of "terrorist propaganda" over attending his son's funeral by carrying his photo.[32] Accounts of military service demonstrate that through military service, men begin to internalize that as "first class citizens," they are politically engaged individuals, and their all kinds of actions are politically loaded in favor of, or against the state. What Arman said about having a boy was an indication of the fact.

However, even Recai did not talk critically of the military. He just expressed his gratitude toward the woman colonel. Educational, military, and other governmental institutions reminded the interviewees of memories of violence, but they did not seem to blame any organs of the state. Instead, they either resort to an arabesque narration romanticizing their poverty or express admiration toward the figures of oppression. His commanders beat Muhsin because he stole a slice of bread, but he refrained from cursing the military and associated the incident with poverty. Indeed, Mücahit firstly praised his stern teacher who resorted to violence to discipline students and then Sadettin Tantan, a former right-wing minister of internal affairs. He said that he has never been against getting beaten up to be disciplined, and although his teacher was a leftist, he appreciated him because he was tough.

---

[32] Hacı Bişkin, "Hacı Lokman Birlik'in Babası Oğlunun Cenazesine Katılmaktan Hakim Önünde," *Duvar,* June 28, 2019, https://www.gazeteduvar.com.tr/gundem/2019/06/28/haci-lokman-birlikin-babasi-yargilaniyor-oglumun-cenazesine-katilmakla-nasil-bir-suc-isledim/.

The reason behind his admiration for Sadettin Tantan is the same. Having described how the former minister attacked a businessperson to force him to shut down his entertainment venue, Mücahit said that the old minister was an intimidating man yet "the man who had a family appreciated him, [but] the corrupt did not like him anyway." However, the extreme example of robust affective investment in state violence is at work in Metin's story. He was a politically active nationalist until being jailed after the 1980 *coup d'état*. However, he is proud that he has not sued the Turkish authorities in the European Court of Human Rights although he was systematically tortured in jail.

In this context, men who take their identity for granted seem to interpret violence as a characteristic of "who we are." Any type of violence is neither "disgusting" nor "hateful" as long as it does not come from "somewhere else" on which the negation of I, "the not," resides. Mücahit and other interviewees with a similar background, could align with representatives of institutions, because they are positioned as "the host" or "the body at-home" "who receives others.[33]" That is in harmony with Žižek's description of life in "really existing socialism" as an "unspoken pact held between those in power and their subjects." In that, while the majority of people are impoverished, they believe that they are in a condition granting them more than they deserve. They violate the law by petty crimes like bribery or black market, and those in power consent them to do so. *Žižek* calls the situation a combination of "cynical distance and an obscene solidarity in guilt."[34] Likewise, the battered soldier is grateful because he is not court-martialed, the court-martialed is grateful because he is not executed. The military contends because it both could protect its dignity and show its merciful face by mitigating its punishments, which can always be harsher.

The psychoanalytic process works through the interpretation of the subjects' symptoms so that the subject's enlightenment about the causes of his symptoms dissolves them. However, in some situations, although the symptoms are interpreted, they continue to exist. In this instance, Lacan puts the

---

33 Ahmad, "The Skin of the Community," 103.

34 Slavoj Žižek, "The Varieties of Surplus" *Problemi International* 1 (2017): 16.

factor of enjoyment (jouissence) into the picture. In that, the symptom pleases the subject like fantasy, a condition he calls *sinthome*, a neologism of symptom and fantasy. The symptom prolongs despite being aware of its cause because in this "radical ontological status of symptom: symptom, conceived as sinthome, is literally our only substance, the only positive support of our being, the only point that gives consistency to the subject."[35] Navaro-Yashin describes the condition plainly:

> even though he knows, now full well, that this symptom is gradually eating him up, the subject persists in repeating it. He chooses to live with it, rather than without it. The imagined consequences of overcoming the symptom (what looms in the subject's mind as a possible future of liberation) produce more anxiety (even fear) in the subject than the state of surrendering to it. The subject signs his own death statement. He'd rather do that than risk the unknown.[36]

Men express alienation from the military by referring to its unintelligible nature, but at the same time hold on tightly to military service as a patriotic duty in order to be known as a man capable of defending his nation and honor. Arman, as an Armenian, is not an exception to the rule although he was exposed to systematic stigmatization in the military. Having said that non-Muslim conscripts were allowed only in two cities back then, Tokat and Amasya, he complained that non-Muslims could not claim any military ranks:

> [They say] You are a soldier, you are a Turkish citizen, perform your military service. You do it but not duly. Let me explain, I was the only high school graduate of the troop of three hundred fifty persons, but I did not have, of course in quotation marks, the luxury of being a sergeant. It was a luxury for me. When they wanted to choose people for positions, they came and said, *"Sakıncalılar* step aside!" [*Sakıncalı* means objectionable or undesirable, denoting non-Muslim minorities and previously convicted men] […] We were always at the back. We were not given any responsibility at the borders. How could it be possi-

35 Žižek, *The Sublime*, 80-81.

36 Navaro-Yashin, *Faces of the State*, 160.

> ble? [They say] You give a gun to an Armenian, he collaborates with the enemy and points the gun at you. Because for people an Armenian is always an enemy […][But] I am the citizen of the Republic of Turkey, I do not come from Armenia, I do not consider Armenia my homeland. My homeland is here […]

He, as a minority man who seems to have thought of a possible armed conflict and his possible reaction to it, said that in any armed conflict, he cannot point his gun at his homeland, Turkey. In this context, men's symptom, their alienation from the military, is related to their manhood. If they fix the causes of their symptom, what will be at stake is their manhood providing them with "first class citizenship" which is denied to women. That a woman lieutenant colonel helped Recai is not a coincidence. The subject whose actions are believed to be politically imbued is a man while the woman is constructed as politically unengaged in the service of her emotions. Therefore, men's relations with the military as the manufacturer of their "first class citizenship" might be summarized by Wagner's Parsifal's words: "the wound can be healed only by the spear which made it."[37]

§ 5.3 The Patriotic or Nationalist Citizen: Building Networks of Solidarity

Men relate to state in a way that they relate to their children, in despair and grandiosity. They, as ordinary citizens with limited means, protect "father state," which is thought to be always under attack. However, they also establish networks of support through this endeavor. Accordingly, I will touch upon some experiences that the interviewees shared with me to show their civic pride as a head of household and how they secured networks of solidarity with that.

While talking about her preparation for the university entrance exam, Osman's daughter said, "My history teachers are discreet men." Yet I could not understand what "discreet" exactly meant to her until she added another

[37] Žižek, *The Sublime,* xxvi.

remark to her sentence: "[they are] nationalist." Some interviewees like Mücahit or Metin are "discreet" par excellence for her criteria.

Michael Billig, criticizing scholars, who maintain that patriotism and nationalism are different things, says, "the force of the claim is stronger than the empirical data." For him, patriotism and nationalism are different names of the same thing.[38] Indeed, Mücahit, like an ardent preacher, feverishly recounted his politically active days saying, "nationalist people do not cause their country any harm." He, just like Osman's daughter, described his friends from Ülkü Ocakları (Hearths of Ideals), the youth wing of Nationalist Action Party, as "nationalist" and naturally "discreet people." By attending their classes on different topics like history, mathematics, geography, religion, and literature, he became an ülkücü (idealist) in his teenage years.

However, as the number of members increased over two million across the country, he said, "It got out of control. All kinds of people joined that two million." His memories of the 1970s terrorized by death squads of political groups leading to the 1980 coup d'état are worth mentioning to exemplify what kinds of people began to call themselves ülkücü. One day in Ramadan while a relative and himself were heading towards home to break fast, he saw a few young ülkücü men standing on the street looking like officers. He passed them saluting "Selamün Aleyküm" meaning May God's grace be upon you in Arabic and one of them responded, "Ve aleyküm selâm," God's grace be upon you too:

> But after taking a few steps, he said, "Wait! Where are you going?" I said, "None of your business." Eight or ten people gathered all of a sudden. I said, "I do not have to say where I am going to. Who are you? It does not matter who you are. I saluted you with the name of Allah. Is not it enough? […] Are you ülkücü? No, you are not! You are bandits! […] We are going to the hearth now!"[…] As we stepped in the hearth, […] I asked, "Who is the head here?" […] [The head of the branch] came and said, "Here I am brother. I am listening to you." I said, "You put a few bandits on the street, call them back, we are not bandits! We are

[38] Michael Billig, *Banal Nationalism* (London: Saga, 1995), 55.

> ülkücüs" […] He said the leftists used to raid them, so they took measures. […] I said, "Okay, there are raids, but I saluted them with the name of Allah, how come they stop a man saluting them with the name of Allah?"

He concluded his memoir saying "men without religious knowledge and belief" got involved in hearths because they wanted to exploit "an ülkücü career" and corrupted the whole mechanism. However, his emphasis upon "an ülkücü career" uncovers the place of patronage in men's lives as well. In the previous chapter, while Recai was describing his fatherly authority over his siblings, he said he found a job for his sister through his connections with the Nationalist Action Party. In fact, his connections reached out to the then Prime Minister Necmettin Erbakan to take his business card, and on behalf of his sister, he made a job application to a factory with the card. In a similar fashion, Mücahit secured a network of support thanks to his good morals.

He told an intricate story to show how effective this network of support was in his life. As he worked in a factory, he represented a union. After four years, he decided to run for president of union:

> When I was a candidate, I went to the headquarters in Ankara […] and asked for impartiality. I said, "If you secure it, I am a candidate." The General President Metin Türker […] promised me a just election. […] However, in the meanwhile, during the strike, Metin Türker came to the factory […] and he said the workers, "If you receive a salary less than 500 liras, hang me at the entrance of the factory." I was beside him, I tugged at his trousers, he looked at me like this, I warned him saying, "Do not offer them any numbers." […] Later on, when the opponent understood that he was going to lose to me, he went to the headquarters and said that Mücahit Karat said that he would hang Metin Beg if he was elected. […] In the end, they told me, "We do not want to work with you." […] Then, four naughty men abducted the candidate that became the new president and fired a gun to scare him. I was not involved in it but I was informed about it. […] I called him until one a.m. but he did not answer. If he had, I would have told him to hide for a couple of days. […] During the interrogation, he gave our [meaning his] name. […] The

> police swept the dossier under the mat, but when the governor put pressure on them, they had to proceed. I was detained for nine days. […] I asked the men who did this why they gave my name too. They said, "If you are out […] the party won't take care of us." […] We [referring to himself] were appreciated by people, so the party had to protect a person appreciated.

He also gave an account of how he gained this well-established appreciation. While he was a union representative, he, along with his coworkers in the factory, decided to go on strike. His attitude and behaviors throughout the strike exemplify the good morals that help a man gain appreciation in many senses:

> That was the last [working] day, at three o'clock I told all of them that everybody would stop working then clean up the workbenches, tools, everything they use. We will leave everything very clean [because] we earn our bread here, [and] we will start to work everything spotless in Allah's will. They said, "Okay, as you wish." […] At five o'clock, the general manager checked everything and saw that it was all orderly. [Then] he summoned me and said, "My son, Allah bless you. Thank you very much." His eyes were filled with tears. He said, "You really love this country, this *vatan*." […] Next day the strike began, […] we put three or four pickets in front of the door […] [but] I permitted many things because the factory had orders to dispatch. What if they hadn't been on time? The factory would have been punished. We closed the door. [The workers] worked secretly. I permitted it […] In Izmir, there was Tariş [oil olive factory], [workers] set the factory on fire. Then the factory was closed; nobody was able to buy bread. It was in the seventies, before September 12 happened. Just in the middle of a war between the rightists and the leftists. I knew all of these. [So] I said, "We will start earning our bread here again." […] But the employer tried to break the strike. They sent termination letters to fifteen people's houses […] I got that as well. Then I went to the main entrance [of the factory]. The security guards said, "Please do not come in! Go back!" "Why?" "A notice was written about you, posted on the door." I had a look at the door, saw the note: "Mücahit Karat's entrance is strictly forbidden." The man

> who thanked me one day before, wrote this. I lost my temper, threw out the guards then shout under the window of the general manager's room. I said something very rude. I said, "You bastard! I am not a traitor! I love the factory more than you do! I protect it more than you do! [...] We just want what we deserve!"[…] At the end, three or four people threw me out. I said, "If the notice is not taken back today, I will destroy the factory!" […] The thing is that workers were too fond of me. They counted on me. If I had told them let's gather and mess up the general manager's room they would have done it.

Bread has been beyond the food with its traditional associations, including honor, dignity, and lawful earning in Turkish culture. Just like Ahmad points out how something turns into disgusting by its relations to other things, which have already been designated as disgusting,[39] the sacredness of bread permeates the place where it is earned. Mücahit, observing that family is the only ideological and moral reference point for all political and social relations in Turkey[40] presents his filial loyalty to their employer in order to protect their bread and the place they earn it; their homeland writ large. His expression, "Am I a traitor?" to his general manager upon the restriction of his entrance to the factory demonstrates that his general attitude toward the factory is a feature of his patriotism.

Üstel analyzes the evolution of Turkish citizenship throughout the modern Turkish history and coins the term "militant citizenship," burdened with duties of which paying taxes, doing military service and obeying the law were the most basics. However, the young republican regime aimed to shape all relationships, including the most intimate ones like spousal and parental in a mechanical way in order to make them serve the secular republican principles. With this feature, it acquires the standing of a "moral regime" whose "militant citizens" were supposed to live in a state of "mental mobilization" against the "Other," which was sometimes the defenders of the *Ancien Régime* or the allied occupiers during the war of independence.[41] Alt-

39 Ahmad, "The Skin of the Community," 103.

40 Aytaç, *Ailenin*, 121.

41 Üstel, *Makbul Vatandaşın Peşinde,* 174-213.

hough "militant citizenship" disappeared by transition to a multi-party system which championed non-secular governments, after the 1980 coup d'état it reemerged against "foreign ideologies" allegedly transforming the youth into the bulk of anarchists.[42] Mücahit is one of those "militant citizens" par excellence. His first memoir and comments on it shed light upon the fact that what constitutes a true Turkish patriot or nationalist is his reverence to Allah, and the negation of his identity comes from infidelity. Mentioning of Allah is a demarcation line between the makbul and the non-makbul.

Young's division between the chivalric masculinity with courage, responsibility, and virtue and "dominative," "selfish" and "aggressive" masculinity is at work here. The former is always "watchful" and "suspicious" against the outer world, and the female subordinate "adores her protector and happily defers to his judgment in return for the promise of security that he offers. She looks up to him with gratitude for his manliness and admiration for his willingness to face the dangers of the world for her sake."[43]

Žižek maintains that we are capable of identifying with weakness or guilt of other people. However, identification is two-dimensional. We identify both "with the image in which we appear likeable to ourselves" and "the very place from where we are being observed, from where we look at ourselves so that we appear to ourselves likeable, worthy of love." Imaginary identification or imaginary role always has an answer for the question "for whom is the subject enacting this role?" which reveals symbolic identification. For example, "an extremely 'feminine' imaginary figure" acts out "fragile femininity, but on the symbolic level she is in fact identified with the paternal gaze, to which she wants to appear likeable." Likewise, the bold and manly intimidating personality is the most likeable for the gaze of a timid and fragile woman because "in imaginary identification we imitate the other at the level of resemblance," but "in symbolic identification we identify ourselves with the other precisely at a point at which he is inimitable, at the point which eludes resemblance."[44]

---

42 Ibid., 278.

43 Young, "The Logic of Masculinist Protection," 4-5.

44 Žižek, *The Sublime,* 117-121.

Therefore, masculinity performance of the "militant citizen" that is always "watchful" and "suspicious" against "traitors" and willing to sacrifice anything for the vatan is constructed based on a symbolic identification with a fragile entity (vatan) so that a courageous imaginary role comes true: the more the vatan is vulnerable, the more "militant citizens" are ready to fight for it. In fact, for the dominant militarist-xenophobic discourse in Turkey, the Turkish state has always been under attack and waiting for its salvation because its internal and external enemies are everywhere.[45] Suffice it to say, since the early republican times the Turkish state has assumed a watchful attitude toward Armenian converts to Islam.[46] The patriotic is necessarily xenophobic.

At this point, Recai's story is worth telling to see how alignment against the "other" is constructed. As a teenager, his family moved to Istanbul. In his new neighborhood, he said, he made friends with whom he frequented pubs where he met an "Armenian" man. His family was unable to buy new clothes, but his new older "Armenian" friend gifted many new ones and took him and his friends to the cinema. He described those days as such:

> We were aware of nothing […] He gave us a small card, which was something of the leftists. If you were caught with it, you were in prison for seven years. I mean we were in the hands of the Armenian thing, Armenian missionary […] Then I met a girl named Zeynep, she was actually an Armenian, I learned this after I completed my military service. […] I was caught with a book in the military. She had given the book to me, I was reading it. It was the leftists' book. We were ignorant then, didn't know what it was […] There was a commander, Allah bless him, he said, "My son, come here. Where are you from?" I said, "I am from Erzurum." He said, "My son are you a Muslim?" "Alhamdulillah, I am." He said, "My son, do you believe in Allah?" "Yes, I do sir." "Who is the creator?" "Allah." […] "If you believe in Allah, what about this book?" In the book [it is questioned] why everybody is not created equally? May Allah forgive us! It was against even [Allah]. [It was written] "I

45 Öztan, "Türk Sağında Devlet Fetişizmine Dair," 429.

46 Cagaptay, *Islam, Secularism, and Nationalism,* 159.

> want freedom too! I want equality!" […] It was written in Turkish, but Armenians wrote it. It was Armenian deceit. I know it now […] In [19]78, Alparslan Türkeş (founder of the Nationalist Action Party) came to Fatih, we went there to make trouble. There was Bahri Abi, he saw us there […] He took me to a coffeehouse where he lectured to me. Then I swore to give up and began to support NMP (Nationalist Action Party).

Embracing nationalism and xenophobia was a moment of enlightenment for Recai and other men like him, who seek true patriotism. Although he stated that the two persons were Armenian, I should note that he might have considered them Armenian because of their political stance, as Arman quoted in the first chapter. That is the point, where Recai and other men like him agree to the "ignorance contract"[47] and position themselves as "the body-at-home" "who receives others."[48]

However, patriotism is not without limitations. Hakkı is also a nationalist and religious man, but his experience demonstrates what might be the limits to patriotism for a working-class man. While he was talking about his days in Libya as a constructor worker, I was struck by a word he used: "In eighty-eight [...] I went back to Libya again, but the firm was not a good one […] After one year, we, five or six fellows came together and went on strike. We left the firm […] [In time] we became fifty or sixty people and took the firm to court [because] it did not pay us." He was a man wearing a flat cap with suit like a typical conservative peasant visiting town and spoke with a marked accent related to Central Anatolian people. I was struck, because for the first time I saw a conservative man with a rural background mention "strike." Therefore, I asked as to where he learned to go on strike and whether there were people directing him. He answered, "Of course, there were people directing us." I asked, "Who were they?" He said, "I'd rather not to tell." However, I insisted, and he, lowering his voice said,

47 Steyn, "The Ignorance Contract," 16.

48 Ahmad, "The Skin of the Community," 95.

"There were Iraqi people of PeKeKe.[49] Understand?" Then the conversation went like this:

Me: They directed you?

Hakkı: They did. They were in favor of workers. They were the ones who took our money from the firm.

Me: Really. How come? You already deserved it by the court ruling. Right?

Hakkı: We did, but they did not give us some of our rights.

Me: Like what?

Hakkı: Like depreciation and compensation.

Me: The company was getting out of it.

Hakkı: It was getting out of it. They went to the company, did not leave them in peace. They told them "You are going to give these guys their money." We couldn't take the money and put it in our pocket. We were paid in dinars; we would go to the bank and get a check in dollars in return then come here to Turkey with the check. And when you gave it to the bank here, they cashed it. It was like this.

Me: You could not take it by yourselves.

Hakkı: No, we could not do it without a translator, a guide. The firm's translator did not work for you. But they [people of PKK] know Turkish. They were within some firms, [they told us] "We are gonna get your dues." We gave them two hundred dinars.

Me: They got a commission.

Hakkı: Of course, of course, but two hundred dinars is nothing against four or five hundred dollars.

The accounts demonstrate that for the interviewees religion and xenophobia are two essential components of good morals based on nationalism or patriotism. These are what make some men "discreet" according to Osman's daughter and other people like her. However, when the actual fragility of the citizen is more overwhelming than the symbolic fragility of the homeland,

[49] Its spelling is interpreted as a signifier of the person's political stance; right-wing groups who are against the organization use "PeKaKa" and disparage those who use "PeKeKe."

as in the case of Hakkı, the "militant citizen" might prefer not to be that much "suspicious" and "watchful" against "traitors."

§ 5.4 The Deceived: An Honorable Man in a Perfidious World

In her research on how women perform the code of honor in Pakistan, Benedicte Grima discovers that "tears and the endurance of hardships" construct honorable womanhood. Women believe that if they have never been through hardships, they have no stories to tell. "With age and hardships, a woman gains respect, her story becomes known […] Her suffering is perceived as action according to the code of honor and morality." The idea behind it is that women suffer for the sake of society (nation), and non-suffering means freedom and selfishness. Any woman who has never been through hardships "considers herself, nor is she considered by the community, to have begun living or to have any kind of story to tell." She is only an "ignorant."[50]

Similar to those women, men have a schema to decide who is honorable or not. According to the schema, decently extracting oneself from a dishonest state caused by relatives or close friends is a sign of honorable masculinity. In contradiction with the interviewees' own claim to know better than their wives and siblings what is "pure" and "dirty," they were enthusiastic about interpreting being deceived as a sign of goodhearted personality. Almost all of them had at least one story of deceit in which they had been the aggrieved side, and the plotlines were similar to each other; they trusted in someone close to them, the trusted person did something behind their back, and they did leave the scene preserving their honor without holding anyone responsible for any harm. Accounts of Muhsin and Nusret epitomized the understanding.

Muhsin working as a truck driver wanted to buy a truck together with his boss. However, his brother-in-law, the husband of his sister-in-law, was

---

50 Benedicte Grima, "The Role of Suffering in Women's Performance of *Paxto*," in *Gender, Genre, and Power in South Asian Expressive Traditions*, ed. Arjun Appadurai, Frank J. Korom and Margaret A. Mills (Philadelphia: University of Pennsilvania Press, 1991), 79-84.

quicker and became partners with his boss in secret claiming that Muhsin was not apt to buy the truck. As Muhsin informed his boss about his real intention, his boss promised to buy a bigger one which Muhsin was to drive. Later, his boss actually bought a bigger truck and Muhsin began to drive it. But one day, his boss asked Muhsin to let him know before his departure:

> He came, took the wheel and said, "Get in." We got in […] [Then he only] let me drive onto ramps. I did not understand whether he was [examining] my driving or something. When we arrived at Orhangazi he asked where I eat during the breaks […] then said, "Let's go eat […]." Then he asked where I change the tire. I said I have never changed a tire. He said "Okay son." […] Fifteen days after that, it was just before the sacrifice feast, I have never forgotten. That time truck drivers were forbidden to drive [during the day], we worked at nights. Two of us [him and his brother-in-law] carried something to Sefaköy. […] We lost each other near the [Bosphorus] Bridge in 4th Levent. I decided to pass the bridge to wait for him. I waited for him, but he had already gone away […]. In the morning, at nine o'clock, I woke up and went to the factory with the truck to check if there was anything I could do. If not, I would go back home. At tenish, he [his brother-in-law] came saying, "Selamun aleyküm aghas." We replied "Aleyküm selam." What else could I say? Then, the only thing he said to me was this; "Muhsin, Hasan Agha [his boss] said something." I asked, "What did he say, brother?" He said, "He said that you quit the truck." I just said "Okay" and delivered the keys to him. It was the eve of sacrifice feast; I did not ask anything about my paycheck.

The same day he came across an old friend who helped him find a new job. After a while, he run into his old boss, Hasan Agha at a repair shop. As soon as his old boss saw him, he began criticizing him for quitting. Only then could Muhsin and his former boss understand that Muhsin's brother-in-law distorted Muhsin's records of expenses and lied about everything since the beginning.

Likewise, a senior friend of Nusret offered him partnership of a nuts shop because Nusret is "an honest man." Nusret was not supposed to do anything but to work on his own at the shop. He accepted the offer and began to work in return for forty percent of the profit:

> I said, if I work bodily I'll get forty percent of the profit, you'll get sixty. It's more rightful religiously. Whatever. I made money for him […] [But] in 97, he handed the shop over and said, "You got two hundred million." Two hundred million. It was worth [just] a thousand dollars. Still, I am yet to receive that money. […] Anyway [later] we started a wholesale trading business together again […] [One day] it was just before the sacrifice feast. I said, "Master, I have two kids, I have to dress them up for the sacrifice feast, I have to buy something new for them." He replied "Okay, on the eve go and sell something. Whatever you earn is yours." I did what he said, but I earned just a little. Fifteen or twenty liras [it was almost nothing] in 98. I called him and told about my situation. He said, "Leave the money, I need it, I'll sacrifice [a cow]." Then I went home with nothing. After the feast I collected the debts, wrote them down, did not take even a penny and quit the job […] that is maybe because we are goodhearted, I trust in other people.

Had these kinds of experiences belonged to their wives, it is doubtful that men would have thought the same way. Now, to be deceived seems to be a right entrusted to men as a sign of goodhearted personality.

However, there were exceptions. Bayram, for example, was self-congratulatory because he has been a man that nobody could deceive. As an evidence of it, he told a story that had happened years ago between him and a beggar. As he was going to work, a beggar approached him and asked for some money. He immediately pretended to check his purse out and then began to grumbling "I forgot my purse at home! Let me go back and take it." As he was insisting upon going back home the beggar started to persuade him not to go. While he was telling his story, he enacted it theatrically and then said, "I had money but why giving it away?" He was critical because the beggar was a young man who was in good shape for work. His wife was very talkative during the interview, and she praised Bayram for his hardworking personality. She told that when he began to work in Istanbul as a teenager, his stepbrother was hospitalized because of an electric shock and Bayram took care of his stepbrother by selling bottles of water on the street. However, they both blamed his step brother for being ungrateful. A story of

ungratefulness between family members was another way of demonstration of goodhearted personality.

However, differently from other interviewees, Ilhami and Arman shared stories of deceit in which they were the deceivers. Both men open-heartedly said that they deceived their wives because of different reasons. Ilhami even told that his wife raided his workplace with his relatives when she figured it out. However, both men underlined the importance of being an honest person instead of good-heartedness.

Waling encourages us to understand how men reflect on their practices instead of detecting which type of masculinity they espouse.[51] However, Chris Beasley's concept of "*sub*-hegemonic" masculinity is helpful to discern the position of *makbul* man. Beasley develops the concept by examining Australian movies honoring a certain kind of manhood against supra-hegemonic foreign authorities and the marginalized "other," the Aboriginals. This "middle ground" manhood is "working-class-inflected" with a "national/cultural identity" positioned against "more powerful models of masculinity from outside" country "but also as *complicit* with" "supra-hegemonic masculinities in the sense of being at a distance from marginalised" others.[52] Indeed, stories of deceit are stories of goodhearted personality because injustice does not come from "somewhere else" which is the negation of I: "the not."[53] Both sides the aggrieved and the deceiver are still members of a "we." Moreover, the border object to differentiate "who we are" is not doing an injustice to a fellow. However, the aggrieved part situates himself in a small circle encircled by a larger circle to identify with the persona of a gariban. Nusret said, "This happens when one does not have anybody to have one's back. In life, you are either powerful in your job or you have a powerful family to have your back. I have nobody to have my back." This point is where men face the fact that the protector might abuse his power.

---

51 Waling, "Rethinking," 11-14.

52 Chris Beasley, "Male Bodies at the Edge of the World: Re-thiking Hegemonic and 'Other' Masculinities in Australian Cinema," in *Mysterious Skin: Male Bodies in Contemporary Cinema*, ed. Santiago Fouz-Hernandez, (London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2009), 63-64.

53 Ahmad, "The Skin of the Community," 103.

People who deceived the interviewees are those the interviewees paid respect to because of some qualities like being from the same town or being a senior friend. Thus, it seems to be a "popular competency" of men in Edensor's terms[54] to consider a story of deceit a story of goodhearted personality but not a story of black-heartedness when injustice does not come from the negation of I: "the not;" an Armenian or a Kurdish, for example. Turkishness is a way of seeing, hearing, knowing and feeling as well as not seeing, not hearing, not knowing and not feeling.[55] This shared zone of affectivity requires this "popular competency" to stay within the boundaries of the Turkishness contract.

Their interpretation of deceit is an important indication of their coping mechanism with injustice done to them within their Sunni- Muslim-Turk vicinity. As in the case of women finding honor in hardships in Pakistan, a *makbul* man in Turkey puts forward stories of deceit in order to prove his purity and stay as a member of "we" despite everything.

§ 5.5 What about Women?

Recai, lighting his cigarette, said off the record, "I improved myself working at Tuborg." He harshly criticized male workers speaking ill of women workers in Tuzla shipyard, his previous workplace, but gratefully mentioned the beer company where he learned the twists of urban life like working with strange women in the same place. Men despised the presence of women in a shipyard because a woman's place was home. Women are dirty or *fitne* in a shipyard because it is men's place. He was against this understanding.

However, he was the only interviewee to mention how his approach to women has been transformed. I assume that the setting of the interviews prevented them from speaking about their socialization with women. Recai was an exception, but he talked about his flirts and his relation with women when I was the only woman in the room. They usually preferred to briefly

54 Tim Edensor, *National Identity,* 89-93.

55 Ünlü, *Türklük Sözleşmesi*, 16.

talk about the ceremony of asking for the girl's hand or how they eloped with their wives. If there was an old fiancé or ex-wife, they avoided talking about that. However, the interviewees, whom I interviewed in their workplaces or in a café or at a secluded place, were more relaxed about the subject. Salim, whom I interviewed in his tailor shop, gave an account of his old fiancé that he left because of her family's unending demands, by referring to her violent husband and how unhappy she is now. Acar, whom I interviewed in a café, and Ilhami, whom I interviewed at home when his wife was at work, were boastful about their ability to communicate with girls when they were young, complaining about their wives' jealousy. Exceptionally, Arman, whom I interviewed in the office of a psychologist friend of mine, was like a confessor when he was mentioning his extramarital affairs. As they have been working since childhood, I believe that their taciturn attitude about the subject was related to their desire not to hurt their wives or cause a *fitne* at home. This being the case, I could not hear their accounts about socialization with women.

§ 5.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I delineated the production of the interviewees as heteronormative fathers by the capacities of a nation-state. Through the stages, they were "interpellated" into an "imaginary relation to the real relations in which they live"[56] by different events and actors. Their accounts exemplify the *makbul* responses to the "interpellation" in different contexts. First, they comprehended the terms and conditions of positioning themselves in the Turkish paternalistic solidarity. Second, military service taught them how manhood and fatherhood are constructed differently from womanhood and motherhood. By that, they learned to position themselves and other men as the citizens whose actions have political bearings as opposed to women citizens. Third, they were politicized and situated themselves as the "host" of the country as performers of Turkishness. They uncovered the uneasy rela-

[56] Althusser, *On the Reproduction of Capitalism*, 183.

tionship between normative manhood, patriotism, xenophobia, and violence. Lastly, they developed coping mechanisms to deal with the injustice done to them within their Turkish community by staying loyal to their community despite deceiving and betrayal. These experiences and the line of thinking that they acquired through these experiences are the rationale behind men's claim to paternal authority over their families.

6

Fathers In-Between

> *Thanks to the maternal care of the collegials – the resistance, as we came to call ourselves – I grew up. Why do I say maternal, not paternal? Because there were no fathers in my world. There were only sires.*
>
> – Ursula K. Le Guin, The Matter of Seggri

> *I had some notes when I was a child. I took notes about how I would behave when I have a child. [Because] I have never forgotten what my father did to me. I used to write them down [with some rules]. "If a child does something wrong, you should not scold him." That was the first rule for me.*
>
> – Salim, Interviewee

LaRossa argues that feeling "'ambivalent' about something is to feel alternately good and bad about it." Fathers are continually reminded of

that, they fail as fathers. They fail "not when compared with their own fathers," but "when compared with the image of fatherhood which has become part of our culture and which they, on some level of consciousness, believe in."[1] Salim, the interviewee I quoted above, is proud of being a genial father to his three daughters in contrast to his detached father. Similar to him, all interviewees portray themselves as more caring and less oppressive than their fathers were. They are certainly emotionally more reflective and open to negotiating the limits of their paternal authority. Although they were referred by my gatekeepers within the framework of *makbul* fatherhood, they are the ones who redefine the "culture" and "conduct"[2] of *makbul* fatherhood. Yet, since they have not built their own terminology, such as "new fatherhood," to define their paternal practices, they seem to have developed another strategy to describe their positionality.

They demonstrated that their minds still are full of stories appreciating patriarchal authority of the past, verifying what Bourdieu argues about symbolic violence. Bourdieu defines symbolic violence as "the transfiguration of relations of domination and submission into affective relations, the transformation of power into charisma or into the charm suited to evoke affective enchantment." For a symbolic exchange to occur two parts have to have "identical categories of perception and appreciation." Symbolic domination is possible when the dominated recognizes the principles in whose name domination is employed.[3] Most of the interviewees have "identical categories of perception and appreciation" with fatherly authority of the past and recognize the patriarchal principles in whose name they were oppressed. However, they also criticized their stern fathers in a position of learned helplessness. Their portrayal of their father as a stern authority before their helpless childhood selves serves to express their stark contrast with them. They tell these stories to manifest what they waive. They tell these stories to prove that they are not a party to an "ignorance contract," to which their

1 LaRossa, "Fatherhood and Social Change," 456.

2 LaRossa, "Historical Study of Fatherhood," 39-40.

3 Pierre Bourdieu, *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 100-102.

fathers were, as they were ignorant to their children's "struggles, pain, joy, and accomplishments."[4]

The "antimodel" fathers have long been a source of motivation for men's commitment to "doing things differently."[5] In *Bodies That Matter*, Judith Butler says that a subject is formed by "identification with the normative phantasm of 'sex,' and this identification takes place through a repudiation which produces a domain of abjection, a repudiation without which the subject cannot emerge." In this case, the stern father as a "threatening spectre" is the "constitutive outside"[6] to the fathers. They do not deny their right to patriarchal authority, but their cynical reason, enabled by the military, is replaced by naïveté. Now, violence is "disgusting" and "hateful" and is not a characteristic of "who we are," because their own father inhabits the place the negation of I, "the not,"[7] resides.

As I revealed in the previous chapter, they grew up by acknowledging another man's paternal authority over themselves, or claim the right to impersonate the father upon having suitable qualifications such as diligent, discreet, clean, just, religious, and attentive to his social environment. They figured out that their father served an "antimodel;" they are their own role models. But they are so by not showing an in-your-face attitude toward their stern fathers. They still observe daily subtleties not to harm their fathers' paternal authority.

This being the case, they have a strong desire to be appreciated by both their natal families as a son and their own children as a father. Yet to be appreciated by children is a more challenging task. They have a strong desire to prevent their children from being socially and economically vulnerable in life, as they were. Thus, they have created an environment for their children to dare to be demanding from their family in many senses. In this context, I

---

4 Steyn, "The Ignorance Contract," 16.

5 Anna Dienhart, *Reshaping Fatherhood: The Social Construction of Shared Parenting* (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1998), 57.

6 Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex* (New York: Routledge, 1993), xi.

7 Ahmad, "The Skin of the Community," 103.

examine their narratives of being fathered and the role of these narratives in legitimizing their attitude toward their children.

§ 6.1 A Denied Childhood

Childhood is the first stage of life-long hardships that most of the interviewees had to face. Since they were born into a rural setting, the harsh conditions of a village life circumscribed them. Some were struck by poverty too. Yet in general, work is both the defining feature of their childhood experiences and how they interpret what life expects from them. The physical and psychological absence of their fathers was also overwhelming, just like other responsibilities. They portrayed either an emotionally distant redundant father who always physically exists or a responsible working father who regularly goes to big cities to work in the construction industry, but has never been existed psychologically. In either case, they experienced a lack and performed to substitute their father as a boy.

In most European countries labor force shifted from agriculture to the urban sector after the Second World War. However, agricultural employment was on the rise until the 1980s and started to decline in the 1990s in Turkey.[8] That is the result of both peasantist ideology and the lack of systematic social policies. During early years of the Republic of Turkey, the intelligentsia was in favor of industry but opposed to industrialization. They dreamed of an industrial development without dismantling the traditional relations of production. That is to say, without dislocation of the peasants, because urbanization was supposedly the origin of all "social problems" such as class struggle, unemployment, strikes etc. In this context, peasant life was exalted as the pure representation of national culture and believed that "joy" was at the center of production in villages rather than "money" as in urban econo-

[8] Şevket Pamuk, "Agriculture and Economic Development in Turkey, 1870-2000," in *Agriculture and Economic Development in Europe since 1870,* eds., Pedro Lains and Vicente Pinilla (London/New York, Routledge, 2008), 378-379.

mies.[9] Secondly, in the absence of a systematic social security system, peasantry functioned to alleviate life conditions for their distressed kith and kin living in urban areas by supporting them in kind.[10] Yet it has become gradually difficult as Turkey articulated with the global economy in the post-1980 era. However, most of the interviewees spent their childhood in villages, and their labor force was indispensable for daily life. Only one interviewee who was born in a village, Hüsamettin, said he had plenty of time to play as a child because he did not have a father, and his older sisters took care of everything. A few interviewees who were born in cities said they missed their childhood and playmates and described some old-fashioned outdoor games. Indeed, the Value of Children (VOC) studies demonstrate that socio-cultural-economic contexts are decisive for the type of value that families attribute to children. Where children materially contributed to their family, the economic/utilitarian value comes into prominence. In that, families expect their offspring to perform as a child laborer in earlier ages and old-age security in adulthood. Children's behavior toward their family might be a matter of family honor.[11]

The interviewees were raised at a time when families mostly attributed economic/utilitarian value to children. In that, classical patriarchy construed by "deference based on age, distinct male and female hierarchies and a relative separation of their spheres of activity"[12] was the defining feature of social relations. Child labor oscillates between masculine and feminine spheres. Salim, as a six-year-old boy had to struggle with his family to enroll in the primary school in their village. When he succeeded to be a pupil on his own, his mother got angry with him because she did not want him to

---

9 M. Asım Karaömerlioğlu, "The People's Houses and the Cult of the Peasant in Turkey," *Middle Eastern Studies* 34 (1998): 74-77.

10 Ayşe Buğra and Çağlar Keyder, "The Turkish Welfare Regime in Transformation," *Journal of European Social Policy* 16 (2006): 220.

11 Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı and Bilge Ataca, "Value of Children, Family Change, and Implications for the Care of the Elderly," *Cross-Cultural Research* 49 (2015): 376-377.

12 Deniz Kandiyoti, "Patterns of Patriarchy: Notes for An Analysis of Male Dominance in Turkish Society," in *Women in Modern Turkish Society: A Reader*, ed. Şirin Tekeli (London; Atlantic Heights, NJ: Zed Books, 1995), 306-307.

spend his time for anything except chores, mainly when his father was working away in cities:

> I was both a son and a daughter [to my mother]. […] We had farm animals; I brought and tethered them […] I was just six years old, but I got to deal with a ton of things […] People used to call me "Emine's daughter." My mother's name was Emine. [They said for me] "He can do anything." […] In the evening, the meal was to be prepared. What would be prepared? Potato, pilaf. Who would prepare them? Salim would.

Hakkı was angry at his father's decisions over his life. He was born in a village like Salim and struggled to enroll in school:

> At seven years old, I dealt with cattle put them out to pasture. At 12 years old, I began to plough. I helped my father. By the way, as I finished the fifth grade, I got a perfect pass degree. Our teacher, the teacher of the village was our kin. He asked me "Do you have an identity card?" There was no [such thing], nobody knew what identity card was. […] He said, "I will make you enroll in Hasanoğlan [a village institute[13] in Ankara, the capital city], you will be a teacher then […] We got my father's identity card, went to the civil registry, the teacher was next to me, he said "I will help you get an identity card and make you enroll in the school." He showed my father's identity card [to the civil servant], but we had not been registered. Even my older sister, who was married, had not been registered. It was because of [my father's] being a stupid peasant. […] Then the teacher came up to my father; it was the time of harvesting. My father was threshing with cattle. [The teacher] said, "Uncle, you will get your son educated, I will help you […]" My father said "No way! I have just bought new cattle, if he leaves how can I farm on my own? I cannot let him go." [The teacher] came three times to ask again, but my father refused […] That's how we started our life.

His last remarks also point out a subtle understanding of life; it means a forced acceptance that one has to work. However, his experience is not

[13] Village Institutes were established to prosper rural areas by educating peasant youth. See: M. Asım Karaömerlioğlu, "The Village Institutes Experience in Turkey," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 25 (1998): 47-73.

unique. All interviewees who were born in a village were prevented from schooling. Some were exposed to violence upon their refraining from work. Muhsin, for example, was sorrowful while he was mentioning his childhood responsibilities:

> In my childhood] I always wanted to play, but I could not […] I had no time. I put cattle out to pasture with my mother […] My father was in the village. He had a horse. He beautified his horse and endlessly visited weddings and frequented taverns. We did not get along well. We never have. [We had quarrels, because] I struggled not to go with the cattle. Then they beat me up, my father and my older brothers.

Except a few, the interviewees are predominantly primary school graduates, and lack of education was a source of sorrow. Cemil expressed how different his life would have been if he had studied at university by referring to his primary school friends' prestigious occupations in the field of medicine, advocacy, and prosecution and added "[my friend] used to say 'You were the cleverest one among us, but you could not study.'" However, schooling did not release them from the harsh conditions of village life. During the research, I got to give an ear to conversations on school memories within households, which I believe my presence evoked and saw that the memories are filled with a variety of violence. Men enthusiastically exchanged detailed stories about teachers, other father figures in their lives, who had beaten them. If the interviewees Tahsin and Bayram knew each other, I assume they would talk about it for hours because they narrated it enthusiastically. However, while Tahsin is literate, Bayram is one of the two illiterate interviewees:

> When we came from school, firstly we took care of animals then studied […] The school was forty minutes away from home, and winters were really hard in villages […] Each child brought wood to school to ignite the stove […] Whoever failed to bring wood, teachers would beat them up. Why? One should bring wood so that the stove heats all day. (Tahsin)

> I went to school barefoot; my feet were cold. Even if you learn how to read and write, you forget it on the road back to home. Then, there was a

> beating. If you were a little late, teachers were ready to beat you to death. They were just like Israelites against Palestinians. (Bayram)

Yet ill-treatment was not restricted to physical violence. Some were lucky to continue middle school, but their teachers mocked them because of their rough peasant dialect. However, as they did not refrain from submitting to the authority of their father despite everything, they paid respects to their teachers because deprivation defines all aspects of their childhood. They used to content themselves with what they had in hand.

Some complained that traditional people in the Anatolia find men who show love to his wife and children in front of the elderly disrespectful. Interestingly, when I questioned about being loved during childhood, the most readily answer that I got was about the mother and endless longing for her irrespective of the rural or urban background of the interviewees. Yüksel was about to cry talking about his mother. Although I asked a general question about being loved during childhood, he brought the subject specifically to his mother:

> My mother loved [me], may God be pleased with her. I received mother love, but I could not live much with my mother. I went to [boarding school] at eleven years old. I came back at eighteen years old, and then married. We could not be together again […] I am fifty-six, fifty-seven years old now, but I still yearn for my mother.

Another interviewee, X, with whom I interviewed at his tailor shop, stood beside me many times and hit my shoulder heavily to describe how he was treated during his childhood. While hitting my shoulder heavily, he said, "We were like donkeys!" and imitated his father "Shut up you little shitty thing!" Then all of a sudden, although the topic was not about her mother, he burst out whimpering:

> [It is] my greatest yearning. I have never lain in my mother's bosom for even two days. I have never […] Now when some of my friends say something about their mother so-and-so, I tell them, you have nothing to do, you go to your mother, and lie in her bosom for two or three days.

An open resentment toward the father unfolds when he, the one who is believed to be in charge of protection, prioritizes his desires over family, which leaves his children vulnerable towards people's maltreatment. Fatih,

for example, held his father responsible for both chronic nightmares and sleep terrors that lasted until his thirties and his shyness preventing him even from asking a driver of a minibus to stop in a station. He described his childhood with the word "lack" but did not say anything about the content of that lack.

However, some interviewees with a peculiar sense of humor like Bayram and Adem named the content of their childhood's lack without hesitation; food. Yet they did not blame their fathers for their hand-to-mouth existence. They just repeatedly said the same thing: "We were starving!" Bayram likened his family's misery to the poverty of people of Nigeria, Kenya and Somalia. He said that his father was too old to handle life when he was a child, while Adem told how he, as the oldest son, left village to work in return for a sack of flour and a can of oil in town at thirteen years old. They, like other interviewees described the harsh conditions of childhood years as any other hardships of life without mentioning any unmet need for paternal love.

Salim's words disclose the nature of the parental aspects of paternity that men experienced. His father was regularly away as a construction worker in cities. He said "My father went away and returned, then my mother became pregnant […] I do not remember any year in which my mother was not pregnant," then continued, "my mother's two sons died […] of course, my father was unaware of them… Only when my brother, named Mehmet, died at four years old, my father saddened very much." He preferred to mention his lost brothers as his "mother's sons." However, this does not mean a total lack of an emotional bond with his father. The word *family* derives from Latin *famulus*, meaning servant, and Roman *familia*, meaning the domestic property of a man.[14] In the absence or malfunction of the head of a family, a son is supposed to relate to his family based on this definition. Thus, sons could establish an emotional bond with their fathers based on strong enthusiasm for sharing life responsibilities. Indeed, vivid memories about father are afflictive when talking of misery. Recai, for example, felt like crying

[14] Scott Coltrane, "Fathering: Paradoxes, Contradictions, and Dilemmas," in *Men's Lives*, eds. Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner (Boston: Pearson, 2007), 450.

when praising of his father's fatherhood surrounded by misery. At thirteen years old, he worked in a brick kiln and secretly bought a new and hassle-free stove by installments for his mother:

> But the man [who sold the stove] was a friend of my father. I did not know, [I was just] inexperienced in life, [it was] only childhood, I did not realize that the man was going to tell my father about it […] My father dropped by his store, the man looked at him, and asked "Âşık,[15] will you go to the village?" [My father] said "Yes, I will." [The man] said "This packet is for you […]" There were buses in the square of Erzurum. I went there, saw my father come with the gas cylinder […] He said nothing on the bus. We came home, and he said to my mother "Look, what your son bought for you […]" They both sat and cried like a child.

He expressed strong gratitude because his father treated him kindly, although he behaved without his approval. Likewise, Salim told how he tried to fill the space left by his father:

> When my father was in Istanbul, my mother weaved carpets. My father was away for four or five months. We had no money. When a carpet seller came, we earned some money. So, I collected scraps to sell them to the second-hand dealer, who used to come to our village. […] I used to buy my shoes from him. […] We wrote a letter to my father […] but it was going to take a month to get the money my father sent to us. […] My mother was highly distressed because there was no money. […] A few days later, the second-hand dealer came to the village with shoes, pants, cloths for children. […] I brought the scraps that I collected to him and asked, "Will you buy them?" He said, "Yes." The vegetable seller dropped by our village at the same time. He had apples, plums, pears… […] Our neighbor had a daughter who was my sister's age. The girl took a plum in one hand and a loquat in the other, and put a plum in her pocket. My sister saw her walking around. She started crying. My mother did not have money. […] I asked the vegetable seller if he would barter with wheat. They were two men, they looked at each other, then,

[15] Âşık is a term used for minstrels in the Anatolia.

> one said okay. My sister was still crying for fruits. […] I put wheat into oilcans and gave them to the man. […] God bless him, he filled my cans with fruits without weighing. My mother knew nothing. […] When my sister saw me on the stairs with the cans, she asked about them. I said, "Look, take them." She took some fruits and stopped crying. My mother was upstairs listening to us. […] Then I saw my mother cry because I bought them, because I protected my little sister.

Osman, the calmest looking interviewee sternly shared the first life goal he set when he began the boarding school in town after having completed primary education in village:

> The conditions of the village, you do not know them, the conditions were hard. People farm, ranch, both men and ladies were busy. Those days, we went down to Çatalzeytin [a town] from the village. I never forget, [when I was in town] my first aim, I mean I set for myself, was to have a good job after education then to save my mother, I mean, my family from the village, from that conditions, [it was] my aim.

Salim's anecdote explains the conditions of the village life that Osman tried to convey:

> There was no electricity. […] It was 1974, I never forget. It was spring, May or June. Three or five street lamps were put in the village. They were incredible for village children. They were big like pear. […] Then, the truck of the General Directorate for State Hydraulic Works came to the village to provide power to the villagers. There was a transformer […] A man came near it holding a walkie-talkie to talk to another man who was on the hill three kilometers away. They talked to each other. […] There were pear lamps swinging from the ceiling like a rope at home. [...] The man spoke through a megaphone, "Turn the lights on!" […] Then the lights were turned on one by one. People applauded. Children rushed into their houses. […] We had oil lamps, my mother found a box. In the past, there were boxes, Vita Oil boxes, written in yellow. […] My mother washed one and put the kerosene lamp in it because the bottle of the lamp was broken. […] My mother said "Be careful son, do not break it. We cannot trust the state. There is war. They might cut off electricity." […] In the meantime, the headman came running back, he said

> to the children, go son, call your father, go call your uncle, the men were his guests. He was preparing for dinner. People gathered, congratulated each other, and [one of the officials] said repeatedly, "Use it sparingly." Nobody understood him. Abdurrahman Abi said, "It is not an oil lamp, how can we use it sparingly?" He whispered it to the person near him. They could not ask the officials not to be rude. Then he asked it the headman of the village. The headman replied, "When you go out turn it off. That is using sparingly."

What becomes clear in the narratives is a common orientation toward lack of certain things in childhood, be it a feeling of security or basic needs. They portray men of a particular generation and social class, who shared a similar "lack" in life.[16] Indeed, they oscillated between the singular and plural

[16] Suffering children had a symbolic place within the zone of national affectivity. Intellectuals tried to uncover that through the analysis of a poster of a tearful boy that was a well-known feature of popular iconography in the 1970s decorating low-class spaces. In 1970s, an advertisement of a bank in Turkey wrote "The crying boy that we see everywhere… The symbol of our unrealized dreams… Who would be counted as having done one's own part unless he smiles…" referring to the poster. (Erdoğan, 1999, 39). Later in the 1980s, it was hung in "grocery shops, coffee houses and workplaces next to portraits of Atatürk and Kenan Evren, leader of the 1980 coup and later president." However, the boy did not look like "the usual representation of agony in Turkey then: mistreated, undersized, uncared-for village children who symbolized neglect." Instead, he had blonde hair with huge blue eyes and clean clothes. Thus, "He made you think less of poverty suffered from birth, less of a lack that had always been there, than of a blow suffered later, and most of all of a motherless or orphaned child." (Gürbilek, 2011, 121). Its popularity was associated with almost nationwide unconscious guilt toward children, and scholars argued that adults embraced the poster as a means to absolution. (Belge, 1997, 184). However, Necmi Erdoğan, pointing out Martin Stokes's anecdote on arabesque culture in Turkey, maintains that the poster represented "our inner misery." Stokes mentions a copper-smith who likened his childhood to a young movie character who had to steal kebab to feed his younger brother. He concludes that weaving together the movie and a part of his life in an arabesque narrative the copper-smith refers to that "everybody carries inside themselves some aspect of the *gariban*, the social outcast." (Stokes, 1992, 131-132). Accordingly, critic Nurdan Gürbilek states that adults looking at the then ubiquitous poster of the tearful boy identified with the child: "They felt like abused children themselves, they saw their own suffering in his face and pitied themselves in the person of that child." His face was a symbol for virtue

forms of the first person, while telling their stories. It is not something to be taken for granted because "the choice of a particular personal pronoun is inherently political." "We" might refer to "any kind of collectivity: gendered, generational, racialized, religious, ideological, social, national" "stand[ing] distinct from 'them.'"[17] In *Imagined Communities* Benedict Anderson exemplifies how novels and newspapers functioned as a means for "national imagination" in eighteenth-century Europe. In excerpts from novels, he underlines that "*comparable*" spaces inhabited by a homogenous community form the sociological landscape in novels. The first-person plural narrator evokes an "imagined community" composed of members with "*comparable*" experiences, "none in itself of any unique importance, but all representative."[18]

Arman as a minority man, who spent his childhood in Istanbul is not an exception. He also has the same attitude toward the relationship between life and work. He said, "Our life began by working at eleven years old" and quoted the same lack of paternal bond. He described his childhood years as an emotional battleground between his father and him. After his father migrated to Istanbul from Eastern Anatolia, he built a new life from scratch and always wanted his children to imitate his zeal:

---

against undeserved suffering. Indeed, the popular city literature favored the theme of good-hearted children suffering in big cities paved the way for movies featuring the same theme in 1960s and 1970s. All of these cultural products presented fortitude in childhood as a national ideal: "the child in agony is the true embodiment of all national virtues" because "virtue is born of agony, honour of poverty, and good of evil." That is the reason behind that a well-nourished blonde boy instead of an Eastern-looking stunted boy represented agony. He is "purified of any psychic stain, any resentment or violence born of childhood suffering. And precisely for this reason, to the extent it displays endurance in sorrow, honour in trial, this face became a metaphor of pain." (Gürbilek, 2011, 120-128). In that sense, narratives of suffering children have an affective value for fathers of a particular generation.

17 Ruth Maxey, "The Rise of the 'We' Narrator in American Literature," *European Journal of American Studies* 10, (2015): 1-12.

18 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 2006), 30.

> We had no luxury of waking up late. Sometimes my father woke me up with a kick saying "Are you still sleeping the son of the agha!" My father had no mercy on me as a child. Sometimes he got angry with a customer or things at his store then he beat me up […] Although I did not like his job, he tried to teach me his occupation: tailoring. I was maybe just a commodity for him. I mean he treated me like a commodity. How? He used to make me sit on a stool in front of the store, [I was] just a little kid, and people passing by saw me stitching. I was like an advertising material [for his store].

He, like many other interviewees said that his biggest regret is failing to study at university because his father did not permit, and support him financially. However, he is also one of some bodies, who are stateless and make an extra effort to be a self-effacing figure in the public sphere.[19] He said, "When we got out playing, we used to call our mother mama in Armenian. So, we were always warned [by our relatives] to call our mother *anne* in Turkish, not mama in Armenian." Because of the "unique importance"[20]of his suffering as a child, his experience is not "*comparable*" nationally.

The official history of the Republic of Turkey informed by peasantist ideology, agricultural and industrial development implicates itself in the stories of the interviewees, who identify as Sunni-Muslim-Turkish. Neither their ancestors nor they come from brutally oppressed minority groups with an alternative historical narrative. In that regard, their childhood memories are "*comparable*" experiences of men from a particular generation, social class, and nation. However, as Arman exemplified, deprivation stands out as an experience that defines a generation, transcending the national. In that sense, I believe that the usage of "we" implies a generational and social difference rather than national functioning as a legitimizing factor for fathers' paternal performance.

---

19 Ünlü, *Türklük Sözleşmesi*, 217-241.

20 Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 30.

§ 6.2 The In-Between Fathers

While I was interviewing Tarık at his workplace, a grocery store, a man in a shabby outfit came in, and in a few seconds, they began to talk to each other. The topic easily led to children, and when Tarık asked the man about his son, the man said that he got his son enrolled in a preparatory course for university entrance exam, but continued his sentence with a wry smile, "Not that anything would happen. Just so he won't say 'He did nothing for me.' Otherwise, I know what will happen." His explanation is the reflection of the fact that children's judgments have a place in fathers' world. However, similar to the schema regarding having a goodhearted personality and being deceived, interviewees' interpretation of fatherhood reveals a preacceptance that a father is never to be properly respected and appreciated. Cemil's story concretizes the mindset well:

> There was a man with three sons. His sons asked him "Father which one of us will be a proper man?" He said, "I don't know yet. Do whatever necessary then I will see it." Then, one of his sons studied at college, he preferred to study. One became a shepherd. One preferred to be a worker in a factory like us. The shepherd and worker showed respect to their father when he came home from work. The one who studied used to come from school then ask his father "Which one of us will be a man?" The father used to reply, "Two of them have become one but the third one I have been expecting." The one who studied became a governor and asked the officials to have his father brought to him. Listen to me carefully; this part is very important. Why? Because his father did not believe in his ability to become a man. But he said to himself, "I am a man now." Then, when his father came, he said, "Look at me father, I have become a man now." His father said, "Son, you failed again." He replied, "Why?" His father said, "You had me brought to you, right?" He replied, "Yes." "You failed to become a man, son. You are a governor but it does not mean that you are a man. You had your father brought to you. What should have you done? Even if you are a governor, you go to your father and say "God bless you, father. You encouraged me. Let me kiss your hands and feet. You made me [a governor]. I am a governor

> now. Please come and visit me when you are available." That is what he is supposed to do. […] Let us say a man got richer, does he have a right to have his father brought to him? No. Why? Because of respect.

The institutional order has to be legitimized "when the objectivations of the (now historic) institutional order are to be transmitted to a new generation." For the taken-for-granted nature of the institutions "can no longer be maintained by means of the individual's own recollection and habitualization. The unity of history and biography is broken. In order to restore it, and thus to make intelligible both aspects of it, there must be 'explanations' and justifications of the salient elements of the institutional tradition." Unsophisticated conceptualizations with some "explanatory schemes," which are "directly related to concrete actions," like "folk tales" are tools for legitimization.[21] Cemil told the story because he was aware that paternal authority, which he has always taken for granted, now required explanation and justification.

The story personifies the fear of a son, who has been in places where his father has never been, has seen things that his father has never seen and has realized things that his father has never dreamed of. We do not know the father's profession, but the emphasis upon the relationship between studying at college and developing a discrete character in family implies the distance between the studying son's aspirations and the father's social background. The father considers everything he has achieved on behalf of manhood and expects his sons to follow his lead. In the story, the three sons have the "identical categories of perception and appreciation" of manhood, but they perform it differently. The father has a say on his sons' manhood based on the symbolic capital of a patriarch, but is willing to appreciate his sons only if their symbolic capital is not hazardous for fatherly authority. Cemil told the story with enthusiasm to exemplify ideal dynamics between a father and his children. However, as he continued to speak, he revealed that he is far from his perceived ideal:

---

21 Berger and Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality,* 111-112.

> I used to stand up when my father came in, we would sit on the floor or on the sofa, when he came in I used to stand up immediately and offer him a seat. Now, the girl[22] and Selim used to be busy with the remote or a cell phone when I come home from work. They do not give a damn about their father or anyone else. I do not think that it's only my children who behave like that. These things are important my dear. Respect is important. You do not have to like a man to respect him. Respect is the order of God. God made it. You respect the older and love the younger.

While he was speaking, he did the impressions of his children hanging his legs over the armrest of the couch he was sitting on. However, he did not speak in an accusing manner. Instead, he mentioned his feeling of inadequacy as a father:

> I have never said no to my children. Why? Do you assume because I learned it from my father? No, not because of that. […] Think about it. My father worked at a factory we grew up with [limited means]. You would not buy a pair of shoes, when we bought a pair we used to wear them for three, five or ten years. I have to tell the truth. My wife and I still discuss about it, I have never said no to my children, [because] I did not enjoy [my life], but they should. […] For example, my daughter goes somewhere, she says, "I feel your gravity even here father." When she goes away, I call and ask her, "What are you doing, girl? Is there any problem? Do you have money?" Really, I do this. I tell this but I cried much. Why? My daughter graduated from college. I ask myself why I cannot buy a car for her. I raised my kids well. I did not leave them without money. Know this. […] They got the best phone, best clothes. I did not let them feel distressed. When people see Selim, they believe that he is the son of a rich man. He even hanged out in Etiler [a fancy neighborhood] for a while. This is real. I have such a feeling, this is fatherhood, when my child asks for money, if I cannot give it I shoot my-

[22] This is a phenomenon that I often come across in daily life; some parents with a daughter and son are tend to talk about their daughter as "the girl" while they talk about their son by name. During the interviews, I observed the same tendency.

> self and I won't bleed. […] Thank God, nothing like that has ever happened.

He, like most of the interviewees, told how he helped his own father turn his authority into "affective enchantment" and then exemplified his softer attitude toward his children. That is the interviewees recognize the principles of fatherly domination. However, they are deprived of "affective enchantment" that their fathers used to have.

6.2.1 *A Lack of Appreciation*

Since the dissolution of the military government in the beginning of the 1980s, Turkey has been implementing neoliberal economic policies to restructure economic and social life in many respects.[23] Privatization, multinational companies, a free market, and foreign goods informed the new order with the help of advertising industry in such a way that "Opening one's business, getting married, owning a house, a car, and home appliances, traveling on holidays, and being financially comfortable came to be *the* aspiration, TV ads featured families who had 'made it.' Happiness was measured on a scale of buying and easily consuming."[24] As such, new identity politics articulated with new consumption patterns.[25] Demet Lüküslü, a researcher of youth, assumes that irrespective of social background, conformism and an inclination to consumption define youth in Turkey.[26] Accordingly, Deniz Yonucu illustrates how young people detach from a working class culture through consumption to be in included in the modern world.[27]

The new order implicates itself in the interviewees' lives by disenchanted children with the father. One of the reasons of disenchantment is that

---

23 Senses, "Turkey's Exprience with Neoliberal Policies," 15.

24 Navaro-Yashin, *Faces of the State*, 80-81.

25 Ilkay Demir, "The Development of and Current State of Youth Research in Turkey: An Overview," *Young* 20 (2012): 98.

26 Demet Lüküslü, *Türkiye'de Gençlik Miti: 1980 Sonrası Gençliği* (Istanbul: Iletisim, 2009).

27 Deniz Yonucu, "From the Place of the 'Dangerous Classes' to the Place of Danger: Emergence of New Youth Subjectivities in Zeytinburnu," MA Thesis, (Boğaziçi University, 2005).

most of the interviewees are men who began working a paid job at a very early age to contribute to the sustenance of the house without their fathers asking. In other words, they become of help to the family, unharming the fatherly authority. On the other hand, their children's help is to be invoked. Their narratives oscillate between a desire to prevent their children from suffering in life and complaining about a lack of appreciation of their fatherhood. Cavit, for example, compared his generation to the younger generation and gave voice to his feeling of inadequacy as a father in the form of accusations toward his children:

> As kids, we would celebrate to have some halvah or fruit at home. Yet they do not. They want different things. You cannot catch up with today's generation. I have never gone on a sea vacation like Antalya, Mersin or Izmir. I never had the opportunity. Yet my children have. They are still not happy. They cannot be satisfied. They have different expectations from life. […] Yet even if we were hungry we would not let our parents feel unhappy, we used to be patient. We swallowed it, and life went on. […] Today's generation is not satisfied. [They seek] always the better, the more. They are so. We cannot do anything about this. We cannot overcome it. We cannot explain it to today's generation so that they become normal again.

He exemplified what Arlie Russell Hochschild names "emotion work" or "deep acting." It is "the act of trying to change in degree or quality an emotion or feeling" to be appropriate to the immediate situation.[28] He, like many other interviewees, was a good performer of "deep acting" to sustain the "affective enchantment" of his father's authority, when he was a child. Now, he is disappointed with his disenchanted children, who refuse to perform "deep acting." The difference between him and his father is that he had to verbalize his need for his children's financial help. He complained, "My children have never supported me financially. They could not find a decent job. They could not finish the school," although his children got a college degree. In fact, he was critical of his eldest daughter since she pursues a

[28] Arlie Russell Hochschild, "Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure," *American Journal of Sociology* 85 (1979): 561.

master's degree instead of working a paid job to contribute to the sustenance of the house.

One of the most striking moments during the research was when the son of Tahsin resembled himself and his brother to Ziraat Bank, a state-owned bank. Tahsin was telling that his son from his first wife called and asked for help with his marriage preparation:

> He talked to my wife. We decided to help him. […] I said, "I will buy five bracelets, furniture and stuff that he and his fiancée need." We organized a beautiful wedding. I bought everything for them. […] My children helped me too. We helped them as a family.

At this moment, his son interrupted his speech and playfully told me "We are, you know, Ziraat Bank." His two sons, my gatekeeper and I laughed at this non-malicious joke. Yet Tahsin continued to speak raising his voice. Half an hour later, he brought the subject back here, "My children give me [money] when I need. They lend each other too. We have a shared budget. If anyone is pressed for money everyone is ready to help." While I listened to the record, I noticed that he raised his voice again saying this. This time his son interrupted his speech to say, "As long as we can, we support [the house]. This house is a family I mean it is a house because there is a family here. So, each one of us will try to support [the house]."

At this point, I would like add that most of the interviewees consider a non-working wife the evidence of a husband's competence in making a living, but some invoked their wives' help too. Eight of the interviewees urged their wives to work in a paid job after years of marriage. Cemil explained the difference between men of his generation and his father's generation saying, "You cannot make a living unless both the wife and husband work. If only a man works, he cannot make a living. Yet, he could do it in the past." Similarly, Muhsin stated that his biggest mistake in life was not to permit his wife to work:

> Everything is about making a living. As your income increases, you feel relieved. […] I wish [I permitted her to work] It was my biggest mistake. I prevented her from working. I did not know. In our village, women would not be allowed to work outside. We did the same thing, because we were raised like that. We did the same thing, but it is wrong.

> Wrong. Why wrong? God forbid! If we did not have children, if I divorced her, what would she do? […] If she had begun working ten years ago, I would have been much more comfortable.

Deniz Yükseker focuses on the affective dimension of poverty caused by the poorly functioning social state mechanism and argues that indebtedness is the cement of the Turkish society. The sense of indebtedness shapes individuals' relationship to family, community, and political society. It reproduces power relations and conflicts by naturalizing them. People cannot escape the idea that they owe to their families as children and to state as citizens. Referring to previous research, which shows that children feel guilty when they enjoy their childhood while their father and mother bear the burden of poverty, she says that in the idealized Turkish family, children cannot pay their debts to their fathers and mothers. Similarly, citizens are born with an unpayable national debt.[29] Indeed, Cemil's anecdote exemplified it well. Although there is no an encouraging father in the story the son is expected to say "God bless you father. You encouraged me. Let me kiss your hands and feet. You made me [a governor]." This was what Cavit defined "normal" in his critique toward today's generation.

The interviewees established an emotional bond with their economically distressed fathers through sharing life responsibilities. They appreciated their wives because they endured deficiencies together. However, their children refuse to relate to them through responsibilities. X expressed it well while I was interviewing him at his small tailor shop. Before speaking, he wiped the sweat off on his forehead with a piece of fabric in his hand, then wiped the sewing table with the same piece and said:

> Your children do not like you eighty percent. I used to tell my son, "Son, I earn my life here. I do not do anything illegal. I earn everything here. I never pauperized any of you."

Not pauperizing their family is a tactical locality in a fatherly defensive position. Thus, losing it is fatal as what Muhsin told about the crisis in 2002 reveals:

---

[29] Deniz Yükseker, "Türkiye Toplumunu Birarada Tutan Nedir? Toplumsal Tutkal Olarak Borç," *Toplum ve Bilim* 117 (2010): 12.

> For nine months, I saw what hunger and poverty meant in 2001 during the crisis. I failed to pay rent for nine months. There was no electricity, no water. They were not cut, but I could not pay [the bills]. [I had] debts. God bless him, I have a friend from Konya, he lives in Konya now. He helped me. He was a worker at a glass factory. When he bought two kilos of something, he bought a kilo of the thing for me too, not for a day or two, but for nine months. […] We got through nine months like this. She [my wife] got sick. We had kids. There was none to take care. […] In the end, I said to myself, "If I cannot manage this, I commit suicide. If I cannot take care of my children, I commit suicide." I thought it.

However, they are also aware of that not pauperizing their family is not enough. In the above quote Cemil said, "My daughter graduated from college. I ask myself why I cannot buy a car for her" and added, "[…] when my child asks for money, if I cannot give it I shoot myself and I won't bleed." What motivates them to act in that way is their experience of deprivation, as Muhsin stressed:

> Muhsin: I have never seen a wedding or a party until I was eighteen. Until I was nineteen, I never wore a normal pair of shoes.
>
> Me: What did you wear?
>
> Muhsin: Rubbers. Black rubbers. My cousin bought me my first shoes before I was conscripted. […] Its size was 35. It was too small. I remember it very well. […] I suffered a lot. I work hard so that [my children] will not suffer, too.

Accordingly, most of the interviewees deal with unending responsibilities toward their children and some of them told that they feel unappreciated. X gave an account of how much he struggled as a father:

> Since 2015, my son's damage to me is five hundred thousand liras. He got divorced, sold my share of a house. I said him not to, but no. He did not listen to me. He wronged. Now, I pay two thousand liras to my grandchildren. I bought a house. When my son got divorced, I said my daughter-in-law that as long as she takes care of my grandchildren I take care of her. They got divorced, the kid [referring to his son] promised to pay five thousand liras a month, but he never did. I like my grandchildren […] my daughter-in-law does not have parents, I cannot leave them

> on the street. […] Fatherhood never ends for us. We cannot say goodbye [to our children] like Europe[ans], when they turn eighteen.[…] We are tenderhearted, we suffered a lot, [we] want our son, our daughter not to suffer.

Hakkı was another interviewee, who asked me questions about my earnings implying that I am a burden to my family because I pursue a graduate degree. He said over and over again, "I have always carried nine people on my back" off-the-record. He is a man whose fatherly authority is tested by urban life. He tried to live his life the way his father did, he went regularly to different countries and cities for construction jobs while his family stayed in his homeland. However, when his sons grew up they collaborated with their mother and moved to Istanbul. He was about to cry as he was telling the whole story:

> Bahtiyar called me and said, "Father, we came to a wedding in Istanbul and rented a house." They went to the wedding of his uncle's child, of [my wife]'s brother's child. Then, relatives told my wife that you have grown-up sons, why do you live in that town? Move here. Your sons will work at the sock factory. […] I said, "You have already rented a house. Do it if you want to." […] I have been carrying Istanbul on my back since [19]72. We grew up with the bread of Istanbul. We made a living because of it. It is a good thing to be in Istanbul for those who can earn some money. However, it did not work for us. I have lost. I have lost everything.[…] When I was in our homeland, I went abroad to work and then bought a tractor in cash. I bought our house in cash. I could save money there. You did not [have to] spend much. You did not [have to] pay rent. You spent sparingly. You could save much more money. […] We came to Istanbul, and I could not save any money since 2002.

In fact, the thing that unsettles him is that he has to live an urban life that is disenchanted with his abilities as a father. He lives both in his homeland and in Istanbul, but his wife refuses to go back to their homeland even for a short period:

> I stood on my own both in my homeland and in the city. I raised my kids in the village as if they were urban kids. Everyone was proud of my children. I used come to Istanbul, while travelling I used to buy clothes

> or stuff, people in our village could not get their family dressed by such clothes but I could. […] Everyone was jealous of my wife. I did not let her work outside. I said her, "You will not go to work. I will go regularly and put money in your pocket." Now, our neighbors ask me "What causes conflict between you? We know you, you did not force her to work, you did not keep her without food and water, you took care of her, you went abroad and opened a bank account for her."

He was upset because he does not have any influence on his family. Yet, he said that despite everything disturbing him, he continues to support his children whenever they ask for help. Similarly, Yüksel stated that whenever her daughter calls on him to stay at her house for a week or ten days he understands that his daughter and son-in-law are in financial trouble. He was proud of himself because he always supported them.

However, Aslan, who, as a divorced father, does not represent normative standards, stated that he did not involve in his son's wedding process not because he has been living apart from his children for the last two years but because he does not have enough financial resources:

> Aslan: I did not go [to the house of the girl to meet her parents] because I was divorced. I said [to my son] "Either I and my relatives come with you or she [his ex-wife] and her relatives." He chose her.
>
> Me: Did you say anything?
>
> Aslan: No, not at all. Even I could avoid a financial burden. […] Let's say, if that day I had had twenty thousand liras, I would not have let my [ex] wife go. I would have intervened. I would have gone. […] I would have said, "She will not come with you, I will."

He is a divorced man, hence his ease to accept his inadequacy as a father. He knew that he is not the normative father, who keeps his family intact at any cost. Indeed, when I asked about the time he began to feel the difficulties of fatherhood he explained it in terms of financial inadequacy:

> When children are grown-ups. When they began to ask for money. Particularly, when things were bad. I mean, our industry was bad too. Five and six months of a year were null. My wife did not work until 2004 or 2005. She began to work later. Specifically, I had a hard time when children were at college. I had a very hard time.

Thus, divorce relieved him from responsibilities that Cemil defined as indispensable qualities of fatherhood, and he has already accepted that he is not able to create "affective enchantment" that his father had.In this context, the neoliberal ethos implicates itself in the interviewees' lives by disenchanted children with them. Their disenchanted adult children make them accept their despair. Although they desire to prevent their children from suffering in life as they did, they do not have the means to achieve this goal. So, they complain about a lack of appreciation of their fatherhood.

6.2.2 *A Generation That Dares to be Demanding*

Ilhami as a minority man, is not an exception. His memories are full of stories upholding patriarchal authority, but he does not act like one:

> My soul is bound by my father. One day, it was a feast day I went to a payphone to call my father. I swear, I was holding a cigarette in my hand. When it was my turn, I was smoking, but when I was talking to my father, I was both crying and hiding the cigarette in my hand. When I finished, I got out. There was an old man behind me. He did not speak on the phone, approached me and asked, "Who did you talk to?" I said, "My father." "Where is he?" I said, "He is in Kars." He kissed me on my forehead, started to cry with me and said, "Good for you, there are 1700 kilometers between you and your father and you are speaking on the phone hiding the cigarette."

To express to what extent he respected his father he added, "Believe me I have two children but I have never taken them in my arms in front of my father." However, his relationship with his children is in stark contrast:

> I have two children and we do not have a father and child relationship. We are like friends. My daughter calls me Ilhami. It shows something for me. I mean we are like friends. […] As a man who is hungry for the love of a father, I never projected it to my children. […] A father has to know who he is, but a child should know that her father is an unbreakable castle.

He defined his relationship with his children as friendly, but condemned his cousin because he behaved disrespectfully toward his father:

> I see it in my own environment, my uncle's son sits next to his father, crosses his legs and waves his rosary in front of his father. He is your father you do disrespect him in the worst way.

Obviously, he is more tolerant toward younger generations. Yet he still does not refrain from appreciating his father's generation:

> How could you love fourteen children? When I compare a person's habit of mind with that of the person of thirty, forty, fifty years ago, I see that the old habit of mind is much better than the mindset of a person of this technology age today. I mean, […] if he had shown his love toward his fourteen children, he would have gone crazy.

Differently from him, his brother told him, "When our beloved deceased father carried his grandchildren on his shoulders I would go crazy. My father, who never loved me, carried his grandson on his shoulders." Ilhami defined his brother's critique on their father's attitude as "indiscretion." Interestingly, in Nusret's account, his son writes a different end to the same story, exemplifying the stark contrast between the interviewees' generation and their children's:

> My brother had a baby. I liked him. I hugged him. Then, my older son told me, "You never hugged us like this. When you hugged him, my heart was broken." […] Since I have been the only breadwinner, my mind was always preoccupied with making a living. In doing so, I realized that I have made my children miserable. Now, I never oppose to them about anything, never, because otherwise they hold grudges. I never expected that. The boy who told me that is twenty-two years old, he has just come back from military service. […] When my twenty-two-year-old son said this to me, I was petrified. Now, I do not hug or show compassion for any baby in front of them.

When I asked whether he held grudges against his father, he said, "Yes." Then I commented, "But you never told it." He replied:

> I did not have such luxury, like my children. Did I hold grudges? Yes, I did. I d… I d… I did. I mean, he was oppressive. He would beat me up. He was well disciplined. He would not forgive a single mistake. I felt the whole world was mine, when he died.

That is another explanation verifying that children's judgments have a place in fathers' world. This is the "luxury" that the interviewees' children's generation has. That might be a direct consequence of the fact that "the autonomy of the growing child is no longer seen as a threat to the family," as Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı argues.[30] However, as I will show, it has a gender dimension.

6.2.3 *A Role with Many Obligations*

Tarık defined the role of parents as helping children handle difficulties in life and specified that he goes to Friday prayers in order to protect his daughter with a piercing and an asymmetrical haircut from malicious comments of conservative people in their town. Ömer, as a leftist man suggested that children are prone to be disenchanted with the world rather than the father and positioned fatherhood in a wider picture to show that it is a role with many obligations with little support rather than a source of authority:

---

[30] Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı, *Family, Self, and Human Development Across Cultures: Theory and Applications* (New York: Routledge, 2017), 146. She argues that the new socio-economic factors brought about a new family type in "the Majority World with cultures of relatedness." She conceptualizes it as "the family model of psychological/emotional interdependence." She maintains that the individualistic worldview originated from the modernization theory expects "the family model of total interdependence" to switch to "the family model of independence." The first is prevalent "in rural/agrarian/low-affluence contexts," in which the child's dependence "is ensured through an obedience-oriented socialization and authoritarian parenting," while the second is prevalent "in urban/industrial/high-affluence contexts," in which "both emotional and material investments channeled toward the child." The relational or separate self is the product of these family systems. However, in "the family model of psychological/emotional interdependence," family bonds are important, but autonomy is valued too. "It is now acceptable for the young person to look after his or her own (material) needs given that the elderly parents' needs are provided for by alternative means, such as old-age pensions and the like." Additionally, "with changing lifestyles, autonomy of the growing child becomes functional. That is, autonomy becomes an asset for success in school and urban employment that require active decision-making, agency, and innovation rather than obedience." Thus, the product of this family model is "the autonomous-related self," which "integrates within itself both autonomy and relatedness." (138-147).

I am a retired worker under the conditions of Turkey. […] My pension is higher than that of other retired people because I retired from the public service […] But is my pension enough for my family? It is not. It is 4000 liras. It is better than that of other people. My father-in-law worked for 35 years but has a pension of 1300 liras. I have worked for 17 years in the public service. […] My pension is good, but when it comes to life conditions, [my daughters are] two university students in other cities. Last year one rented a house with her friend in Balıkesir. It costs 700 liras. Two persons pay this. She has to make a livelihood too. She wants to dress and adapt to her environment too. They cost 1500 2000 liras to me per month. Now, my other daughter will leave to study too. She could not find a place in the dormitory. […] Now I have to spend my pension on two of them. We have a life here too. […] Their older sister will marry. There will be expenses for her too. […] There are certain things that the family of the bride is expected to do. […] So, I am a father in Turkey. I have to think about these things. I am their father I have to help them live certain things. What kinds of things? They should not worry about livelihood. They expect it from me. You are a father you help me study. They think so. If you cannot afford, you should not have let me enroll at university in there. My middle daughter says so now. She is right. […]As they grow up, as they socialize, [it becomes harder.] And the society, the system makes them a wannabe. They say my friend has that brand phone and wears from that store. I have no brand new sneakers. I have no brand new boats. […] The system makes them a wannabe. They are under the effect of it with their friends. In the end, it affects family. Family is father at the individual level. Mother does not get involved in anything, saying "I am a mother." I am a primary school grad, as my wife. So, I always worked but my wife never did. […] My middle daughter dreams of being rich. She says, "I am gonna be rich after finishing the university." How? She does not know how. She will be disappointed. I want the system to break down right away so that she won't be disappointed.

6.2.4 *Exercising Authority*

Some interviewees like Metin, Acar, Mücahit, and Erdinç could exercise power over their children's life choices by virtue of their "affective enchantment." After graduating from high school, Metin's two daughters continued their education in distance learning and married because he preferred so. Acar gave an account of his impact on his daughter's preference to study in the Guidance and Psychological Counseling program instead of Law School. At the first year, she decided to quit school and she returned home:

> She came back a few months later and said, "I will not study. I will go to Law School next year." At this point, your paternal instinct is at work. I said, "You will go back and finish that school, then come back here and start to work. If you still want to study law, you will. I am the father, what I say will be done. It is over." I did not compromise. The next day, I bought her ticket and sent her back to the school.

He said that she is happy with the choice and still seeks his guidance on important matters. However, Mücahit was remorseful about his attitude toward his daughter's schooling:

> I did a great mistake. I am honest about it. It was a moment of thought, later, I regretted much, but it was too late. I did not let the girl study. I mean, if she had had an interest in school I would have supported her. She did not show any success in primary and middle schools. She was not interested in classes. I was honest to her. I told her, "If you study you have to study well, not just pass grades. Success is important. Otherwise, I will not let you study. You stay at home and prepare your dowry. I am honest to you. If you study, I support you but if you continue like this, I will not." I am at ease because I told her this. She did not change. So, I said, "Stay at home and prepare your dowry." But I should have let her get a degree of high school at least.

Yet, his "affective enchantment" did not affect his son, who married a girl that Mücahit did not like and then got a divorce. Erdinç also intervened in his son's schooling. He did not let his son study at university forcing him to work a paid job. Yet, he was at ease because he said that his son was learning about life.

In this context, the interviewees, as children of deprivation performed "deep acting" as a requirement of respect toward fatherly authority. They did not embarrass their fathers for lack of paternal love or basic needs. They did not dare to be demanding from their father. They acted as children, who always live indebted to their fathers and mothers, as Yükseker describes. When they became a father, they did not give up on this responsible identity. Fatherhood, in an age of conspicuous consumption, never ends for them. However, they feel unappreciated. They do not have a terminology to define this reality, but they have stories glorifying patriarchal authority of the past. At first glance, these stories might seem as a sign of homesickness for the position of patriarch. Honestly, I had conceptualized their state as being "patriarchsick." However, a nuanced analysis lays bare that they tell these stories to show a "threatening spectre" or "constitutive outside" to fatherhood. They tell these stories to manifest what they waive. They tell these stories to prove that they are not "antimodel" fathers, like their fathers were, but are fathers who are never to be properly appreciated by children.

§ 6.3 The Mores and Fatherly Authority

The interviewees' construction of fatherhood is not independent from their children's ability to construct a socially or nationally acceptable personality. Ünlü maintains that the Turkishness contract requires that each head of household is responsible for keeping the family members within the limits of Turkish affectivity.[31] Thus, men's status of *makbul* fatherhood partly depends on their progeny's ability to see, hear, know, and feel in a certain way as well as not to see, hear, know and feel particular things.[32] In this framework, I will examine the interviewees' evaluation of fatherhood in relation to their adult children's position within society and the methods they invented to sustain fatherly authority.

31 Ünlü, *Türklük Sözleşmesi*, 214-215.

32 Ibid., 16.

While I was at Tahsin's home, he just ignored me in a subtle way and expressed admiration for his children's morality by looking only at his relative's eyes, who was my gatekeeper. He said none of his children would take any lost wallet on the street and told a story of a lost wallet that he returned to the owner. The interviewees shared similar accounts about the fate of real or imaginary full wallets entrusted to their children to show that honesty is their intrinsic asset and the most important inheritance to their children. In this manner, Tahsin's words about his children's and his own morality result from his will to prove that he is a qualified man to father his children and be respected by society. By virtue of their good morality, he and his children are not a source of danger causing disorder. Instead, they maintain order, which is considered more important than the well-being of the individual. Cemil's words crystallize the understanding:

> If a man disturbs the society, not an individual or person, but the society, he is a nuisance. […] If a man disturbs the majority, he is bad, […] but if a man is bad at home, [the inhabitants of his] street cannot say he is bad. Why not? Because, he does not disturb the street.

As such, unqualified or dirty fathers are the source of *fitne* disrupting communal harmony. Indeed, it was a pride for the interviewees that their children were never a reason for complaint within their circles. In that sense, the interviewees have been striving for keeping their children within the limits of Turkish affectivity. Cavit, for example, oscillated between condemnation and pride as he was talking about his eldest daughter, who quit wearing headscarf and his headscarved younger daughter:

> My parents have the religious knowledge; they read Qur'an. I did not teach my children how to say Bismillah, because my parents did. My children know how to read Qur'an, perform prayers, my parents taught them. […] Daily prayers, ablution, wearing a headscarf are important things. […] Fatmanur used to wear a headscarf but quit. […] I let her do. I did not pressure her. If they were headscarved I would be happy, but I did not pressure them. […] But my Esma wears a headscarf. That makes a difference for me. She gives me confidence, I find her that way warmer, and she can create a different atmosphere. She carries out our long-lasting customs. That gives me peace of mind. […] Now, my two daugh-

> ters do not use headscarf. I respect them. There is nothing we can do about it. I do not pressure them. But Esma is different. I am proud of her.

Because of his insistence to interpret his daughter's decision as something he allowed to happen, I questioned about the time her favorite daughter began to wear headscarf he said, "She has never opened her head" as if she had been born headscarved. Then he criticized his youngest daughter:

> She has never used headscarf. She was born and grown up here [Istanbul]. Because of the habits of this place, she has never. She sometime wore a [long, prayer] skirt, performed daily prayers […] but then quit.

Upon hearing this, I wanted to find out more about his eldest daughter and asked about what he felt when she made her decision:

> I did not receive it well. I got upset. I could not accept it at first but I did not pressure her so that she would not face any trouble at school or workplace because of me. There was a headscarf problem at schools before. They were considered extremists or something like that, so I left it up to her so that she would not face such things.

As such, some interviewees portrayed a more permissive and softer image toward their daughters than their sons in educational matters. I believe that "the image of fatherhood which has become part of our culture and which they, on some level of consciousness, believe in,"[33] persuaded them that their daughters are also the inhabitants of the linear historical time. Thus, they expect their daughters to progress in life, too. However, in general, they do not apply the same rules to their daughters and sons, because unlike sons, the private life of daughters can disturb "the street." Salim exemplified it well by his daily warnings he makes to his three daughters: "Do not spend my money on cigarettes. Do not spend my money on *rakı*, alcohol, gambling. Do not go to a bar. Spend my money on books, food, helping the forlorn." In accordance with that, the interviewees are more rigid in handling of challenges from their daughters. Muhsin, for example, said he slapped his daughter in the face once because he found a pocket of cigarettes in her bag:

[33] LaRossa, "Fatherhood and Social Change," 456.

> I caught my daughter with a pocket of cigarettes. There was a pocket of Muratti in her bag. I did something that I did not usually do. It is not my custom to rummage through anything, but I rummaged through my daughter's bag and I found a pocket of cigarettes. I did it because I was worried. […] Then she said, "It is not mine. It is my friend's." I slapped her in the face. […]She was fifteen or sixteen years old, which is an event that happened six or seven years ago.

It was the only occasion in which he resorted to physical violence to control his children. Acting with the same motives, Salim did not put pressure on his daughters, but stalked them in disguise when necessary:

> This is something I got in life. If you do not claim ownership of what you have, somebody else will. As to girls, you should not overwhelm them; you should be friend with them. […] The youngest girl goes to the library. She is always at the library. […] One evening, my wife said, "She will be at the library till ten o'clock." I said, "Okay, I am not here till ten. If she asks, tell her that I am at the coffeehouse." […] I wore a hood and went to the library. I got inside and sat somewhere. I checked it out, but she was not there. There were stuff wandering inside so that nobody does something wrong. I mean there were guards. I asked them whether the place had another floor. One said that there was another floor and a cafe too. […] I went down the stairs […] and saw that they were sitting there; three girls and a boy. They were studying as a group. They were all quiet. I got behind the door and called her. "Where are you girl?" "Father, I told my mother, I am at the library. I will be late. They did not tell you?" […] I hung up and took a glass of tea. I sat there until ten o'clock. They got outside. There were dirty cafes around the place [selling] hookah, beers and whatnot. There were many hooligans in front of the door. Their hair shaped by hair gel, which is I never like. They got outside. I put the hood down on my head. They were walking, and one girl was with my girl. They went down to the subway station I used the elevator. We got inside through different doors. […] We got off the subway […] and they separated at the bus station, the girl walked across the street […] there was a hospital, where my friend's son worked as night security. I would introduce my daughter to him because he is

> like her brother he would protect her. I crossed over and said, "Psst!" She did not look back. She walked faster. Then I said, "Hey!" She said, "Father! What are you doing here?" I said, "I went to the coffeehouse with a friend of mine, now, I am going back home." I did not tell her. Otherwise, she would not trust me.

Later, he stalked her again but showed himself to his daughter and her friends that time because he promised her to visit her in the library. Acar resorted to a more affective path to protect his daughter's morality during her teenage years:

> She fell in love in high school, was over with classes and escaped from school. […] Her teacher warned me saying, "Be careful about her. She is getting away from classes […] We sat and talked. But, you know your child, if she stares at a definite point and does not listen to you, you know that she has already made her decision. I mean whatever you say is meaningless. We began to write to each other at home. Because you say something but she did not understand. I sat and wrote. She wrote back to me. We wrote to each other so that it would be solid. I mean we were at the same house, she was sitting on the sofa across me, I wrote on a paper, as if we were texting. […] Those letters remained until a few years ago. Then I destroyed them because there might be something in them that her husband should not see. […] But I never stalked my children, never intended to find their fault. When I went to school to take them I parked in front of the school door so that they would see me when they got outside.

His method worked in that, he said, his daughters still consult with him about anything related to their private and professional lives. For example, when his daughter, who is an officer in Istanbul, was commissioned during the coup attempt in 2016, she called him to ask what to do because a shoot order was issued. He said that he suggested her that she should follow the orders. Yet he summarized his experience of being a father to his two daughters as such: "Being a girl's father made me a humanist, I began to understand and love people more."

6.3.1 *The Way of Sons*

Fathers seem to have already accepted that the rules are not for their sons. With respect to sons, they were ready to make teasing comments. Muhsin said, “He does not recognize the rules. When I say, do not do that, he does that on purpose. This is his way.” Cemil found the mores responsible for the inequality:

> You easily break the heart of a girl but at the same time, you tame her more easily. A girl easily learns what is right and wrong. You cannot make a boy learn them. This is real. A boy does not follow what you say like a girl. Why is it so? It is in our mores; girls, ladies are of secondary importance.

As a reflection of this understanding, some interviewees, who have both sons and daughters, were prone to talking about their sons more, and during one of those moments, I asked an interviewee, Hüsamettin, why he replied my questions in relation to his son, glossing over his daughters, he said: “Because he is the one who will become a father.” He was proud of his son for his ability to express himself in plays as an amateur actor and told what he expected from his son in return for his fatherly support:

> I told him “Do whatever you want to do. I am not a stern father, but you watch your manners among people. You observe our mores. Do not offend anyone. I wish people come and tell me ‘This is your son, mashallah; he is on his best behavior. He is respectful.’ You do not need to study at university, you do not need to be a doctor, you can be a coolie, he coolie is a man too, he works for a living, but be a man that everybody appreciates.”

In this context, sons have a wider range of freedom as long as they do not become a cause for complaint within their circles. Muhsin’s account corroborated the statement, exhibiting how men apply different rules to their children based on gender:

> I told him, “You can smoke as much as you like in front of me, but do not smoke in front of me in public. This is my only demand from you.” We are father and son but we are like friends. But, in public, you switch back to father and son. I mean, if he smokes in front of me in public it means, “I do not recognize you. I can do whatever I want to. I am free.”

> Sometimes, we drank alcohol together. We did, it is the truth. In fact, we came across in an entertainment. Then we came across again, but I told my friends, "Excuse me, I cannot come with you because my son is there. I cannot join that crowd. If we have fun let us go to another place. But I cannot join the same society with my son." They said, "What about it?" I replied, "No, no way. He is there. When I go to the same place, he will either leave or sit and drink with me. Some tolerate it, but later, they will make gossip of me, saying 'Look, the Sergeant's[34] children do not recognize him. They drink together in public.' People will say that." I have no problem in private.

Obviously, to an extent, the interviewees do not consider the autonomy of their sons a threat to their family. However, they believe that the autonomy of their daughters can damage their family at any time. They permit their sons to have "individual autonomy *within* relatedness" [35] but demand their daughters to have "the related self" whose "boundaries are permeable."[36]

6.3.2 *Keeping Assertive Daughters within Limits*

Daughters with permeable boundaries can be assertive though. As long as they stay within the *makbul* boundaries, fathers expect their daughters to be autonomous at a certain level, as Recai expressed:

> My daughters would adapt to any environment. They stopped when you told them to stop, but you could not tell it a boy. You cannot tell them to stop at some point. […] We have yet to clear this mindset. Man or woman, if they are not confident, they cannot live. They live as a meek person. My wife, for example. She has always been a meek person. We would go to a doctor she could not explain her situation, wondering if the doctor would get angry with her, because her father had oppressed her. [He would tell her] "Shut up! Girls do not talk! The father will speak!" […] I took her to a psychiatrist, the doctor asked her age, she

34 Sergeant is his nickname.

35 Kağıtçıbaşı, *Family, Self*, 363.

36 Ibid., 109.

> was fifty-two or fifty-three, but she said, "I am forty-seven." I told, "Does not your forty-seventh age end? You are fifty-two years old." The doctor was a woman, she said, "Get out. It is none of your business. Our age does not interest you. We are either forty or thirty. Get out, do not interfere!" Why? It does not interest me. It was my fault. She asked her. That's it. Fathers used to be like this.

Yet, girls can be assertive without going beyond the *makbul* limits. While talking about how he connected to his granddaughters, he informed these limits:

> I did not beat them up. Not even a slap. […] My daughters scorn my grandchildren. I encourage my daughters to talk to their children not to yell at them. Recently, I took my granddaughter to Kadıköy. I showed some girls and said, "Look at these girls, they are drinking alcohol, you see their state. Is it good?" She said, "No, grandpa." Then, I showed her other people. "Look at them. What are they doing? Is that family good or not?" She said, "No, grandpa, this family is good, not that." I said, "Well […] but that family. Everybody curses them. That is the bad way. You choose your friend well. Have two clean friends instead of ten."

It is ironic that as a man, who worked at a beer factory, has a bad judgment for women who drink alcohol. Since he does not criticize men for the same reason, the mores, not his religious belief is what makes him critical of women for drinking alcohol. His explanations imply that girls are responsible for maintaining social harmony by observing the *makbul* limits:

> I would say, "Girl, adapt to environment. [If there are] covered families, you cover your head too." […] I mean, if people are covered, cover your head. The environment does not adapt to you, you adapt to it. There was a girl here, she would put her dress in her bag [at home] then change it [somewhere else]. My sisters did not cover their heads too, I don't ask people "Why is your head not covered." [I don't care] whenever you cover [your head]. Derya, the one who is a teacher, has always been uncovered. One day, she came and told me "I will cover my head." I said, "Inshallah." She would grow her nails, I would tell, "Trim them!" She used to say her mother, "Don't interfere with my things." My wife measured the time between home and school, when the girl was late she

> got out. [She was like] where are you? […] [The girl was like] but mother, my friends… I said, "No, bring your friends home." When she brought her friends, I met her friends' families too. I met one's family then I told "Girl, don't let this one in. She is bad. Her mother and father were bad too." In the end, she was convinced. […] You should choose family environment and their friends, […] a boy can protect himself but a girl cannot. […] If a girl is stained, her life is over.

In this framework, a girl is expected to be assertive as long as she does not counteract with the mores. Indeed, he shared how his youngest daughter conflicted with a dean at university on behalf of her religious belief:

> She studied in […] for two years, in the second year she squeezed the dean's throat. The dean called me. I was working in the shipyard. He said, "Your daughter squeezed my throat. I will sue her." It was because of religion. He was an atheist. She read Qur'an. [They had discussed] whether there is a god or not. I thought they would not let her live there peacefully. I asked her what to do. She said, "I will transfer to another university." I said "Come here, it does not matter which university." Her first choice was not successful. She transferred to […] University. There, she came second but they did an injustice to her. She objected. We hardly stopped her. Her fiancé, mother-in-law, father-in-law were here. She was engaged that time. [But] we hardly stopped her.

Similarly, the most self-critical interviewee, Acar was proud of his younger daughter's idealism. He said he interfered with his daughters' jobs to protect them when necessary and gave a very heartbreaking example:

> There were boarding schools known as YIBO here. My daughter was working there. There was sexual harassment. She was staying overnight a month. There, girls told her. Next day, she came to me she did not speak to her mom. She said, "I want to talk to you about something." We talked for four or five hours because families might reject their daughters, girls might deny, the opposing side might take a stand against us. We talked about all. I said, "Give up." This is paternal instinct to protect. I said, "Give up, talk to families, they do something." […] My daughter said, "No father." She was not married that time. She said, "It will be on my conscience. I cannot for-

> give myself in future if I do not do anything." I said, "You know better." Next day she talked to the principal. He rejected, because the harasser was the vice principal. […] Then she asked me to go with her to the counseling center. We did. […] YIBO was closed because of this incident. […] Then other incidents happened […] I told her to stay away. We were threatened, they accused her of defamation, she was threatened too. […] I told her not to get involved in such things again. In the meantime, she got engaged, married and got away from these things.

Contrarily, Ömer was critical of his daughters because they are politically less active:

> My wife saw my humanistic side but also knew that I am faithless. […] If her family knew my way of living, my ideas they would not let us marry. If they find out, they take their daughter back now. I mean religion is such hostility. My in-laws practice religion in every sense. They get angry with their sons and daughters when they do not practice religion. […] So, my wife pressures our daughters not to follow their father. […] I sometimes take my children to the events of the party. […]. But sometimes they are affected by their mother. […] Their mother are used to say them, "Don't follow your father's opinion." She can't spell his ideology or system, [but in fact she means it]. She has such concerns. The government imprisoned many innocent people. Sometimes my wife tells me her concerns; "Be careful, you have three daughters. If anything happens to you, they cannot carry on their studies. I cannot take care of them. […]" She also warns our daughters, asking them not to join any movement. For example, my oldest daughter met the youth organization of the party when she was a freshman but she was corrupted later because of her mother. […] She had become a member of Syndicate of Educational and Scientific Labor at my insistence. I told her the syndicate would protect her. At the start of her tenure, in […] district of Diyarbakır, the district director of national education summoned her to ask why she is a member of the syndicate. […] It coincided with the time FETO attempted [to overthrow the government] in 2016.

> She said, "I will leave the syndicate." But she was not alone. Ninety percent of her teacher friends left the syndicate. It coincided with that time. She could not resist. Because she does not have such consciousness, she left the syndicate. […] She probably likes her way of life because she knows how the party works from her youth. When she is in the party, she gets tired, has stuff to do, has to resist the system. She does not prefer it, finds comfort in her way.

Nevertheless, girls do not easily claim "their own way." While I was at Osman's house, her daughter came home from a preparatory school for the university entrance exam at the end of the interview and as soon as she met me, we began talking about her preparation process for the second time. During the conversation, Osman said, "What if you slap in the face" yearning for his stern teachers at his vocational high school and complained about the corruption in the education system that does not let teachers beat students up. He told that his teacher slapped him in the face once because he made a dangerous mistake while working with a lathe, and thanks to that slap, he never made the same mistake again. His daughter immediately objected to him and disaffirmed any kind of violence at schools. She said that the slap worked for him because he had already been a student conscious enough to realize the damages of his mistake. The quarrel continued by her complains about people's reaction to other people's visible identities. She was a headscarved young girl wearing a long and loose dress with yoke and harshly criticized that people always expect her to be a well-mannered girl. She was very clear that feeling obliged to act in that way makes her feel tired.

In that sense, daughters challenge to fatherly authority and sometimes ally with their mothers. When I was at Iskender's house, his wife sat beside me and after the interview, she whispered to me that their newlywed daughter has flirted with her husband for a longer time than her father knows. She was proud that they successfully managed a lie together for years. Men do not permit their daughters to flirt for long periods, because they consider it a sign of the malevolence of the groom-to-be. It is important for them to marry their daughters off to a man of honor, like themselves. This is a subject that all interviewees irrespective of their background, agree upon. Metin

expressed that he did not care about the financial situation of his sons-in-law, instead, he valued their morality:

> They take care of my most precious assets. They were both students when they stood before me. [...] We talked to the older groom for two and a half minutes. [...] I do not know how to play soccer, I do not understand trade at all, there are many subjects I do not know about, there are many subjects I am ignorant of, but I think I understand a man. [When I sized up him] I thought he is a man enough.

Arman reflected on the issue similarly:

> In my opinion, [I do not approve if] he is an Armenian, but does not take care of his family. Let him be a Sunni or Alawite, it does not matter, he should take care of his family. He should take care of his wife, his children. He should make them happy, not upset. This is my only expectation as a father. If it comes true, I can die without a desire unaccomplished.

However, I should add that Arman supported his daughter to flirt with different persons so that she could compare them and take a life changing decision more wisely.

6.3.3 *Daughters-In-Law Testing Fatherly Authority*

For most of the interviewees, who have sons and daughters, only sons had the privilege of testing fatherly authority by wrong partnerships and marriages. When Hakkı's daughter-in-law wanted to divorce, he defended his son against his in-laws:

> She said, "I cannot live with her [her mother-in-law]." I wanted to separate their house. But she did not want it. Then I said, "If you don't want him, take him to court!" Her family waited us to do it, they thought they would earn something from it, but we did not. It dragged on for two years. Then they did. I hired a lawyer right away. […] After that, I married the son off. The second bride is from a village nearby ours. She had married and divorced too.

Mücahit, too, was not happy with his daughter-in-laws, but he said, his son disregarded his comments:

> Although young men live with their father, sometimes they do not listen to their father's advice. For example, a person can feel it. It would be easier to get along, no matter who she is, if he married someone from my homeland, but it is difficult to get along with the people of the Iskenderun, especially of Adana. They met in Ankara, while he was studying at military university. He told me. Fathers hear it last, mothers always know before. We met the family of the girl, but as soon as I saw them, I said, "Look son, give up on this, when you have time. You cannot get along with them." He said, "No, I love her." I said, "Son, at first, it looks like love, but over time it turns to a knife and cuts you." […] They married for eight and a half months. We are people of moderate means. […] If I have a *lira*, I will make a living according to a lira. […] You need a family to adapt to this. But they were not like that. I sensed this as soon as I saw them. You know what I mean? It took him three years to pay the debt he owed in eight and a half months.

In a similar fashion, Ilhami complained about his daughter-in-law off-the-record when we stayed alone, because she is a religious Sunni girl wearing niqab and teaching Qur'an in the neighborhood. However, the most striking comment on daughters-in-law comes from Aslan, who, when I asked where his son met his daughter-in-law, said, "We found her on the street" and told how his son met his daughter-in-law at a protest against the government.

All these comments confirm that, except for fathers like Ömer, fathers resort to different methods to keep their children within the *makbul* limits not to let them be a source of danger causing disorder or *fitne*. Because that their children were never a reason for complaint within their environment validates their performance of good fatherhood. For example, as Acar typifies, they do not want their children to conflict with state institutions. Both Acar and Recai implied that their daughters' way to marriage was the reason leading them to the right path. They, like other interviewees, pushed their daughters to make a patriarchal bargain, securing "protection in exchange

for submissiveness and propriety."[37] Acar suggested to his daughters that they should not get involved in any conflict with state institutions, while Recai admonished his daughters to adapt to the sensitivities of their entourage. In that sense, Cavit's daughter was the bravest to break her chains. But Cavit preferred to interpret her decision as something resulting from his permissive and softer fatherhood. Indeed, all interviewees, unlike their fathers, who had resorted to violence, resorted to more affective ways, improving their codeswitching skills to maintain both their closer relationship with their children and their father image in their entourage. However, with respect to daughters, they do not hesitate to resort to violence, as in the case of Muhsin.

§ 6.4 Conclusion

Waling, arguing that "agency is a conditional possibility for negotiating discourse and subjectivity," recommends that we endeavor to understand how men conceptualize and reflect on their practices.[38] In this manner, I try to understand how the interviewees conceptualize and reflect on their paternal subjectivities.

Their military and other life experiences taught them to be cynical and not being critical of violence, but they prefer to treat their children based on what they learned as a child worker; they acknowledged another man's paternal authority over themselves, or claimed the right to impersonate the father upon having suitable qualifications such as diligent, discreet, clean, just, religious, and attentive to his social environment. They do not deny their right to patriarchal authority, but their cynical reason is replaced by naïveté. I believe, this is the result of being emotionally reflective on their difficult childhood experiences. Abject poverty, lovelessness, and being fathered by an "antimodel" father motivated them to prevent their children from being socially and economically vulnerable in life, as they were. Simi-

37 Deniz Kandiyoti, "Bargaining with Patriarchy," 283.

38 Waling, "Rethinking," 11-14.

lar to the schema regarding having a goodhearted personality and being deceived, for them, fatherhood requires a preacceptance that a father is never to be properly respected and appreciated. They accept that they are not capable of creating "affective enchantment," and that their children, born to the culture of conspicuous consumption, are not willing to perform "deep acting," as they were, and dare to be demanding in many senses.

Since they have not built their own terminology to define their paternal practices, they describe their positionality by telling stories glorifying patriarchal authority of the past. Their "antimodel" fathers are their "threatening spectre" or "constitutive outside," enabling them to redefine the "culture" and "conduct" of *makbul* fatherhood. Yet, this does not mean that they do not continue to uphold patriarchal rules. Except for fathers with a non-*makbul* social background like Ömer and Arman, they apply different rules to their sons and daughters to keep them within the confines of *makbul* limits. However, that is understandable considering that these limits are also the limits of their networks of solidarity.

7

Conclusion

The men whose narratives of *makbul* fatherhood constitute the basis for the analysis offered in this study are over fifty years old, who identify as Turkish-Sunni-Muslim, whose work experience is predominantly in manual labor. Almost all of them come from a rural family. They are predominantly the children of not-yet urbanized Turkey aiming an "agriculture-led growth" and "import-substituting industrialization" respectively in the 1950s and 1960s.[1] Thus, labor is the most encompassing feature of their childhood experience. Moreover, the physical and psychological absence of their father forced them to substitute him as a boy. They exemplify men of a particular generation and social class, who shared a similar "lack" in life. Differently from their families, most of them started their own breadwinner-homemaker family and had children in urban areas during the country's neoliberal transition.

They are men who are qualified to enter into "the contract of fatherhood" between heteronormative men and the nation-state, which provide men with certain privileges, as long as they accept that only men are politically engaged individuals and their all actions are politically loaded in favor of or against the state. Therefore, I embarked to expose the relationship be-

[1] Pamuk, *Uneven Centuries*, 207-220.

tween "the heteropatriarchal-nationalist governmentality" and their construction and experiences of fatherhood.

In this manner, first, drawing upon Douglas's conceptualization of "dirt" I problematized the term fatherhood and pointed out the difference between having a child and performing fatherhood. What the interviewees socially understand from fatherhood goes beyond having a child. Once they shouldered financial responsibilities and established paternal authority over their wives or siblings, they began to perform it. They have a different temporal experience from their wives, for whom motherhood does not begin as soon as they get married. As the inhabitants of the linear historical time, they know the burden of being "pinioned" to manly progression. Thus, in the case of siblings, their paternal role overlaps with being a good son. They prefer to act without harming their father's authority.

In that sense, *makbul* fatherhood is the ability to make a living in a pure way and differentiate the good or "pure" from the bad or "dirty" on behalf of their dependents. Therefore, their children were born into a house where there was an already established pattern of fatherhood. Consequently, the interviewees interpreted having a child by the emotional and intellectual tools that their established pattern of fatherhood has been providing them for years. They experienced a tension between an unwavering trust in their ability to provide for the family in a pure way and their socio-economic vulnerabilities because of the lack of comprehensive social policies. They solved this problem by considering fatherhood "as an inevitable fate, for which the individual may disclaim responsibility" and reifying it by "bestow[ing] on it an ontological status independent of human activity and signification."[2] Thus, grandiosity and despair informed the dynamics of their paternal bond with children. However, the interviewees with non-*makbul* affiliations like Ilhami and Arman portrayed different figures. Ilhami decried all established rules about the "pure" and "dirty," at least in terms of ethno-religious sensitivities and refused to be the ultimate decision-maker, while Arman questioned what fatherhood is and tried to discover its meaning for him after

[2] Berger and Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality*, 107-108.

having a child. Nevertheless, all interviewees agree to that fatherhood has something to protecting and preserving home. Yet protectiveness toward home and family is not a free-flowing concept for minority men, because socio-political environment interrupts their protective affection. They find themselves in a position to protect themselves in the first place.

Second, the rationale behind men's paternal authority over their wives, siblings, and children are some male-specific experiences that had prepared them to be a patriarch with networks of solidarity. By exploiting Goffman's term, "moral career," I deconstructed these formative male-specific experiences serving as justification of fatherly authority. Except those who were students at a boarding school after having completed primary education in their village, the interviewees' life journey began by leaving their village either for the sake of a paid work in cities at an early age or for military service. However, whatever the reason is, their departure marks the beginning of their "moral career" as an individual. First, they comprehended the terms and conditions of positioning themselves in a world of paternalistic solidarity. Men, who left their hometown for work at an early age either sought a fatherly protector or acted as one. Either way, they demonstrate that society has some criteria to assess a man as to whether he is qualified to father or not. People acknowledge a man's paternal authority over another man upon having some qualifications such as being diligent, discreet, clean, just, religious, and attentive to his social environment. Thus, the interviewees tried to prove that they had these qualities. Second, through military service, they intuitively gained the knowledge of politics of paternity. By that, they learned to position themselves and other men as the citizens whose actions have political bearings. Third, they met politics through different experiences; however, their point of destination was the same. They went to the point where they situated themselves as the "host" of the country. Their stories uncovered the uneasy relationship between normative manhood, patriotism, xenophobia, and violence. Fourth, they learned how to deal with injustices done to them within the Turkish community by staying loyal to their community despite deception and betrayal. These experiences and the line of thinking that they acquired through them are the rationale behind their claim to paternal authority over their families.

Third, I examined their narratives of being fathered and the role of these narratives in legitimizing their attitude toward their children. They, as children of deprivation performed "deep acting" as a requirement of respect toward fatherly authority. They did not embarrass their fathers for lack of paternal love or basic needs. They did not dare to be demanding from their father. They acted as children, who always live indebted to their fathers and mothers, as Yükseker describes. Most of them have "identical categories of perception and appreciation" with fatherly authority of the past and recognize the patriarchal principles in whose name they were oppressed.

However, they figured out that their father served an "antimodel;" they are their own role models. But they are so by not showing an in-your-face attitude toward their stern fathers. They still observe daily subtleties not to harm their fathers' paternal authority. They criticize their stern fathers in a position of learned helplessness. Their portrayal of their father as a stern authority before their helpless childhood selves serves to express their stark contrast with them. All interviewees portray themselves as more caring and less oppressive than their fathers were. Although they were referred by my gatekeepers within the framework of *makbul* fatherhood, they are the ones who redefine the "culture" and "conduct" of *makbul* fatherhood.

This being the case, they have a strong desire to be appreciated by both their natal families as a son and their own children as a father. Yet to be appreciated by children is a more challenging task. They have a strong desire to prevent their children from being socially and economically vulnerable in life, as they were. Thus, they have created an environment for their children to dare to be demanding from their family in many senses. They invented new mild methods to sustain fatherly authority. However, they feel unappreciated.

Since they have not built their own terminology, such as "new fatherhood," to define their paternal practices, they seem to have developed another strategy to describe their positionality. They describe their positionality by telling stories glorifying patriarchal authority of the past. They tell these stories to manifest what they waive. They tell these stories to prove that they are not a party to an "ignorance contract," to which their fathers were, as they were ignorant to their children's "struggles, pain, joy, and ac-

complishments."[3] They tell these stories to show that they are fathers who are aware that they are never to be properly appreciated by children.

Their "antimodel" fathers are their "threatening spectre" or "constitutive outside," enabling them to redefine the "culture" and "conduct" of *makbul* fatherhood. Yet, this does not mean that they do not continue to uphold patriarchal rules. Except for fathers with a non-*makbul* social background like Ömer and Arman, they apply different rules to their sons and daughters to keep them within the confines of *makbul* limits. However, that is understandable considering that these limits are also the limits of their networks of solidarity.

In this context, for lower-middle class men of a generation that falls under the category of "old fatherhood," *makbul* fatherhood qualifies those men, who suffered a lot but was able to secure a network of patriarchal Turkish-Sunni-Muslim solidarity by virtue of being diligent, discreet, clean, just, religious, and attentive to their social environment. It qualifies those, who never hesitated to take responsibility on behalf of their dependents and could provide a living in a pure way. It qualifies those whose adult children have never been a source of complaint in their circles. Lastly, it qualifies those who are emotionally reflective on their childhood experiences and flexible enough to redefine the limits of *makbul* fatherhood by acting more permissive and approachable for their children to maintain the dignity of both their children and their own. So, ironically, although the experiences and the line of thinking that they acquired through their "moral career" are the rationale behind their claim to paternal authority over their families, the rationale behind giving them the symbolic recognition of a "good" father in the habitus of "old fatherhood" is their ability to redefine the "old" *makbul* boundaries.

[3] Steyn, "The Ignorance Contract," 16.

Appendix A Information on the Interviewees

1. Muhsin, father of one daughter and a son in their twenties, is a fifty five-year-old, primary school graduate driver in a factory. He was born in a village of a small city located in Marmara Region, but after having completed military service migrated to Kocaeli, an industrial centre, for paid work. His daughter is a graduate of middle school and married while his son is a graduate of industrial school and single. Both his wife and son work to contribute to livelihood.
2. Yüksel, father of one daughter in early thirties and a son in late twenties, is a fifty five-year-old retired man with a vocational high school degree. He was born in a village in the Black Sea region where he currently lives. His children studied in religious vocational school and both are married, but his daughter lives in Istanbul.
3. Hakkı, father of three daughters and four sons, is a primary school graduate retired man in his sixties. His children live in different cities, but he lives both in Istanbul and his village in an inland city of the Black Sea region. His only one son has high school degree which is the highest level of education among his children.
4. Cavit, father of three daughters and a son in their twenties except the thirty one-year-old daughter, is a primary school graduate constructor worker in his fifties. He was born in a village of the east coast of the Black Sea region and after marriage he migrated to Istanbul for paid work. His three daughters have bachelor's degree while his son is a high school graduate. Except the oldest daughter, his children are married. At the time of the interview he was unemployed because of the crisis in construction industry in Turkey.
5. Recai, father of four daughters in their late twenties and early thirties, is a primary school graduate retired man. He was born in a village of the East Anatolian city then migrated to Istanbul with his family as a teenager. But after many years he decided to move an-

other city in the same region where he currently lives. His one daughter has bachelor's degree, and all of them are married.

6. Osman, father of one daughter and a son in their twenties, is a fifty seven-year-old, vocational school graduate retired man. He was born in a village of the west coast of the Black Sea region and later migrated to another city in the Marmara Region for paid work. At the time of the interview, his daughter was preparing for university entrance exam while his vocational high school graduate son worked as a technician.
7. Salim, father of three daughters of who two are in mid-twenties while one is a teenage, is a fifty five-year-old primary school graduate tailor. He was born in a village of the Central Anatolia and then moved to Istanbul for paid work where he currently lives. His two daughters are married and have bachelor's degrees while the youngest one is a student in high school.
8. Cemil, father of one daughter and a son is a primary school graduate factory worker in his fifties. He was born in a village of the east coast of the Black Sea region and migrated to Istanbul where he currently lives. His daughter pursues graduate degree while his son is a high school graduate. At the time of the interview, his daughter was a grad student and his son was unemployed.
9. Tahsin, father of four sons, one from a different mother, and two daughters is a primary school graduate house agent in his fifties. He was born in a village of the east coast of the Black Sea region then migrated to Istanbul where he currently lives. After having completed middle school, his sons began to work and his daughters went to Quran School. One of his daughters is engaged and one is legally married, but both of them are religiously married.
10. X, father of a daughter and a son, is a sixty-year-old primary school graduate tailor. He was born in a small town in the Marmara Region then moved to Istanbul where he currently lives. His thirty-one-year-old son is a private driver with a high school degree and twenty-nine-year-old daughter is a nurse pursuing a graduate degree in nursing.

11. Fatih, father of two daughters in early twenties and a nineteen-year-old son, is a primary school graduate baker in his fifties. He was born in a village of the west coast of the Black Sea region then moved to Istanbul where he currently lives. His daughters pursue graduate degree, while his son is preparing for the university entrance exam.
12. Iskender, father of a son and a daughter in late twenties, is a high school dropout worker in a supermarket chain in his fifties. He was born in the capital, and then moved to Istanbul where he currently lives. His daughter is a teacher while his high school graduate son works in a store as a sales clerk.
13. Nusret, father of two sons in their early twenties, is a fifty-year-old primary school graduate cleaner in a fancy shopping mall. He was born in a village of the capital, and then moved to Istanbul where he currently lives. His two sons have been working since their middle school graduation.
14. Hüsamettin, father of three daughters at twenty, sixteen and twelve years old and a twenty-two-year-old son, is a vocational high school graduate forklift operator at forty-five years old. He was born in a small village of a city in Central Anatolia, and then moved to the center of the city where he currently lives. His son studies at university in the same city, while his eldest daughter is a vocational high school graduate.
15. Acar, father of two daughters in early thirties, is a fifty-eight-year old high school graduate retired man. He was born in a village in the Central Anatolia, and then moved to another city in the same region where he currently lives. His two daughters have bachelor's degree in educational sciences, but one of them works as a teacher while another one as a police officer because of the chronic problems in the central appointment system through which teachers are recruited.
16. Mücahit, father of two sons and a daughter in late twenties and early thirties, is a sixty-two year-old vocational high school graduate retired man. He was born in a village of a city in Central Anatolia and moved to the center of the city where he currently lives. His daugh-

ter is a middle school graduate while his two sons have bachelor's degree in educational sciences working as police officers because of unappointment of teachers.

17. Muhittin, father of a daughter and a son in twenties, is a fifty-three-year-old primary school graduate janitor at a public university, but works as a concierge as well. He was born in a small village in the Black Sea region then moved to Istanbul where he currently lives. His son is unemployed with a bachelor's degree in journalism while his daughter studies management at a private university and works part-time in different jobs.
18. Metin, father of a fourteen-year-old son and three daughters in their twenties, is a sixty-six-year old former worker of a conservative political party. He was born in a village in the Central Anatolia then moved to another city of the same region where he currently lives. He graduated from a college of education, but has never been able to work as a teacher because of his political activism. His son is a high-school student while his two daughters are high-school graduates and one has a bachelor's degree.
19. Mehmet, father of three daughters in their twenties, is a fifty-year-old primary school graduate shopkeeper. He was born in a village in the East Black Sea region then moved to a town of an inland city of the same region where he currently lives. His two daughters have bachelor's degree while one of them is a high-school graduate.
20. Tarık, father of two daughters at twenty four and eighteen years old and a six-year-old son, is a fifty-three year old grocer. He has bachelor's degree in statistics, but have never worked in a job related to his degree. He was born in a town of an inland city of the Black Sea region where he currently lives. His older daughter is a pharmacist while younger one is a freshman in another city.
21. Erkan, father of one daughter and two sons at twenty-five, twenty-one and ten years old respectively, is a fifty-three years old shopkeeper. He continued his education in distance learning after he graduated from high-school. He was born in a town of an inland city of the Black Sea region where he currently lives. His daughter pur-

sues graduate degree while his older son is an undergraduate student in another city.

22. Mesut, father of two sons at twenty-eight and thirty-one years old, is a sixty-one-year-old shopkeeper. He was born in a village in the west coast of the Black Sea region and studied at college of education in the same city. After his graduation, he worked as a primary school teacher, but he quit and worked as a driver in Istanbul. Now, he runs a cafe in his homeland with the help of his high school graduate older son. His younger son has a bachelor's degree in engineering and lives in another city.
23. Bayram, father of two daughters and two sons in their early and mid-thirties, is a primary school dropout retired man. He was born in a village in the west coast of the Black Sea region then moved to Istanbul for paid work. But after his retirement he moved back to his village leaving his children behind. His four children are primary school graduates and work since their teenage years.
24. Adem, father of three sons at forty-one, thirty-five and twenty-three years old and a thirty-eight-year-old daughter, is a primary school dropout retired man. He was born in a village in the west coast of the Black Sea region then moved to Istanbul for paid work. But after his retirement he moved back to his village leaving his children behind. His four children are primary school graduates and except his daughter his three sons work in Istanbul.
25. Saffet, father of three daughters at thirty-two, twenty-five and twenty-six years old and a twenty-two-year-old son, is a primary school graduate seaman. He was born in a village in the west coast of the Black Sea region then moved to Istanbul for paid work. Since then he has been working as a seaman. His three daughters have college degrees while his son is still studying at university.
26. Erdinç, father of two sons at twenty and thirteen years old and a nine-year-old daughter, is a primary school graduate shopkeeper at forty-three years old. He was born in a village in the west coast of the Black Sea region then moved to Istanbul for paid work. After having experience in different jobs he decided to go back to home-

land where he lives now. His son has high-school degree while his younger children are still students.

27. Ahmet, father of three sons and two daughters in their twenties and thirties is a primary school graduate construction worker at fifty-nine years old. He was born in a village in the east coast of the Black Sea region then moved to Istanbul for paid work, where he currently lives. His two children were primary school graduates while three of them graduated from a religious high school.
28. Ömer, father of three daughters, is a sixty-two-year old primary school graduate retired man. He was born in a village in the Central Anatolia then moved to the center of the city where he currently lives. He has worked as tailor throughout his life but now he is a representative of a leftist political party. His two daughters in their twenties have bachelor's degree while his eighteen-year-old daughter is a freshman at a university in another city.
29. Arman, father of a daughter in early twenties is a high-school graduate goldsmith in his early fifties. He was born in Istanbul where he currently lives. His daughter is college student.
30. Aslan, father of a daughter and a son in their twenties, is a primary school graduate retired worker in his fifties. He was born in in outlying district of Istanbul where he currently lives alone. He got divorced a few years ago. His children have college degrees.
31. Ilhami, father of a son and a daughter in early thirties, is a primary school graduate worker in his fifties. He was born in a village of the East Anatolia then migrated to Istanbul where he currently lives. His children are high school graduates.

Appendix B Interview Questions

These questions were the ones that I asked in all interviews, but not necessarily in this order. In general, my questions varied based on the flow of the conversation.

1. Can you describe your relationship with your father?
2. What was your position within your family?
3. How was your experience of being fathered?
4. Did you spend your childhood with your family?
5. Do you have a quality that makes you stand out among other men?
6. Do you remember the day your children were born? How was it? How did you feel?
7. What does fatherhood mean for you?
8. When does fatherhood begin for you?
9. When does fatherhood end for you?
10. What is the difficult part of being a father?
11. Do you see similarities and differences between you and your father?
12. When you compare your childhood to your children's, what do you see?
13. When you look at your children, do you see similarities or differences?
14. Is there any difference between raising boys versus girls?
15. What do your children do?
16. Do you have any story related to be deceived.[1]

[1] This was a question that the stories pushed me to ask. After more than ten interviews, I started to ask this question because the interviewees tended to give accounts of being deceived as proof of being an honorable man.

Appendix C Quotations in Turkish

4.1 Fathering the Wife

Benim yurt amirim vardı. Gelsin hanımın dedi işe başlasın, ben onu üç ay sonra kadroya aldıracağım. [...] Hanım da bakamayacağın karıyı niye aldın dedi. Şimdi pişman oldu ama iş işten geçti. [...] Sen niye beni zorla getirmedin bilmem ne, yine ben suçlu oldum. Ben de gururlu bir insanımdır, sinirlendiğim zaman asla bir daha şey yapmam yani. Üç aylık bir sigorta bile yaptırmadım. Yani sinirlendim ya. Eğer üç aylık bir sigorta bile yaptırsam yine kurtarırdı baya bir şey. Aradaki boşluğu öderdi. Bağkur yaptırdım. Bazı şeylerde beyin istediğini yapacan yani anladın mı. Yapmadı bana tersine gitti. Tersine gidince her şey tersine tepti. [...] Şimdi yaptırdık ama on beş sene sonra filan emekli olacak. Senin iyiliğin için senin şeyin için düşünen bir insanı kötü yormayacaksın ama beni dinlemediği için hep kaybetti hayatı boyunca da hep kaybetti. (Muhittin)

Ben köyden geleni bizim eve getirirdim misafir ederdim, dışarda koymazdım yani. öyle de bir huyum var. onlar da memleketten geldiler. [...] Kadın da hırsızmış, biz bilmiyoruz. Affedersin annemin külodunu, atletini çalıyormuş. Hanıma diyor ki sen aldın, çaldın. O da diyor ki benim anam yok bir şeyim yok. [...] Şeker çalınıyor, kızım sen şekerleri başkasına mı verdin? Anne vermedim. Bunlar birbirlerine girdiler. Ben de işten geldim. Biri anam biri ailem. Şimdi ona acıyorum, bir şey diyemiyorum hanıma. Yetim. Bir şey diyemiyorum. Bu yanda anam, karşı gelemiyorum. Ben de gittim bu abime dedim ki, dedim git anneme hani abimdir ortayı bulsun dedim. Git dedim onlara kız dedim, annemle hanımı barıştır dedim. Bir iki saat kahvede oturdum ben, dedim barışmışlardır, ben de gideyim. Geldim, ses yok. Ne oldu dedim, edemedim dedi. Ben de açtım davayı böyleyken böyle, hanım da anlattı, dedi ben ne yapacağım senin dedi affedersin atletini külotunu, sutyenini. Ne yapacağım ben dedi anne dedi, şuydu buydu. Annem de o da dedi ki sen onu başkalarına verdin dedi. [Hanım da] kime vereceğim ben? Ben düşman mıyım senin evinde dedi, ben senin kızınım dedi. Gelin olarak görme beni kızın olarak gör, şuydu buydu. O sert

davrandı bu sert davrandı. Bu arada anneme bir şey söyledi, ben de elimin tersiyle hanıma vurunca dişi kırıldı. Ağzı kanadı. Git dedim. Anneme dedim ki ya sen de sakin ol dedim. Hanım gitti abim de peşinden gitti. Ben de dedim abim büyük, sen niye gidersin yardım etmeye, ağzı burnu, baktım bir bozuntu geldi, gittim ki abim yatmış bıçakla kesiyor bunu. Seni keserim, anama karşı gelme [diyor]. Benim heyheyler geldi. Geldiğim gibi böyle yakasından tuttuğum gibi onu fırlattım. Defol evden dedim, bir daha benim evime girmeyeceksin dedim. Benim evime gelmeyeceksin dedim. Annemi aldım ortaya, kız kardeşlerimi aldım, dedim oturun buraya. Anne dedim ya, ben bu giderse ben de gidiyorum ya da dedim git oğullarının yanında kal dedim. Sade ben değilim oğlu. [...] Sonradan işi hanım seziyor, anne diyor gel buldum. Boş çantayla gelip dolu çantayla gidiyor kadın evden. (Recai)

Ben çalıştırıyorum onu. Çalıştırıyorum onu şimdi, bazı şeyleri kabullenemiyor. Sen bugün yalan konuşuyorsun ona, ona alışamıyor. Bu diyor niye böyle yapıyor diyor. Bağırıp çağırıyor. Diyorum ki hanım buna bağırdığın zaman onu kaybedersin. İnsanların yapısı böyle. [...] Bugün insan farklı konuşuyor yarın farklı konuşuyor. O benim hanım onu görmediği için bende, çocuklarım da öyle, bende öyle bir şey görmediği için dışarda gördüğü için insanlardan bu sefer nefret ediyor ama bu hayat böyle diyorum. (Mehmet)

4.2 Like a Father for Siblings

Babam dışarı çıkmak zorunda olduğu için evin yükü tamamen benim üzerimde oldu. [...] Mevsimlik çalışmaya giderdi inşaata, mayıs ayında giderdi onuncu on birinci ayda geri dönerdi. Bu süre zarfında evdeki hayvanlarla ilgili tarlalarla ilgili bütün işleri evin mesela ihtiyaçları konusunda olsun ben üstleniyordum. Babam bize arada harçlık gönderirdi. Çarşıdan ben alıyordum. Bu şekilde bir hayatımız oldu. Ben sorumluluğu erken yaşta aldığım için babalıkta da hâlâ ben kardeşlerime karşı babalık duygusunu hissediyorum. Ben bir tane kardeşim öldü, yedi kardeş, altı tane daha var, dört kız iki oğlan, hâlâ ben onların bir abisi olarak sorumluluklarını hissediyorum, taşıyorum. (Cavit)

Ben çocukların hiçbirini çalıştırmadım. Kız kardeşlerimi de kızlarımı da. Yalvardılar beni işe koy diye. Ben istemiyorum kızların ezilmesini. İş hayatında olduğum için biliyorum. Bunlar da cahil çocuk, yine ezilecek. Benim büyük kızım ben gideyim halama bakayım dedi. İyi, git dedim. […]Gitti işte orda bir iş buldu çalıştı iki üç ay kadar. […] Bir gün telefon etti, baba dedi acele gel dedi. Çabuk gel dedi, gittim. Ne oldu? Dedi halasıgil geldi çocukları yurda götürüp vereceklermiş. Biz bakamayız. Kız kardeşime demişler ister gel bizimle kal, ister kocaya git. Yahu öyle saçmalık olur mu dedim yani. […]Çağırdım halalarını, gel halası, gel buraya, babaannesini de çağırdım. Dedim gel bak böyle ben yurda vermiyorum. […] Bende de o zaman silah vardı. Silahı çektim, bunları evden kovaladım. […]Dedim ben ölene kadar size bakarım. (Recai)

4.3 Negotiating Fatherhood and Sonhood

Biz daha babalığı anlayamadık. Anca yeni yeni çünkü babamız vardı önümüzde. Biz baba varken baba olamadık yani çünkü sen de çocuksun onun yanında. Senin de bir baban var, sen de bir çocuksun yani. (Erdinç)

Hanım da bu arada zaten aynı binada oturmaktan bunaldı. Dedikodu çoğalmaya başladı. Bizim işte yaptıklarımızı gelinler, bizim yüzümüzden abilerimle kavga ediyor. İşte bak o çalışıyormuş şunu var senin niye yok filan falan böyle dedikodular oluyor. Anam söylüyor buraya sonra ondan sonra bazen oluyor ki mesela doktora gidecek paraları olmuyor annem geliyor benden [istiyor], hiç esirgemiyorum çıkarıyorum veriyorum. 95 senesine kadar hiçbir yatırım yapmadım. Böyle poşetle para kazanıyordum. Hep kardeşlerime [harcadım …] Bir tane şey vardı bu evi aldığım müteahhit vardı bizim hemşehrili, ya buraların en güzel semti neresi dedim […] Pazar günü […] evi gördük, ev değil saray. […] Hanım aktı böyle aktı eve. […] Herkesten de utanıyorum, söyleyemiyorum, abimin evi yok. […] Evi aldık ama nasıl söyleyeceğiz? […] Eve geldik, kimseye söylemeyeceğiz. Dedim ki abime de bir ev bulalım. […] Abime de giriş katında bir ev bulduk. Çok güzel. […] Yengem beğenmedi. […] Benim evin oraya geldik, o [emlakçı]

Salim Bey filan deyince adam abim nerden tanıyorsun dedi. Dedim ya işte ev bakmaya geldiğimizden dedim işte buraya da baktık da. […] Geldik oraya dedi ki işte kaç para, valla Salim Bey dedi burayı dedi sana verdiğim fiyattan veririm. Abim sen burdan daire mi aldın dedi. Aldık abi dedim. […] Abi dedim babama söyleme dedim. Aramızda kalsın dedim danışmadan aldığım için üzülür belki diye. […] Sabahleyin babamla anamı aldım hanımı da aldım çocuklarla beraber […] babam dedim böyle bir yer var dedim, bak dedim. […] Babamla içeriye girdik, adam perde takıyor. Bura değil baba dedim anahtar yok, bunun bir alt katı. Oranın anahtarı yok da buraya girdik adam çalışıyor da aynı evin alt katı dedim. Doğru eve girdik aslında. Babamı alıştırıyorum ya. Lan oğlum saray gibi ev lan dedi. Oğlum buraya gücün yetecek mi dedi ya. Param olsa da keşke yardım etsem oğlum, alsam dedi. Ondan sonra alsam iyi olur değil mi sevinirsin değil mi dedim. Sevinmez miyim lan dedi. Ne et et al oğlum burayı dedi. Ben burayı aldım dedim. Bu perdeler bizim perdelerimiz, takılıyor. Puh sana dedi. Ondan sonra babamın bir sarılışı vardı bana, ya oğlum Allah yolunu açık etsin dedi. (Salim)

Kayınbiraderimi, baldımızı, hepsini buraya getirdim memleketten, onları iş güç sahibi yaptım. Hepsi, her biri burda hepsini evlendirdik, maddi manevi hiç eksik etmedim. […]Evin yanından bir daire aldım, kiraya verecektim. Hanım üzülüyor annesi babası köyde diye […] beş yüz elli liraya kiraya veriyordum o zamanlar. Eve geldim hanıma dedim ki sana bir teklifim var dedim. Neymiş dedi. Aldığımız eve dedim anneni babanı oturt, çağıralım gelsin onları oturtalım […] seninle benim hakkımı almayacağız, üç tane çocuğun hakkını alacağım ama dedim. Üç kızım oldu o zaman. 150 lira 300 lira kira versinler bize otursunlar. Hanım ağladı. Yani babalık yaptım onlara diye. Verdim evi, aldık evi buraya getirdik. Yedi sene oturdular, hâlâ dua eder diye inanırım kayınpederim rahmetli oldu burda. Dedi ki biz yaş olarak rakam olarak büyükmüşüz ama dedi sen bizim hepimize babalık yaptın dedi. […Çocukları] hiç enişte demezler bana hep abi derler. Şimdi mesela bir şey olsa çağırsam hepsi koşa koşa gelir. Hep babası şey derdi ne olacak anası babası kim ki Ayşe'yle Salim derdi. Şimdi kayınvalidem var mesela […] çocuklar evlenip giderse evim kocaman ev, şu oda senin anne derim, […]

sen benim evimde kal. İstediğin yerde kalabilirsin ama bu oda senin. Buraya istediğin zaman, bir de anahtar yaptıracağım ona istediği zaman gelip kalacaksın çünkü senin kızın benim anama babama öyle baktı. Ben de sana anne dediysem bu ev senin. (Salim)

4.4 Extending Fatherhood

Biz baba olmazdan evvel de ee öyle ızdıraplar yaşadık ki hatta dedim ki herhalde babalık böyle bir şey […] biz aynı, başka anneden babadan doğmuş insanlara olan sevgimizi de bir baba gibi [gösteririz]. (Metin)

Kızım gel buraya diyorum sana bir şey diyeceğim diyorum. Bak diyorum arkadaş edinmişsin ama cebinde bir kahve parası yok. Sen veriyorsun. Bu sana ne kadar kocalık yapar? Seni yolda bırakır. Buralarda Tarlabaşlarında seni evlenir, kötü yollara düşürür dedim. Patron da birkaç kez şahit olmuş benim [bu yaptığıma], ya usta diyor sen diyor bütün milleti diyor [rahatsız ediyorsun], ya dedim senin dedim hemşehrin, Rizeli, kız Rizeli, çocuk Diyarbakırlı, niye Diyarbakırlı kıza gönül versin? […] Sevdiği çocuğu ben biliyorum nerelerde ne yaptığını, ara sokaklarda hırsızlık yapıyorlar. Yani bankadan mesela sen para çekiyorsun, ben orda müessese çalıştırıyoruz yani lokantada görüyoruz kaçarken. Bu tip bu tür adamlara tanıdığımız bir tanımadığımız bir kız olsa da ona ben tasvip etmiyorum. Biz istemiyoruz yani böyle bir Kürt nasıl alsın bir Rizeli […] işte yani Karadeniz, Batı Karadeniz neresinden olursa olsun, ben tasvip etmiyordum. Onların çünkü ne yaptığını biliyorum. Hiç iyi bir çocuklar değil yani. Hep kapkaççı. (Metin)

4.5 Having a Child

Özel hastane [vardı]. Orda bir doktor baya şeyleri ee sezaryen yapmış, çocuklar baya hastanenin bahçesinde o zamanlar yanılmıyorsam on beş on altı tane çocuk çıkarttılar. [...] Ben de hanımı oraya muayene etmeye getirdim. Kızımın doğumunda. Doktor dedi ki dispanserin sahibi dostum,

sakın dedi sezeryan derse dedi kabul etmeyin dedi, tamam dedim. [...] Doktor sezeryan yapmak istiyor […] biraz ukalalaşınca doktora ben bir tane vurdum. (X)

Kız erkek benim için fark etmiyordu. Köyde yetişen köyde duran ablalarım falan hani niye oğlun olmuyor senin bir tane daha yap falan filan diyordu ama kazara bir tane daha en küçük oldu. Hatta ben eşime şöyle de dedim ya zaten zor geçiniyoruz, işte geçinemiyoruz, zorlanıyoruz işte hayat pahalı, gel bunu aldıralım falan dedim, eşim de biraz ee şey, nasıl söyleyeyim, kendi ailesinden kaynaklı çok dindarlar [...] Yok dedi, onu dedi zamanında düşünecektin, ben çocuğu aldırmam, onun günahına girmem. [...] doğumda doktor geldi [...] dedi tekrar çocuk yapmak istiyor musunuz? Dedim yapmak istemiyoruz. O zaman şuraya dedi bir imza at bakayım dedi. O arada işte çocuk olma olayını bitirmişler. [... Eşim] eşime sorun demiş herhalde. Hani bu da kız çocuğu olunca üçüncü de, acaba hani erkek çocuğu tekrar ister mi diye. (Ömer)

Ultrason falan yok ya hani, erkek mi kız mı diye bir şey yok. Anadolu çocuğuyuz illaki erkek olsun istiyoruz. [...] Bekliyoruz kapıda, hemşire geldi, dedi oğlunuz oldu gözünüz aydın olsun falan. Hemen havalara girdik falan. Eşim giremiyoruz tabii öyle şey yapamıyoruz filan. Ben hemen gittim bir çiçek yaptırdım falan geldim. Sonra annem geldi dedi ki oğlum dedi nurtopu gibi bir kızımız oldu falan. Dedim anne bir yanlışlık olmasın işte hemşire hanım böyle dedi falan. [...] Tabii ki sonra araştırdık ettik tabii ki kızımız. Eşim de söyledi bu bizim kızımız falan diye. [...] 87'nin 20 Mart'ında ikinci kız çocuğum dünyaya geldi. [...] Birinci çocuk kız olunca ikinci çocuğu erkek bekliyorsunuz. ataerkil toplumda yaşadığımız için. onu doğumevine götürdük. [...] Vardım doğum yapmış. Annem merdivenden geliyor, merdivenlerden iniyor, bana gülerek iniyor, ben anladım tabii kız olduğunu gülerek inince. Üzülmek yok dedi. Tabii bir reaksiyon gösteriyorsunuz yani o an için. Sonra dedi ki oğlum dedi işte Allah'ın takdiridir, eşin hastadır lohusadır, kırma falan filan dedi. Artık gittik çiçek yaptırdık eşimize geldik. (Acar)

Amcamızın oğlunun adını babamın adını koydular, Rıza babamın adı. Birkaç ay sonra da çocuğun adını Murat diye değiştirdiler. Biz üçümüz de üç erkek kardeşiz [...] Üçümüzün de eşi hamile. Dedik ki ilk doğan çocuğa hem ciddi konuşuyoruz hem şaka yollu konuşuyoruz, ilk doğan çocuğa babamızın adını koyacağız. İlk benim hanım doğum yaptı. Kız. İkinci erkek kardeşimin eşi doğum yaptı iki tane kız, ikiz kız. Üçüncü erkek kardeşim, Almanya'da onlar, yurt dışında yaşıyor, onun hanımı doğum yaptı, dört tane kız. Babamın adını koyamadık. [...] Annem de o dünyasıyla bize şunu söyledi. Dedi ki oğlum dedi işte soyun yürüsün. Niye dedi hani bir çocuk daha yapmıyorsun, biz büyütürüz dedi. Şudur budur falan dedi. Yok anne dedim, bırak dedim. Benim çocuğum var, soyum yürüyecekse onlarla yürüsün dedim. (Acar)

Şimdi bu üçüncü kattan camdan bakıyor, ağlıyor peşimizden, ben diyorum ben gitmiyorum ben buradayım. [...] Yukarıdan haber geliyor sürekli, işte filanca kişinin hastanın sahipleri, işte gözünüz aydın çocuğunuz dünyaya geldi, haber geliyor. Bizim iki gün oldu yok, üç gün oldu yok, yok. Bu bir gün olmuş doğum yapalı, ismi Mükerrem diye yazılmış, kapıda güvenlikler, girilecek gibi değil, hakikaten çok zordu o zamanlar. Kapıdan geçirmiyorlar. Hastanenin içine insan salmıyor. Öyle birisi yok diyor. [...] Ben bir şekilde o kapıdan geçtim. O kapıdan geçtim, bunu arıyorum ama nasıl dolanıyorum hastanenin içinde. Ta doğumhanenin içine kadar girdim. Bir tanesi hemen yakaladı beni. Kadının biri kolumdan. Ne yapıyorsun sen burada dedi. Ne yapacağım dedim ya üç gün önce karıyı getirdik karı kayboldu. İsmi ne? Dedim Münevver. Dedi Münevver aşağıda yatıyor dedi. Nerde yatıyor? Dedi doğum yaptı. Dün dedi doğum yaptı o. Nasıl dün doğum yaptı? Aşağıda ismi yok. Dedi gel peşimden. Gittim. Bunu [bebeği] hemen aldı kadın, saklar göstermez. Göstermiyor. Harçlık alacak. O yana dönüyorum yok bu yana dönüyorum yok. Bozuk param yok. İki yüz elli lira param var, bütün para. Başka yok. Ya ne yapayım şimdi. Versem bana yok. Vermesem göstermiyor. Hasta bakıcı. Neyse, mecburen verdik parayı. Aldı hemen cebine soktu parayı. Senin paran var mı yok mu bakmıyor ki. [...] Dediler ki bunu götürebilirsiniz, çıkarabilirsiniz istediğiniz zaman hastaneden. Yav hastaneden çıkaracağız da ben bunların ikisi hastaneye yattıkları zaman

yüksek tansiyonu olduğunu söylediler, dediler ki burda doğum yaparsa dediler yani ölümle sonuçlanabilir. Büyük hastanelere götür. Ben de o ara kendi kendime içimden dedim ki eğer bunları dedim sağ salim dedim geriye getirebilirsem kurban kesmeden dedim eve sokmayacağım. [...] Sorduk hocalara dediler ki bu şekilde dediler evine getiremezsin. [...] Bunları kardeşinin oraya bıraktım. Hemen aynı gün Adapazarı'na devam ettim. Bir de demin dedim ya askerden gelirken başkaları benim paramı topladı geldi çünkü ben çok sıkıntılar çektim eğer dedim ben bu askerliği sağ salim bitirebilirsem döndüğüm zaman dedim bir tane adak keseceğim. Şimdi köye gittim. Hayvan var. [...]. Hocayla konuştum [...] dedi ki askerde adadığını dedi burda kesebiliriz [...] diğerini dedi nasıl adadın. Dedim ki diğerini de eşimle dedim çocuğumu sağ salim hastaneden çıkartabilirsem kesmeden eve sokmayacağım dedim. Orda dur dedi hoca. Onu dedi burda kesemezsin. Ne olacak? Onu dedi orda kesecen. Hoca etme eyleme orası neresi orası neresi, ben bu hayvanı nasıl götüreceğim. Onu dedi adak adarken düşünecektin. [...] Otobüsün bagajına koyduk getirdik. Evin önünde getirdim ben hayvanı buraya [...] birini buldum kurbanı kapıda kesecek diye, bunlar geldiler kurban kapıya yatırıldı, kesildi kanı akarken bunlar üzerinden geçti, ikisinin de alnına kan sürdüler geçti içeri [...] dedim ki evime kesinlikle sokmayacağım. Dağıttım komşulara, yiyin. (Muhsin)

4.6 The Dynamics of Paternal Bond: Despair and Grandiosity

Tombul olduğu için şeylerde yara, çaresini bulamıyoruz. Pişik oluyor, çaresini bulamıyorum. Mümkünü yok. Öyle bir şey ki ya çıldırma[ma]k elde değil artık. Çıldırma[ma]k elde değil. Tedavisi yok. Altını ıslattığı zaman kıyamet kopuyor. Artık resmen kanamaya başladı. O derecede oldu. Artık ben işi gücü bıraktım. Çalışıyorum ama öylesine çalışıyorum. [...] Her eczaneye girip soruyorum, böyle böyle bir şeyim var buna bir çare. Doktora da gidiyorum ilaç veriyorlar, yok. Yok. […] En sonunda […] bir eczane var bir baktık kadın var eczanede, dedi ki kardeşim senin derdin bende de var dedi, benim çocuğumda da var aynı hastalık ama dedi bu ilaç yok. Dedi ki depoları karıştırmam lazım, dedim ki ne olur Allah rızası için yani gerçekten çok zor durumdayım. […] Öyle hemen bir dakika bakmayla bulunacak bir şey değil dedi. Arkada dedi binlerce dedi ilaç var […] sen dedi öğleden

sonra bir uğra dedi. Ben öğlen olmadan gittim kadının yanına. Dedi ki daha arıyorum. İyi. Saat dört gibi akşam bir daha gittim. Gittim ki yani şöyle serçe parmağım kadar bir ilaç kutusu. Merhem. […] Bana dese ki maaşını ver vereceğim. O hâldeyim. Dedi ki kadın iki tane buldum, birini sen kullan birini ben kullanayım dedi. […] Bir kere kullandık ikinciye gerek kalmadı. Hemen iyi oldu. (Muhsin)

Tuborg'da çalışıyorum […], dediler ki daha çok paraya çalışmak ister misin? Daha çok paraya çalışmak isterim de nerde öyle bir iş? Dedi ki adam ben seni dedi bir yere göndereyim, orda dedi çalış. Dedim ki yapabileceğim bir şey mi? Oğlum aynı iş. O da bira işi. [...] Formu ben doldurdum içeri verdim. [… arkadaşım müdüre] diyor ki abi diyor ben[im] dediğim adamı yapmadın diyor almadın diyor ben bir adam gönderdim diyor almadın. [Müdür] diyor ki oğlum kimi gönderdin de almadım diyor ya. Ben diyor sana bir adam gönderdim, almamışsın işe diyor [...] bir tane sekreterimiz vardı, soruyor diyor ki kızım diyor böyle böyle diyor birisi gelecekmiş, bir form getirecekmiş falan diyor, getirdi müdürüm diyor formu. Nereye koydun? Filan yere koyduyduk. Git oraya bak diyorlar, form yok. Ya diyorlar burdaki formu kim [ne yaptı?]. Muhasebe müdürüne soruyorlar burdaki formu kim aldı. Saklamış, vermiyor. Neyse, daralınca çıkartıyor formu adam. [...] Marmara Bira diye bir firma [...] bir şekilde ben burdan Tuborg'dan yakamı kopardım. […] Burda da şeylere karıştık, karıştık derken sendika olaylarına […işçilerin] ne istedikleri belli değil [... bir işçi]sendika dedi benim hakkım dedi ben alırım. [...] İki gün sonra bir duyduk firma satılık [...patron] şart koymuş, bu çalışan personelden demiş bir tane işçi almayacaksın. [...] O arada bizim piyasayı gezerken artık firma kapanıyor ya yanımdaki arkadaş bir yerden para almış, zamanında 700 lira para. Yav şimdi paranın sahibini bulamıyoruz. Şirket parayı almıyor. Makbuz yazmamız lâzım bir yerden veresiye tahsilat almışız, bir karışıklık olmuş, yazılı alınmamış para. [...] Tazminatımızı aldık. Akşam oldu döndük geri geliyoruz bu tarafa. Dedik böyle böyle. Madem dedik bunlar bu parayı kabul etmiyor, dedim arkadaş o zaman gel yanımdaki adama, kardeş payı yapalım bunu. Paranın yarısı senin, al dedim hadi bunu da götür. Yarısını dedim sen al yarısını ben alayım. [...] O arada da oğlan küçük daha bisiklet

almıştım [...] evin önünde düşüyor kafasının üstüne aşağı. Tazminatım cebimde [...] bir geldim eve, kıyamet kopmuş evde. Çocuğun kafanın bir tarafı yok. Simsiyah. Hemen apar topar acile [...] sadece nefes var, konuşma denen hiçbir şey yok. Aklı başında ama korkmuş hiçbir şey konuşmuyor. Üç gün biz bunu götürdük getirdik. Götürdük getirdik oraya. Üç gün. Götür getir götür getir götür getir yok! Bize gün verdiler, tam altı ay sonraya. Acil bu ya! […] Doktor dedi ki şu an görünürde hiçbir şey yok ama dedi ileriye dönük ne çıkar bir şey diyemem dedi adam. İyi, aldık getirdik. Getirdik de yemek yiyemiyor. [...] Baktık bir akşam gene oturuyorlar aşağıda teyzesinin evinde baktık yine fenalaştı bu, bayılır gibi oluyor ikide bir. Orda bir arkadaş vardı, [...] taksisi vardı onun. Bindirir bindirmez arabaya [...] adamlar muayene ettiler, bir şey yaptılar dediler ki bir şey diyemeyiz [...] döndük geri geliyoruz [...] öyle bir kusmaya başladı ki çocuk arabanın içinde yemyeşil zehir kusuyor ve kokudan arabanın içinde duramıyoruz. Öyle kokuyor. Şimdi biz araba battı diye bağırıyoruz, adam diyor bağırmayın, mal sahibi. Yav dur işte araba battı. Size ne diyor ya batarsa batsın, kussun çocuk, ellemeyin. [...] Neyse bu kustu. İçini boşalttı. [...] Anne karnım aç benim dedi. Dediği tek kelime bu. Karnım aç. Rahatladı. Heh dedim, tamam dedim kurtardık dedim. [...] Arabasını temizlettirdi adam. O para, Marmara'dan aldığım para benim üç gece dört gecede bitti. O üç yüz elli milyonun içinden bitti çünkü ben helalıma haram karıştırdım orda. O onu götürdü. (Muhsin)

Ben var ya ben lafımı bilirim, ben konuşmamı bilirim. Ben oturduğum kalktığım yeri bilirim. Bizim köyden birkaç kişi var, çapulcular, çapulcu, camiye geliyorlar, bir tane adam yok. Onlar olsa hep ölülerdi yollarda. Geberirlerdi. [...] Allah'ıma şükürler olsun karnım herkese karşı doğru. (Bayram)

Babam dedi ki bana Allah iki yakanı bir araya getirmesin dedi, iliklemeyiveririm dedim. İki ekmeği üst üste kodurtmasın dedi, birini akşam yerim birini sabah yerim [dedim]. Allah dedi çatal tırnaklı koşturtturmasın, eşek koşuveririm dedim. Hep onlar dua yerine geçti. (Bayram)

Baba gerçekten şerefli bir şey yani, tamam mı? Düşün ya bir çocuk sana baba diyor veya bir ihtiyacı olunca baba şunu yap diyor, sen babasısın, bunu yapacan yani. Bana ben kumar oynayacağım para ver diyemez sana veya ben hovardalığa gideceğim para ver demez değil mi? Ben şuraya gideceğim para ver baba, ne yapacaksın? Vereceksin çünkü babasın neticede yani. Merteben yüksek. [...] Bir baba bir çocuğuna ah derse, ilenmeyi bırak, ilenme işini bırak, ah dese var ya o çocuğa yapışıyormuş. İlenç geçiyor, duası geçiyor anında. Anında. Bir kişi oğluna veya kızına ilense, çocuk diyorum sana yaramazlık yapıyor misal babasına veya anasına evde huzursuz yaramaz sen de içinden gelerek böyle ona kötü dualar etsen o çocuğun iki yakası bir araya gelmiyor daha. Bitti. Bitik yani. Anladın mı? Ben bunu söylerim hep. Herkese derim. Oğlun, çocuğun sana silah da çekse derim bak silah, ilenme. Kötü dua yapma. Kız olsun erkek olsun çünkü sonuç var ya o bunu araştırma yap bulursun zaten gittiğin yerlerde, sen çocuğa ilendin mi de, ondan sonra çocukların durumunu sor ona, anladın mı? Hani işte hani babalık var ya bu babalık annenin yerine geçmiyor he söyleyeyim ben bunu. Aslında çocuğun üzerinde en fazla hakkı olan anne ama ilenci geçmiyor çocuklarına. Annesi ne kadar ilenirse ilensin, ne kızına olsun ne oğluna geçmiyor ama babası ilenmeyi bırak bak, bak benim diyelim moralim bozuk çocuk şey yaptı, of be bunu niye yaptın böyle dedin mi yapışıyormuş ona. Anında vermiyor Allah onu. Ona o şeyi yapıştırıyor yani onun iki yakası bir araya gelmiyor. Onun çocuğu da ona yapıyor. Yaptıracak. Bu zincirleme gidermiş. [...] Bana çocuk silah da çekse ben ilenmem. İlenmeyeceksiniz [...] sonra ömür boyu hayatını sen karatmış oluyorsun o çocuğun. İlençin geçiyor senin, duan geçiyormuş [...] babalığın böyle sorumlulukları var, bunu herkesin uygulaması lâzım. (Cemil)

Hanım hasta, ben onu Çankırı'ya götürdüm, yazdırmaya. Bolu Gerede'de kaza yaptık. Arabayı devirdik. Bizim arkadaşın arabası. Benim kaburgalar kırıldı. [...] Her taraf dağınık benim, arabayı marabayı kaldırdılar, Bolu valisi dedi ki bizden beş dakika önce de orada beş kişi ölmüş. Savcı mancı da daha ordalar. [... Vali] dedi ki ben yazdıracağım, sen git dedi Ankara'ya. […] Yok dedim ben kendim götüreceğim. O şekilde gittim. Gittim bir tırcıyı kaldırdım. [...] Adam beni görünce korktu. Kafam gözüm kan. Korkma

dedim. Böyleyken böyle dedim, benim kızı Çankırı'ya götüreceğim yazdıracağım, dedi abi tamam. [...], Çankırı'nın önünde indik. Ordan bir taksi maksi bulsam gideceğiz ama duramıyorum. Sancıdan ölüyorum. Kaburgalar içeriye batıyormuş. O arada Kastamonu'dan Çankırı'ya minibüs geldi, köy minibüsü, durdurdum, yer mer yok, dedim valla biz bineceğiz. Millet bizi görünce hayrola geçmiş olsun [dedi], dedim biz kaza yaptık biz bineceğiz. Götürdüm o şekilde kızımı yazdırdım üniversiteye. Maksat ne? Onu yazdıracağım.(Recai)

Ondan küçük de olsa erkek kardeş ekmek almaya gönderilir, kız çocuğu gönderilmez. Hatta bunun çok çarpıcı bir örneği, böyle içime yara gibi ok gibi oturan bir şey. [...] Üniversite harcını yatıracağız, okula gittik, formları aldık, ben dedim ki sen otur kızım ben yatırayım geleyim dedim. Ordaki müdür yardımcısı bırak kardeşim dedi ya, kendi yatırsın çocuk dedi. Sen bunu şehir dışına gönderiyorsun dedi. Bırak dedi ya kendi yatırsın. Sen niye gidip
yatırıyorsun dedi. Ver parayı gitsin dedi. Hakikaten çok doğruydu. (Acar)

4.7 Other Stories

Aileye yeni bir birey gelmiş, yoktan var olmuş, hiç kendimi baba gibi hissetmiyorum yeni doğduğunda. Baba mıyım ben? Bu benden oldu ama geceleri izliyorum bakıyorum ya babalık nedir yani ne yapmalıyım ne etmeliyim? (Arman)

Aileyi korumak zorundasınız. Ben aileyi şuna benzetirim. İçişleri bakanı vardır, dışişleri bakanı vardır. İçişleri bakanının görevleri vardır dışişleri bakanının görevleri vardır. Dışişleri bakanı ne yapar? Ülkesini korur. Dışişleri bakanı ailesini korumakla mükelleftir. karısını, çoluğunu çocuğunu, kızını bilmem nesini, işte onların ırzını. [...] E şimdi böyle bir ortam içinde ne kadar koruyabilirsiniz, ne kadar edebiliriz? Çünkü siz burda azınlıksınız. Azınlığı biraz daha filtreleyelim, siz bir Ermeni'siniz. Yani Ermenilikten kasıt nedir? Ermeni kastı şudur, siz bulunduğunuz ülkede hep bir düşmansınız. Hep topun ağzında olan kişisiniz. Efendim bugün bir asker ölür bilmem ne olur Ermenilerin yüzünden olur, PKK saldırır Ermenilerin

yüzünden olur. Bilmem ne olur Ermenilerin yüzünden olur. Daireleriniz, oturduğunuz apartmanlar işaretlenir edilir, tehdit mesajları gelir, mailleri alırsınız, işte ne bileyim Hrant Dink öldüğü zaman ben sayısız mesaj aldım. Üstelik de benim yani hiç öyle şeylerim olmadı. yani siyasi. [...] E böyle bir ortam içerisinde nasıl bir çocuk yetiştirebilirsiniz? [...] Bir kız babası olduğunuz gibi bir de erkek babası olmak güzel bir duygu olsa gerek. […] Ama ikinci bir çocuğu neye güvenerek yapacaksınız? […] Böyle itilmiş böyle işte ötelenmiş bir kişilikle böyle bir kimlikle nasıl çocuk yapacaksınız? Neye güvenip de. Nasıl ben ona gelecek vadedeceğim? Bir erkek oldu askere göndereceğim, bir sürü haksızlıklarla karşılaşacak. İsmi belli olmasın diye Murat koyacağım ismini. Bilmem ne koyacağım falan filan. Bu hak mı? Bu doğru mu? Etik mi? [...] Ölüm ilanlarına bakıyorsunuz, haftada onlarca yirmişer tane bizim cemaatimizden üyeler var ölenler var ama onun yanı sıra bakıyorsunuz doğan kimse yok. Biz bitmeye yüz tutmuş durumdayız. (Arman)

5. The building Blocks of Paternal Authority

Biz üniversite mezunu değiliz ama hayat fakültesi mezunuyuz. Şimdi ben elli beş yaşına kadar gelmişim, elli beş yaşına kadar çok şeyler gördük yani, neler gördük biz. (Cemil)

7.1 The Protector

Çarşamba günü hiç unutmuyorum, abim dedi ki terziye bir pantolonum var dedi, gidelim de onu alalım akşama işten çıkalım, tamam dedim. İnşaattan çıkmışız hava da soğuk. Parmaklarım, Kayseri'nin soğuğu çok soğuk olur, parmaklarım tutmuyor sanki. Kaç yaşındayım? On iki yaşındayım, inşaatta beşinci katta çalışıyorum. [...]. Terzi dükkânına girdik, sıcacık, içerde soba yanıyor. İki tane adam çalışıyor bir de ustam çalışıyor. Öyle üşümüşüm ki abim pantolonu deneyecek ya, sobanın yanında sandalye var sandalyeye oturdum şöyle, şöyle duruyorum. On iki yaşında bir çocuk. Şöyle ustama bakıyorum, kalfaları çalışıyor, üstü başı tertemiz, dikiş dikiyor. Zamanında

işte buralara babam gelseydi böyle bir sanat sahibi yapsalardı, içimden böyle geçiriyorum. O ara omzuma bir el, ne o çok mu beğendin çalışmalarımızı? Ne güzel tertemiz çalışıyorlar inşaat işi gibi değil dedim. Abim kabinden çıktı. Hasan dedi bunu bana versene dedi, ben dedi bunda bir ışık görüyorum, ben bunu terzi yapayım. Ne yapacak dışarda bu çocuk sürüm sürüm sürünecek. Abim al senin olsun lan dedi. [...] Abim dedi ki ya dedi hafta sonuna kadar bir işimiz var dedi, orayı bitirelim de dedi pazartesi sana getireyim teslim edeyim oğlanı dedi. Beni. Aman Allah'ım ya rabbim diyorum abim inşallah unutmaz beni. İnşallah başka iş çıkmaz da abim direkt beni buraya getirir. Sabah akşam böyle dua ediyorum yani. […] Cumartesi günü işte saat öğlende bitirdik geldik işi, abim dedi ki bana ben dedi nalbura gidecem sen de eve git banyonu yap güzel temizlen bir de tıraş ol, pazartesi günü dedi terziye başlayacan dedi. Unutmamış kurban olayım ona ben. […] Pazartesi günü getirdi beni ustamın oraya verdi. […] İşte o benim hayata dönüş yeriydi galiba ya da ee onun adına ne derler bilmiyorum ama senin teriminle söyleyebilir miyim bilmiyorum. Yeniden doğuş gibi. Bütün sıkıntılarım bitti. Allah bütün kapıları kapattı bana öyle bir kapı açtı ki. Sonsuzluk. [...] O dükkâna girdikten sonra ben böyle bir adamın eline düştükten sonra dedim ki bu benim herhalde ki hayattaki ilk fırsatım ve tek şansım diye düşündüm. (Salim)

5.2 Acting as a Father

Az buçuk ellerine para geçmeye başladı, biraz da sevinmeye başladılar. Daha sonra ben orda rahatsız oldum. O sekiz kişi o evde oturanların hani hâl ve hareketlerine ayak uyduramıyorlar. Ee şimdi orda kadıncağız orda mutfak var, gerçi bizim annemiz yerinde ama ne olursa olsun ben babamın karşısında anamın babamın karşısında bırak böyle yarı çıplak gezemem ki ben hani bırak biz pijamayla biz üstümüzü başımızı giymeden babamızın anamızın karşısında dikilemeyiz yani. Öyle bir terbiye görmüşüz. Ayak kokuları, en gıcık kaptığım şey, ondan sonra ben ilkokul dördüncü sınıftan beri namazımı abdestimi orucumu tutan insanım. Yani hiç bırakmamışım. Bana ters geliyor. [...] Dedim rahatsız oldum. Ayak kokuyor, dedim ki […]sen bunlardan kaç para alıyorsun dedim. Dedi buraya dedi yüz elli lira

para veriyorum eve dedi, yetmiş beş lirasını onlardan alıyorum dedi. Dedim ben buraya bir kural getireceğim dedim [...] dedim bu şekilde devam ederlerse dedim o yetmiş beş lirayı ben vereceğim sana dedim, bunları hepsini at burdan dedim. [...] Herkes dedim elini ayağını yıkayacak, pijama giymeden evinde içinde dolaşmayacak, bir. Ondan sonra herkes dedim her cumartesi günü gidecek dedim. Ondan sonra hamama gidecek banyosunu yapacak dedim. Banyosunu yapmasın, ayaklarını yıkamadan dedim yatağa yatma yok. [...] Bunu yapmazsanız dedim ben bırakıyorum dedim. Adam baktım sabah ağlıyor, o kadar durumda ağlıyor, sen ne diyorsan dedi o olur dedi. Tamam dedim yetmiş beş lirayı ben veriyorum dedim, dedim gözünün yaşına bakmadan o zaman herkes kendine ev bulsun. Tamam mı? Hâlâ bak, hâlâ daha ölmeden önce kaç yere gitmiş beni söylemiş kadın, biz demiş onun hakkını veremeyiz, mümkün değil. (Tahsin)

7.3 The Cynical Subject

Şeytan demiş ki her şeye demiş aklım er[iyor], [herkesi] şaşı[rtı]yor da bi askeriyeyi şaşır[t]amıyorum dermiş. O da nasıl oldu biliyor musun? Bir komutan şimdi askeriyeye yürüyüş yaptırıyor, rap rap bandoyla yürüyüş yaparlar ya. Şeytan şimdi diyor ki bunları ben diyor bu köprüden aşağı diyor dökeyim. Hayal, öyle hayal, şeytan diyor ki [onlar] bu köprüye gelince, bu köprüyü göçüreyim. Köprünün başına geliyorlar, komutan diyor askeerrr! Dur! Komutan böyle durur hani, tam köprüyü geçmeden köprüye geliyor, asker dur! Sola dön! Geri yürüyüş yaptırıyor. Şeytan bu sefer diyor, orda diyor şeytan, ya diyor bu askerin işine aklım ermiyor benim diyor. (Cemil)

Aynı sizin gibi geldi böyle beni dinledi, anlattım. Dedi ki tek bir kurtuluşun var, ya divan-ı harbe gideceksin ya Bakırkırköy'e. Bakırköy'de bir ay yattık. [...] Ordan rapor aldık askeri mahkemeye çıktık işte, albay dedi ki kadın albay, şimdi girersen oraya dedi, subaylar var rütbeli büyük rütbeliler, ondan sonra bağırırlar çağırırlar, sen subaya nasıl karşı geldin divan-ı harbe vereceğiz. Fazla dedi şey etme ortadaki dedi, subayların önünde dedi şey var, su var, bardakla su var, git onu al iç dedi, ondan sonra çık kapıya dedi, vur, vur deseler bile korkma dedi. Vur emri yok dedi. Ben gittim oraya ama

hakikaten korktum zaten, kelli felli adamlar, içeri girdim ulan bağırıyorlar çağırıyorlar, vatan haini misin sen, savaşta şu bu. Eeh dedim suyu aldım kafama diktim, [gittim] kapıya, asker vur, vur. Demişler tamam deli. Askeri rapor verildi deli diye, yani sivilden daha almamıştım o zaman. (Recai)

Sen askersin, sen Türk vatandaşısın, askerliğini yap diyorlar sana. Yapıyorsun ama hakkıyla yapamıyorsun. Şöyle, üç yüz elli kişilik bölükte bir tek lise mezunu bendim ama benim çavuş olma gibi bi bana göre tabii tırnak içinde lüksüm yoktu çünkü o hak bana tanınmıyordu. Şimdi birileri gelirdi, işte birilerini seçecekler, önce derlerdi işte sakıncalılar ayrılsın. İçerde yatmış girmiş, siyasi tutuklular, bilmem neler yani. Biz hep geri hizmetteydik. Bize dış nöbet filan verilmezdi. Nasıl olacak yani Ermeni birine silah vereceksin, ondan sonra çatışmaya girecek, karşı düşmanla işbirliği yapıp da sana naumluyu çevirirse. Çünkü insanlar için Ermeni her zaman bir düşmandır. […] Ben T.C. vatandaşıyım, ben buraya Ermenistan'dan gelmedim, kaldı ki ben Ermenistan'ı zaten kendi vatanım kabul etmiyorum. Benim vatanım burası. (Arman)

7.4 The Patriotic or Nationalist Citizen: Building Networks of Solidarity

Geçtik yürüdüm. Şöyle üç beş adım açılınca hop hemşerim bi dakka dedi, nereye gidiyon? Sanane dedim. Sekiz on kişi varlar. Hemen toplandılar. Sana gideceğim yeri söylemek mecburiyetinde değilim dedim. Kimsin? Kim olduğun da önemli değil, geçerken sana Allah'ın selamını verdim. Yetmez mi dedim. […]. Sen ülkücü müsün lan dedim. Eşkıyasınız siz dedim lan […] hadi yürü dedim şurdan derneklerine varak dedim. [...] Ülkü ocağına vardık, [...] kim lan buranın başkanı dedim. Buyur kardaş dedi, dedim ki oraya koymuşsun üç beş tane eşkıya, bu eşkıyaları çağır dedim, bizeeşkıya değiliz kardaş, biz ülkücüyüz. [...] Solcular biliyon mu baskın yaparlarmış, bunlar da oraya tedbir almışlar. […] Baskın varsa dedim ben ordan geçerken selamı Allah'ın selamını vermişim ben, Allah'ın selamını veren adamı çevirirler mi lan orda? (Mücahit)

Ben aday olurken genel merkeze gittim Ankara'ya[…] ben tarafsızlık istiyorum dedim. Bana bunu sağlarsanız ben bu işte adayım dedim. Bana söz verdi genel başkan bak rahmetlik oldu gitti, Metin Türker. [...] Fakat bu ara grev esnasında Metin Türker fabrikaya gelip […] işçiye bir vaatte bulundu […] dedi ki arkadaşlar size beş yüz bin liradan aşağı eğer maaş alırsanız kapıya nizamiyeye ipi hazırlayın orda beni asın dedi. Ben de şöyle yanında oturuyorum. Pantolonundan şöyle çektim, şöyle ne var dedi bana baktı, hocam dedim ki başkan rakam verme. […] Karşımdaki rakip kaybedeceğini aklı kesince genel merkeze gider Ankara'ya, Ankara'ya varır der ki Mücahit Karat diyor ki sizin hakkınızda eğer ben buraya şube başkanı olarak gelir de seçilirsem Metin Bey'i getireceğim burda Metin Bey'i asacağım diyor. […] En sonunda bana şunu dediler, biz dediler ki arkadaş biz seninle çalışmak istemiyoruz. […] Hasılı vesselam tuttu dört tane yaramaz adam tut sen sendika başkanını kaldır götür korkutmak amacıyla bir tane silah sık, ondan sonra, hiçbir alakam yok. Yalnız şunu söyleyeyim, olayı yapacaklarından bilgim var. […] Evini aradım, telefonla, gecenin saat birine kadar aradım cevap vermedi. Cevap verseydi ona diyecektim ki şu anda evini bırak git, iki gün evine de gelme diyecektim. […] E bizim ismimizi vermiş […] Burda emniyet de davayı dosyayı sümenaltı etmiş, atmış rafa. Ele almayacaklarmış ama vali baskı yapınca dosyayı çıkartmışlar. [...]. Tam dokuz gün gözetim altında kaldım. [...] [İşi yapana] niye bunu böyle yapıyon oğlum dedim, seni bu işin içinden çıkarırsak [...] teşkilat bizimle ilgilenmez [dedi]. [...] Dışarda da sevildiğimiz için sevilen insanı parti mecbur tutacak. (Mücahit)

Greve gideceğiz, bir gün bütün atölyeleri dolandım, bütün herkese dedim ki saat üçte şimdi o gün son biliyon mu öğlenleyin öğlenden sonra saat üçte herkes her türlü işini tezgâhını kapatacak, tezgâhlarını tertemiz pırıl pırıl temizleyeceksiniz, bütün her tarafı tezgâhınızı, aletinizi neyiniz varsa temizlenecek, pırıl pırıl gideceğiz ha, fabrika bizim ekmek kapımız, pırıl pırıl da gelip başlayacağız Allah'ın izniyle dedim. Herkese bütün talimat verdim, gezdim gezdim tek tek. Tamam başkan sen nasıl istiyorsan öyle dediler. Saat üçte herkes işini bırakmış, ee bi dolandım gene herkes baktım temizlik yapıyor, saat beşte de fabrikanın genel müdürü dolanmış. Bakmış

tezgâhların hepsi pırıl pırıl tertemiz, [...] ondan sonra bir de baktım beni çağırıyor, gel de bir görüşelim. Buyur müdür bey dedim, dedi ki oğlum Allah razı olsun, çok teşekkür ederim dedi. Gözleri doldu adamın. Gerçekten dedi ülkesini, vatanını seven insan sensin dedi. [...] Bir gün sonra grev başladı […] üç dört kişi oraya kapıya grev gözcüsü koyuyorduk [...] çok göz yumdum ben yani çünkü o fabrikanın sipariş tezgâhları var, zamanında yetişmese ne olacak, ceza yiyecek fabrika yazık günah değil mi? Kapıyı kapattık, gizliden çalışıyorlar, ben ona göz yumdum. [...] İzmir'deki Tariş, fabrikayı yaktılar, ondan sonra fabrika kapandı sonra da herkes ekmeksiz kaldı. 12 Eylül'den önceydi işte yetmişli yıllar. Tam sağ sol kavgasının kızışık olduğu dönemlerde Tariş'i yaktılar. Onun için bunları bildiğim için ben fabrikanın, ekmek kapımız dedim ben burayı ha biz gene gelip burdan biz ekmek yiyeceğiz. [...] Tabii işveren de durmuyor, grevi nasıl kıralım onun şeylerini yapıyor, on beş kişinin evine mektup göndertmişler, iş akdiniz feshedildi diye. [...] Benim evime de geldi. Ha fakat ben nizamiyeye vardım, nizamiyeye vardım, ee şeyler güvenlikçiler aman gadanı alayım içeri gelme diyor. Niye? Hakkında yazı asıldı. Ne yazısı lan! Yazı asıldı. Kapıya bir vardım baktım ki, Mücahit Karat'ın nizamiye kapısından içeri girmesi kesinlikle yasaktır. Bu yazıyı astırmış. Bir gün önce bana teşekkür eden adam bunu yazdırmış. Benim sigorta bir attı, bekçileri bir sağa sola savurdum, ta genel müdürün odasının altına vardım ama orda biraz çok terbiyesizce konuştum. Seni şerefsiz pezevenk! Ben vatan haini değilim! Bu fabrikayı ben senden daha çok seviyorum, daha çok korurum dedim. [...] Biz alın terimizi istiyoruz! […] En sonunda beni üç dört tane güvenlikçiyle dışarı çıkardılar. Orda dedim bu yazı bugün kalkmazsa dedim, bu fabrikayı senin başına yıkarım dedim [...] ama şu da var, işçi seviyordu, işçi güveniyordu bana. İşçiye desem ki gelin girin la şurayı genel müdürün odasını darmadağın edin desem darmadağın ederler. (Mücahit)

Neyin ne olduğunu bilmiyoruz […] ama bize bir kart vermişti, şöyle şu kadar kart, onu yakalattığı zaman zaten içeriye bir girdin mi yedi sene çıkamazsın. Yasaktı. Solcuların şeyiydi. Yani anlayacağın biz Ermeni şeyinin eline geçmiştik, anladın mı şimdi, o misyonerlerin eline geçmiştik o zaman. […] Ondan sonra Zeynep diye bir kızla tanıştım ben, o da aslında

Ermeni'ymiş. Sonradan öğrendim, askere gidip geldikten sonra öğrendim. [...] Askerde yakalandım, kitabı, bir kitap verdi ben de okuyordum o kitabı. Solcuların kitabıydı. Biz o zaman cahildik ya. Ne olduğunu bilmiyorduk. [...] Bir komutanımız vardı, Allah mekânını cennet etsin. Dedi ki oğlum gel buraya dedi, nerelisin sen? Dedim Erzurumluyum. Oğlum dedi Müslüman mısın dedi, elhamdüllillah komutanım dedim Müslümanım. Oğlum dedi Allah var mı dedi. Var komutanım. Peki dedi yaradan kim dedi. Dedim Allah. [...] Ya allah var dedi bu ne dedi, o kitapta herkes niye eşit yaratmamış [yazıyor] Allah, haşa! Ona bile karşı geliyordu. Ben de özgürlük istiyorum. Bana da eşitlik olsun [yazıyordu]. [...] Türkçe yazılı ama Ermeniler yazmışlar bunu. Ermeni oyununa [geldim] şimdi ben onları hep anlıyorum. [...] [19]78'de rahmetli Alsparslan Türkeş Fatih'e gelmişti. Biz de gittik onların oraya orda şey çıkaracağız, kavga çıkaracağız. Bir abi vardı, Bahri Abi diye, orda bize rastladı, [...] aldı götürdü beni bir kahveye. Fatih'te. O kahvede bana öğüt, nasihat verdi ondan sonra tövbe ettim. Ondan sonra MHP'ye geçtim. (Recai)

Hakkı: Tabii ki yönlendirenler var.
Ben: Kim yönlendirdi?
Hakkı: Orayı söylemeyeyim.
Ben: Niye? Bir şey olmaz, ne olacak?
Hakkı: Orada Iraklı Pekekeliler vardı. Anladın mı?
Ben: Onlar mı akıl verdiler?
Hakkı: Tabii ki. Onlar işçi yanlısı. Onlar işçi yanlısı. Hatta bizim paraları şirketten alan onlar oldu.
Ben: Gerçekten mi? Nasıl oldu? Ama davayla siz zaten kazandınız.
Hakkı: Dava kazandık da bazı haklarımızı vermiyorlardı.
Ben: Ne gibi mesela?
Hakkı: Yıpranma hakkı, tazminat gibi.
Ben: Kaçıyorlardı.
Hakkı: Kaçıyorlar. Şirketin gittiler yakasına yapıştılar, bu adamların paralarını çıkaracaksınız, vereceksiniz [dediler]. Şimdi cebimize alıp da gelemiyoruz, oranın, o zaman parayı. O para dinar olarak veriliyor, bankaya gidiyoruz bankaya dinar yatırıyoruz karşılığında dolar çeki alıyoruz, dolar

çekiylen geliyoruz buraya, Türkiye'ye. Onu da burda bankaya verdiğin zaman bozuyor. Böyle.
Ben: Ama siz zaten mahkemeyle kazandınız o hakkı. Gidip kendiniz alamıyordunuz.
Hakkı: Alamıyorduk, tercüman, kılavuz olmayınca alamıyorduk. Şirketin tercümanı da sana tercümanlık yapmıyor. Onlar Türkçe biliyorlar, girmişler böyle birkaç şirketin içine, sizin haklarınızı biz alacağız [dediler], verdiğimiz de ikişer yüz dinar onlara.
Ben: Onlar da komisyon alıyorlar?
Hakkı: Tabii, tabii ki ama iki yüz dinar bugün dört bin beş bin dolara karşı hiçbir şey değel.

5.5 The Deceived: The Honorable Man in a Perfidious World

Adam geldi arabaya, direksiyona kendi geçti bin dedi bindik. […] Rampalara geldik arabayı bana verdi […] Orhangazi'de dedi ki oğlum dedi yemeği nerde yiyorsunuz? [...] Gir dedi bir yemek yiyelim. [...] Oğlum lastiğin dedi patladığında nerde yaptırıyorsun veya dedi lastik alman gerektiğinde nerden alıyorsun? Dedim ki abi şeytan kulağına kurşun benim ne lastiğim patladı ne lastik almam gerekti. Öyle bir şey gerekse zaten senin haberin olur. Tamam oğlum dedi. [...] Aradan bir işte on beş gün ya geçti ya geçmedi bayram üzeri, kurban bayramı hiç unutmam, o zaman kamyon yasağı var, bayrama iki üç gün kala kamyoncular çalışamıyor, hep gece çalışıyor. Sefaköy'de bir yere malzeme götürdük ikimiz [kayınbiraderimle]. [...] Köprüde 4. Levent'in orada bir yerde biz birbirimizi kaybettik, dedim ki köprüyü geçeyim, bekleyeyim gelsin. Ben onu bekliyorum o geçmiş gitmiş. [...] Ben sabah kalktım saat dokuz, gittim arabayı çalıştırdım götürdüm fabrikaya. İş varsa yapacağım yoksa bırakıp bayrama geleceğim. Saat dokuz buçuk veya on gibi bu geldi. Ağalar selamünaleyküm dedi, aleykümselam dedik, ne diyeceğim başka? Bana tek dediği kelime şu; Muhsin dedi Hasan Ağa sana böyle diyor dedi. Ne diyor abi dedim, arabayı bıraksın diyor dedi. Tamam dedim çıkardım anahtarları teslim ettim. Bak arefe günü. Benim alacağım var, vereceğim var sormadım. (Muhsin)

Ben de dedim ki madem bedensel çalışacağım yüzde kırkı benim olsun altmışı senin olsun, hak geçmesin dedim. Neyse o adama para kazandırdım. [...] 97 senesinde dükkanı devretti, senin hakkına iki yüz milyon para düştü dedi. İki yüz milyon. İki yüz milyon para da bin dolar yapıyor. O parayı da hâlâ tahsil etmiş değilim. [...] Biz ondan sonra onunla beraber toptancılığa girdik. Yani dükkân işini bıraktık toptancılığa döndük, [...] toptancılık yaparken, kurban bayramıydı, dedim ki usta dedim benim iki tane çocuğum var, ben dedim çocukların üstü başı yok, bunlara bir şeyler almam lâzım, bana para ver. O da bana dedi ki, arefe günü piyasaya çık, satış yap, yaptığın satışı al götür, arefe günü de ben piyasaya çıktım, piyasayı gezdim ama tabii arefe dolayısıyla pek bir şey olmadı. Cüzi bir miktar para toplandı. On beş yirmi lira yani o zaman sene 98 filandı. Telefon ettim, dedim böyle böyle sen dedi o parayı oraya bırak, ben kurban keseceğim [dedi]. Dedim usta, ben böyle böyle demiştim. Ben dedi kurban keseceğim dedi parayı bırak. Ben de o öyle söyleyince ben de eve boş gittim. Ertesi gün bayramdan sonra bütün piyasadaki esnaflardan alacak paramı toparladım. Kuruşu kuruşuna yazdım, bir lira parasına da tenezzül etmedim. Getirdim parayı teslim ettim. Hesabımı verdim, işi bıraktım çektim gittim, [...] bizim bu iyi niyetimiz, güvendiğim için belki de. (Nusret)

6. Fathers In-Between

Bazı notlarım da vardı benim çocukken. Notlar almıştım. Çocuğum olursa nasıl davranırım ona diye. Babamı hep babamın bana karşı davrandıkları şeyleri çok hiç unutmazdım yazardım böyle. O notlarda şey şöyle, çocuk bir yanlış yapınca onu azarlamamak gerekiyor. Birinci kural buydu benim için. (Salim)

6. 1 A Denied Childhood

Hem oğlu hem kızıyım [annemin]. […] Hayvanlarımız var onları getiriyorum, bağlıyorum. […]. Altı yaşındayım ben dünya iş yapıyorum. […] Salim öyle oldu ki şey diyorlardı bana artık Emine'nin kızı. Annemin ismi Emine ya. Her işe koşuyorum. İşte Emine'nin bu kızı. Her işi yapar bu.

[…] Akşamleyin yemek yapılacak mesela ne yemek yapılacak? Patates yemeği, bulgur yemeği, o bulgur ayıklanacak, onları kim yapacak? Salim yapacak. (Salim)

Yedi yaşında yine, fakirlik, babam köylü olduğundan dolayı öküz, o zamanlar koşu olarak traktör olarak öküz vardı. Öküzlerle, onlarla uğraştım, otlattım, büyüdüm geri on iki yaşıma geldim, çift sürmeye başladım. Babama yardımcı oldum. Bu arada okulu bitirir bitirmez de beşinci sınıfı, pekiyiyle diploma aldım. O arada öğretmenimiz, köyün öğretmeni yakın köylümüzdü, bana dedi ki babanın nüfus kağıdı, senin nüfus kağıdın var mı dedi o zaman, yok nüfus kağıdı neyi, hiçkimse, bilmiyoruz. Nüfus kağıdı kim taşıyor? [...] Dedi ki ben seni Ankara Hasanoğlan'a yazdıracağım ordan öğretmen çıkacaksın dedi. […] Babamın nüfus kağıdını aldık, nüfusa vardık, öğretmen yanımda öğretmen şey yapıyor nüfus kağıdı çıkarttırıp ben seni yazdıracağım diyor. Vardık nüfusa, babamın nüfus kağıdını verdik, ne kayıtta varık daha ne doğumda varık ne bi şey, hatta büyük aplam gelin oldu getti, daha nüfusta yok. Bu kadar geri kafalı, geri zekalı işte köylü. [...] Şimdi öğretmen babamın yanına geldi böyle harman zamanı düven sürüyor öküzlerle, amca dedi şu çocuğu okutacaksın, ben de yardımcı olacağım. [...] Babam dedi ki yok ya ben daha yeni öküz eşek düzdüm, ben o giderse ben rençberliği nasıl yapacam, ben yapamam gönderemem. Üç kere geldi babamın yanına reddetti babam. Yok dedi gönderemem dedi. Öyleliğine hayata başladık. (Hakkı)

Oyun oynamak istedim oynayamadım hiç. […] Yok, zamanım yoktu. Hayvan otlatıyordum. […] Babam köyde, gezerdi. Atı vardı, atını güzel süslerdi, o düğün senin bu düğün benim o meyhâne senin bu meyhane benim gezerdi. Anlaşamazdık. Oldum olasıya anlaşamadım. Hayvanlara gitmiyorsun diye, he ben gidiyordum mesela gitmemek için uğraşırdım, döverlerdi hep. Babam, abilerim. (Muhsin)

Okuldan geldiğimiz zamanlar önce onları şey ederdik daha sonra da derslerimizi yapardık. [...] Okulla evin arasında da kırk dakika yürüme mesafesi vardı ve o zaman kış çok oluyordu köylerde. [...] Okula da

elimizde sobayı tutuşlamak için yakmak için herkes birer tane odun götürürdü. [...] O odunları götürmeyenleri öğretmenler döverdi. Neden? E odun götürecek ki orda soba yansın akşama kadar. (Tahsin)

Ben yalınayak gitcem okula akşam gelicem ayaklarım cıscıplak soğuk, öğrensen bile okuma yazmayı yolda gelirken yine unutuyorsun. Sonra dayak, biaz geç git okula, döve döve döve öldürüyorlardı öğretmenler. Aynı bildiğin İsrail ne yapıyorlar şeylere Filistinlilere aynı bizim öyle yaşantımız. Aynıydı bizim yaşantımız. (Bayram)

Annem severdi, benim annem Allah razı olsun. Annem, anne sevgisini almışımdır ama annemle ben fazla yaşayamadım. Mesela on bir yaşında gittim, on sekiz yaşında geldim, annemle fazla, ondan sonra evlendik, gene beraber olamadık, hala gene beraber değiliz yani. […] Ben mesela kaç yaşına gelmişim, elli altı elli yedi yaşındayım ben, hâlâ annem diyorum ya, yani bana şey geliyor yani. Hala ben annem diyorum yani. (Yüksel)

Mesela benim en büyük ukdemdir, gidip annemin koynunda iki gün yatmadım. […] Şimdi bazı arkadaşlarım anlatıyor işte analarından falan, diyorum ki oğlum yapacağınız çok bir şey yok, ananın kucağında gidip iki üç gün yatacan. (X)

O adam da babamın arkadaşıymış, bilmiyorum cahil, çocukluk ya, bilmiyorum ki babama söyler. Niye gizli yapıyorsun? [...] Babam da tesadüf oraya giriyor, oturuyor falan, [adam] böyle bakıyor diyor ki âşık köye gidecen mi? Gidecem diyor. O paketler de sizin ha! [...] Erzurum meydanında bizim arabalar kalkıyor oraya geldim, baktım babamın elinde tüp geliyor [...] hiç sesini çıkarmadı. Arabada gık demedi. Eve geldik anneme dedi ki bak oğlun sana ne almış [...] oturdu çocuk gibi ağladılar. (Recai)

Babam İstanbul'dayken tabii annem halı dokuyor, babam dört ay beş ay gidiyor ya. Bizde para yok. Halıcı gelirse para verirse oluyor. Ben bu arada eski demir, yün, ondan sonra böyle eskiciler gelirdi o zaman şimdi hurdacı

diyorlar […] gelince satardım ayağıma ayakkabı neyi kendim alırdım. […] Babama mektup yazıcaz [... ama] babamın para göndermesi, anneme, eline ulaşması bir ay. […] Annem öyle bunalmış ki rahmetli para yok. […] Bir iki gün sonra eskiler alırım diyen şey var ya o eskici [geldi], hem eskiler alıyor gelirken de mesela çocuk ayakkabısı getiriyor, çocuk pantalonu getiriyor, bluzlar getiriyor, [...] biriktirdiklerimi adama vardım dedim ki ya bunları alır mısın? Alırım dedi. Bu arada o alırım derken sebzeci geldi. Sebze meyve satıyor. Yenidünya, erik, kayısı, şeftali, elma, armut [...] Kız kardeşim de daha küçük, komşu almış elmayı armudu şeftali neyse, çocuk, karşı komşumuz onu kız kardeşimin yaşında bir kızı var, kız bir eline erik almış bir eline yenidünya almış cebine işte başka bir erik koymuş, öyle gezerken benim kız kardeşim gördü onu ben de istiyorum diye ağlamaya başladı. Yok ki alsın anam. [...] Sebzeciye vardım dedim ki arpayla buğdayla veriyor musun dedim, yanındakine baktı, iki kişiler, buğdayla verelim dedi. Kız kardeşim kapıda ağlıyor. Ben de istiyorum, erik istiyorum işte yenidünya istiyorum diye. [...]Tenekelerimiz vardı şöyle işte yağ tenekeleri olur, bir tane döktüm ona doldurdum, bir tane, koşarak gittim adama verdim. [...] Allah razı olsun adamdan tartmadan dolduruyor şeyi o benim tenekeleri. Annemin haberi yok. […]Benim kardeşim merdivenleri, onları görünce koşarak bir geldi bana doğru abi onlar ne dedi, dedim bak al. Bir ondan aldı bir ondan aldı bir tane de cebine koydu ağ[laması], kesildi. Annem merdivenlerin üstünde bizi dinliyor. [...] Annem ağlıyor. Hani o çocuğu kimseye şey yapmadık ya. Aldım ya onu. (Salim)

Köy şartları, siz bilmezsiniz, o dönem şartlar ağırdı, yani ekim dikim yapıyorlar tarlayla uğraşıyorlar, hayvancılıkla uğraşıyorlar, erkekler de bayanlar da çok yoğun, yoğun oluyorlar. O zamanlar Çatalzeytin'e inmiştik köyden hiç unutmuyorum. İlk hedefim şey demiştim hani, annem rahmetli güle güle bir iş sahibi olmak hani okuyup, ondan sonra annemi, ailemi daha doğrusu o köyden, o şartlardan kurtarmaktı hedefim. (Osman)

Elektrik yok […]1974 hiç unutmuyorum. Böyle daha yeni yaz geldi, çiçekler açıyor, demek ki mayıs ayı oluyor herhalde o zaman. Mayıs haziran gibi, köye sokak lambası falan yapmış koymuşlar, üç beş tane. Yani köy

çocukları için müthiş güzel böyle lambalar nasıl biliyor musun? Eskiden bi lambalar vardı böyle büyük armut gibi. […] Köye Devlet Su İşleri'nin kamyonu geldi. Elektrik verilecek ve herkesin. Trafo var […] böyle adamın elinde telsiz gibi, üç kilometre şeyi varmış, bizim köye üç kilometre bir tepe var, adamın biri ordaymış, orda üç kilometre öbür köyde bir adam varmış. O ona bildiriyor o ona bildiriyor […] Evlerin hep armut lambaları böyle ip gibi sallanıyor. […] Şöyle elinde bir megafon var böyle kırmızılı bir megafon var, adam diyor, herkes diyor elektrik lambalarının düğmelerini açsın. […] Bir de böyle tık tık tık ışıklar yandı, bir alkış ben o arada koşarak herkes çocuklar evine gidiyor. […]Gaz lambaları var [… annem] bir tane kutu buldu. Eskiden şey kutular vardı, Vita yağ kutuları vardı, sarı yazılı, […] anam onu yıkamış, gaz lambasını oraya koymuş. Şisesi Kırık [çünkü lambanın]. […] Ne olur ne olmaz devletin işi belli olmaz diyor tamam mı. Savaş da var keserler neyim diyor tamam mı. […] Bu arada muhtar koşarak geri geldi, neyse çocuklara dedi git oğlum babanı çağır, git oğlum amcanı çağır gelsin, adamlar misafir ya. Onların yanında yemek hazırlayacak filan diye onlara. Adam geldi, üç beş kişi işte falan toplandı, kardeşler Allah hayırlı etsin işte bilmem ne diye şey, [görevli dedi ki] aman hacı idareli kullanın ha! […] İdareli kullanın ha! İdareli kullanalım da nasıl idareli kullanacak onun idaresini bilmiyor ki kimse. İdareli kullan demeyi bilmiyor. Şey Abdurrahman Abi miydi neydi, lan gaz lambası değel ki fış diye söğündiriyim dedi ya, bunu ne edecek dedi idareli kullan, nasıl kullanacaz. Yanındakine diyor, sormaya bile cesaret yapamıyorlar yani saygıda kusur etmemek için gibi galiba. Muhtara gel dedi, muhtar idare nasıl olacakmış söyle bakayım. Bir yere giderken açık bırakmayın kapatın. İşte idare bu. (Salim)

Sabahları geç saatlere kadar yatıp keyif yapmak gibi bir şeyimiz, lüksümüz olamazdı. Ağanın oğlu yatıyor musun deyip tekmeyle uyandırdığını bilirim babamın beni. Babam hani çocuktur, ilkokul çocuğudur bilmem ne deyip de acıdığı ettiği yoktur yani. Bazen müşterisine kızardı, işlere kızardı, kalkar döverdi ederdi yani. [...] Hiç sevmediğim hâlde kendi işini öğretmek isterdi. Terziliği. Ben onun için belki o zamanlar bir metaydım. Yani meta olarak kullanırdı. Ne gibi? Dükkânın önüne koyardı bir tabureye, küçük çocuk, işte

orda dikiş yaparken gelip geçen görüyordu, ediyordu. Bu bir reklam malzemesi gibi. (Arman)

6.2 The In-Between Fathers

Adamın üç oğlu varmış, ondan sonra hangimizden adam olur demiş adama, adam da demiş ki şu anda ben karar veremem. Okuyun, çalışın, ondan sonra adamlığınızı o zaman öğreneceğim demiş. Ondan sonra şimdi oğlunun biri okuyor bunun, okulu seçiyor, okumayı, ona gidiyor biri çobancılığı seçiyor, biri de işçiliği seçiyor yani. Bizim gibi işte fabrikada çalışan. Ondan sonra şimdi çobanlığı seçenle işçiliği seçen saygı gösterirlermiş babasına. İşten gelirmiş mesela adam, yorgun da işte çalışıyor, işte saygı sevgi. Okumayı seçen şimdi gelirmiş okuldan, gelirmiş ondan sonra hiç böyle okuyom ayağına filan ondan sonra neyse bu baba dermiş şimdi okuyan, hangi oğlun demiş adam olacak demiş, oğlum ikisi adam oldu da birini bekliyorum daha demiş. Neyse, adam okuyor ediyor kaymakam oluyor, adamın oğlu. Kaymakam oluyor diyor ki haber veriyor şimdi gidin diyor babamı getirin diyor. İyi dinle bak, burası çok önemli, babamı diyor buraya getirin diyor. Niye? Bana diyor adam olamazsın dedi diyordu ben adam oldum diyor. Şimdi babası ondan sonra gidiyor. Baba diyor bak diyor ben diyor adam benden diyor adam olamaz dedin diyor ben diyor şu anda bir mülki amirim diyor. Adam oldum diyor. Oğlum diyor sen yine adam olamamışsın diyor. Adam şimdi niye diyor? Sen diyor babanı diyor ayağına kadar çağırttıran getiren değil misin diyor. Evet diyor. Sen daha olamamışsın oğlum diyor. Olmamışsın diyor. Bak. Buraya bak. Sen kaymakam olmayla adam olmuş mu oluyorsun? Baban senin babanı sen ayağına çağırıyorsun. Ne yapman gerekiyordu adam [olmak için]? Kaymakam vali olduysan, sen babanın ayağına gideceksin, baba böyle böyle diyordun Allah razı olsun, beni teşvik ettin, tetikledin ettin, ben senin ayağına geldim. Senin elini ayağını öpeyim. Beni şey [kaymakam] yaptın. Ondan sonra ben işte filan yere memur oldum kaymakam oldum, bilmem ne oldum, müsait zaman olduğu zaman gelirsin. Yapması gereken buydu normalde adam olan kişi. [...] Parayı buldu diyelim bir adam zenginledi. Ben şimdi kendi babamın yaşında bir adamı veya bir babamı oraya çağırma lüksüm olur mu ya? Niye? Saygıdan. (Cemil)

Önceden rahmetli babam gelirdi tamam mı mesela dışardan o zaman böyle koltuk falan yok ya şey var sedir deriz biz sedir, tahtadan böyle, oturak koymuşlar veya yerde otururduk, ondan sonra hemen kalkardım babama derdim mesela geç. Şimdi bak çocuk kız olsun Selim olsun ben mesela işten geliyorum, benimkine göre konuşmuyorum herkese göre konuşuyorum, böyle kumanda elinde veya telefon, eh babam geliyormuş Ahmet gitmiş Mehmet gitmiş hiç. İşte bunlar çok önemli gülüm. İşte her işin başı saygı. Bir adamı zaten sayarsan sevmek zorunda değilsin. Saymak şöyle bir şey zaten Allah'tan. Allah böyle yapmış, sen büyüğe saygı küçüğe sevgi göstereceksin. (Cemil)

Hiç hayır çıkmadı ağzımdan. Niye? Ben babamdan gördüğüm için değil [...] Şimdi bak düşün, benim babam fabrikada çalışıyordu, biz öyle şey büyüdük yani, ayakkabı nerde öyle alıyorsun, biz ayakkabı alsak belki üç sene beş sene on sene giyiyorduk yani. Doğruyu konuşacaksın. Ondan sonra, şimdi ben hatta bazen hanımla konuşuyoruz o konuda anlaşamıyoruz, hiç hayır demiyorum [diyorum] sana ya, ben yaşamadım onlar yaşasın diye. […] Şimdi bak mesela benim kız şimdi bir yerlere gider baba diyor ta diyor ordan ağırlığını hissettiriyorsun diyor bana. Tamam mı? Ne yaptın kızım, ne ettin yavrum. Bir sıkıntın var mı, paran var mı [diye arar sorarım]. Vallahi bak. Şimdi bak, ben şimdi burdak konuşuyorum yani ben çok ağladım, ondan sonra, niye ağladın? Şimdi mesela benim kız üniversiteyi okumuş, bitirmiş, ben bunun altına bir araba niye alamıyorum? Anladın mı? Çocuğa bir yani aslında ben çocukları iyi yetiştirdim, parasız bırakmadım. Bunu bil. [...] Telefonun en iyisi onun oldu, elbisenin en iyisi onlarda olmuştur, sıkıntı yaptırmadım, hâlâ çoğu der yani Selim'i gören bir fabrikatör çocuğu zanneder, zaten bir ara Etiler'e takılıyordu. Bu bir gerçek yani, yalan konuşmaya gerek yok. Ondan sonra ama bak şöyle bir his var bende biliyor musun? Babalık görevini bir adam mesela benim çocuğum baba bana harçlık ver dediği zaman ben bunu veremezsem var ya hani ben kendimi hani o anda kurşunlasam benden kan çıkmaz. [...]Allah'ıma çok şükür bu zamana öyle bir şey olmadı. (Cemil)

Bizim çocukluğumuzda biz pazardan gelen bir helva, meyveye bayram yapıyorduk. Onlar buna rağmen bayram yapmıyorlar mesela. Çok daha farklı şeyler istiyorlar. Yani yetişemiyorsun bugünkü nesle. Bugünkü nesle yetişmen zor, yetişmen zor. Ben mesela ömrümde bir deniz kenarına bir Antalya bir Mersin bir İzmir gibi tatile gitmiş insan değilim mesela. Böyle bir şeyim, imkânım olmadı benim. Ama benim çocuklarımın gittiği yerler de oldu. Hâlâ yani mutlu olamıyorlar. Memnun olamıyorlar yani. Hayattan farklı beklentileri var. [...] Aç da kalsak açıkta da kalsak annemize babamıza bir mutsuzluk hissettirmezdik yani, sabrederdik. Sineye çekerdik, o şekilde giderdi. [...] Var olan nesil bugün doymuyor, yetinemiyor. Yani hep daha iyisi, daha fazlası. Bugünkü nesil öyle. Pek yapacak bir şey yok. Bunu aşamıyoruz. Bugünkü nesle bunu anlatmak izah etmek normal döndürmek gibi yok yani görmüyorum öyle bir şey. (Cavit)

Bu benim hanımla konuşuyor diyor böyle böyle. Biz de karar aldık gittik dünürcülük yaptık. [...] Ben dedim beş tane altın yaparım, mobilya ihtiyaçları neyse gerekirse onları yaparım. Güzel bir düğün yaptık. Her şeyini aldım. [...] Bak çocuklar da bana yardım ettiler şey ettiler biz ailece [yardım ettik]. (Tahsin)

Artık her şey geçim, kazancın rahatladıkça kendin de rahatlıyorsun. [...] En büyük hatayı orda yaptım. Çalışmasın diye uğraştım. Ne bileyim. Şimdi bizim köy yerinde çalışan kadını dışarda çalıştırmazlar. Biz de öyle gördük, öyle şey yaptık ama yanlış. Yanlış. Niye yanlış? Şimdi Allah gecinden versin, çocuklar olmasa. Ben boşanmış olsam ne yapacak? [...] On sene önce çalışmaya başlasaydı çok rahat olacaktım. (Muhsin)

Çocukların seni yüzde seksen beğenmiyor. Ben oğluma diyorum ki oğlum ben ne yaptımsa burda yaptım, benim gayrimeşru bir işim yok. Ben ne yaptıysam, ne kazandıysam burdan kazandım. Sizi hiçbir şeye muhtaç etmedim. (X)

Tam dokuz ay bak tam dokuz ay açlık nedir yokluk nedir orda gördüm. 2001'de. Krizde. Tam dokuz ay. Kira vermedim. Elektrik yok. Su yok.

Kesilmedi ama ödeyemiyorum. Hep borç. Allah razı olsun Konyalı bir arkadaşım var şimdi Konya'ya yerleşti. Az da olsa adam elinden geldiğince yardım etti. Cam fabrikasında işçiydi adam. Kendine iki kilo aldıysa bana bir kilo almış. Olmadı yarım kilo almış. Bu bir gün değil, iki gün değil, tam dokuz ay. [...] Dokuz ay içinde hanım hasta oldu, çocuklar var. Bakan yok. Aç, susuz, evin içi rezillik. [...] En sonunda dedim ki yav arkadaş ben bu işi yapamayacağım, intihar edeyim dedim ya çoluğum çocuğuma ekmek götüremiyorsam intihar edeyim. (Muhsin)

Muhsin: Ben on sekiz yaşıma girene yani askere gidene kadar düğün, bayram, dernek bilmem. Senede bir veya iki kere berbere tıraş olmaya giderim, ben yaklaşık on dokuz yaşına kadar normal ayakkabıyı ayağımda hiç görmedim.
Ben: Ne giyerdin?
Muhsin: Lastik ayakkabı ,kara lastik. Onu da o ilk ayakkabıyı da bana dayımın oğlu askere gitmeden aldı. [...] 35 numara ayakkabı aldım. çok küçüktü çok da iyi hatırlıyorum. [...] Ben çok çektim, o yüzden elimden geldiğince çektirmemek için çok uğraşıyorum.

Mesela 2015'in üçüncü ayından beri benim oğlumun en zararı bana beş yüz milyon. Beş yüz milyon. Eşinden ayrıldı. Benim aldığım dairemin hissesini sattı, yapma oğlum dedim, yok. Kafasına göre takıldı. Yanlış şeyler yaptı. Mesela ben şimdi torunlarıma her ay iki bin liraya yakın para masrafı ediyorum. Dairesini aldım, yani şey yapmadım. Mesela benim oğlum eşinden ayrıldı, ben gelinime dedim ki benim torunlarımın başında durduğun sürece sen benim başımın tacısın. Hiç sıkıntı yok. Sen benim torunlarımın başında durduğun sürece. Onlar ayrılmışlar çocuk her ay beş yüz lira nafaka vereceğim demiş, hiçbirisini verdiği de yok. Ben de zaten torunlarımı çok seviyorum. [...] Benim gelinimin annesi yok babası yok, ben onları sokakta bırakamam. [...] Babalık bizde bitmez, biz Avrupa gibi on sekiz yaşında hadi bak işine diyemeyiz. [...] Biz şimdi yufka yürekli olduğumuz için biz çektik, kızımız çekmeyecek, oğlumuz çekmesin [istiyoruz]. (X)

Bahtiyar bir telefon etti bana, baba dedi, ee söyle, biz İstanbul'a düğüne geldik dedi, annemle falan filan, düğüne geldik dedi ya burdan da dedi bir ev kiraladık. Dayısının çocuklarının düğününe gidiyorlar, [hanımın] kardeşinin çocuklarının düğününe. Ondan sonra oraya da gelince diyorlar ki ya sizin gelin var, yetişmiş oğlan var, şu var bu var, siz daha orda ne duruyorsunuz. Gelin. Aha çalışın burda, çorapta çalışın, şurda çalışın. [...] Göçüyorsanız göçün dedim, kiralamışsınız madem. [...19]72'den beri İstanbul'u taşıyorum. İstanbul'un ekmeğiyle büyüdük. Geçindik. Şey yaptık. İstanbul'a gelmek iyi bir şey ki kazanan için. Bir şeyler kazanan için. Bizim için hiç iyi olmadı. Ben çok kaybettim. Her şeyi kaybettim ben. [...] Ben köydeyken dışarı gittim geldim traktörü hemen peşin aldım. Yine gittim geldim evi peşin aldım. Oralarda para birikiyordu. [...] İstanbul'a geldik. 2002'den bu yana ben üst üstüne bir şey koyamadım. Biriktiremedim. (Hakkı)

Kimseye muhtaç etmedim. Köyde olsun şehirde olsun. Herkes beni şehirli çocuğu gibi yetiştirdim köyde. Herkes benim çoluğumla çocuğumla [gurur duyardı]. İstanbul'a çok gelip gidiyorum ya, gelir giderken bir elbise alırdım bir şey alırdım, köyde öyle elbiseleri herkes alıp da giydiremez mesela. [...] Mahallede benim hanıma imrenmeyen kimse kalmadı. Bir işe göndermedim. Sen sakın işe gitmeyeceksin, ben gelir giderim, harçlığını cebine doldurur çeker giderim. Yan mahalle der ki ya, bu şey aranıza nasıl girdi, nifak nasıl girdi. Nifak aranıza sizin nasıl girdi. Sen yani şurda takip ediyoruz, görüyoruz, bir işe göndermedin, aç koymadın, perişan etmedin, dışarı gittin, bankaya giderken hesapları üzerine açtın gittin. (Hakkı)

Aslan: Ben hiç gitmedim. Eşimle ayrı olduğum için ya dedim ben dedim gelirim onun tarafı gelmez, ya o gider benim tarafım gelmez. O onu seçti.
Ben: Bir şey dediniz mi?
Aslan: Hayır, hayır tam tersi. Biraz da maddiyattan kurtuldum. [...] Atıyorum o gün mesela elimde yirmi bin lira olsa hanımı hiç konuşturmam sokmazdım devreye ben giderdim. Kesinlikle ben giderdim. [...] O gelmeyecek ben gidiyorum. Ben öyle derdim.

Çocuklar yetişince, benden para istemeye başlayınca. Biraz da şey olunca, işlerimiz de kötüydü. Yani bizim sektörümüz de kötüydü, yılın altı ayı, beş ayı boş geçiyor. Tabii, 2004, 2005'e kadar eşim çalışmadı, ondan sonra çalışmaya başladı. Bilhassa çocuk üniversiteye giderken mesela baya zorlandım yani. Baya zorlandım. (Aslan)

Ruhum babamın üzerinde. Yine bir gün bir bayram günüdür, tabii o zamanlar evimde telefonum yok, bayram sabahı kalktım ankesörlü telefona gitmişim babamı arıyorum. Yeminle söylüyorum elimde sigara, sıra bana geldi sigara içiyorum ama babamla sohbet ederken hem de ağlıyorum bir taraftan, sigara da avucumda saklı. Neyse konuşmam bitti dışarı çıktım. Arkamda bir tane yaşlı bir adam var. Konuşmadı dedi yavrum hele gel böyle beni kenara aldı, dedi sen kiminle konuştun, babamla dedim, nerde baban, dedim Kars'ta. Adam kalktı alnımdan öptü ve o da benimle ağlamaya başladı. Dedi helal olsun sana, bak aranda 1700 kilometre mesafe var, artı telefonda konuşuyorsun, sigarayı saklıyorsun. (İlhami)

Benim iki tane çocuğum var hiç böyle baba evlat ilişkisi yok. Bak iki tane çocuğum var ikisiyle de arkadaş gibiyim. Kızım bana Ilhami der, bu da bana ayrı bir şey veriyor. Yani bir arkadaş gibiyiz. [...] Baba sevgisini yaşayamayan, baba sevgisine aç birisi olarak ben asla çocuklarıma bunu yansıtmadım. [...] Yeter ki baba babalığını bilsin ama çocuk da babanın yanında [olduğunu] baban[nın] çocuk için yıkılmaz bir kale olduğunu unutmasın. (İlhami)

Şimdi görüyorum fazla uzakta değil, amcamın oğlu, baba yanında oturur ayak ayak üstüne atar elinde tespih sallar. Ya bu baba ya, buna saygısızlığın en büyüğünü yapıyorsun. Yani babaya bundan başka bir şeyim yok. (İlhami)

On dört çocuğa sevginin neyini verebilirsin? Ve o zamanın yani şöyle söyleyeyim sana bundan otuz, kırk yıl öncesinin elli yıl önceki bir insanın kafa yapısıyla şimdiki kafa yapısını yan yana getirdiğim zaman o elli yıl önceki kafa yapısı şimdiki bu teknoloji çağında olan insanın kafa yapısından kat kat ilerde olduğunu görürüm. [...] [Babam] acaba [sevgisini] on dört kişiye bölseydi

ne yapabilirdi? Kafayı tırlatırdı. (İlhami)

Kardeşimin çocuğu var, küçük, onu sevdim. Aldım kucakladım. Benim oğlum kalktı, büyük oğlum dedi ki bizi dedi hiç böyle kucağına alıp sarmalamadın dedi. İçim parçalandı dedi onu kucağına aldığın zaman dedi. [...] Tek başıma çalıştığım için evime para kazanıp evimin ihtiyacını görmekti, ben orda mesela çocukları ne kadar mağdur ettiğimi orada farkına vardım. Şimdi o yüzden şimdi iki çocukta da hiçbir zaman gözünün üstünde kaşın var demiyorum. Hiç demiyorum çünkü kinci oluyorlar. Ben hiç beklemiyordum mesela. Bana bunu söyleyen çocuk yirmi iki yaşında ya. [...] Bana bunu söyleyince ben dondum. Şimdi çocuk sevemiyorum ben onların yanında. Şimdi onların yanında ben çocuk almam kucağıma. (Nusret)

Benim onlar gibi öyle bir lüksüm yoktu. Ben kin tuttum mu? Evet. Şöyle tuttum, tutmuş, tuttum. Çok şeydi, ee baskı çok kullanıyordu. Döverdi. disiplinliydi, ufak bir hatayı affetmezdi. Vefat ettiği zaman sanki dünya benim olmuştu. (Nusret)

Ben türkiye şartlarında bir işçi emeklisiyim. [...] Diğer emeklilere bakarak belki maaşım yüksek, kamudan emekli olduğum için [...] ama aldığım maaş bugünkü için aileme yeterli mi? Yeterli değil. Yetmiyor. Ben dört bin lira aylık alıyorum. İyi bir aylık diğer emeklilerin maaşlarına göre. Benim kayınpederim mesela 35 sene sigortası yatmış. Adamın 1300 lira maaşı var. Mesela. Ben kamuda 17 sene çalıştım. Benim maaşım 4000 lira. [...] Benim maaşım iyi ama hayat şartlarına girdiğim zaman iki tane üniversite öğrencisini ben [okutuyorum, dışarda birisi ev tuttu, geçen seneki Balıkesir'deki ev tuttu arkadaşlarıyla, 700 lira kirası var. İki kişi verecek bunu. Bunun evi geçinecek. Orda bir genç kızın giyimi kuşamı topluma adapte olması nerden bakarsan bak bana bir buçuk iki milyara mal oluyor aylık. En az bir buçuk milyara mal olacak. E şimdi bu da gidecek. Şeysi çıkmadı, adını sen söyle, yurt çıkmadı. [...] Şimdi ben aldığım maaşı bu iki gence sıvamam lazım, vermem lâzım, harcamam lazım. Burda da kendimizin bir geçimi olacak. [...] Ablalarının evlenme şeysi var, onun masrafları olacak. [...] Yani kız tarafının yapması gereken birtakım masraflar var. [...] Türkiye şartlarında ben babayım işte yani. Bunları düşünmek mecburiyetindeyim. Ben bu çocuklarımın babasıyım, onlara bu şeyleri yaşatmam lâzım. Neyi yaşatmam lazım? Geçim şeyleri olmaması lâzım. Onlar bundan, onlar benden bunu bekliyorlar. Sen babasın diyor, beni

okutacaksın diyor bir yerde yani. Eğer şeyin yoksa okutacak durumun yoksa beni hiç oraya yazdırmasaydın diyor şimdi mesela ortanca kızım. E dolayısıyla haklı. [...] Büyüdükçe, topluma girdikçe bir de toplum, sistem özenti yetiştiriyor, benim arkadaşımın diyor şu marka telefonu var diyor. E benim arkadaşım diyor falanca mağazadan giyiniyor falanca spor ayakkabım yok diyor. Falanca bilmem ne botum yok diyor [...] sistem onları hep öğütüyor, hep işte özenti yapıyor. Bir şeyleri parlatıyor. Bilmem ne yapıyor. Onlar da arkadaşlarıyla birlikte onun etkisinde kalıyor. E o da kime yansıyor, dönüyor dolaşıyor aileye yansıyor. Aile bireyde baba. Anne elini eteğini çekmiş. Ben bir anneyim [diye]. Zaten ben de ilkokul mezunuyum ama eşim de ilkokul mezunu, dolayısıyla hani hep erkek çalıştığı için eşim pek çalışmadı. [...] Ortanca kızım, hayal kuruyor, işte ben okulu bitirdiğim zaman şöyle zengin olacağım, böyle zengin olacağım diyor. Ya nasıl olacak onu bilmiyorsun ki işte. Yarın hayal kırıklığına uğrayacak. İşte ben de o hayal kırıklığına uğramaması için bu sistemin bir an evvel kökünden yok olması lazım düşüncesi var bende de. (Ömer)

> Birkaç ay sonra geldi bu, pılıyı pırtıyı toplamış, öyle tabir ederler ya ben dedi okumayacağım. Bir sene sonra tekrar Hukuk Fakültesine gideceğim. İşte burda babalık içgüdünüz devreye giriyor. Dedim ki gideceksin, o okul bitecek, geleceksin, göreve başlayacaksın. Sonra hukuk okumak istiyorsan okuyacaksın. Ben babayım dedim. Benim dediğim yapılacak. Bitti. Hiç taviz vermedim. Hemen ertesi gün tekrar biletini aldım geri gönderdim. (Acar)

> Ben büyük bir hata yaptım onda. Açık söyleyeyim. Bir anlık bir düşünceyle hareket ettim ama sonradan pişman oldum ama iş işten geçti. Kızı okutmadım. Okutmadım derken yani kendisi okusaydı benim ona şeyim yoktu, ben okuması taraftarıydım ortaokulda, ilkokulda bir başarısı olmadı. Pek hevesi olmadı. Ben açıkça söyledim yani ortaokuldayken dedim bak kızım okuyacaksan iyi oku. Öyle aburcubur sınıf geçmeyle iş olmaz. Başarı önemli. Yoksa okutmam dedim evde oturur çeyizini hazırlarsın. Ben açık konuşuyorum dedim. Okuyacaksan sonuna kadar okuturum ama bu şekilde gidersen okutmam ama bunu söylediğim için de rahatım yani. Pek şey yapmadı ben de tuttum o zaman otur evinde çeyizini hazırla dedim ama ne

olursa olsun en azından bir lise diplomasını aldırmam gerekiyordu. (Mücahit)

6.3 The Mores and Fatherly Authority

Bir adam toplumun, toplumu rahatsız ediyorsa, bireyi değil şahsı değil yani, toplumu rahatsız ediyorsa o adam sıkıntı. [...] Çoğunluğa bir adamın zararı varsa çoğunluğa bak, o adam kötü ama [...] evde bir adam kötü diye bu sokak bu adama kötü diyemez. Niye diyemez? Sokağa zararı yok adamın ki. (Cemil)

Annem babam benim dini bilgileri iyi insanlar, ikisi de Kuran okur, ben çocuklarıma bismillah çekmeyi dahi öğretmeyen bir insanım yani annem babam yaptı bunları. Onların hepsi Kuran okumayı, namaz kılmayı benim çocuklarımın hepsi bilir, hepsi Kuran okur, annem babam bunları yaptı başardı yani. [...] Namaz, abdest, kapalı olmak mesela bunlar önem arz eden şeyler. [...] Fatmanur kapalıydı da yakında açtı. [...] Ben de serbest bıraktım. Baskı yapmadım. Kapalı olsalar sevinirdim. Daha beni mutlu ederdi ama baskı da yapmadım. Zorlamadım. [...] ama Esmam kapalı. Daha farklı bir şey oluyor bana karşı tabii ki. Daha güven verici oluyor bana, daha sıcak geliyor o şekilde olması. Daha farklı bir ortam yaratabiliyor yani. Öteden beri gelen âdetimizi, töremizi uyguluyor mesela böyle bana bir huzur veriyor. [...] Şimdi iki tane kızım açık. Saygı duyuyorum yapacak da çok bir şey yok. Zorlamıyorum ama Esma'nın durumu farklı. Onunla da gurur duyuyorum. (Cavit)

O hiç kapanmadı yalnız. O burda doğdu büyüdü. Buranın şeylerine [alışkın], o hiç kapanmadı. Arada [başörtü] takardı, etek giyerdi, başörtüsü takardı, namaza dururdu, başörtüsünü çekerdi falan. [...] İlk baştan uyguluyordu daha sonra işte uygulamayı da kesti yani. (Cavit)

Çok iyi algılamadım, üzüldüm. Kabullenemedim ilk başta ama okuluyla mesleğiyle bir ilgisi olur benden dolayı bir sıkıntıya uğramasın diye üstüne de gitmedim, serbest bıraktım. Mesela okullarda eskiden başörtüsü sorunları

filan çok oluyordu ya dinci görülüyordu, farklı algılanıyordu falan, öyle bir şeyle karşı karşıya gelmesin diye kendi iradesine bıraktım. (Cavit)

Kızımı bir kere ben sigarayla yakaladım, bir kere yakaladım. Murattı paketi vardı çantasında, hiç yapmadığım bir şeyi yaptım, âdetim değildir öyle bir şeyi karıştırmak kızımın çantasını karıştırdım ve sigara yakaladım. Huylandığım için baktım. [...] Ondan sonra dedi ki bu benim değil baba dedi, arkadaşımın dedi. Sadece bir tane tokat attım. [...] On beş on altı yaşlarında falandı. Bundan altı yedi sene önceki olay. (Muhsin)

Ne olursa olsun hayatta şunu öğrendim, senin olan şeye sahip çıkmazsan başkaları sahip çıkar. Kız çocuklarında şu var, sıkmayacaksın ama onlarla arkadaş olacaksın. [...] Küçük kız kütüphâneye gidiyor. Mütemadiyen kütüphânede. [...] Hanım dedi ki bugün dedi kütüphâneye gidecekmiş saat ona kadar ordaymış dedi. Tamam dedim. Ben ona kadar yokum dedim söylerse baban kahveye gitti de dedim. [...] Ben burdan gittim kütüphâneye, kapüşonu taktım kafama, şapkayı giydim, içeriye girdim, oturdum bir yere, baktım, iki katlı orası. Yok. Görevliler dolaşıyor içerde. Kimse yanlış yapmasın diye, içerde bekçiler var. Güvenlik. güvenliğe dedim ki ya buranın tek kat mı başka bir yeri var mı buranın, abi alt katta bir yer daha var dedi. Ayrıca kafe var. [...] İndim merdivenlerden aşağı, baktım altı tane kapı var, [...] bir baktım orda oturuyorlar, üç kız bir erkek. Grup yapmışlar, hiç kafalarını kaldırmıyorlar. Ses yok. Hep ders çalışıyor çocuklar. Kapının arkasına geçtim, [arayıp sordum] kızım nerdesin. Baba ben anneme söyledim, ben kütüphânedeyim, geç geleceğim biliyor musun haber verdiler mi sana [dedi]. [...] Geçtim ordan bir çay aldım arkamı döndüm kapıya. Saat ona kadar oturdum orda. Bunlar çıktılar, etrafında da çok pis kafeler var, nargileler, biralar, bilmem ne, etrafında. Kapıda bir sürü zibidi. Tipleri görsen böyle var ya, jöleli jöleli saçlar, hiç sevmediğim tipler. Onlar çıktı ben de kapüşonu kafama indirdim, onlar yoluna gidiyorlar, otobüs durağında bir tanesi bizim kızla beraber geliyor, onlar otobüs durağına, bizimkiler metroya, hemen metronun ben de asansörden indim. Baktım onlar başka kapıdan biniyor, ben de başka kapıdan bindim. [...] Metrodan indik [...] eve gelmeden otobüs durağı var orda kız bu tarafa gidiyor bizimki o tarafa

gidiyor, orda ayrıldılar, ışıklar var ışıklardan geçti bizim kız [...] hastane var, oranın gece güvenliği de arkadaşımın oğlu [...] onla da tanıştıracağım ya fırsat olacak, hani gece geliyor ya bir şey olursa orda baksın diye, ondan sonra kızıma da söyleyeceğim ki işte bak burda abin var burda, şey olmaz diye. Işıklardan geçtim, hişt yaptım böyle tamam mı. Bakmıyor. Hızlı hızlı yürüdü biraz. Alo dedim. Aa baba ne yapıyorsun burda dedi. Kahveye gittik dedim arkadaşın biri gel dedi, geri eve gidiyorum, ondan sonra söylemedim. Söylersem şimdi güvensizlik olur.

İşte gitmiş kör kütük aşık olmuş lisede. Dersler bitmiş, [...] bir hocası beni uyardı, dedi ki biraz daha dikkat edin, dedi konulardan uzaklaşıyor. [...] Oturduk konuştuk ama yani bir de çocuğun bir şeysi var çocuğunuzu bilirsiniz, sabit bir noktaya bakıyor da sizi dinlemiyorsa bilin ki o kendi kararını vermiştir. Yani ne deseniz boştur yani artık ondan sonra. Evin içinde yazışmaya başladık biliyor musunuz? Yani çünkü bazı şeyleri söylüyorsunuz anlamıyor. Oturuyorum yazıyorum. O da bana cevap yazıyor. Yani yazışıyoruz bir de kalıcı olsun diye. Yani evin içindeyiz mesela oturuyor karşımda, kanepede oturuyor, ben burdan yazıyorum. Mesajlaşıyormuşuz gibi. [...] Hatta o mektupların bir kısmı birkaç sene öncesine kadar duruyordu. Bir şekilde sonradan ben imha ettim yani. Ben kaldırdım çünkü belki de o mektupların içerisinde şimdi eşlerin de görmemesi gereken ne bileyim içinde kötü anılar da oluyor. [...] Hiçbir zaman gizli saklı takip etmedim çocuklarımı, yani onları ofsayta düşüreyim, hatasını yakalayım bulayım falan demedim. Okuldan almaya giderim tam okulun kapısının önüne çekerim arabayı. Çıkınca beni görsünler diye. (Acar)

Kız çocuğunu daha hem tez küstürürsün hem tez yola getirirsin. Yani yanlışı doğruyu tez öğrenir kız çocuğu. Erkek çocuğuna öğretemezsin. Bu gerçek. Erkek çocuğu çok lafa gitmez kıza bakarak. Ondan sonra şimdi nasıl oluyor bu acaba, şimdi kız hani bizim tabii örf ve âdet geleneklerimizde var ya hep kızlar bayanlar işte ikinci planda. (Cemil)

Ben dedim ne istiyorsan yap, ben kısıtlayıcı bir baba değilim ama toplum içindeki hareketlerine dikkat et. Örf âdet ananelerimize dikkat et. Kimseyi

kırma, üzme. Yani herkes desinler ki ya bu senin oğlan, maşallah çok efendi bir çocuk, çok akıllı bir çocuk, çok saygılı bir çocuk desinler. Hiçbir yeri kazanmasan da olur benim için. Doktor da olmasan olur, amele ol ama amele de bir insan o da ekmek parası kazanıyor ama herkesin takdir ettiği bir insan ol. (Hüsamettin)

Ben dedim ki buna benim karşımda istediğin kadar [sigara] iç, toplum içinde dedim karşıma geçip içme. Bak bu tek istediğim senden bu dedim. Şimdi biz ikimiz baba oğuluz ama iki arkadaş gibiyiz ama topluma girdi mi baba oğula dönüyorsun. Yani toplum içinde içtiği zaman babanın karşısında sigara, sen kimsin hesabına geliyor. Yani ben istediğimi yaparım, ben hürüm. Ben dedim buna, yeri geldi oturduk beraber alkol de aldık. Yapmadık desem yalan olur. Bir eğlencede denk geldi o da. Ondan sonra gittik baktık yine denk geldi, dedim kusura bakmayın arkadaşlar, ben gelmem buraya. Niye? E dedim benim orda benim boyumda oğlum var. Ben dedim girmem o topluma. He gideceksek dedim başka bir tarafa gidelim. Aynı topluma girmem ama gideceksek başka bir yere gidelim ama dedim ben o topluma girmem. E ne olacak? Dedim yok arkadaş. O toplumun içinde bu da var, o toplumun içinde bu da var şimdi ben gittiğim zaman ya bu gidecek ya da benimle oturup içecek. E şimdi orda onu hoş karşılayan da var muhabbet esnasında ama yarın bir gün derler ki bak işte çavuşun çocukları hiç insan tanımıyorlar. Toplum içinde beraber oturup içiyorlar. Bunu derler. Baş başayken hiçbir şeye sıkıntım yok. (Muhsin)

Kızlarım her ortama yatıyordu. Dur diyorsun duruyor ama erkeğe dur diyemiyorsun. Bazı yerde dur diyemiyorsun. [...] Hâlâ bu zihniyeti temizlemedik. Halbuki erkek olsun kadın olsun kendine güveni olmadı mı o hayatı yaşayamaz. Eziklik yaşar. Benim hanımım işte, hep ezik yaşamıştır. Doktora giderdik, doktorda kendini anlatamazdı. Acaba doktor bana kızar mı çünkü baba baskı yapmış, “Sen sus! Kız kısmı konuşmaz, baba konuşacak!” [diye öğretmiş]. [...] Hanımı götürdüm ben psikiyatrik doktora, hanıma sordu kaç yaşındasın dedi, hanım elli bir elli iki yaşındaydı dedi ki kırk yedi yaşındayım. Ya dedim senin hiç kırk yedi yaşın bitmiyor mu dedim, elli iki yaşındasın. doktor bana dedi, kadındı, çık dışarı dedi, sanane

dedi bizim yaşımızdan, sen ne karışıyorsun biz kırka da gireriz otuza da gireriz, çık dışarı dedi, karışma dedi. Şimdi niye? Sanane, kabahat benim. Ona soruyor. İşte eskiden babalar da öyleydi. (Recai)

Dövmedim, bir tane fiske vurduğum yoktur. […] Torunlarıma da aynısını söylüyorum, anneleri bağırıyor, babaları bağırıyor, bağırmayın. İzah et. Aldım geçen Kadıköy'e gittim, bak kızım dedim bak onlar içki içiyorlar, kızlar, o hâllerini görüyor musun? O iyi mi? Yok dede dedi. İşte dedim, ondan sonra öyle bak dedim. Bak onlar orda ne yapıyor? Bu aile mi iyi bu aile mi iyi? Ya dede bu aile iyi. Bak ne güzel dedim [...] ama o aile, herkes onlara lanet okuyor. İşte kötü yol budur dedim. Arkadaşını iyi seç. On tane arkadaşın olacağına iki tane arkadaşın olsun. Temiz olsun. (Recai)

Ben derdim ki kızım bak bu muhite uyun, kapalı aile. Sen de kapalı ol. […] Ortam kapalıysa kapalı ol, ortam sana değil, sen ortama uyacaksın. Burda kız vardı, çantasına koyuyordu orda elbiseleri değiştiriyorlardı. Benim kız kardeşlerim de açıktı, ben niye açıksın demiyorum, ne zaman kapanırsan kapan. Derya hepten açıktı. Öğretmen olan, bir gün geldi dedi ki ben kapanacağım. Hadi inşallah dedim. Tırnakları uzatırdı, kızım onları kes kes kes. Annesine diyordu ki her şeyime karışmayın. Hanım okulla evin arasını ölçmüştü, bir dakika geçti mi hanım ayakkabıları giyip hemen gidiyordu, nerdesin? […] anne arkadaş... Hayır. Arkadaşlarını getir eve. Arkadaşlarını getirdi mi o arkadaşlarının aileleriyle tanışırdım. Bakayım aileleri nasıl. Bir tanesinin ailesiyle tanıştım, dedim bunu koymaycaksın eve kızım. Bu yaramaz. Ana da yaramaz baba da yaramaz. Sonunda dediğime geldi. [...] Aile ortamını, arkadaşını seçeceksin. […] Erkek bir yerde kendini savunur kız çocuğu savunmaz, [...] kıza leke geldi mi hayatı söner. (Recai)

[...]'da iki sene okudu bir sene okudu ikinci senenin yarısında dekanın gırtlağını sıkmış. Dekan telefon etti bana ben de bir işte çalışıyorum. Tersanede. Senin dedi kızın benim gırtlağımı sıktı dedi mahkemeye vereceğim. Bu dinsizlik davasında, ateistmiş dekan. Bu da Kuran okuyor. Allah vardır yoktur şuyu buyu. Ulan bunu burda yaşatmayacaklar. Ne yapalım edelim. Dedim kızım ne yapalım. Baba dedi yatay şey varmış geçiş

varmış. Ben onu yapacağım bu tarafa. Burda nereyi tutturursan tuttur. İyi dedim. Onun en çok istediği karşı taraftaydı orası olmadı. [...] Üniversitesini kazandı. Yatay olarak. Burda da ikinci oldu, hakkını yediler. Orda da isyan etti. Zor durdurduk. Nişanlısı, kaynatası, kaynanası gelmişti o zaman nişanlıydı orda. Zor durdurduk. (Recai)

Burda yatılı YİBO dediğimiz yatılı öğretim okulları vardı, kızım orda görevli. Orda kız çocuklarına taciz olayı [oluyor]. Kızım işte ayda bir gün falan nöbette kalıyor, yatılı. Orda kız çocukları buna anlatıyor. Ertesi gün kızım geldi bana baba dedi, annesiyle de konuşmuyor, seninle bir şey konuşmak istiyorum dedi. Anlattı konuyu bana ama konuyu biz dört beş saat konuştuk çünkü bu konunun ortaya çıkması hem aileler açısından reddedilme olayı var, çocuğun inkâr olayı var, karşı tarafından cephe alması var, bu işin yargı dönemi var falan hepsini konuştuk. Dedim ben vazgeç. İşte yine babalık içgüdüsü koruma içgüdüsü. Vazgeç çünkü bunu aileleriyle konuş onlar bir önlem alsın. [...] Dedi ki kızım hayır baba dedi o zaman ben çok, bekar o zaman, çok vicdanen rahatsızlık hissederim dedi. Bunu yapmazsam kendimi dedi affedemem dedi ileriki yıllarda dedi. Sen bilirsin dedim. Ertesi gün gitti okul müdürüyle konuştu. Okul müdürü şiddetle reddetti, yani böyle bir şey olması mümkün değil dedi çünkü taciz yapan da müdür yardımcısı. [...] Baba dedi birlikte şeye gidelim rehberlik merkezine. Gittik. […] Yani bu olay yüzünden YİBO kapatıldı. […] Sonra burda başka olaylar oldu. […] Dedim artık uzak duracaksın kesinlikle. Biz tehditler almaya başladık. İftira atıyorsunuz dediler kızıma. Kızımı tehdit ediyorlar. [...] Bir daha dedim kesinlikle bu işlere bulaşmayacaksın. Bu arada nişanlandı evlendi derken bu işlerden uzaklaştı. (Acar)

İnsancıl yönümü görüyordu ama dinsiz olduğumu da biliyordu. [...]evlenirken benim bu yaşantımı, bu düşüncemi bilmiş olsalar bu kızı bana vermezlerdi. yani daha hala mesela şimdi eğer açık etsinler bu yaşta kızlarını geri almaya çalışırlar. Yani din böyle bir şey yani karşıtlık. çünkü onlar dinini beş vakit namazıyla her şeysiyle yaşıyorlar mesela. kaynanamla kaynatam. kızlarına da kızarlar erkek çocuklarına da kızarlar niye namaz kılmıyorsunuz, neden dininizi yaşamıyorsunuz [diye ...] Anneleri bazen

baskı da yapar aman kızım bak babanızın izinden gitmeyin diye. [...] Çocuklarımı zaman zaman ben partinin etkinliklerine götürüyorum. […] He zaman zaman da annelerinden etkileniyorlar. […]. Annelerinin de şeysi var ya, kızım aman babanızın düşüncesine veyahut da onu da söyleyemez de hani ideolojisine sistemine şey etmeyin. Başınıza iş getirirsiniz falan. o türlü endişeler de var. bu hükümetin birçok insanları hani suçsuz yere içeri atıyorlar bilmem ne yapıyorlar, zaman zaman eşim de bu kaygılara bana dile getirir hani dikkat et. bak üç tane kız çocuğun var senin. senin başına bir şey gelse hapishaneye girsen o çocukların işte eğitimi yarım kalır. ondan sonra ben onun arkasından koşamam. […] Onun için işte kız çocuklarına da kendi çocuklarına da burdan işte dikkat edin her harekete kendinizi kaptırmayın falan filan [diye akıl veriyor]. Mesela en büyük kızım üniversite birdeyken partinin gençlik kollarıyla falan tanışmıştı ama annesinin şeysiyle yozlaştı sonra. Uzaklaştırdı. [...] En büyük mesela parti gençliğiyle tanışmıştı o da annesinin yüzünden geri durdu. Yoksa o da partinin bir neferi olacaktı. Benim ısrarımla Eğitim-Sen'e üye olmuştu. Ol kızım hiç değilse seni sendika korur ney demiştim. Orda da gittiği ilk kadrolu öğretmen olup gittiği yerde Diyarbakır'ın [...] ilçesindeki ilçe milli eğitim müdürü çağırmış, sen bu sendikaya niye üye oldun demiş doğrudan doğruya. [...] Bu tam işte Eğitim-Sen'liler falan da işinden edilme noktaları vardı ya birkaç sene önce şu şey kalkışmasında Fetöcülerin 2016'de 15'te işte, o döneme rastlıyordu. Ben dedi sendikadan istifa edeceğim dedi ama sadece bu değil. Bütün öğretmen arkadaşlarının yüzde doksanı sendikalarından istifa ettiler. [...] Bu da o döneme denk geldi. O baskılara da şey edemedi. O bilince tam sahip olmadığı için sendikadan istifa etti. [...] Biraz da bu tür yaşantı onun hoşuna gidiyor herhalde çünkü partinin nasıl çalıştığını az çok biliyor. Gençliğinden. Onun için partiye girdiği zaman yorulacak, önüne iş gelecek, ondan sonra işte sisteme karşı mücadele etmesi gerekecek. O da onun işine gelmiyor. Böyle rahat ediyor. (Ömer)

Benim en kıymetli varlıklarıma sahip çıkıyorlar. Karşıma dikildiklerinde ikisi de öğrenciydi. [...] Büyük damatla iki buçuk dakika kadar konuştuk. [...] Ben top oynamayı bilmem, ticaretten hiç anlamam, bilmediğim birçok konu var, cahili olduğum birçok konu var ama adamdan anladığımı

zannediyorum. Dedim ki bu adam gibi adam. (Metin)

Bana göre Ermeni olmuş ama ailesini sahiplenmemiş, hayırsız bir evlat olmaktansa bırakın Sünni olsun Alevi olsun ama ailesine sahip çıksın. Karısına çoluğuna çocuğuna sahip çıksın. Onları mutlu etsin. Üzmesin, tek beklentim bir baba olarak bu. Bu böyle olduktan sonra benim gözüm arkada gitmez. (Arman)

Ben dedi yaşayamam artık o kadınla dedi. Nasıl kandırdılar, nasıl şey yaptılarsa. Ee sonuç dedim? Sonuç dedi, siz bilirsiniz dedi. Ben dedi daha onunla yaşayamam. E ayrı indirelim, e yok. Ben dedi gitmem. Bu iş burda bitmez, bu iş mahkemede biter, istemiyorsan verirsin mahkemeye dedim. Beklediler biz verelim de bizden biraz bir şeyler koparacaklar zannettiler, para pul eşya şunu bunu. Biz de vermedik. İki sene sürüncemede kaldı. Kendileri veriyorlar ondan sonra, ben de bir avukat tuttum hemen. [...] Hemen yeniden everdim oğlanı da ben de. İkinci gelini de yakın köyden aldık. Onun da başından bir olay geçmiş, o da evlenmiş boşanmış. (Hakkı)

Gençler her ne kadar babanın yanında dursa da bazen babanın sözlerini tutmuyor yani. Mesela bir insan bilir. Benim bu yöremden biriyle evlenseydi kim olursa olsun geçinmek biraz daha kolay ama İskenderun tarafının hele Adana tarafının insanıyla geçinmek zordur. Bunlar Ankara'da tanışmışlar işte, astsubay okulunda okurken tanışmışlar. Geldi bana açıldı, böyle böyle dediler. Babalar en son duyar da analar duyar her zaman. Gittik, kızın ailesiyle tanıştık, fakat ben görür görmez Allah var şimdi dedim bak oğlum gel yol yakınken dön bu işten, bunlar senin ne yapına uyar, ne tipine uyar, ne geçimin olur, geçinemezsin. Yok ben seviyorum dedi. Dedim oğlum bak ilk önce bu sevgi gibi gözükür ama zamanla törpüye döner adamı ömür törpüsü gibi yontar. […] Sekiz buçuk ay evli kaldılar. Biz orta hâlli bir aileyiz […]bir lira param var benim, ben bir liraya göre geçineceğim. […] Buna uyum sağlayacak karşında bir aile lazım. Fakat bunların yapıları öyle değil yani. Bunu ben görür görmez sezdim. Anlatabiliyor muyum? Sekiz buçuk aydaki borcunu üç senede ödedi. (Mücahit)

Bibliography

Acar, Feride and Gülbanu Altınok. “The Politics of ‘Intimate’ at the intersection of neo-liberalism and neo-conservatism in Contemporary Turkey.” *Women’s Studies International Forum* 41 (2013): 14-23.

Açıksöz, Salih Can. “Sacrificial Limbs of Sovereignty: Disabled Veterans, Masculinity, and Nationalist Politics in Turkey.” *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 26, no.1 (2012): 4-25.

——— . “Ghazis and Beggars: The Double Life of Turkish Disabled Veterans.” *Ethnologie Française* 44, no. 2 (2014): 247-255.

Ahmad, Sara. “Happy Objects.” In *The Affect Theory Reader*, edited by Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, 29-51. Durham; London: Duke University Press, 2010.

——— . “Affective Economies.” *Social Text* 22, no. 2 (2004): 117-139.

——— . “The Skin of the Community: Affect and Boundary Formation.” In *Revolt, Affect, Collectivity: The Unstable Boundaries of Kristeva’s Polis*, edited by Tina Chanter and Ewa Plonowska Ziarek, 95- 111. New York: State University of New York Press, 2005.

Akkan, Başak. “The Politics of Care in Turkey: Sacred Familialism in a Changing Political Context.” *Social Politics* 0 (2017): 1-20.

“AKP’nin 20 Yıldaki İntihar Bilançosu Ortaya Çıktı.” *Cumhuriyet*, February 24, 2021. https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/haber/akpnin-20-yildaki-intihar-bilancosu-ortaya-cikti-1816146

Althusser, Louis. *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. Translated by G. M. Goshgarian. New York; London: Verso, 2014.

Altınay, Ayşe Gül. *The Myth of the Military-Nation: Militarism, Gender, and Education in Turkey.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

——— . “Undoing Academic Cultures of Militarism.” *Current Anthropology* 60 (2019): 15-25.

Altınay, Ayşe Gül and Yeşim Arat. *Türkiye’de Kadına Yönelik Şiddet*. İstanbul: Punto, 2007.

http://kasaum.ankara.edu.tr/files/2013/11/Ay%C5%9Fe-G%C3%BCl-Alt%C4%B1nay-Ye%C5%9Fim-Arat-turkiyede_kadina_yonelik_siddet_2007.pdf.

American Psychological Association, “Grandiosity.” Accessed July 12, 2022. https://dictionary.apa.org/grandiosity

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso, 2006.

Anderson, Eric. *Inclusive Masculinity: The Changing Nature of Masculinities*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Asma, Türkay. “Yasalarda ve Uygulamada Cinsel İstismar: Tanıklıklar.” In *Ailenin Karanlık Yüzü Ensest,* edited by Alanur Çavlin, Filiz Kardam and Hanife Aliefendioğlu, 227-253. İstanbul: Metis, 2018.

Atay, Tayfun. “‘Erkeklik’ En Çok Erkeği Ezer.” *Toplum ve Bilim* 101 (2004):11-30.

Atılgan, Eylem Ümit. “Erkeklerin Öldürme Hakkı: Erkeklik İndirimi.” *Toplum ve Bilim* 145 (2018): 161-193.

Atkinson, Paul and Martyn Hammersley, *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. London; New York: Routledge, 2007.

Aykaç, Şafak. “Şehitlik ve Türkiye’de Militarizmin Yeniden Üretimi: 1990: 1999.” In *Asker Millet Erkek Millet: Türkiye’de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek(lik)ler*, edited by Nurseli Yeşim Sünbüloğlu, 141-179. İstanbul: İletişim, 2013.

Aytaç, Ahmet Murat. *Ailenin Serencamı*. İstanbul: Dipnot, 2007.

Babül, Elif. “The Paradox of Protection: Human Rights, Masculinist State, and the Moral Economy of Gratitude in Turkey.” *American Ethnologist* 42, no. 1 (2015): 116-130.

Barutçu, Atilla and Naz Hıdır, “Türkiye’de Babalığın Değişen Rolleri.” *Fe Journal: Feminist Critiquel* 8, no. 2 (2016): 27-45.

Beasley, Chris. “Male Bodies at the Edge of the World: Re-thiking Hegemonic and ‘Other’ Masculinities in Australian Cinema.” In *Mysterious Skin: Male Bodies in Contemporary Cinema*, edited by Santiago Fouz-Hernandez, 59 –76. London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2009.

——— . “Problematizing Contemporary Men/Masculinities Theorizing: The Contribution of Raewyn Connell and Conceptual-Terminological Tensions Today.” *The British Journal of Sociology* 63, no. 4 (2012):747-765.

Belge, Murat. “Bir Poster.” In *Tarihten Güncelliğe*, 180-184. İstanbul: İletişim, 1997.

——— . “Askerin Önemini Öğretmek ya da Türkiye’de Profesyonel Ordunun İmkânsızlığı Üzerine.” In *Erkek Millet Asker Millet: Türkiye’de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek(lik)ler*, edited by Nurseli Yeşim Sünbüloğlu, 181-186. İstanbul: İletişim, 2013.

Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge.* New York: Penguin Books, 1991.

Berggren, Kalle. "Sticky Masculinity: Post-Structuralism, Phenomenology and Subjectivity in Critical Studies on Men." *Men and Masculinities* 17, no. 3 (2014): 231-252.

Bernard, H. Russell. *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* New York: Altamira Press, 2011.

Bernard van Leer Vakfı. *Türkiye'de 0-8 Yaş Arası Çocuğa Yönelik Aile İçi Şiddet Araştırması*. İstanbul, 2014.

http://www.ailecocuksiddet.info/RAPOR.pdf.

Beşpınar, Fatma Umut, and L. Zeynep Beşpınar. "Türkiye'de Orta Üst Sınıf Laik ve Muhafazakar Kimliklerin Babalık Deneyimleri Üzerinden İrdelenmesi: Benzerlikler, Farklılıklar, Önyargılar ve Mesafeler." *Toplum ve Bilim* 143 (2018): 5-42.

Beşpınar, Fatma Umut. "Between Ideals and Enactments: The Experience of 'New Fatherhood' Among Middle-Class Men in Turkey." In *Gender and Sexuality in Muslim Cultures*, edited by Gül Özyeğin, 95-113. Surrey: Ashgate, 2015.

Billig, Michael. *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage, 1995.

Biricik, Alp. "7. Ok-Militarizm: Vatandaşlık, Borçluluk ve Çürükleştirmek Üzerine." In *Asker Millet Erkek Millet: Türkiye'de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek(lik)ler*, edited by Nurseli Yeşim Sünbüloğlu, 369-392. İstanbul: İletişim, 2013.

Bişkin, Hacı. "Hacı Lokman Birlik'in Babası Oğlunun Cenazesine Katılmaktan Hakim Önünde." *Duvar.* June 28, 2019. https://www.gazeteduvar.com.tr/gundem/2019/06/28/haci-lokman-birlikin-babasi-yargilaniyor-oglumun-cenazesine-katilmakla-nasil-bir-suc-isledim/.

Bolak-Boratav, Hale, G. Okman-Fişek, and Hande Ziya Eslen. “Unpacking Masculinities in the Context of Social Change: Internal Complexities of the Identities of Married Men in Turkey.” *Men and Masculinities* 17, no. 3 (2014): 299-324.

——— . *Erkekliğin Türkiye Halleri*. Istanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2017.

Boratav, Korkut. *İstanbul ve Anadolu’dan Sınıf Profilleri*. İstanbul: İmge, 2004.

Bora, Aksu. “Aile: En Güçlü İşsizlik Sigortası.” In *Boşuna mı Okuduk? Türkiye’de Beyaz Yakalı İşsizliği,* edited by Tanıl Bora, Aksu Bora, Necmi Erdoğan, and İlknur Üstün, 181-202. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2011.

Bora, Tanıl. “Fitne.” *Birikim*. March 15, 2017.

https://www.birikimdergisi.com/haftalik/8217/fitne#.XZLhPtIzbMw.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Brajuha, Mario, and Lyle Hallowell, “Legal Intrusion and the Politics of Fieldwork: The Impact of the Brajuha Case.” *Urban Life* 14, no. 4 (1986): 454-478.

Bridges, Tristan, and C. J. Pascoe. “Hybrid Masculinities: New Directions in the Sociology of Men and Masculinities.” *Sociology Compass* 3, no. 3 (2014): 246-258.

Brod, Harry. “The New Men’s Studies: From Feminist Theory to Gender Scholarship.” *Hypatia* 2, no. 1(1987): 179-196.

——— . “Men’s Studies: A Retrospective View.” *The Journal of Men’s Studies* 21, no. 1 (2013): 49-61.

Buğra, Ayşe and Çağlar Keyder, “The Turkish Welfare Regime in Transformation,” *Journal of European Social Policy* 16, no. 3 (2006): 211-228.

Bumpass, L.L. “What is Happening to the family? Interactions Between Demographic and Institutional Change.” *Demography* 27, no. 4 (1990): 483-498.

Buran, Ahmet. “Metin-Bağlam İlgisi Bakımından *Ak Gemi*’de ‘Babalık’ Kavramı ve Baba-Çocuk İlişkisi.” *Türk Dünyası Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi* 27 (2009): 49-59.

Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Buyuk Lugat. “Makbul.” Accessed June 19, 2022. https://www.buyuklugat.com/osmanlica-turkce/makbul

Cagaptay, Soner. *Islam, Secularism, and Nationalism in Modern Turkey: Who is a Turk?* London: Routledge, 2006.

Calvey, David. “The Art and Politics of Covert Research: Doing ‘Situated Ethics’ in the Field.” *Sociology* 42, no. 5 (2008): 905-918.

Çalışkan, Dilara. “Queer Postmemory.*” European Journal of Women Studies* 26, no. 3 (2019): 261-173.

Charmaz, Kathy. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis.* London: Sage, 2006.

Chase, Susan E. “Narrative Inquiry: Multiple Lenses, Approaches, Voices.” In *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 651-679. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2005.

Cengiz, Kurtuluş, Uğraş Ulaş Tol and Önder Küçükural. “Hegemonik Erkekliğin Peşinden.” *Toplum ve Bilim* 101 (2004): 50-70.

Cindoglu, Dilek and Didem Unal. “Gender and Sexuality in the Authoritarian Discursive Strategies of ‘New Turkey.’” *European Journal of Women’s Studies* 24 (2017): 39-54.

Coles, Tony. “Finding Space in the Field of Masculinity: Lived Experiences of Men’s Masculinities.” *Journal of Sociology* 44, no. 3 (2008): 233-248.

Coltrane, Scott. "The Future of Fatherhood: Social, Demographic, and Economic Influences on Men's Family Involvements." In *Fatherhood: Contemporary Theory, Research, and Social Policy*, edited by William Marsiglio, 255- 301. London: Sage, 1995.

———. "Fathering: Paradoxes, Contradictions, and Dilemmas." In *Men's Lives*, edited by Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner, 432-449. Boston: Pearson, 2007.

Coltrane, Scott, and Justin Galt. "The History of Men's Caring." In *Care Work: Gender, Labor, and the Welfare State*, edited by Madonna Harrington Meyer, 15-36. London: Routledge, 2000.

Connell, R.W. "The Concept of Role and What to Do With It?." *A.N.Z.J.S.* 15 (1979): 7-17.

———. *Gender and Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.

———. *Masculinities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995.

———. "On hegemonic Masculinity and Violence: Response to Jefferson and Hall." *Theoretical Criminology* 6, no. 1 (2002): 89 – 99.

Connell R. W. and James W. Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society* 19, no. 6 (2005): 829-859.

Coşar, Simten and İnci Özkan Kerestecioğlu," Feminist Politics in Contemporary Turkey: Neoliberal Attacks, Feminist Claims to the Public." *Journal of Women, Politics & Society* 38, no. 2 (2017): 151-174.

Craig, L. "Does Father Care Mean Fathers Share? A Comparison of How Mothers and Fathers in Intact Families Spend Time with Children." *Gender & Society* 20, no. 2 (2006): 259-281.

Crowley, Jocelyn Elise. "A Friend or Foe?: Self-Expansion, Stigmatized Groups, and the Resarcher- Participant Relationship." *Journal of Contemporary Etnography* 36, no. 6 (2007): 603-630.

Çavlin, Alanur, Filiz Kardam and Hanife Aliefendioğlu. Giriş to *Ailenin Karanlık Yüzü Ensest,* edited by Alanur Çavlin, Filiz Kardam and Hanife Aliefendioğlu, 11-44. İstanbul: Metis, 2018.

Çetin, Altan. "Kutadgu Bilig'de Türk Aile Kültüründe Bir Babanın Oğul İmajı ya da Süregiden Bellek/Kültür." *Milli Folklor* 85 (2010): 122-132.

"'Çocuklarım Aç' Diyerek Valilik Önünde Kendini Yaktı." *Sözcü*. February 7, 2020. https://www.birgun.net/haber/cocuklarim-ac-diyerek-valilik-onunde-kendini-yakti-287039

Delaney, Carol. "The Meaning Of Paternity and the Virgin Birth Debate." *Man* 21, no. 3 (1986): 494-513.

——— . *The seed and the Soil: Gender and Cosmology in Turkish Village Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

——— . "Father State, Motherland, and the Birth of Modern Turkey." In *Naturalizing Power: Essays in Feminist Cultural Analysis*, edited by Sylvia Yanagisako and Carol Delaney, 177-199. London: Routledge, 1995.

Dedeoğlu, Saniye. "Veiled Europeanisation of Welfare State in Turkey: Gender and Social Policy in the 2000s." *Women's Studies International Forum* 41 (2013): 7-13.

Demir, Ilkay. "The Development of and Current State of Youth Research in Turkey: An Overview." *Young* 20, no. 1 (2012): 89-114.

Demos, John. "The Changing Faces of Fatherhood." In *Past, Present, and Personal: The Family and the Life Course in American History,* edited by Catt S. Gurwitt and J.M. Ross, 425-445. New York: Oxford Press, 1986.

Dienhart, Anna. *Reshaping Fatherhood: The Social Construction of Shared Parenting*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1998.

Dogruoz, Deniz and Debbie Rogow. “And How Will You Remember Me, My Child? Redefining Fatherhood in Turkey.” *Quality/Calidad/Qualité* 19 (2009).

Donatan, Ayşe Senem. “Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Tiyatrosu’nda Baba Otoritesinin Temsili: Arafta Kalmış Babalar.” *Tiyatro Eleştirmenliği ve Dramaturji* 20 (2012): 93-117.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Duben, Alan. “The Significance of Family and Kinship in Urban Turkey.” In *Sex Roles, Family, & Community in Turkey*, edited by Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı, 73-99. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1982.

——— . “Turkish Families and Households in Historical Perspective.” *Journal of Family History* 10 (1985): 75-97.

Edensor, Tim. *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life*. New York: Berg, 2002.

Ekal, Berna. “Collaboration Gone Awry: The Formation of Women’s Shelters as Public Institutions in Turkey.” *Mediterranean Politics* 24, no. 3 (2017): 1-18.

Enç, Uğur. “Çocuğuna Okul Kıyafeti Alamayan Baba İntihar Etti.” *Sözcü*. September 22, 2018, https://www.sozcu.com.tr/2018/gundem/cocuguna-okul-kiyafeti-alamayan-baba-intihar-etti-2639574/.

Enloe, Cynthia. *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases*. London: University of California Press, 1989.

Erdal, Burçak. “Yarı Tanrı Babalar ve Onların Mahsun Oğulları.” *Suret* 6 (2015): 73-94.

Erol, Maral and Cenk Özbay. “No Andropause for Gay Men? The Body, Aging and Sexuality in Turkey.” *Journal of Gender Studies* 27, no. 7 (2018): 847-859.

Erdoğan, Necmi. “Ağlayan Çocuk… Gerçekleşmeyen Hayallerimizin Sembolü.” *Birikim* 124 (1999): 39-41.

Evans, Cressida. “Turkish Fathers’ Attitudes to and Involvement in Their Fathering Role: A Low Socio-economic Example.” Master’s thesis, Boğaziçi University, 1997.

Ezzy, Douglas. “Qualitative Interviewing as an Embodied Emotional Performance.” *Qualitative Inquiry* 16, no. 3 (2010): 163- 170.

Figlerowicz, Marta. “Affect Theory Dossier: An Introduction.” *Qui Parle* 20, no. 2 (2012): 3-18.

Filipović, Andrija. “Resonant Masculinities: Affective Co-production of Sound, Space, and Gender in the Everyday Life of Belgrade, Serbia.” *Norma* 13, no. 3-4 (2018): 213-226.

Fineman, Martha L. “Images of Mothers in Poverty Discourses.” *Duke Law Journal* 274 (1991): 274-295.

Freeman, Elizabeth. *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2010.

Furstenberg, F.F. “Good Dads-Bad Dads: Two Faces of Fatherhood.” In *The Changing American Family and Public Policy*, edited by A. J. Cherlin, 193-218. Washinton D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1988.

Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason.* Translated by Richard Howard. New York: Vintage Books, 1988.

Genç Hayat Vakfı. *Çocukların Ev İçinde Yaşadıkları Şiddet Araştırması*. İstanbul: Genç Hayat Yayınları, 2012.

http://www.cocukhaklariizleme.org/wp-content/uploads/evicisiddet-arastirma.pdf.

Goffman, Erving. “The Moral Career of the Mental Patient.” *Interpersonal and Biological Processes* 22, no. 2 (1959): 123-142.

Grima, Benedicte. “The Role of Suffering in Women’s Performance of *Paxto*.” In *Gender, Genre, and Power in South Asian Expressive Traditions*. Edited by Arjun Appadurai, Frank J. Korom and Margaret A. Mills, 78-101. Philadelphia: University of Pennsilvania Press, 1991.

Güler, Hasan. *Patron Baba ve İşçileri: İşçi Sınıfı, Köylülük ve Paternalizm*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2014.

Günay-Erkol, Çimen. “İllet, Zillet, Erkeklik: Eleştirel Erkeklik Çalışmaları ve Türkiye’deki Seyri.” *Toplum ve Bilim* 145 (2018): 6-31.

Güneş-Ayata and Fatma Tütüncü. “Party Politics of the AKP (2002‑2007) and the Predicaments of Women at the Intersection of the Westernist, Islamist and Feminist Discourses in Turkey.” *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 35, no. 3 (2008): 363-384.

Gürbilek, Nurdan. “Azgelişmiş Babalar.” In *Kötü Çocuk Türk*, 52-65. İstanbul: Metis, 2001.

——— . “Child of Agony.” In *The New Cultural Climate in Turkey: Living in a Shop Window*, 120-136. New York: Zed Books, 2011.

Hanson, Rebecca and Patricia Richards. *Harassed: Gender, Bodies and Ethnographic Research*. California: California University Press, 2019.

Hawkins, Alan J, Shawn L. Christiansen, Kathryn Pond Sargent, and E. Jeffrey Hill. “Rethinking Fathers’ Involvement in Child Care.” In *Fatherhood: Contemporary Theory, Research, and Social Policy,* edited by William Marsiglio, 41-56. London: Sage, 1995.

Herzfeld, Michael. *Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics and the Real Life of States, Societies, and Institutions*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Hewlett, Barry S. “Culture, History, and Sex: Anthropological Contributions to Conceptualizing Father Involvement.” *Culture, History, and Sex* 29, no. 2-3 (2000): 59-73.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. “Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure.” *American Journal of Sociology* 85, no. 3 (1979): 551-575.

hooks, bell. *The Will to Change: Men, Masculinity, and Love*. New York: Atria Books, 2004.

Horrocks, Roger. *Masculinity in Crisis: Myths, Fantasies, and Realities*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Jayawardena, Kumari. *Feminism and Nationalism in the Third World*. London: Zed Books, 1986.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Çiğdem, and Bilge Ataca. "Value of Children, Family Change, and Implications for the Care of the Elderly." *Cross-Cultural Research* 49, no. 4 (2015): 374-392.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Çiğdem. *Family, Self, and Human Development Across Cultures: Theory and Applications*. New York: Routledge, 2017.

Kandiyoti, Deniz. "Bargaining with Patriarchy." *Gender and Society* 2, no. 3 (1988): 274-290.

——— . "Women and the Turkish State: Political Actors or Symbolic Pawns?" In *Woman-Nation State*, edited by N. Yuval-Davis N. and F. Anthias 126-150. London, Macmillan Press, 1988.

——— . "Women, Islam, and the State: A Comparative Approach." In *Comparing Muslim Societies: Knowledge and the State in a World Civilization*, edited by Juan Cole, 237-260. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992.

——— . "The Paradoxes of Masculinity: Some Thoughts on Segregated Societies." In *Dislocating Masculinity*: *Comparative Ethnographies*, edited by Andrea Cornwall and Nancy Lindisfarne, 197-213. London: Routledge, 1994.

——— . "Patterns of Patriarchy: Notes for An Analysis of Male Dominance in Turkish Society." In *Women in Modern Turkish Society: A Reader*, edited by Şirin Tekeli, 306-318. London; Atlantic Heights, NJ: Zed Books, 1995.

——— . “Fear and Fury: Women and Post-revolutionary Violence.” *Open Democracy*, January 10, 2013.

https://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/deniz-kandiyoti/fear-and-fury-women-and-post-revolutionary-violence

——— . “Mainstreaming Men and Masculinities: Technical Fix or Political Struggle?” *Masculinities* 12, (2019): 30-41.

Kaptan, Senem. Çatlakların Gölgesinde Militarizm: Türkiye’de Askerlik, Annelik ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet.” In *Asker Millet Erkek Millet: Türkiye’de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek(lik)ler*, edited by Nurseli Yeşim Sünbüloğlu, 337-368. İstanbul: İletişim, 2013.

Karadayı, Figen. “Gençlerin Babalık Rolüne İlişkin Tutumları Kendi Babalarının Davranışı ve Sosyo Demografik Faktörlerle İlişkisi.” *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 8 (2001): 165-188.

Karaömerlioğlu, M. Asım. “The People’s Houses and the Cult of the Peasant in Turkey.” *Middle Eastern Studies* 34, no. 4 (1998): 67-91.

Karpat, Kemal H. *The Politization of Islam: Reconstrucing Identity, State, Faith, and Community in the Late Ottoman State*. New York: Oxford, 2001.

Kaya, Ayhan. *Europeanization and Tolerance in Turkey: The Myth of Toleration*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Kıray, Mübeccel. *Ağır Sanayiden Önce Bir Sahil Kasabası*. İstanbul: Bağlam, 2000.

Kılınçarslan, Pelin and Özlem Altan-Olcay. “We are Family: Women’s Labor Mobilization and Gender Norms in Turkey.” *Women’s Studies International Forum* 72 (2019): 9-16.

Kibal, Kathryn. “Realizing Modernity Through the Robust Turkish Child, 1923-1938.” In *Symbolic Childhood*, edited by Daniel Thomas Cook, 89-108. New York: Peter Lang, 2002.

Kimmel, Michael S. and Michael A. Messner. "Introduction," In *Men's Lives*, edited by Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner, xix-xxi. Boston: Pearson, 2007.

Kocatepe, Büşra and Sabiha Bilgi. "Toplumsal Bir İnşa Olarak Babalık: Annelerin Yaşam Öykülerinde Baba İmgesi." *Fe Dergi* 10, no. 2 (2018): 43-59.

Koğacıoğlu, Dicle. "The Tradition Effect: Framing Honor Crimes in Turkey." *Differences* 15, no. 2 (2004): 118-151.

Kurtuluş-Korkman, "Politics of Intimacy in Turkey: A Distraction from 'Real' Politics." *Journal of Middle Eastern Women's Studies* 12, no. 1 (2016): 112-121.

Kramer, Paul Gordon. *Turkish Governmentality: A Genealogy of Heteropatriarchal Nationalism*. Bristol: Bristol University Press, 2022.

Lamb, Michael E. "How Do Fathers Influence Children's Development? Let me Count the Ways." In *The Role of the Father in Child Development*. 5th ed., edited by Michael Lamb, 1-26. Hoboken, NJ.: John Wiley & Sons, 2010.

LaRossa, Ralph. "Fatherhood and Social Change." *Family Relations* 37, no. 4 (1988): 451-457.

———. *The Modernization of Fatherhood: A Social and Political History*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1997.

———. "Historical Study of Fatherhood: Theoretical and Methodological Considerations." In *Fatherhood in Late Modernity: Cultural Images, Social Practices, Structural Frames*, edited by Mechtild Oechsle, 37-58. Germany: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 2012.

Lenzen, Dieter. *Vaterschaft*. Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1991. Quoted in Dieter Thoma, *Babalar*. Translated by Fikret Doğan. İstanbul: İletişim, 2011.

LexiQamus. "مكبول." Accessed June 21, 2022, https://www.lexiqamus.com/tr?search_type=box&_word=%D9%85%D9%83%D8%A8%D9%88%D9%84.

Lugosi, Peter. "Between Overt and Covert Research: Concealment and Disclosure in an Ethnographic Study of Commercial Hospitality." *Qualitative Inquiry* 12, no. 3 (2006): 541-561.

Luciano, Dana. *Arranging Grief: Sacred Time and the Body in Nineteenth-Century America* New York: New York University Press, 2007.

Lupton, Deborah and Lesley Barclay. *Constructing Fatherhood*. London: Sage, 1997.

Lüküslü, Demet. "Creating a pious generation: youth and education policies of the AKP in Turkey." *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 16, no. 4 (2016): 637-649.

———. *Türkiye'de Gençlik Miti: 1980 Sonrası Gençliği*. İstanbul: İletisim, 2009.

McAfee, Noelle. *Julia Kristeva*. Oxon, Routledge, 2004.

Macht, Alexandra. *Fatherhood and Love: The Social Construction of Masculine Emotions.* Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020.

Marsiglio, William. "Contemporary Scholarship on Fatherhood: Culture, Identity, and Conduct." *Journal of Family Issues* 14, no. 4 (1993): 484-509.

———. "Fatherhood Scholarship: An Overview and Agenda for the Future." In *Fatherhood: Contemporary Theory, Research, and Social Policy*, edited by William Marsiglio, 1-20. London: Sage, 1995.

Mason, Jennifer. *Qualitative Researching*, 2nd ed. London: Sage, 2002.

Martin, Emily. "The Egg and the Sperm: How Science Has Constructed a Romance Based on Stereotypical Male-Female Roles." *Signs* 16, no: 3 (1991): 485-501.

Maxey, Ruth. “The Rise of the ‘We’ Narrator in American Literature.” *European Journal of American Studies* 10, no. 2 (2015): 1-15.

McClintock, Anne. “Family Feuds: Gender, Nationalism and the Family,” *Feminist Review* 44, no. 24. (1993): 61-80.

———. *Imperial Leather*: *Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Mies, Maria. *Towards a Methodology of Women’s Studies*. The Hague: Institute of Social Studies, 1979.

Mills, Charles W. “White Ignorance.” In *Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance*, edited by S. Sullivan and N. Tauna, 11-38. Albany: SUNY, 2007.

Minsky, Rosalind. “Lacan: The Meaning of the Phallus.” In *Psychoanalysis and Gender: An Introductory Reader*, edited by Rosalind Minsky (137-177). London: Routledge, 1996.

Mintz, Steven. “From Patriarchy to Androgyny and other Myhts: Placing Men’s Family Roles in Historical Perspective.” In *Men in Families: When Do They Get Involved? What Difference Does It Make?*, edited by Alan Booth, Ann C. Crouter, 3-30. Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1998.

Mitchell, Richard G. “Secrecy and Disclosure in Fieldwork.” In *Experiencing Fieldwork: An Inside View of Qualitative Research,* edited by William B. Shaffir and Robert A. Stebbins, 97-108. London: Sage, 1991.

Moore, Henrietta L. *Feminism and Anthropology*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.

Mother Child Education Foundation. *Involved Fatherhood and Its Determinants in Turkey*, 2017. Accessed July 14, 2018. http://www.en.acev.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/1_involved-fatherhood-and-its-determinants-in-turkey.pdf

Nadir, Ural. *Nasıl Korunabilirdik? Şiddete Uğrayan Kadınlar ve Çocuklar*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2017.

Nagel, Joane. “Masculinity and Nationalism: Gender and Sexuality in the Making of Nations.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21, no.2 (1998): 242-269.

Navaro-Yashin, Yael. *Faces of the State: Secularism and Public Life in Turkey*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Onaran, Onaran, Seçil Büker, Ali Atıf Bir. *Eskişehir’de Erkek Rol ve Tutumlarına İlişkin Alan Araştırması*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi, 1998.

Onur, Hilal and Berrin Koyuncu. “’Hegemonik’ Erkekliğin Görünmeyen Yüzü: Sosyalizasyon Sürecinde Erkeklik Oluşumları ve Krizleri Üzerine Düşünceler.” *Toplum ve Bilim* 101 (2004):31-49.

Oylubaş-Katfar, Duygu. “Babanın Alfa Karakteri: Tarihi Romanlarda Oğlunu Öldüren Sultanlar.” *Uluslararası Beşeri Bilimler ve Eğitim Dergisi* 4 (2018): 217-235.

Öncü, Ayşe. “Küreselcilik Çağında Orta Sınıf Olmanın Kültürel Kozmolojisi.” In *İstanbul: Küresel ile Yerel Arasında*, edited by Çağlar Keyder, 117-144. İstanbul: Metis, 2013.

Özarslan, Osman. *Hovarda Alemi: Taşrada Eğlence ve Erkeklik*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2016.

Özbay, Cenk and İlkay Baliç. “Erkekliğin Ev Halleri!” *Toplum ve Bilim* 101 (2004): 89-103.

Özbay, Cenk. “Türkiye’de Hegemonik Erkekligi Aramak.” *Dogu Bati* 63 (2013): 185-204.

———. “Living Like a Hetero: Southern Homonormativity in Istanbul.” *Sexualities* 0, no. 0 (2021): 1-19.

Özbay, Cenk and Maral Erol. “Vatandaşlık Rejimi, Cinsellikler ve Beden Siyaseti.” *Cogito*, 90 (2018): 201-204.

Özbay, Cenk and Ozan Soybakis. “Political Masculinities: Gender, Power, and Change in Turkey.” *Social Politics* 27, no. 1 (2020): 27-50.

Özbay, Ferhunde. “Ulus-Devlet, Gözetim ve Nüfus Bilgisi.” In *Aile, Kent ve Nüfus*, 287-304. İstanbul: İletişim, 2017.

Özkan, Hediye. “Ataerki Sadece Kadına mı Baskı Yapar? *Masculinities Journal* 2 (2014):135-148.

Öztan, Ece. “Türkiye’de Ailecilik, Biyosiyaset ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rejimi.” *Toplum ve Bilim* 130 (2014): 176-188.

Pamuk, Şevket. “Agriculture and Economic Development in Turkey, 1870-2000.” In *Agriculture and Economic Development in Europe since 1870*, 375-396. Edited by Pedro Lains and Vicente Pinilla. London/New York, Routledge, 2008.

———. *Uneven Centuries: Economic Development of Turkey Since 1820*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018.

Parla, Jale. *Babalar ve Oğullar: Tanzimat Romanının Epistemolojik Temelleri*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1990.

Pateman, Carole. *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988.

Peterson, V. Spike. “The Intended and Unintended Queering of States/Nations.” *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 13, no. 1 (2013): 57-68.

Pleck, Joseph H. “American fathering in historical perspective.” In *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity*, edited by M. S. Kimmel, 83-97. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, 1987.

Pleck Elizabeth H., and Joseph H. Pleck. “Fatherhood Ideals in the United States: Historical Dimensions.” In *The Role of the Father in Child Development*, edited by M. E. Lamb, 33-48. New York: Wiley, 1997.

Ranson, G. “Men at Work Change –or No Change?- in the Era of the New Father.” *Men and Masculinities* 4, no.1 (2001): 3-26.

Rose, Nikolas. *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*, 2nd ed. London; New York: Free Association Books, 1999.

Rotundo, Anthony. “American Fatherhood: A Historical Perspective.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 29, no. 1 (1985): 7-25.

Rubin, Gayle. “The Traffic in Women: Notes on the ‘Political Economy’ of Sex.” In *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, edited by Rayna R. Reiter, 157-210. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975.

———. “Sexual Traffic.” By Judith Butler. *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 6 (1994): 62-99.

Sancar, Serpil. *Erkeklik: İmkansız İktidar: Ailede, Piyasada ve Sokakta Erkekler*. Istanbul: Metis, 2009.

———. *Türk Modernleşmesinin Cinsiyeti: Erkekler Devlet, Kadınlar Aile Kurar*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2017.

Sartre, Jean Paul. Being and Nothingness: *An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*. Translated by Hazel E. Barnes. London: Methuen, 1966.

Saydam, M. Bilgin. *Deli Dumrul’un Bilinci: “Türk-İslam Ruhu” Üzerine Bir Kültür Psikolojisi Denemesi*. İstanbul: Metis, 1997.

Sehlikoglu, Sertaç. “Intimate Publics, Public Intimacies: Natural Limits, Creation and the Culture of Mahremiyet in Turkey.” *The Cambridge Journal of Anthropology* 33, no. 2 (2015): 77-89.

Selek, Pınar. *Sürüne Sürüne Erkek Olmak*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2008.

Senses, Fikret. “Turkey’s Exprience with Neoliberal Policies Since 1980 in Retrospect and Prospect.” In *The Making of Neoliberal Turkey,* edited by Cenk Ozbay, Maral Erol, Aysecan Terzioglu, and Z. Umut Turem, 15-32. Farnham/Rochester: Ashgate, 2016.

Sever, Mustafa. “Toplumsal-Kültürel Bağlamda Babalık Kurgu ve Pratiklerinin Çocuk Eğitimine Etkileri: Üç Kuşak Babalar Üzerine Karşılaştırmalı Bir Araştırma.” Master’s Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi, 2002.

Sharma, Sonya, Sherly Reimer-Kirkham, and Marie Cochrane. “Practicing the Awareness of Embodiment in Qualitative Health Research: Meth-

odological Reflections." *Qualitative Health Research* 19, no. 1 (2009): 1642- 1650.

Shows, C., and N. Gerstel. "Fathering, Class, and Gender: A Comparison of Physicians and Emergency Medical Technicians." *Gender & Society* 23, no. 2 (2009): 161-187.

Sirman, Nükhet. "Gender Construction and Nationalist Discourse: Dethroning the Father in the Early Turkish Novel." In *Gender and Identity Construction: Women of Central Asia, the Caucasus and Turkey.* edited by Feride Acar and Ayşe Güneş Ayata, 162-176. Boston: Brill, 2000.

———. "The Making of Familial Citizenship in Turkey." In *Citizenship in a Global World: European Questions and Turkish Experiences*, edited by Fuat Keyman and Ahmet İçduygu, 147-172. New York: Routledge, 2005.

———. "Constituting the Modern Family as the Social in the Transition from Empire to Nation-State." In *Ways to Modernity in Greece and Turkey: Encounter with Europe, 1850-1950*, edited by Anna Frangoudaki and Caglar Keyder, 176-190. London; New York: Taurus, 2007.

Sloterdijk, Peter. *Critique of Cynical Reason*. Translated by Michael Eldred. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Smith, Sidonie and Julia Watson. *Reading Autobiography: A Guide For Interpreting Life Narratives.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

Spradley, James. *The Ethnographic Interview.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1979.

Stearns, P. N. "Fatherhood in historical perspective: The Role of Social Change." In *Fatherhood and Families in Cultural Context, edited by* F. W. Bozett & S. M. H. Hanson, 28-52. New York, NY, US: Springer Publishing Co., 1991.

Steyn, Melissa. “The Ignorance Contract: Recollections of Apartheid Childhoods and the Construction of Epistemologies of Ignorance.” *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 19, no. 1 (2012): 8-25.

Stokes, Martin. *The Arabesk Debate: Music and Musicians in Modern Turkey*. New York: Oxford, 1992.

Sugarman, Léonie. *Life-span Development: Frameworks, Accounts and Strategies*. Hove: Psychology Press, 2001.

Swain, Jon. “The Role of Sport in the Construction of Masculinities in an English Independent Junior School.” *Sport, Education, and Society* 11 (2006): 317-335.

Tecik, Zeynep. “Fatherhood Experience of Lower-Middle Class Men: The Case of Eskişehir.” Master’s Thesis, Middle East Technical University, 2012.

T.C. Sanayi ve Teknoloji Bakanlığı Kalkınma Ajansları Genel Müdürlüğü, *İllerin ve Bölgelerin Sosyo-Ekonomik Gelişmişlik Sıralaması Araştırması SEGE-2017*, by Salih Acar, Mustafa Caner Meydan, Leyla Bilen-Kazancık, and Mustafa Işık.https://www.bebka.org.tr/admin/datas/sayfas/89/sege-2017_1581687211.pdf. Ankara, 2019. (accessed June 21, 2022).

Tekeli, Şirin. “Emergence of the Women’s Movement in Turkey.” In *The New Women’s Movement*, edited by Drude Dahlerup, 179-199. London: Sage, 1986.

Topçu, Gökhan. “Varsayılan Aile Kıskancında Babalık: Türkiye’de Farklı Babalık Algıları ve Sosyal Politika İlişkisi.” *Toplum ve Bilim* 145 (2018): 54-101.

Turan, Ömer. “‘Esas Duruş:’ Kışla Deneyimleri ya da Türkiye’de Zorunlu Askerliğin Antropolojisi.” In *Asker Millet Erkek Millet: Türkiye’de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek(lik)ler*, edited by Nurseli Yeşim Sünbüloğlu, 261-336. İstanbul: İletişim, 2013.

Türköz, Meltem. “Fathering the Nation.” *Traditiones* 43 (2014): 53-64.

Ufuk Sezgin, Ayşe. "Enseste Yakından Bakmak: Bir Klinik Psikoloğun Biriktirdikleri." In *Ailenin Karanlık Yüzü Ensest*, edited by Alanur Çavlin, Filiz Kardam and Hanife Aliefendioğlu, 94-111. İstanbul: Metis, 2018.

Ünlü, Barış. *Türklük Sözleşmesi: Oluşumu, İşleyişi ve Krizi*. Ankara: Dipnot, 2018.

———. "The Kurdish Struggle and the Crisis of the Turkishness Contract." *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 42, no. 4-5 (2016): 397-405.

Üstel, Füsun. *Makbul Vatandaşın Peşinde: II Meşrutiyetten Bugüne Vatandaşlık Eğitimi*. Istanbul: İletişim, 2019.

Waling, Andrea. "Rethinking Masculinity Studies: Feminism, Masculinity, and Poststructural Accounts of Agency and Emotional Reflexivity." *Journal of Men's Studies* (2018): 1-19.

Wall G. and S. Arnold. "How Involved is Involved Fathering? An Exploration of the Contemporary Culture of Fatherhood." *Gender & Society* 21, no. 4 (2007): 508-527.

Yalçınkaya, Fatoş. "Geleneği Geleceğe Taşıyan Oğullar: Dede Korkut Kitabı'nda Baba-Oğul İlişkisi." *Milli Folklor* 107 (2015): 60-71.

Yalçınöz, Büşra. "From Being a Son to Being a Father: An Intergenerational Comparison of Fatherhood in Turkey." Master's thesis, Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2011.

Yazıcı, Berna. "The Return to the Family: Welfare, State, and Politics of Family in Turkey." *Anthropological Quarterly* 85, no. 1 (2012): 103-140.

Yonucu, Deniz. "From the Place of the 'Dangerous Classes' to the Place of Danger: Emergence of New Youth Subjectivities in Zeytinburnu," Master's Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2005.

Young, Iris Marion. "The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflections of the Current Security State." *Signs* 29, no. 1 (2003): 1-25.

———. “Pregnant Embodiment: Subjectivity and Alienation.” In *On Female Body Experience: “Throwing Like A Girl” and Other Essays*, 46-61. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Yuval-Davis, Nira and Floya Anthias. Introduction to *Woman-Nation-State*. Edited by Nira Yuval-Davis and Floya Anthias, 1-15. London: Macmillan, 1989.

Yükseker, Deniz. “Türkiye Toplumunu Birarada Tutan Nedir? Toplumsal Tutkal Olarak Borç.” *Toplum ve Bilim* 117 (2010): 6-18.

Yıldırım, M. Esra. *Yeni Bir Hayat Kurmak. Kadınlar Anlatıyor: Babalık, Evlilik ve Boşanma*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2017.

Yılmaz, Zafer. “‘Strengthening the Family’ Policies in Turkey: Managing the Social Question and Armoring Conservative-Neoliberal Populism.” *Turkish Studies* 15, no. 3 (2015): 371-390.

Zeybek, Sezai Ozan. “‘Bu Bebeğin Annesi Nerede?:’ Cinsiyet, Babalık ve Armağan İlişkileri.” *Toplum ve Bilim* 126 (2013): 120-143.

Žižek, Slavoj. *The Sublime Object of Ideology.* New York: Verso, 2008.

———. “The Varieties of Surplus.” *Problemi International* 1, no. 1 (2017): 7-32.

Zürcher, Erik Jan. *Turkey: A Modern History*. London: I. B. Tauris, 200