MISDIRECTED FEMINISM: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF DUYGU ASENA'S WORKS AND PROMINENT WESTERN FEMINIST WRITINGS

Thesis submitted to the

Institute of Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

English Language and Literature

by

Seval ARSLAN

Fatih University

May 2008

For all those who seek independence

APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Seval ARSLAN
Institute: Institute of Social Sciences
Department: English Language and Literature
Thesis Subject: Misdirected Feminism: A Comparative Analysis of Duygu Asena's Works and Prominent Western Feminist Writings
Thesis Date: May 2008

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

Assist.Prof. Martin Cyr Hicks
Head of Department

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

Assist.Prof. Martin Cyr Hicks
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist.Prof. Martin Cyr Hicks …….

Assist.Prof. Lucie Tunkrova …….

Prof.Dr. Mohamed Bakari …….

It is approved that this thesis has been written in compliance with the formatting rules laid down by the Graduate Institute of Social Sciences.

Assoc.Prof. Mehmet Orhan
Director

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

1. The material included in this thesis has not been submitted wholly or in part for any academic award or qualification other than that for which it is now submitted.

2. The advanced study in the English Language and Literature graduate program of which this thesis is part has consisted of:

i) Research Methods courses both in the undergraduate and graduate programs.

ii) English literature as well as American literature including novel, poetry and drama studies, a comparative approach to world literatures, and examination of several literary theories as well as critical approaches which have contributed to this thesis in an effective way.

3. This thesis is composed of the main sources including several books by the major authors discussed in comparison; and the secondary sources including scholarly articles from academic journals as well as newspaper articles, and theoretical books on the history and improvement of the feminist movement.

Seval ARSLAN

May, 2008

University: Fatih University
Institute: Institute of Social Sciences
Department: English Language and Literature
Supervisor: Assist.Prof. Martin Cyr Hicks
Degree Awarded and Date: May 2008

ABSTRACT

MISDIRECTED FEMINISM: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF DUYGU ASENA'S WORKS AND PROMINENT WESTERN FEMINIST WRITINGS

Seval ARSLAN

The aim of this thesis is to discuss the status of women in Turkey from the perspective of an important contemporary Turkish feminist, Duygu Asena, in comparison with the prominent western feminist works of Simone de Beauvoir, John Stuart Mill, and Virginia Woolf. In her books, Duygu Asena criticizes the status of women in Turkey for being restricted within the boundaries created by the male power in the patriarchal society. She focuses on the negative influences of these restrictions deriving from the marital relationship and the domestic responsibilities on the female individuality and independence. The female individuality and independence is impeded by the masculine power which fabricates its own truth to claim that women must always be dependent on men to survive. However, as Duygu Asena asserts, this fabricated truth in no way represents reality. In reality, the only difference between man and woman is the male physical power, but this power should not give man the right to dominate, rule and oppress.

By tracing the ideas in the prominent western feminist scholarship of Beauvoir, Mill, and Woolf, it is easy to realize how Turkey is trailing far behind the Western

feminist movement. Duygu Asena's ideas about the female submission in the patriarchal society find its background in the feminist thinkers of the past. Although, the Western world has already discussed and produced solutions to the basic problems of the female sex, Turkey is still struggling to define these problems. The importance of this thesis is that it analyzes the situation of women in Turkey from different perspectives concerning the critical approaches and ideas of the historically prominent feminist critics. On the other hand, it is important to emphasize that although Asena's feminism is influential in Turkey, because of its emphasis on sexuality, it becomes misdirected; thus, it appears to be an elite feminism which excludes most women in Turkey.

Key words:
Feminism, Woman and man, Sexual discrimination, Patriarchal society, Female submission, Marriage.

Üniversite: Fatih Üniversitesi
Enstitüsü: Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
Anabilim Dalı: İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Tez Danışmanı: Yrd.Doç.Dr. Martin Cyr Hicks
Tez Tarihi: Mayıs 2008

KISA ÖZET

YANLIŞ YÖNLENDİRİLMİŞ FEMİNİZM: DUYGU ASENA KİTAPLARININ BATI'NIN ÖNDE GELEN FEMİNİST YAZILARI İLE KARŞILAŞTIRMALI ANALİZİ

Seval ARSLAN

Bu çalışmanın amacı Türkiye'de kadınların durumunu çağdaş feminist yazar Duygu Asena'nın bakış açısı ile Simone de Beauvoir, John Stuart Mill ve Virginia Woolf gibi Batı'nın önde gelen feminist çalışmalarını ortaya çıkarmış yazarların savunduğu fikirleri karşılaştırmalı olarak analiz ederek incelemektir. Duygu Asena çeşitli çalışmalarında Türkiye'de kadının durumunu ataerkil toplum içindeki eril güç tarafından yaratılmış kısıtlamalar içerisine sınırlandırılmış olması sebebiyle eleştirmektedir. Bu kısıtlamalardan bahsederken de evlilik ilişkileri ve ev içindeki sorumlulukların kadının kişiselliğini ve özgürlüğünü nasıl olumsuz etkilediğine vurgu yapar. Kadının öznelliği ve bağımsızlığı kendi gerçeğini yaratan ve kadınların hayatta kalabilmek için erkeklere bağımlı olduklarını iddia eden eril güç tarafından engellenmektedir. Fakat, Duygu Asena'nın da vurguladığı gibi, bu üretilmiş gerçek aslen tamamen farklı olan gerçeğin kendisini temsil etmemektedir. Gerçekte kadın ve erkek arasındaki tek fark erkeğin fiziksel gücüdür, fakat bu fiziksel güç erkeğe egemen olma, buyurma ve baskı altına alma hakkını vermemelidir.

Batı'nın önde gelen feminist eserlerininin yaratıcıları Beauvoir, Mill ve Woolf'un fikirlerinin izini sürdüğümüzde Türkiye'nin feminist akımı Batı dünyasına nazaran oldukça geç bir tarihte takip etmeye başladığı ortaya çıkmaktadır. Duygu Asena'nın ataerkil toplumda kadının teslimiyeti hakkındaki düşünce ve eleştirileri de temelde geçmişin bu önemli feministlerinin fikirlerine dayanmakta ve onlardan etkilenmektedir. Her ne kadar Batı dünyası kadının temel sorunlarını geçmişte tartışmış ve çeşitli çözüm yolları önermiş olsa bile, Türkiye günümüzde halen bu temel sorunları tanımlamak, ve çözüm arayışlarında bulunmak için çaba sarfetmektedir. Bu çalışmanın önemi Türkiye'de kadının durumunu tarihsel olarak oldukça önemli olan Batılı feminist çalışmaların eleştirel yaklaşımlarını ve düşüncelerini de göz önünde bulundurarak değişik bakış açılarından analiz ediyor olmasıdır. Duygu Asena'nın feminist eleştirilerinin Türkiye'de oldukça etkili olduğu bir gerçektir, fakat diğer bir yandan Asena'nın cinsel yaşam özgürlüğüne gereğinden fazla vurgu yapıyor olması Asena'nın savunduğu düşüncelerin yanlış yönlendirilmiş olmasına sebebiyet vermiş, ve Asena feminizminin elit tabaka feminizmi olarak görülmesine neden olmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Feminizm, Kadın ve erkek, Cinsel ayrımcılık, Ataerkil toplum, Kadının teslimiyeti, Evlilik.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Above all, I owe my most special thanks and gratitude to Dr. Martin Cyr Hicks, separately as my adviser, my chair and also my office mate. As an adviser, I have appreciated his deep help, contribution, and motivation during the entire time that I have been working on this thesis. I thank him very much for not losing his faith in me, even at the times when I tended to lose my own trust in myself. He has always believed in me and supported my self-confidence; without his encouragement and inspiration, this process would not have beeen such a beneficial and productive experience. As my chair, he provided me with a perfect example of strong discipline and effective organization, both in the academics and administration areas. Not only as a respectable scholar and researcher, but also as a highly disciplined chairperson, he has taught me how to be a well-organized, successful academic and administrator at the same time. Thus I want to express my great fortune to work and study with him during the last three years which have contributed to my future in an invaluable way. Lastly as my office mate, I would like to present my deepest indebtedness to him for his endless support and friendship.

In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Mary Beth Davis for all her help with my thesis writing process, and for teaching me to improve myself as a good lecturer in the future. I also thank all my professors and friends at Fatih University for encouraging and motivating me with their positive support. I also present my appreciation to my jury members Prof.Dr. Mohamed Bakari and Dr. Lucie Tunkrova for their contributions.

Finally, I extend my gratitude to my mother, who is at the same time my best friend, for her loving encouragement and advice, not only during my thesis process

but during my whole life. I owe all my success to her love and care. I also thank my father and my brother for always supporting me during this long, long process. I would also like to express my gratitude to my best friends Suna, Nurtaç, Özlem, Fatma, and Hilal for always being there and for their invaluable sisterhood.

PREFACE

I had already decided to work on feminism when I registered for my courses in the English Language and Literature graduate program at Fatih University. My studies on Orientalism and Turkish literature during my undergraduate thesis gave me the idea of comparing the East and West division to the sexist discrimination between men and women. Thus, I decided to work on the status of women in Turkey in comparison to the prominent Western scholars, Simone de Beauvoir, John Stuart Mill, and Virginia Woolf, whose works I had already studied in detail during my undergraduate years. The distinction between the East and West and the Western domination over the Eastern part of the world reminded me the secondary and inferior status of women in patriarchal society; thus the relations between men and women appeared to be a small example of the larger discrimination between these two parts of the world.

I wanted to analyze Duygu Asena's works on the female submission and male superiority in a masculine society after realizing her deep influence on the Turkish feminist movement in the late 20th century. In order to analyze her works, I preferred using Beauvoir's, Mill's and Woolf's critical approaches that have been effectual on the improvement of the feminist movement in the West. The aim of this thesis is to show the influential arguments Asena makes about the individual and social status of women in modern Turkey. The first reading of Asena's novels overloads the reader with much emphasis on sexual independence, and the reader can easily become prejudiced against the text thinking that it does not include any valuable critical ideas to define and solve the female problems. I actually had such ideas when I read them first, however, after reading the texts more closely, I realized how Duygu

Asena focuses on the problems of the female sex in social, professional and domestic lives. Her criticisms against the illogical claims of male superiority and so-called female inferiority, and her encouragement to struggle for female independence and individuality actually constitute the main point in her novels.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Feminism was born out of the issue of woman and her inferior status in the patriarchal society. Since early times, woman has been defined by man and she has been given specific characteristics and responsibilities. All these characteristics and responsibilities are actually ascribed to her by the masculine power in order to fit her into the requirements of the patriarchal society. Thus, one of the most important claims of the feminist movement is that the most commonly accepted female characteristics and responsibilities are in fact not biological or scientific truths but rather fabricated realities favoring and reinforcing masculine power. The only significant biological power differential between man and woman is that man is generally physically stronger than the woman, and he uses this physical power to dominate and oppress her. As a result of this domination and oppression, man gains superiority while reducing the woman to an inferior object. Most feminists consider the relationship between man and woman as a master-slave or subject-object relationship that is obviously not based on equality conditions. Man opens himself to the social and professional world while imprisoning the woman within the domestic world. He regards himself as the ultimate superior who has the right to rule and dominate the woman who is the inferior and passive object. Man is the subject in his man-made world, and he supposes that woman is dependent on him to survive.

However, the point that is most often discussed by feminist critics is that woman is actually not as weak and passive as she is thought to be. Her inferiority and passivity is fabricated by the male power to maintain his dominance. Man remains the subject as

long as woman is the object, and in the same way, man remains the master as long as he can keep the woman as a slave. The Self-Other relationship ends up creating a passive and inferior character for the woman who is constructed as the Other. This relationship is in fact based upon sustaining male subjectivity while impeding female individuality and independence.

In the Western world, influential authors on feminism like Simone de Beauvoir, John Stuart Mill, and Virginia Woolf began discussing the problems the female sex faces in masculine society at a much earlier time than in Turkey. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, these well-known feminist critics presented their arguments about the oppression of women in society, and they tried to encourage the woman to struggle for her independence. On the other hand, in Turkey, the critical approaches to the inferior status of the woman appeared at a later time. Duygu Asena is the most well-known contemporary Turkish feminist; she wrote several books on female subjectivity and equality in late 20th century discussing Turkey's current position. When she died in 2006, she left behind a big group of women seeking for their individual rights as well as equality between the sexes. Duygu Asena has been the most famous Turkish feminist critic who could talk about the issues that had never been discussed before in the public. Her courage and ambition for the economic and social independence of women has encouraged a lot of women in Turkey to realize their problems and to struggle for solutions.

Although Duygu Asena points out the basic problems and obstacles women have in the masculine Turkish society, she focuses on the independence in sexual life so much

that it overshadows the more important arguments in her works. Turkish society can easily be divided into two parts with regard to the position of women. The Western part of Turkey has been able to give more equal rights to women in education, in social and in professional life; however, on the other hand, in the Eastern part of Turkey there are still women who are struggling to overcome far more basic problems. There are many girls who cannot get an education there, who are forced to marry at a very early age and who are imprisoned within the four walls of the home without any rights to individuality and independence. Thus Asena's emphasis on the sexual independence is rather irrelevant to the larger eastern part of Turkey. In this study, I am going to focus on Asena's arguments about the individual rights women should have in their social, educational and professional lives in comparison with the prominent western feminist works of Simone de Beauvoir, John Stuart Mill, and Virginia Woolf. And I will try to show that although Asena overshadows and misdirects her feminism with an overly emphasized focus on sexual relationships, she actually discusses more important or basic problems and obstacles women have in Turkish society, and tries to encourage women to realize these problems and struggle for individuality and independence. While giving a comparative analysis of these feminist critics, I will use three different works by Duygu Asena and compare each to the works from the western authors in the last three chapters of this thesis.

In the first chapter of the thesis, I will focus on the development of the feminist movement in Turkey. Considering the improvements of feminism in Turkey, it is possible to divide this process into three periods. The first period includes the early

years of the Turkish Republic. After the foundation of the republic in 1923, many rights were given to women by the government. However, this was actually done for the sake of the Republic rather than for the woman herself. Thus, this period is called *state feminism*. The second period is in the 1980s which is considered the second wave of Turkish feminism. During this time, feminism evolved into a more *individualized* movement. The feminists were seeking individual rights and they were doing it for the sake of the women rather than for the nation. And lastly, the third period is in the 1990s which is called the *third wave* of Turkish feminism. This third wave converted individual feminism into a more institutionalized feminism; in other words, women began having more institutions and organizations to encourage the feminist struggle for independence.

The second chapter gives a comparative analysis of Simone de Beauvoir's The Second Sex and Duygu Asena's Women Do Not Have a Name. This chapter begins with a detailed discussion of Self-Other relationship between man and woman. Then, the situation of woman at different ages is analyzed. Firstly, the comparison focuses on the childhood and teenage years of a girl. The emphasis here is that, as Beauvoir asserts, one is not born but rather becomes a woman, which means the feminine characteristics are ascribed to the girls since their early childhood by the masculine society. Then, the status of a married woman who is also a mother is discussed in the light of the arguments made by Asena and Beauvoir. The assertion here is that the married woman is forced to become a passive and inferior object within the house. Although there is no natural distribution of the work between the sexes, the male power prevents the married

woman from becoming a social and active individual by giving her the burden of the housework, child bearing, and rearing. The last part of this chapter emphasizes the importance of the economic independence and self-confidence for women to become independent individuals who refuse to be doomed to inferiority and passivity. This is the longest chapter in this thesis and the order of the western authors is actually not chronological. The reason for this is because both Simone de Beauvoir's analysis of the female problem is a very detailed one, and also the similarities between Asena and Beauvoir are many. It is important to point out these similarities between the authors because they reflect how Duygu Asena was influenced by the ideas and approaches of such an important feminist critic. Simone de Beauvoir's feminist criticisms can be applied easily to the basic female problems of today's Turkey; thus she is analyzed before the earlier authors John Stuart Mill and Virginia Woolf.

In the third chapter, I analyze Asena's There is No Love, Either in comparison with John Stuart Mill's The Subjection of Women. This chapter consists of two parts focusing on the sex roles in the marriage life and the importance of freedom of choice for the woman. Both Mill and Asena discuss that woman is not given any freedom of choice, and she is doomed to inferiority and subordination by the masculine power. The sex roles in the marriage prevent the woman from becoming a successful individual; thus she becomes a slave doing the housework, cleaning her husband's clothes, cooking, and looking after the children. The solution to female submission is to give woman the freedom of choice. She should not think that this is her ultimate duty; on the contrary, she should have the choice to be actively included in the social and professional life.

In the last chapter of this study, Duygu Asena's Nothing Changes and Virginia Woolf's A Room of One's Own are discussed, highlighting professional and economic issues. In her work, Virginia Woolf claims that if a woman wants to become a successful author, she needs to have her own room as well as financial independence. In the same way, Duygu Asena talks about the importance of economic independence for women in becoming successful individuals. Obviously, the reason for the female dependence on the male is that man has the money, and money means power. As a result of this power, man supposes that he has the absolute right to enslave the woman. The solution for this enslavement and oppression is that, as both Asena and Woolf assert, woman should realize her own power to claim her individuality and independence, and the easiest way to achieve this purpose is to have economic freedom, and not to be dependent on someone else.

In the conclusion, this study focuses on the idea of misdirected feminism. I argue that Asena's feminism is misdirected because, unlike her Western counterparts, she puts far too much emphasis on the necessity of sexual freedom for women. Although this might be a good argument to make in regard to absolute equality between the sexes, considering the circumstances in Turkey, this argument overloads the reader who is actually supposed to be influenced and encouraged by her more fundamentally important ideas. Since even the main individual and social problems of women could not be solved in most parts of Turkey, especially in eastern Turkey, this emphasis on sexuality is not immediately useful for these women who are not even aware of their own individualities. However, although Asena's feminism appears to be overloaded by

sexual emphasis in a first reading, when it is analyzed in detail, as this thesis demonstrates, it becomes easier to realize that her criticisms can lead to possible solutions to the major problems of *all* women in Turkey.

- **Note to the reader:** All of the passages from Duygu Asena's novels have been translated by the author of this thesis from the original Turkish to English. Asena's prose style is colloquial and unconventional by Turkish standards; therefore, the author of this thesis has attempted to retain the meaning of Asena's writing, as well as its style in her translations.

CHAPTER 1

THE HISTORY OF THE FEMINIST MOVEMENT IN REPUBLICAN TURKEY

1.1. State Feminism and Women's Rights in the Early Turkish Republic

The foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923 paved the way for the improvement of the status of women in the country. Although in the later period of the Ottoman Empire, women had already begun obtaining some rights in regard to education and professions, women's rights substantially improved with the birth of the new Republic. Before focusing on this improvement during the Republican era, we must begin by outlining the status of women in the Ottoman Empire. During the Ottoman period, women lived in their own worlds separate from men and they had their own rules, rewards, social hierarchies, and systems of status organization (Dengler 229).

Ottoman society was divided along gender lines, and it was obviously a patriarchal society in which women were supposed to stay at home taking care of their children and the housework; they generally did not have the rights to be educated or to have public professions, and they had to be veiled. Most of the time they had to be accompanied by their husbands or a male kin to go out, and it was seldom that they could travel alone. Although privileged daughters could get some limited education, the priority was always given to the boys and women were almost entirely excluded from the public sector of government (Dengler 230). In this society, it was always men who had the serious responsibilities and who made the serious decisions. Although women

could become teachers, nurses or midwives, their first duty was to be good mothers and wives; therefore marriage was the most important thing for a woman.

As mentioned above, the status of women actually began to develop slowly in the 19th century Ottoman Empire as a result of Western influence. During this century many schools from primary to high school were established for girls. As a result, the first feminist voices were heard by the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century in the Ottoman Empire, and they began establishing various foundations for women's rights. However, the most rapid and important improvements in the female status began to occur with the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. The founder of the Republic Mustafa Kemal Atatürk believed that many reforms had to be done in order to reach the same level of modernity as the Western world. These rapid changes included many reforms regarding the rights of females in society. After the Independence War (1919-1923) during which women fought alongside the men against the enemy, helping men behind the scenes and sometimes in the front lines, the status of women had already begun to change. During the war, they frequently replaced the male workforce, and proved how successful they could be if the opportunities were opened for them.

After the foundation of the Republic, Atatürk abolished the laws created by Islamic Sheri'a and tried to create a secular society in which men and women were relatively equal. With the adoption of the Swiss Civil Code, many rights were given to females in 1926. Women were encouraged to unveil, polygamy was abolished, women had the same rights to divorce as men, they were given the same right of inheritance and they had the same legal rights as men in the courts, and eventually they had the right to

vote and to be elected. Additionally, Atatürk gave much importance to the education of women and their involvement in politics. Under the new Republican regime, education became a vital national duty, and as a part of the promotion of general education, girls' education improved quickly. Turkey adopted co-education in 1925, and by this way, the inequality in the education of girls and boys was diminished (Woodsmall 218-219). As such, education became secularized and the educational program in Turkey was modernized. However, although the new education system in the Turkish Republic was modernized, there were different courses in the program based on household economics, home arts, sewing, tailoring, cooking, and laundry which showed that being a good housewife was still among the prime responsibilities of girls. Ruth Frances Woodsmall, a critic of Women's status in early Republican Turkey, exposes the improvements in education for women:

> Secularization of schools, co-education, equality of opportunity for boys and girls from the primary school through the university, emphasis on vocational courses for girls, equality of salaries for men and women teachers, a new language, education of the masses, the use of foreign experts, a deepening of the Turkish consciousness are all steps in the general educational process which has definitely raised the intellectual level of Turkish women. (Woodsmall 235)

Together with all these improvements in the educational field, there were also some innovations in the professional and public lives of Turkish women. First of all, women began working in different fields rather than teaching or nursing, and the first female

doctors, lawyers, pharmacists, dentists, engineers and mayors began to work publicly. When Woodsmall talks about the professional improvements for women in the Turkish Republic, she states that:

> Regarded by the public as professionally equal to men and received on a basis of cordial equality by their colleagues, the Turkish women doctors have made their entrance into the profession under much more favorable conditions than those faced by the women pioneers in medicine in the West. (Woodsmall 255)

Thus, the development of the female status in the newly born Turkish Republic was so rapid that Turkish women got many rights even before the women in the West. However, these rapid changes in their lives did not change their duties as wives and mothers; in other words, their professional life was not an alternative to marriage. On the contrary, it went together with marriage, and women retained their basic responsibilities as wives and mothers. Nezihe Muhittin, one of the first leading Turkish feminists, emphasized the importance of female responsibilities as good mothers and wives:

> However, if the only goal of each woman in her life was to obtain one of these professions, the social balance would be destroyed. Women's improvement was necessary for the country's happiness and the continuation of the revolution. However, the different characteristics of women from men should have been emphasized. If the basic feminine aspects of women such as motherhood were abstracted from the superstitious beliefs about women,

> women would be able to carry the responsibilities of the rights they had (or would have). (Baykan, Ötüş-Baskett 33)

So, in the early years of the Turkish Republic, all the changes in the social, educational and professional lives of women actually did not intend to change their familial lives. Even an important feminist like Nezihe Muhittin focused on the importance of distinguishing women from men because she believed that these two sexes originally had different characteristics and it was not possible for them to be equal on all terms because they were biologically different from each other. According to her, women should have had the same rights as men in their educational and professional lives; however, this did not mean that women could ignore their role in marriage, their children and houses while pursuing their careers. As long as they could be good mothers bringing up good children for the future of the new Republic, they could benefit from the responsibilities and new rights they received. This is why feminism in those times was labeled 'state feminism' rather than an individual feminism focusing on women's rights for the sake of individual females.

The reforms in the female status in early Republican Turkey were actually done by the 'feminist' state, and they did not happen as a result of any demands originating from within the society. In other words, as Jenny White, one of the critics of Turkish Republican feminism suggests, all these reforms were imposed from above, and they were made for the sake of the Nation rather than for women as individuals (White 1). Even the feminists of those times (e.g. Nezihe Muhittin) thought that the most important objective was the improvement of the Republic, not the improvement of women as

individuals. Atatürk and his contemporaries were trying hard to educate women because women were regarded as the mechanisms to produce new generations, powerful and educated enough, to carry the nation towards a more westernized and modernized way of life.

> The forces pushing Atatürk to give suffrage to women in early 1930s and open seats for eighteen women in the parliament in 1973 explain partially how women were objectified by the political projects. It can be said that in Atatürk's anti-religious political program women served as 'pawns'. As Tekeli says giving suffrage to women, unlike the fascist parties in Italy and Germany, was a tactic to show the entire world that under Atatürk's one party regime Turkey had become democratic. (Baykan, Ötüş-Baskett 37)

The best example of Republican feminism was Nezihe Muhittin who was a nationalist feminist herself. She not only believed that women and men were different from each other, but also they were two opposite poles. However, until the Republic, all the focus was on only one of the poles and for the development of the republic, it was necessary to distribute the focus to both poles simultaneously. "Neither Nezihe Muhittin's nor the Republican's ideology was based on the idea of subject. Feminists did not consider women's rights as 'individual' rights. Unlike the West European countries, the social change in Turkey was based on not glorifying individual's intelligence and rights" (Baykan, Ötüş-Baskett 34).

The state feminism of the 1930s was based on glorifying the secular and modern nation rather than the female as individuals. Among the policies of the new Republic,

women were actually used as tools to prove that Turkey was as modern as the other Western countries. That is why state feminism has been criticized for not dealing with what was happening to women behind the closed doors of their homes. The ideal woman of the newly born Republic in the 1930s was a "citizen woman" who was both socially progressive but also uncomplaining and dutiful at home because modernity included marriage and motherhood as a national duty for women (White 2). As Jenny White explains in her article,

> … in 1923, Atatürk called for women to "take their places in the general economic division of labor" and stated that "a woman's highest duty is motherhood" (Duben and Behar 1991, 221). Even women's journals at the time wrote about the need for women to become educated so that they would be able to carry out their political duty properly, that is, to bring up the children into whose hands the future would be entrusted, a theme echoed in the "republican motherhood" of nineteenth-century France… (White 6)

The recent critique of this "state feminism" is that behind the closed doors of their homes, women were still subordinate to men. After they received the right to be educated and work outside the home, their duties at home did not change at all, and this caused them to have a double burden on their shoulders. This feminism was actually shaped by the demands of the Republic rather than the needs of the individual women; therefore what the Republic dealt with was the public appearance of the women because this was a way to demonstrate the modernization of the new Republic. On the other hand, women were still supposed to accept their prior duties as mothers and wives for

the sake of the nation's future. Even Nezihe Muhittin herself, although she was a feminist, revealed the fact that what was important was the nation rather than the individual beings, and thus the most important duty for women was to contribute to the development of the Republic:

> One of the realities that no longer needs to be protected is that the only thing expected from women for the development and innovation of the country is that they become good mothers who bring up physically and spiritually vigorous, sturdy, active and bold children for the sake of the country, and they become good housewives and wives who are capable of handling the house well. (Baykan, Ötüş-Baskett 96)

Muhittin obviously says it is not a secret that the national responsibility of women was still to be good wives and mothers who can manage the family life, bring up healthy and well-educated children who will save the future of the Republic. The ideal Republican woman was defined according to the demands and requirements of the new Turkish Republic; therefore although there were some attempts by some feminists to be more active, it was impelled by the government. For example Nezihe Muhittin founded The Turkish Women's Union (TWU) in 1924, and under her leadership, the group became the most important organization of women in Turkey (Libal 5). The goal of this organization was to achieve social and political rights for women, and to be in contact with the international women's organizations which it actually realized. The feminists in this organization attended congresses organized by International Alliance of Women and they succeeded in inviting this Alliance to Turkey to host their 1935 congress. This

congress was a big success because the international delegates were astonished at the rapid improvement of the women's status in Turkey in such a short period of time. Their impressions were expressed in the Western media which saw it as proof of the modernization of the new Turkish Republic.

Despite this success of the TWU as a first Muslim and non-Western national women's organization, the organization was criticized for being too independent. As mentioned before, the feminism at that time was a "state feminism," and it was supposed to be under the control of the government, thus any sort of division whether based on gender, class, ethnicity, or religion, was not actually tolerated by the state. So, the TWU ended up being closed and the feminists went on working for charity foundations (Libal 14).

The fact that the basic reason for all the reforms in women's status in the early years of the Republic was for the sake of the Republic itself did not change the other fact that actually there were many reforms done in society on behalf of women. All these reforms enabled women to have a more equal, if not completely equal, status to men in the Republican Turkish society. Nezihe Muhittin clarifies the differences in women's status those days and writes:

> Yes, the woman whose voice was sin yesterday is increasing the harmony and melody of her larynx on the art scenes today… The woman who did not have any other opportunities other than being a cook or wet nurse yesterday finds the doors of every profession completely open for her today. The woman who thought that going to a doctor was sinful and shameful yesterday

becomes a doctor herself today… The woman who became embarrassed under her veil while uttering two words of defense in front of the judge yesterday sits proudly on the chair of the judge today… The woman who did not have any value in the sight of the law yesterday has almost all civil rights of men today… Yesterday… Today… Yesterday… Today…If you want, we can tell more... (Baykan, Ötüş-Baskett 127)

1.2. Individualized Feminism: The Second Wave of Turkish Feminism (The 1980s)

Up to the 1980s, feminism was still serving the national goals of the Republic of Turkey. However, after a certain time this state feminism began to evolve into a more individualized feminism which began to focus on women as having individual rights, and they began demanding more private rights for women. The acceleration in the Turkish feminism during the 80s stemmed from the political gap in the country at that time which made it possible for feminism to emerge as an individualized and independent movement (Doltaş 61). The improvements in education and urbanization were also another reason that enabled women to become more active in feminist causes (Çaha 9). Some of the educated and urbane women, although they were not essentially feminists, began to support feminism to defend women's rights against the Islamic radicalism which developed after 1980 (Doltaş 61).

As a result, since 1980, feminism became a movement focusing on the individual women's rights, and women began to demand more private rights such as the right to abortion, the right to divorce, punishments for the violence at home, the right for maternity leave, equality in the familial life, and the abolishment of the legal arrangements that included discriminatory rules against women (Çaha 9). Yeşim Arat, one of the critics of Turkish feminism in the 1980s, believes that the feminist movement in Turkey after 1980 was an inevitable extension of the Kemalist movement, and states:

> The women's movement of the 1980s is an unexpected but also inevitable extension of the Kemalist tradition. Women's movement is part of the

> Westernization process under the leadership of the Kemalist reforms. It could emerge as a result of the facilities created by these reforms. If women's movement is an extension of the Kemalist tradition, it is an extension going beyond because it questions the sufficiency of tending towards the subject of women within the borders of this tradition. It supports a radical change separate from the leadership of the Kemalist tradition. (Arat 76)

As Unat puts it, the Kemalist feminism of the 1930s which gave many social and political rights to women led to the feminist movement in the 1980s. The actual source of this second wave of Turkish feminism in the 1980s was the "state feminism" of the 1930s; therefore, although this feminism was an inevitable extension of that movement, it was an extension which exceeded the old movement focusing on women and their individual rights rather than focusing on the future of the Republic. Arat goes on defining this new wave of Turkish feminism emphasizing its differences from the so-called "state feminism:"

> After the military coup in 1980, a women's movement which discussed the problems women had only because they were women emerged in Turkey. The movement consisted of individual writers, artists and journalists or small groups which emerged spontaneously independent from the state, and sometimes gathered around certain publishing agencies or sometimes around common identities. The common purpose was to question the problems women had because they were females and try to find solutions for these problems. (Arat 80)

The new wave of Turkish feminism in the 1980s was independent from the government, and it discussed the problems women had. This movement was pioneered by women who called themselves feminists and believed that the patriarchal structure of the society oppressed them. The most important goal was to change the patriarchal structure of society to enable women to become more independent from men. Yeşim Arat explains how these feminists aimed to change the patriarchal essence of the Turkish society:

> The women who defined themselves feminists and pioneered the women's movement in the 1980s believed that women's problems originated from the patriarchal structure of society. The patriarchal structure of society overpowered women. The problem was not women's rights but the liberation of women. Beyond the equality between men and women, the purpose was to create a fair world which women can shape with their own values. For the liberation of women it was necessary to reshape the patriarchal structure beginning with the state and other means of oppression ("family, law, health, education, science and security institutions under the protection of the state"). It was obligatory to overcome the cliff between the private and public areas and enable the woman to have security in her private life as well as the right to choose. (Arat 84)

According to these activist feminists, the problems women faced were based on the patriarchy, and they believed that the patriarchal structure made women live under suppression. The most important goal for these feminists was actually to subvert the society dominated by the masculine power, and to recreate a new and just world in

which women could live according to their own value judgments. In such a patriarchal society, there was a gap between the private life and public life, and in order to give women independence and freedom of choice, it was obligatory to overcome this gap. The most important thing which separated these feminist women from the Kemalist frame was that they were against the male dominated state. The state had a patriarchal essence, and it shaped and promulgated this patriarchal structure; therefore, these feminists strongly believed that as long as this patriarchy was not abolished, the problems women had could not be solved. Dilek Doltaş, another Turkish feminist critic in the 1980s focuses on the same problem, and explains it by quoting another theorist of sex and gender politics, Gayle Rubin:

> According to her men are shown to be dominant both economically and politically in this system, and thus they are given the opportunity to overpower women. For Rubin, family is both the starting point and guarantee for the sexist discrimination. Since the family in which men and women come into being and their sexes are formed is under the domination of the patriarchal system, family produces new governing men and new governed women with each new generation. The woman who is forced to stay within the family and shoulder the responsibilities given to her within the family becomes domestic while internalizing her gender role. However this process of domestication is full of sorrows and insults for the woman. She learns to live within borders under various oppressions. (Doltaş 53)

We see in Doltaş and Rubin how the feminist movement in the 1980s focused on destroying the patriarchal structure of the state in order to free the females. The patriarchal state dominates the family, and the family becomes both the source and the guarantee of patriarchy creating a sexist discrimination between males and females. Within the limits of the house, women are restricted and they are given special responsibilities which they have to obey; as a result, they are domesticated and subordinated by the superior male power. The second wave Turkish feminists were aware of this problem, and thus they became activists fighting against the patriarchal state. In the pursuit of this goal, they started to be active in the feminist causes through journals, campaigns, and protests.

In 1987, they began to publish a journal called *Feminist*. The feminists publishing this journal said that they had been thinking on the subordination of the females for some time, and this journal gave them the courage to talk about private problems of women as individuals. According to the publishers, the goal of *Feminist* was to question the hegemony and masculine authority (Arat 81). In this period of feminism, the feminists were able to talk about women as individuals and focus on the possible solutions for letting women become independent individuals. In the same year, they started a campaign called "Alliance against Violence," and during the preparation process for the campaign, they founded the Women's Association against Discrimination. The purpose of this association was to abolish the discriminative rules of patriarchal institutions, traditions, and value judgments.

In 1988, they began to publish another journal called *Socialist Feminist Cactus*. The group of feminists publishing this journal believed that the reason behind the inequality between males and females was not only the ideology but also the whole network of social relations (Arat 81-82). One of the major slogans of those times was "*Our Body Belongs to Us – No to Sexual Harassment*," and with that protest, women organized seminars and panels about the topic and encouraged other women to fight against these social injustices (Çaha 10). Also women had slogans such as "I do not want paradise under my feet, I want the world," and "My mother, myself, my daughter, what is changing?" (Timisi, Gevrek 27). With these slogans, women showed that they were reacting against the traditional norms of society. The prophetic hadith "Paradise is under the feet of mothers," was changed by the feminists of those times to state that they wanted the world before heaven because they did not have the individual rights for an independent life in the world. Nothing was changing from mothers to daughters, so something had to be done.

The reason why the 1980s was called the second wave of Turkish feminism was that it discussed the basic problems of social existence for women. Feminism was debated as a social project, differences were defined, and the meanings of being a woman and femininity were clarified (Timisi, Gevrek 14-15). As a result of the actions and campaigns of the feminist groups in the 1980s, feminist terminology was used by many women's associations whether they were officially feminists or not. Even in the media, state institutions and daily language, people began using this feminist terminology. Forming groups, gatherings, or organizing activism were impossible for

Turkish feminists until the 1980s (Timisi, Gevrek 38). All these protests and campaigns of the second wave Turkish feminism generated even more organizations and associations in the 1990s to promote women's rights.

1.3. Institutionalized Feminism: The Third Wave of Turkish Feminism (The 1990s)

The activist individualized feminism of the 1980s evolved into a more institutionalized feminism in the 1990s during which feminists began establishing more foundations, organizations and associations for defending women's rights in society. The continuity in the campaigns, activities and protests during the 80s enabled the institutionalization of Turkish feminism in the 1990s. Two Turkish feminist critics of the 1990s, Filiz Kardam and Yıldız Ecevit, explained the development of Turkish feminism:

> The efforts of the women who participated in the women's movement to discuss the problems on a larger platform, to obtain more supporters and to lay the foundations of women's policy continued in the 1990s as well. However this decade was obviously different form the previous decade. The main reason creating the difference was that women's groups in which female problems were discussed became diversified compared to the previous years in respect of their ideological stance, working areas and organizational styles. Many large and small 'discussion groups,' 'enterprises,' and 'initiatives' the numbers of which will never be known occurred. What was more important than this quantitative increase was that the movement was no longer only a movement of the women in three big cities. In many cities like Adana, Antalya, Mersin, Gaziantep, Diyarbakır, Samsun and Eskişehir, the word of the women's movement and the feminists ideas it supported began expanding. Variety in organization and becoming

> widespread brought about women's attempts to find solutions for the various dimensions of the women's problem. Women Consultation Centers and Women's Refuges were among the most common ones. (Kardam, Ecevit 90)

The most distinctive aspect of the 1990s' feminism, as Kardam and Ecevit puts it, was that the number of feminist groups, organizations and associations increased, and feminist movement became a movement of both eastern and western Turkey. Women created discussion groups and new enterprises in which they discussed the private individual problems of the female gender and tried to find possible solutions.

One of the most important topics for feminism in the 90s was the violence against women in the family. At that time, feminism was fighting against violence and there were many campaigns and protests to encourage women to support this fight and say "No to Domestic Violence." One of the most attractive slogans was "No to Violence." Feminists were trying to give a clear message with this short slogan (Işık 46-47). According to another critic of the 1990s' Turkish feminism Nazik Işık, feminism succeeded in becoming independent from other ideologies and political movements, and it was used as an ideology based on women's rights and sexual equality. Işık says that in order to maintain the struggle, feminism started to become institutionalized. For example, the Purple Roof Foundation of Women's Health was founded and it had the purpose of creating safe houses for women who were abused by their husbands.

Women uninterruptedly continued struggling against violence during the 1990s. Nazik Işık emphasizes that the continuity of feminist struggles from 1980s and 1990s was the reason for the success of feminist institutionalization into the 1990s:

> It is a fact that women's struggles to stop domestic violence against women were continuous in the 1990s. Women put the topic of domestic violence on their agenda as well as the state's agenda in the 1980s, and they did not accept to go back or to other cities in order not to remove the topic of domestic violence from the agenda and also in order to make the cooperation among women enduring in the 1990s. They continuously gave voice to and maintained their struggle against domestic violence and they succeeded to keep this on the state's agenda as well as their individual and collective agendas during the 90s. Thus "continuity" was recorded as the first major feature providing the institutionalization in the 1990s. (Işık 47)

The feminist struggle against violence which started in the 1980s was continuing without any interruptions during the 90s, and the most important aspect of their struggle was that it was no longer a taboo to talk publicly about familial violence against women. Although it was difficult, this topic became one which could be investigated and discussed. The political party representatives and government authorities were actively trying to represent this right of women to live without violence.

Feminist women also began publishing a newspaper only for women titled Monday (Pazartesi). With the publication of this newspaper, feminists proved that they had overcome many taboos in society and they were able to discuss their private problems publicly in their newspaper. The goal of this newspaper was elaborated as such:

> We see that it is necessary to change the laws, rules and traditions which arrange the social life and put us under oppression in order to change our lives. We also realize that this is not enough, and we should rebel against our fates which look like each other although they are called “private life.” And we notice that all these can change when women act altogether. What is now left? To come together. Pazartesi will work for this purpose. (Koçali 77)

In addition to letting women discuss their problems publicly, one of the most important functions of this newspaper was to enable women to come together and act in cooperation. According to the feminists at that time, the crucial thing was to be united in the fight against the traditional norms, laws, and rules which subordinated women. As mentioned in the quote above, although it was called personal life, even the private personal lives of the females were similar to each other because of the traditions that restricted women within patriarchal norms. And these feminists were aware of the fact that the key to success was in cooperation. If they revolted together, it would be possible to change the patriarchal domination and thus the status of women.

Another feminist group founded in the 1990s was Flying Broom Association (Uçan Süpürge) which also published a bulletin called *Flying News* (Uçan Haberler) (Çaha 10). In 1998, the Flying Broom Association was trying to organize meetings to gather together the Turkish and foreign feminists, and organizations. The founders of the Flying Broom Association were also participating in various women’s meeting abroad. This association became well-known internationally and many foreign women’s

organizations were interested in it in order to see what was happening in regard to the status of women in Turkey (Kardam, Ecevit 69).

Also in the 1990s, feminists founded women's libraries, women studies departments at universities, and safe houses for women (Çaha 11). Another Turkish feminist, Selma Acuner explains why institutionalization was very important for the progress of women's status in society. She writes:

> Setting up national or international mechanisms about the subject of women means it is socially and politically accepted that there is a problem of inequality between men and women. This recognition emphasizes that inequality is not an unchangeable fact but it is mutable. In other words, it is a struggle with systematic tools and resistance forms against the injustice and systematic oppression women have faced throughout history. (Acuner 126)

According to Acuner, having institutions, national or international, dealing with the status of women confirms that there is an inequality between the male and female gender. Women's organizations make the problem of discrimination against women socially and politically accepted, and make it easier to discuss and struggle against this discrimination. Acuner points out that the only way to solve this problem of systematic discrimination is to systematically create more women's organizations and associations; therefore, the institutionalization in Turkish feminism during the 1990s was an important attempt in making the problems of women more visible and socially and politically accepted.

Another major problem for women was education; during the 1990s feminists tried to develop new projects to give women greater access to higher education. One such feminist was Belkıs Kümbetoğlu:

> In the 1990s, since women's education was one of the important factors of the economic marginalization of females and female illiteracy was still continuing in a confirmed way, new education projects were developed, and new alternatives such as weaving carpets, making shoes, engraving jet stones, producing candles, and engraving mosaics for women to obtain more abilities and incomes became widespread against the exclusion of women from the economic field. (Kümbetoğlu 162)

It was important for women to be educated and to have some professional skills in order to earn their own money because one of the most obvious reasons for male dominance was the economic dependence of the females on their husbands. If they were well-educated and economically independent from their husbands, they could more easily discuss their problems and find solutions. That is why during the 1990s Turkish feminists were also developing new projects enabling women to access higher education, or to obtain some professional skills.

One of the other important aspects of the feminist movement in the 90s was that it was extended to the eastern cities of Turkey as well as the western ones. In other words, feminism became a broader movement including all women throughout Turkey; it did not only focus on the women in the bigger cities. Many women's associations were founded in the eastern cities in order to discuss the problems of the rural women

and try to find ways to solve these problems. For example, feminists founded an organization called Ka-Mer in Diyarbakır (a city in the southeastern Turkey) investigating the status of women there. Nebahat Akkoç defines Ka-Mer by stating,

> Most females in our society are not aware of the reality they are living with. Either they think what they live is natural and men are privileged, or they say there is nothing they can do and they assume that this is their fate. As a result of these findings, we aimed at helping women become conscious of women's rights. (Akkoç 8)

As Akkoç explains, some women especially in eastern Turkey are not even aware of their own subordination because they were brought up to believe that it was normal. However, if they were made conscious of the facts, it would be possible for them to struggle for their freedom and rights. Thus, Ka-Mer struggled to increase female consciousness about issues such as discrimination and equal rights.

As mentioned before, the feminist movement in the 1980s was called to be the second wave of Turkish feminism during which feminists emphasized the importance of women as individuals. All the efforts in the 80s to create a more individualized feminism that focused on solving the individual problems of the females and to set up more organizations for this purpose paved the way for the third wave of feminism in the 1990s, during which time the focus became the institutionalization of the feminist movement. The male dominated state feminism of the 1930s became an actively female generated feminism focused on the individual women's rights during the 80s and the 90s. The struggles of women against the inequalities yielded results. As a consequence,

some changes were made in 2001 in the Civil Code: men ceased being the legal head of the family, women no longer received harsher punishments for adultery, women got equal rights to divorce, women could use their maiden names, and inheritance was shared equally between men and women. Due to the efforts of these active feminist groups, all of these disadvantages against women were legally abolished, in the Civil Code (Çaha 11).

CHAPTER 2

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SIMONE DE BEAUVOIR'S THE SECOND SEX AND DUYGU ASENA'S WOMEN DO NOT HAVE A NAME

2.1. Women as the Second Sex: The Self/Other Relationship between Man and Woman

Simone de Beauvoir begins her famous book The Second Sex, which changed the feminist perspective in the early 20th century, with a question: "What is a woman?" Although there had already been many discussions and attempts to define what a woman was before Beauvoir, this question stayed unanswered until Simone de Beauvoir came up with her distinctive way of describing woman as the second sex in society. With the second sex, Beauvoir means that woman has been made the Other, and the reason for this otherness cannot be found in the biological, psychological or economic fate of the female sex:

> One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman. No biological, psychological, or economic fate determines the figure that the human female presents in society; it is civilization as a whole that produces this creature, intermediate between male and eunuch, which is described as feminine. Only the invention of someone else can establish as individual as an *Other*. (Beauvoir 267)

The most distinguishing aspect of Beauvoir's feminism is that she claims woman is not actually born a woman but she becomes one. In the patriarchal structure of society, it is not the biological facts that determine what a woman is and how she functions in society; on the contrary, it is the masculine power in society itself that defines woman and her functions in the world.

> History has shown us that men have always kept in their hands all concrete powers; since the earliest days of the patriarchate they have thought best to keep woman in a state of dependence; their codes of law have been set up against her; and thus she has been definitely established as the Other. (Beauvoir 139)

Man is the self while woman is the other, man is the good, while woman is the bad, man is the positive while woman is the negative, man is the defining while woman is the defined, and man is the oppressor while woman is the oppressed. It is possible to make the list of definitions about man and woman longer, and all these definitions are made by the patriarchate. As Beauvoir, states, since the early days of the patriarchal society, men have thought that it is the best to keep women under their power in order to define themselves. As a result of the oppression upon women, men could have the right to define the existence and function of the female sex in society. As a result of this power, woman has become the oppressed and subordinate sex. Beauvoir points out that "Representation of the world, like the world itself, is the work of men; they describe it from their own point of view, which they confuse with absolute truth (Beauvoir 143). Men represent the world from their masculine point of view, and they believe that this

representation is the truth. However, what they do is only to confuse their own representation with the absolute truth. The truth is that there is actually no woman born to be the second and subordinate sex, but she is made to be subordinated.

Man, in order to define what a man is, just needs an other as a mirror to see himself. In other words, woman has been made the other by man because he needs to define his own identity and function in society by comparing himself with what he is not. He is in need of an Other to identify himself. So, this otherness is not an essential reality for woman, but only a made-up story. From this perspective, the case can also be the same for woman. Woman is the other for man, so man might be the other for woman as well. However, since men hold the power in society, they construct the truth from their own perspective, and take the other under their control by defining and subordinating her.

> Once the subject seeks to assert himself, the Other, who limits and denies him, is none the less a necessity to him: he attains himself only through that reality which he is not, which is something other than himself… There can be no presence of an other unless the other is also present in and for himself: which is to say that true alterity – otherness – is that of a consciousness separate from mine and substantially identical with mine. (Beauvoir 139 - 140)

As it is clear in Beauvoir's words, woman as the other is a necessity for man because man can only obtain his own identity through the other; therefore, whatever man is, woman is not, or whatever man is not, woman is. Thus, the definitions of being man and

woman are in binary opposition. In order to become the positive, good and creative sex in society, man has defined woman as the negative other:

> These self-critical questions lead Beauvoir to introduce and study the notions of otherness and subordination. She notes that a man would never write a book on "the particular situation that males have in humanity". Thus, the relation between man and woman is not symmetrical. Man represents both the positive and the neutral aspects of humanity, woman represents only the negative. Man describes himself in his theories and histories of humanity, woman remains in silence. He stands both for the normal and for the ideal, she for the deviant. Beauvoir comments by putting forth her well-known thesis: He is the Subject, he is the Absolute, she is the Other." (Heinämaa 8)

As Heinämaa claims, man would not need to write a book to define his own identity and function in society because it is already he himself who describes the male sex. Nevertheless, the situation is not the same for woman. Again her existence as a woman is neither biological nor psychological; in other words, it is man made. Therefore, she needs to write and fight against the so-called truth created by man about her. As long as man stays the subject, he will keep on objectifying woman as the inessential other.

Sonia Kruks, a critic of Simone De Beauvoir, explains that Beauvoir distinguishes two separate kinds of otherness. One of them is between socially equal people, and the other is between socially unequal people. If the self-other relationship is between socially equal people, it is actually based upon reciprocity which means each person sees the other as his/her Other to define himself/herself. And this relationship

does not actually stem from any power or oppression. On the other hand, if this self-other relationship is between socially unequal people, it is based upon oppression. According to Beauvoir, the self-other relationship between man and woman is not based on equality; therefore, man's oppression and power result in negative definitions about woman. Thus, Kruks states, woman's otherness is not actually a natural one, but it is a subjection which makes woman the unequal Other to man (Kruks 101).

Judith Butler, in her article "Sex and Gender in Simone de Beauvoir's Second Sex," claims that there is a distinction between sex and gender made by Beauvior in The Second Sex. According to her, the most distinguished contribution of Simone de Beauvoir's expression "one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman" is this distinction between the biologically born woman and socially constructed woman (Butler 35). Butler believes that Beauvoir differentiates the biological sex from the socially constructed gender. Although another critic of Beauvoir Toril Moi states that critics who read The Second Sex and result in having the idea that Beauvior makes a distinction between sex and gender have completely misunderstood the text. In Moi's opinion, the sex and gender distinction is a problematic one because it observes the body from two different perspectives, one of which is "objective" and the other is "scientific." However, she claims, Beauvoir's perspective of the body as a situation, which means it is an absolute condition, on the other hand, rejects the idea of dividing the body into objective and scientific, and it accepts it as a whole (Moi 73).

> I mean that Beauvoir considers that only the study of concrete cases – of lived experience – will tell us exactly what it means to be a woman in a given

> context. For her it is impossible to derive the definition of ‘woman’ from an account of social norms alone, just as it is impossible to derive the definition of ‘woman’ from an account of biological facts alone. (Moi 76)

Simone de Beauvoir sees the body as a situation which means it is not to be divided into two components (biological and cultural). According to her, the body is given to her as a condition, not as her destiny. Although Toril Moi is right in claiming that Beauvoir observes the body as a situation rather than a destiny, it is also necessary not to forget that she formulates woman’s situation saying “one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman.” Butler’s idea, though it is not completely accurate because Beauvoir does not give two distinctive terms as sex and gender, is right in the sense that Beauvoir believes woman’s destiny is determined by the culture after she is born. The stance and function of woman in both family and society are decided by the patriarchal culture; that is why woman is not born but rather becomes a woman afterwards.

What Simone de Beauvoir means in claiming that woman becomes a woman after birth is related to her idea about the self-other relationship between man and woman. Women actually are not born with the culturally given duties and responsibilities, however they are brought up with these givens in the patriarchal culture. It is actually not biological facts that restrict the woman within the home, but the power of her master. The self-other relationship between man and woman in a sense resembles the master-slave relationship. In this case, man reduces woman to slavery to obtain his existence together with the power. Man makes himself the master via his power so that

he appears to have the right to define, represent, objectify, dominate and subordinate woman.

> To the extent that Beauvoir accepts a radical dualism between subject and object, the very idea of viewing a person in terms of representational properties would be, in some sense, a way of negating that person's subjectivity by reducing that person to the status of a perceived or representational object. In other words, the active, perceiving, dominating, subjectivity of the self would render the other, represented, human subject as a mere object or Other, a product of subjectivity's representational objectifying gaze. For men, this problem is not without remedy, because they can strongly identify themselves as active, conscious, dominating subjects through their dynamic thinking, activity, and power in the world. (Shusterman 118)

Shusterman explains that man as the subject perceives and represents woman, thus he makes her an object. On the other hand, Sonia Kruks claims that although biology is not actually destiny, man oppresses woman on the grounds of his real biological power. (Kruks 102) Strength is the only difference between the two sexes and man's oppression and domination over woman is only based on this biological power. Thanks to this power, man holds the right to master the woman, subordinating her to himself. Kruks uses Foucault's terms and says that "Woman is historically constituted, not a constituting, subject" (Kruks 103). Thus woman is constituted by the patriarchate, and there occurred a master and slave relationship between man and woman. Actually,

according to Beauvoir, the self-other relationship or master-slave relationship is necessary for each human being to define his/her existence. However, this relationship should be based upon equality rather than inequality and oppression of one sex. If this relationship was based upon equality between the sexes, each sex would be both subject and object without feeling the need to oppress and dominate the other:

> Each tries to fulfill himself by reducing the other to slavery. But the slave, though he works and fears, senses himself somehow as the essential; and, by a dialectical inversion, it is the master who seems to be the inessential. It is possible to rise above this conflict if each individual freely recognizes the other, each regarding himself and the other simultaneously as object and as subject in a reciprocal manner. (Beauvoir 140)

Thus Beauvoir believes that the relationship between man and woman should be reciprocal. If each sex recognizes the other both as object and subject at the same time in an equal manner, there would be no inequality between these two sexes. She emphasizes that each human being needs an Other to identify himself/herself with, however, as long as this otherness is based on social equality, it does not create a problem. On the other hand, if the otherness is based upon domination and power, it creates an inequality for the subordinated sex. Both man and woman should be able to recognize themselves as objects as well as subjects, but since man is not eager to lose his power and domination, he is not willing to accept the woman's individual subjectivity, and he reduces her to objectivity. This requires a change both in man and woman:

> On the contrary, *The Second Sex* argues that both men and women have to change. Their enmity can be overcome when both have the courage to accept their contingent bodily existence as individuals. Men should give up their desire to *be* and accept their contingency so they will no longer need woman as their mirroring object. Women should no longer choose the safety of a supposed object status, insofar as they did so. Men and women, in other words, should stop using the other sex to hide their status as contingent individuals. (Vintges 3)

Karen Vintges, another critic of Simone de Beauvoir, asserts that the solution given by Simone de Beauvoir requires a change not only in man but also in woman because part of the mistake belongs to woman who accepts the subordinate and passive role in social life. Man makes the original mistake by dominating and objectifying the female individual, but woman also contributes to his mistake by accepting her inferior status. What is necessary in such a situation is a difference in the mutual comprehension of individuality. Man should give up considering himself as the powerful subject and accept the fact that there is no difference between woman and himself. At the same time, women should not accept what is presented to them as a given by man. She should consider herself as a subject and act upon her individual ideas rather than from the oppression of man. She should become aware that she is not originally inferior to man, but that she has been made to believe that she is.

The same idea of the master-slave dialectic comes up in Women Do Not Have a Name by the famous Turkish feminist author Duygu Asena. With this novel, Duygu

Asena focuses on the idea that woman does not have her own individuality, because she is subordinated by the man. Throughout the novel, she emphasizes her idea that women do not have a name in the masculine society because they are made submissive and inferior to the men. Her criticisms about the current inferior status of women in modern Turkey end up with encouraging all women to struggle for their subjectivity and independence. She creates an unnamed female character that is a successful professional holding her economic independence, and she presents her as an example of the necessary struggle for independence. Also in this novel she mentions that each woman is actually aware of her status as a slave in society, however none of them does anything to change this status and to become more powerful because they do not believe that they can actually succeed. She emphasizes that in the patriarchal society woman is supposed to be weak and passive, and if she does not obey these so-called masculine rules, she is condemned, she is beaten, and she is scorned:

> The people are like this, they can neither live nor let you live… They want to oppress and kill, we are women, we should be oppressed, we should obey them, if we do not, they hurt, break, beat… Don't worry, everything will be good. (Asena 117)

If you are a woman, you cannot decide what you want to do because society has already decided it for you; and if you do not want to obey what society has decided for you, you are not a real or a good woman. Woman should be weak, woman should obey the rules of the society she lives in, and if she does not she is never successful. What Duygu

Asena suggests as a solution for the inferior status of women is that they should be strong:

> You should be powerful. When this phrase is frequently repeated, it loses its meaning. You should be powerful, you should believe in your own power, but at the same time you should really struggle to be powerful. People have inner motives to oppress, dominate and rule the ones who are weaker than themselves, all people have these motives, and unfortunately, women who regard themselves as weak constitute this army of the weak. Then, why shouldn't they believe that they have the right to order them, rule them, and enslave them? We should not let this happen. If you cannot say "no" to the first order, first restriction or first slap, this keeps on happening. However, a firm "no" will be the solution for many problems. "If you love me and want me, you should not order me, you should not look down on me, we are equal, and if you do not accept this, I will go" Then you should believe that they will take you and your rules up seriously. They will respect your principles. However, you should first have your own principles. (Asena 169)

Woman should have her own principles for existence and success; as long as she keeps obeying the male principles and rules, she will always be doomed to inferiority and slavery. The only reality about man is that he is aware of being powerful, especially more powerful than woman; thus, he thinks he can oppress, dominate and subordinate her. The mistake made by the woman is that she thinks she is not powerful and she ignores her own power to create principles and rules for herself. As a result of this, man,

who has the hidden motive to oppress the weak and inferior being, keeps defining and ordering her as if she was his slave. The solution suggested by Asena is that a woman should be strong enough to decide her principles and not to forget that she is equal to the man. As long as woman does not forget this reality, the man will also have to remember it.

Another important contribution of Beauvoir's feminism is the idea of transcendence and immanence. In Beauvoir's discussion of what a woman is, she comes up with the fact that woman has been forced to stay passive and immanent while man is as free as he wants to be as a transcendent individual which means woman is restricted within the boundaries of the home and she always repeats doing the same things in there. Unlike man, she is not a social person. On the contrary, man goes beyond the home and he obtains a productive and active social life which is completely different from the woman's.

> An existent is nothing other than what he does; the possible does not extend beyond the real, essence does not precede existence: in pure subjectivity, the human being *is not anything*. He is to be measured by his acts. Of a peasant woman one can say that she is good or a bad worker, of an actress that she has or does not have talent; but if one considers a woman in her immanent presence, her inward self, one can say absolutely nothing about her, she falls short of having any qualifications. Now, in amorous or conjugal relations, in all relations where the woman is the vassal, the other, she is being dealt with in her immanence. It is noteworthy that the feminine comrade, colleague, and

> associate are without mystery; on the other hand, if the vassal is male, if, in the eyes of a man or a woman who is older, or richer, a young fellow, for example, plays the role of the inessential object, then he too becomes shrouded in mystery. And this uncovers for us a substructure under the feminine mystery which is economic in nature. (Beauvoir 257-258)

What makes an existent exist is actually the actions. It is important what one does to claim his/her existence in the world. As Beauvoir asserts, a human being is measured by his/her acts in society. That is why man dominates woman as the Other and makes her a passive object within the house. This makes everything easier for the man so that he becomes the essential, active and socially productive subject. By the way of objectifying the woman, man succeeds in holding all the power in his hands, and since he does not want to give up this power, he is never willing to accept woman as an independent subject.

> Yet, unlike Hegel, Sartre emphasizes an "ontological separation" between consciousness bound within an ahistorical relationship, which entails that the subject constitutes itself as the subject by conceiving itself as not the Other. For Sartre, the Other transcends me and places restrictions on my freedom, and I must therefore negate and transcend the Other by making him or her into an object. The Self-Other relation in early Sartrian philosophy is therefore, as Lundgren Gothlin argues, characterized by a double negation: the Self negates itself as not the Other and negates the Other as the object to

> be transcended. The Self is henceforth condemned to conflict with no room for recognition of, and reciprocity with, the Other. (Tidd 164)

In Sartre's philosophy, known to have deeply influenced Beauvoir's ideas, the Self-Other relationship is based upon transcending the Other to have a total freedom. By having the total freedom and transcendence, the Self restricts the Other's freedom. In the case of man and woman, the man who has produced himself as the Self and woman as the Other, is the transcendent being and he forces woman to stay immanent. As Beauvoir says, it is possible to evaluate a female worker for her performance; however, it is never possible to evaluate the talent of an immanent woman who has a restricted freedom within the boundaries of the home. Jean Leighton says, "Man's power and transcendence make him fully "existent" while woman, doomed to immanence and passivity, is not really "existent" or even as fully human as the male" (Leighton 32). What Leighton asserts is identical to Beauvoir's claim that an existent is nothing more than what he does. If this is so, woman who cannot do anything in social life is not actually an existent. As a result of being doomed to immanence, she becomes a passive object subordinated by the active subject.

> If we now return to de Beauvoir, we can see that rather than equating her distinction between transcendence and immanence with the opposition between being for-itself and being in-itself, we will make more sense of what she says if we think of it as a distinction between two kinds of subjectivity corresponding to Sartre's second and first fundamental attitudes to the other. Transcendence involves objectifying the other and asserting one's own

> subjectivity; immanence involves accepting objectification and attempting to rely on an exterior transcendence for justification. (Green 4)

Karen Green here draws attention to the difference between being for-itself and being-in-itself. As a transcendent being, man exists for himself; on the contrary, woman, as an immanent being, only exists in herself. Woman's both existence and freedom is limited by the domination of man's power. Man who is an independent and powerful being, allows woman to exist only as a dependent being. The fact is that this dependency of woman is not based upon an absolute truth; on the contrary, as previously mentioned, it is just a man-made story to keep the patriarchy working well. What is necessary for woman is to claim her own freedom and individuality, however, when a woman tries to do this, she is condemned by the patriarchal society and she is believed not to be a "true woman:"

> "Woman is lost. Where are the women? The women of today are not women at all!" We have seen what these mysterious slogans mean. In men's eyes – and for the legion of women who see through men's eyes – it is not enough to have a woman's body not to assume the female function as mistress or mother in order to be a "true woman." In sexuality and maternity woman as subject can claim autonomy; but to be a "true woman" she must accept herself as the Other. The men of today show a certain duplicity of attitude which is painfully lacerating to women; they are willing on the whole to accept woman as a fellow being, an equal; but they still require her to remain inessential. For her these two destinies are incompatible; she hesitates

> between one and the other without being exactly adapted to either, and from this comes her lack of equilibrium. With man there is no break between public and private life: the more he confirms his grasp on the world in action and in work, the more virile he seems to be; human and vital values are combined in him. Whereas woman's independent successes are in contradiction with her femininity, since the "true woman" is required to make herself object, to be the Other. (Beauvoir 261-2)

According to Beauvoir, woman is a lost sex, because it is very difficult for her to be an autonomous being as well as accepting her male-imposed female destiny. However, what is expected from her in the patriarchal society is to accept herself as inessential and inferior to man. A "true woman" is the one who is both a subject at home as the wife and mother, but an object outside the house, a subordinate and passive one. If a woman wants to claim her freedom and subjectivity, she is easily blamed for not being a true woman, and this causes the woman to feel deficient. On the other hand, as Beauvoir mentions, there is no distinction between the public and private life for man. He can easily experience a private and public life without being dependent on any other individual. He can be as active and independent outside the house while he can come home and get relaxed without having any responsibilities for the home except the finance. However, even if the woman wants to be free to have a social life, her duties and responsibilities as a true woman prevent her from doing so.

2.2. Childhood and the Young Girl's Upbringing

As already stated, "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman," says Simone De Beauvoir, and this process of becoming a woman begins as soon as the girl is born into the patriarchal society. There are already various differences in the way parents bring up their boys and girls because each one is prepared for different tasks and responsibilities in the world. Before their birth, the destiny and function of the female sex in society has already been decided by masculine power. As Beauvoir emphasizes, being a woman is not a biological destiny, but a culturally given one, which means the girl is not born to be a woman in the sense that society understands. Nevertheless, rather than the biological facts, it is the cultural and social principles that decide for the existence and function of the female sex. Thus, the child as a girl is brought up in a completely different way from the boy. Simone de Beauvoir points this fact thus:

> This is just where the little girls first appear as privileged beings. A second weaning, less brutal and more gradual than the first, withdraws the mother's body from the child's embraces; but the boys especially are little by little denied the kisses and caresses they have been used to. As for the little girl, she continues to be cajoled, she is allowed to cling to her mother's skirts, her father takes her on his knee and strokes her hair. She wears sweet little dresses, her tears and caprices are viewed indulgently, her hair is done up carefully, older people are amused at her expressions and coquetries – bodily contacts and agreeable glances protect her against the anguish of solitude. The little boy, in contrast, will be denied even coquetry; his efforts at

> enticement, his play-acting, are irritating. He is told that “a man doesn’t ask to be kissed... A man doesn’t look at himself in mirrors... A man doesn’t cry.” He is urged to be “a little man”; he will obtain adult approval by becoming independent of adults. He will please them by not appearing to seek to please them. (Beauvoir 270)

Since early childhood, the boy is made to get accustomed to standing on his own feet, to seek for his liberty and to be independent from anyone around him including his family; thus he is slowly denied kisses or hugs from his parent because he is supposed to become an adult as quickly as possible. And the only way to his complete freedom is to let him fight alone for his own existence and principles. On the other hand, the case is just the opposite for the little girl; there is no urge for her because she is not in need of protecting herself or claiming her liberty. For her, there is always someone who will take care of her, decide instead of her, order her, and protect her from the threats of the outer world. During her childhood and teenage years, her parents will protect her from the difficulties and dangers of life, and after she gets married, she will have her husband to protect her. She will never be in need of defending herself because she will be doomed to have a limited life within the house. She is not actually expected to be an independent and active being in society. She is weak and inferior; thus she cannot decide for herself, she needs to be decided and defined, as well.

Both Simone de Beauvoir and Duygu Asena emphasize that what is taught to the girl and boy is absolutely different. A boy is taught to be strong and independent while,

on the contrary, the girl is taught to be weak and dependent. The boy should be powerful and although he sometimes feels weak, he should not show it:

> Crying is bad. My friends' fathers are always telling their sons that "men do not cry"; and if they are saying this, it means crying is not right. Well, if crying is not a good thing, why isn't it forbidden for girls? I wonder whether it is right for girls to do bad things, but not for boys. Or are there different goods and bads for girls and boys? But this is not possible, bad is bad, can something which is good for someone be bad for others? (Asena 14)

Asena creates a female character in her book who has been aware of the different approaches to boys and girls since her childhood. A boy should not cry because crying is a sign of weakness, however, the boy is supposed to be strong. Thus, parents warn their boy against crying and teach him that if he cries he will lose his manly power. On the other hand, a girl can cry as much as she wants because she is already a weak being, and she is not supposed to show herself as a strong individual. Society expects her to be inferior and submissive. So, the fact is there are different standards for the girl and boy in society. What is good for a boy is bad for a girl, and what is bad for the boy is good for the girl. With this logic, freedom, power and superiority is good for the boy and restriction, weakness and inferiority is good for the girl. As a result, the boy should not do anything that shows weakness, and the girl should not do anything that shows rebellion against the decisions taken for her.

In Asena's book, the main character, who is a woman without a name, realizes that the relationship between man and woman is based upon power; thus she concludes that the girl should have power from her early childhood to be equal to the boy:

> Maybe they are really more powerful than us. However, we should not let them do the things we do not want. Then, we should be powerful, as well… It is good that I have discovered this. Girls need to be powerful, too. And from now on, I am very powerful… (Asena 15-16)

A boy can do everything he wants and he can scorn the girl, make fun of her and oppress her, but the girl cannot do anything because she is not taught that she can be powerful. Her lesson is weakness and submission. However, Asena depicts such a character that she is aware of what is happening around her concerning the man-woman relationship. This relationship is constituted by the power man holds since his childhood, and due to this power, he sees the right to dominate the woman. What is important to realize for the little girl is that individually she can be as strong as the boy not to obey his principles. If a girl finds out that she has the power, as well and give up being protected by the elders around, she can stand on her own feet as well as the boy.

Simone de Beauvoir contends that the male sexual organ is the symbol of the power he has. The phallus becomes, rather than being a sexual organ, a sign of power. Since his early childhood, the boy learns that he has a phallus and he is more powerful than the other sex. The phallus represents the subjectivity the boy has, it is the tool to dominate and oppress the other sex.

> Because he has an *alter ego* in whom he sees himself, the little boy can boldly assume an attitude of subjectivity; the very object into which he projects himself becomes a symbol of autonomy, of transcendence, of power; he measures the length of his penis; he compares his urinary stream with that of his companions; later on, erection and ejaculation will become grounds for satisfaction and challenge. (Beauvoir 278)

Beauvoir states that the male sexual organ is the tool symbolizing challenge and transcendence for the boy. The reason for his subjectivity is his penis, and he is never ashamed of this organ. On the other hand, Beauvoir argues, the girl is always told not to talk about her sexual organ or anything about sexuality. What is embarrassing for the girl is something to be proud of for the boy. The penis becomes an object in which the boy finds his own subjectivity and independence, and it is something to be compared with the others as a symbol of more strength. On the other hand, for the little girl, the case is not the same. She is still playing with her dolls and protected by her parents from any threats of such subjects as sexuality. She does not know anything about her own biology and the parents do not think it is necessary for her to know. She is prevented from talking about her sexual organ or anything about it:

> While the boy seeks himself in the penis as an autonomous subject, the little girl coddles her doll and dresses her up as she dreams of being coddled and dressed up herself; inversely, she thinks of herself as a marvelous doll. By means of compliments and scoldings, through images and words, she learns the meaning of the terms *pretty* and *homely*; she soon learns that in order to

> be pleasing she must be “pretty as a picture”; she tries to make herself look like a picture, she puts on fancy clothes, she studies herself in a mirror, she compares herself with princesses and fairies. (Beauvoir 279)

For the boy, the phallus becomes the symbol for liberty outside the house, he is a subject and he is supposed to seek for activity and success outside the home. He does not need the protection of his family or anyone else. However, while the boy is paving his way to the outer world, the girl is still at home playing with her dolls, making them more pretty. The doll becomes a symbol for the girl in society; she is as passive as it. Her only expected function is to become more attractive and beautiful than the other girls. And between the girl and boy, there is not even a field to compete. The girl is competing with the other girls for her beauty and charm while the boy is competing with the other boys for his power and liberty.

Toril Moi, in her article “Ambiguity and Alienation in *The Second Sex*,” points to how Beauvoir analyzes the boy and girl’s alienation during their childhood:

> Initially, then, all children are equally alienated. This is not surprising, since the wish to alienate oneself in another person or thing, according to Beauvoir, is fundamental to all human beings: “Primitive people are alienated in mana, in the totem; civilized people in their egos, their names, their property, their work. Here is to be found the primary temptation to inauthenticity.” But sexual difference soon transforms the situation. For little boys, Beauvoir argues, it is much easier to find an object in which to alienate themselves than for little girls: admirably suited to the role as idealized *alter ego*, the

> penis quickly becomes every little boy's very own totem pole: "The penis is singularly adapted for playing this role of 'double' for the little boy – it is for him at once a foreign object and himself," Beauvoir claims. Projecting themselves into the penis, little boys invest with the whole charge of their transcendence. For Beauvoir, then, phallic imagery represents transcendence, not sexuality. (Moi 104)

In order to claim his/her existence, the human being needs to alienate himself/herself in a different person or object according to Beauvoir. For the little boy, this object to get alienated in is his penis which reminds him of his power. By the way of his sexual organ, the boy succeeds transcendence, and Beauvoir argues that the penis no longer symbolizes sexuality, but transcendence. Thanks to the power the penis gives to the little boy, he accomplishes his process of transcendence over the girl and he imprisons her into immanence. Moi also mentions the difficult time the girl has in alienating herself because she does not have a given object to alienate herself in like the boy. She uses Freudian concepts to explain how the girl feels herself lacking compared to the boy because she does not have a penis (Moi 104).

While the little boy is made to be proud of his sex, the girl is forced to be embarrassed about anything regarding her sex. Womanly facts are never presented to her as something to praise, but rather to hide and be ashamed of. Duygu Asena talks about the girl's menstruation and shows how it is supposed to be hidden:

> Enough is enough. Why are we bleeding then if it is shameful? If bleeding means becoming a woman, why is it shameful? Are these all happening

> because we do not have a penis? If we had a penis, were we going to have parties as well? Why isn't theirs shameful but our bleeding is? It is enough, mother, it is enough. If I menstruate, you will see I will announce to everyone that I do. (Asena 24)

When the girl asks her mother about menstruation in the book, her mother reacts badly and says that she should not talk about it in front of someone else. This is something embarrassing; therefore when she begins to menstruate, she should not mention it to anyone. When the girl hears this reaction from her mother, she rebels because she does not understand the double standard applied to boys and girls. When a boy is circumcised in Turkey, there are big celebrations for it because it is considered to be the first step into manhood. And becoming a powerful man is the most important thing both for the boy and society, as well. On the other hand, the girl's first step into womanhood is menstruation, but she has to keep it as a secret and not even talk about it in public. Asena points attention to the double standard against the girls in the Turkish society and criticizes it via the reactions of her main character. Simone de Beauvoir also talks about the same issue:

> She does not yet grasp the significance of what is taking place in her. Her first menstruation reveals this meaning, and her feelings of shame appear. If they were already present, they are strengthened and exaggerated from this time on. All the evidence agrees in showing that whether the child has been forewarned or not, the event always seems to her repugnant and humiliating. (Beauvoir 310)

As soon as the girl begins menstruating, her feeling of shame occurs, and most of the time this stems from the social pressures upon her. She is never allowed to talk about such issues; in other words, she is never taught anything about her sex and womanly features. Thus when it is time to face the realities about her sex, she feels forced to be ashamed of them.

Beauvoir also points out what is taught to the girl while the boy is learning to be proud of his sex:

> Even a generous mother, who sincerely seeks her child's welfare, will as a rule think that it is wiser to make a "true woman" of her, since society will more readily accept her if this is done. She is therefore given little girls for playmates, she is entrusted to female teachers, she lives among the older women as in the days of the Greek gynæceum, books and games are chosen for her which initiate her into her destined sphere, the treasures of feminine wisdom are poured into her ears, feminine virtues are urged upon her, she is taught cooking, sewing, housekeeping, along with care of her person, charm, and modesty… In brief, she is pressed to become, like her elders, a servant and an idol… (Beauvoir 281-2)

While the little boy is opening himself to the outer world and claiming his liberty, the little girl at home is taught how to become a true woman; in other words, a true idol and servant to her male master. The girl is supposed to become a good housewife and a good mother, but nothing else. Although these standards for girls and boys might have changed in the West where women began seeking for independence and equal rights at a

much earlier time, it is still very true of Turkey that the sex roles are assigned by the patriarchal society, and girls are brought up to fit these standards since their early childhood. For the Turkish girl social successes are not actually important, she should know how to cook, to sew, to clean and to look after children, and she should know how to be beautiful and attractive, as well. Being charming is very important for her because only by this way, she can succeed her ultimate goal which is to find a good husband. This ultimate goal is actually not decided by the girl herself, this is what is decided on behalf of her by the masculine society. A girl, since she is supposed to be a dependent and inferior being, needs a husband to protect and feed her. While the boy has all opportunities for success presented to him by society, the girl only has obstacles in front of her again presented by society which prevents her individual independence and success.

In the same way, Duygu Asena states how parents do not expect their daughters to be educated and successful in social life as individuals:

> And it was the time for my sister and I to take the university entrance exam... My father said, "No. Why are you taking this exam, what is the necessity, soon you will get married, why are you bothering me for nothing?" "Father, you will not be bothered, we will take the exam. By the way, we don't want to get married, we want to work..."
>
> "What do you mean working, I won't hear this from you again, in my house nobody can work, and no men can let you work." (Asena 45)

Here, the protagonist of Women Do Not Have a Name is facing problems with her father when she declares that she wants to get a university education and become a successful individual in her profession. Her father thinks that all of her attempts towards getting an education and professional success are in vain because she will soon get married and stay at home, working as a housewife and mother. This fact of how the girls and boys are being brought up differently can be explained through "Socialization" theory. This theory tries to examine Simone de Beauvoir's famous statement "-- One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman --" and explain how children, especially girls, develop their characteristics in society as they become adults. According to Nermin Unat, "socialization theory actually tries to explain how a biological creature becomes a social creature. All girls are brought up for certain roles. Boys, too. The suggested roles of being a wife and mother for girls are considered as given. Actually it is also necessary to question these roles, too" (Arat 23-24). Considering this socialization theory, it is easier to understand why fathers don't expect their daughters to get educated and work outside the home. Girls, since their childhood, are forced to be in the house helping their mothers with the housework while the boys are always outside the house either with their friends or fathers. The girls are trained as good housewives and mothers by their own mothers because this is what is expected of them. On the other hand, boys are trained to struggle against the difficulties of life outside the house.

Girls become so accustomed to their passive roles as mothers and wives that sometimes they prefer this passivity to activity because they develop a fear of the dangers of freedom outside the house. This fear makes them choose a passive but protected life

rather than an active but possibly dangerous life. Dorothy Kaufmann McCall argues that women are afraid of being socially active members of society:

> Against the difficult assertion of self, woman is beguiled with a promise of security not offered to the male. She is led to believe that she does not need to create her future through her own actions in the present; her vocation, in the form of marriage and motherhood, will happen to her. If she accepts the feminine role of Other, she denies herself the opportunities of transcendence, but she also feels safe from its hazards. Her femininity is the mirage that she will be taken care of, not only economically but absolutely. All the elements of woman's situation encourage her to prefer the pleasured of passivity and the repose of definition to the risks and uncertainties of freedom. (McCall 213)

The girl, since the early years of her childhood, is offered protection. During childhood she is protected by her family, and by her husband after she gets married. On the other hand, there is no protector for the male sex because men do not need someone else for protection. Women are taught that they always need someone to save them. After having been so well protected, the girl herself starts thinking that she has to be passive and inferior. Thus, staying passive and inferior but protected sometimes seems to be preferable to being independent but without protection. Since the girl has not become used to be socially included in the active life, she fears the dangers of this life and does not believe that she can manage alone. Here, power becomes important again. As both Asena and Beauvoir emphasize, the woman should trust her own power and believe that

she can be as powerful as the man if she tries it. The problem is that woman is not allowed to try it, and so she becomes afraid. If she overcomes this fear, she can become equal to man in every area of life.

However both Asena and Beauvoir argue another problem for the girl who tries to become as powerful as, and equal to the boy. Although she tries to be a socially included and transcendent individual, the pressures of patriarchal society on her to be a "true woman" make her life much more difficult.

> Moreover, even when she chooses independence, she none the less makes a place in her life for man, for love. She is likely to fear that if she devotes herself completely to some undertaking, she will miss her womanly destiny. This feeling often remains unavowed, but it is there; it weakens well-defined purposes, it sets limits. In any case, the woman who works wishes to reconcile her professional success with purely feminine accomplishments; not only does this mean that she must devote considerable time to her appearance, but, what is more serious, it means that her vital interests are divided…It is not a matter of mental weakness, of an inability to concentrate, but rather of division between interests difficult to reconcile. (Beauvoir 369)

Although the girl prefers being a free subject in social life and become professionally successful, she also tries to fulfill her womanly duties. She cannot ignore what society decides as her ultimate goal. Even if she wants to get educated and have a profession, she cannot avoid her duties as a wife or mother. If she is not married, she looks for love, and she pays attention to her appearance. If she is married, she deals with the house and

children. Thus, her interests are always divided into various spheres, and this makes her life much more difficult than the boy's who only focuses on one thing at a time.

2.3. The Married Woman and Motherhood

In the patriarchal society, marriage is determined as the ultimate goal for the woman. Under the pressures of patriarchy, woman begins thinking that marriage is the only way for her to claim her own existence. Most women, after they reach the normal age of marriage, starts to look for a good husband, and while doing this they always have the inner anxiety of not being able to find one. The reason behind this fear is that girls who cannot get married until a certain age are condemned by masculine society. Simone de Beauvoir states the importance of marriage as the traditional destiny of woman:

> Marriage is the destiny traditionally offered to women by society. It is still true that most women are married, or have been, or plan to be, or suffer from not being. The celibate woman is to be explained and defined with reference to marriage, whether she is frustrated, rebellious, or even indifferent in regard to that institution. (Beauvoir 425)

According to Debra B. Berfoggen, a critic of marriage and autonomy, the most important term here is ‘destiny’ because, she argues, Beauvoir criticizes marriage since it is not a choice for woman but a fate. On the other hand, it is only a fate for the woman, not for the man, and since it is a contract between two unequal partners, it is not a reciprocal relationship (Bergoffen 20). During her childhood, the girl is always trained to achieve her ultimate goal; she learns how to become a good housewife and a good mother. For this purpose only, mothers teach their daughters how to be a “true woman,” both charming and beautiful and capable of the housework and child rearing. Even

playing with her dolls, the little girl is being prepared for her future role as a wife and mother. Marriage is an imposed institution for the woman; if she cannot achieve it, she is made to believe that she cannot have a place for herself in the world. Andrea Veltman asserts that marriage "leads to the atrophy of women's intelligence and self-determination and lowers women to using trickery in catching and "managing" a husband (Veltman 125). Marriage is presented to the woman as a home in which she can find her so-called limited liberty and a vocation which only includes the routine housework.

Duygu Asena criticizes marriage as an enforced duty for women and she rebels against the traditional idea that woman always seeks marriage, and she tries to deceive the good man she finds to take her:

> The day I met KDG's family, when his aunt slowly came near me, looking at me mercifully, showing me a close friendliness and asked, "Why don't you get married, won't he take you?" Many things were clarified in my mind. I could only say, "It is me who will not take him." Her eyes were widely opened. But she never believed it. All girls are programmed to get married. When a man is so kind as to marry her, she dies out of pleasure. The day they get a proposal is the biggest day of their lives. They have a few more big days such as the wedding day, the first night, the day they become a mother. And the creators of all these big days are naturally the men. Without men, they do not have any big days. Since you are also one of them, you should obey their rules, if you do not, you suffer, you are excluded, and you stay

> isolated. What if you obey? If you obey, you suffer again, and this time you actually suffer. You suffer even without realizing that you are suffering… (Asena 155)

The traditional belief in Turkish society is that by proposing to the woman, a man does her a favor, and this minute is what the girl has been waiting during her life. Here, Duygu Asena criticizes the phrase in Turkish "take the girl," which means to decide to marry a girl. When a boy and girl date, if they do not get married in a short time, people around, if they know the relationship, begin asking the girl: "Won't he take you?" Here taking sounds like buying a product from the supermarket. It is not considered to be possible that the girl might not want to get married; it is always the boy who puts off the marriage. Nobody believes that the girl might not be ready or even eager for marriage because it is supposed to be her only goal in life. Asena strongly criticizes any suggestion that the most important days for girls must revolve around proposal, marriage and motherhood. All of these days depend on the man. This means woman cannot have any other important days for her individual successes because she is not believed to have success outside the marriage and home. Asena creates a character who tries to rebel against all these traditional norms in the patriarchal society. She wants to prove that woman does not have to get married to be successful; on the contrary, marriage is not always a success, and it prevents woman from being a socially important and successful individual by restricting her within the boundaries of the home and the husband. She claims that it is not easy to fight against these rules of society, and the woman might feel

isolated and unhappy if she denies them, however, if she obeys them by doing something she does not really want, she will certainly be even less happy.

The fact that it is only the woman who is made to feel that she has to get married, but not the man, gives man the right to become the master of the home and dominate the woman. Debra B. Bergoffen explains the unequal relationship between the man and woman in the marriage:

> In Rousseau's hands, the alienating experience of passion becomes the basis for a theory of marriage where autonomy, exiled as independence, returns as the right to rule. Having been raised to value autonomy, the husband camouflages his need of his wife by imagining her as dependent, in need of him, and by establishing himself as her teacher, tutor, master. To become a member of the body politic then, a man must give up the idea that he can live independently of others but need not accept the implications of interdependence. Now defined as the one who rules himself and/or as the one who is not ruled by another, the autonomous man is identified as the husband who, as the head of the moral person created by marriage, has the right to rule his wife (the body of this new person) and legislate for the couple. As the husband schooled in the art of ruling, he may become the citizen who accepts the authority of the state insofar as its laws reflect the general will, the law to which he has given consent. (Bergoffen 30)

Marriage, as a social contract, gives the man the right to dominate and subordinate his wife. As Beauvoir claims, marriage is bad in the sense that it is not a reciprocal

relationship which means there is no equality between the partners. Since marriage is regarded as the only way for a woman to save herself, man appears to have the right to rule. Marriage gives the authority to man; thus he becomes the only autonomous subject in the relationship, thereby dominating his partner and forcing her to immanence. The only liberty marriage gives to woman is that she has her own house which she can take care of. The house and the future children are the only given belongings to her and this restricts her in passivity and immanence.

> Marriage has always been a very different thing for man and for woman. The two sexes are necessary to each other, but this necessity has never brought about a condition of reciprocity between them; women, as we have seen, have never constituted a caste making exchanges and contracts with the male caste upon a footing of equality. A man is socially an independent and complete individual; he is regarded first of all as a producer whose existence is justified by the work he does for the group; we have seen why it is that the reproductive and domestic role to which woman is confined has not guaranteed her an equal dignity. (Beauvoir 426)

Beauvoir argues that although both sexes are in need of each other, because of the masculine belief that woman is the one who is dependent; marriage cannot become a reciprocal relationship. Man's need of woman is always ignored because he is supposed to be the ruling power in society and he should be enough for himself. The one who needs protection and help is the woman; therefore, the man thinks that he has the absolute right to rule her while protecting her. The reason why in most masculine

societies, marriage is doomed for the woman is that she is believed to need someone who is superior to her to save her from the hazards of life. That is why marriage has always been very different for each partner. While it limits woman's life to the home and children, it opens the way for the supplier male to outer social life and successes:

> Since the husband is the productive worker, he is the one who goes beyond family interest to that of society, opening up a future for himself through co-operation in the building of the collective future: he incarnates transcendence. Woman is doomed to the continuation of the species and the care of the home – that is to say, to immanence… For *man* marriage permits precisely a happy synthesis of the two. In his occupation and his political life he encounters change and progress, he senses his extension through time and the universe; and when he is tired of such roaming, he gets himself a home, a fixed location, and an anchorage in the world. At evening he restores his soul in the home, where his wife takes care of his furnishings and children and guards the things of the past that she keeps in store. But she has no other job than to maintain and provide for life in pure and unvarying generality; she perpetuates the species without change, she ensures the even rhythm of the days and the continuity of the home, seeing to it that the doors are locked. But she is allowed no direct influence upon the future nor upon the world; she reaches out beyond herself toward the social group only through her husband as intermediary. (Beauvoir 429-430)

Because the husband is the financial supplier of the home, he also becomes the head and has the right to order his wife. His life is active and he transcends his wife who sits at home and deals with the routine housework. The life of the wife, on the contrary, is limited to the house, and her interests should be only cleaning, cooking, and taking care of her children. Whether she is happy with her situation or not, this immanence is her destiny given to her by the patriarchy. In Turkey, a famous saying is "a woman's place is her house" which means that she is not supposed to be an active member of society nor is she supposed to be a successful or professional individual. Her place is her home, and her ultimate vocation is to be a "true woman" (i.e. a good housewife, an attractive wife, and a concerned mother). While the woman is supposed to stay in a state of immanence, she is actually helping her husband's transcendence outside the house. The husband works outside, has an interactive communication with others, becomes successful, earns money, enjoys himself with his friends, and while he is doing all these things, his wife stays at home, cleans, cooks, and makes sure that her husband will be relaxed when he comes back in the evening. Anca Parvulescu defines marriage thus:

> Marriage is a trap. The drama of marriage, as Beauvoir calls it, is that it keeps us within repetition and routine. As an institution, marriage is about maintaining a relationship meant to reinforce the status quo. Moreover, Beauvoir recognizes the contract in marriage. In a parallel approach to Wittig's engagement with the notion of the social contract, Beauvoir suggests that marriage, precisely in its being a contract, is always already "arranged." (Parvulescu 14)

Marriage is an arranged contract in the sense that the woman is supposed to be the housekeeper while the man will be free to do whatever he wants in the outer world. And the worst thing about this aspect of marriage is that even if the woman also works and contributes to the house financially, this does not alter her role as a housewife and mother at all. Asena criticizes the fact that although contemporary women are working as much as their husbands, this does not make any difference in the attitudes of the man; thus the burden on the shoulders of woman is doubled:

> The day after and after, the same scene was repeated… I am wandering around happily with the light in my mind… I saw that he came full of packages in his hands on the next day… "Let's take and cook this" said he. (Look at me, stop ordering me, I am not your slave, I am working as hard as you, I am earning almost the same money as you, I am as educated as you, who do you think you are to always have me serve you… What superiority do you have over me? Is your superiority only because of your penis? (Asena 85)

The changing position of the woman in contemporary society as a more active and professional individual does not necessarily affect the life and the attitudes of the husband. He still wants to keep living as the head of the family and keep his wife as a slave who is cooking and cleaning for the comfort of her master. Asena's rebellious female character fights against the norms and asserts that while both the man and woman are working outside the home and contributing equally, there should not be an unequal distribution of the housework between the partners. To achieve an equal

distribution at home, the woman should know how to claim her own power and rights against her husband who is still regarding himself as the master of the house. On the other hand, as Veltman believes, Beauvoir is more optimistic about the future of marriage because she thinks marriage might be transformed into a more egalitarian institution in which the husband and wife share their lives in a reciprocal manner (Veltman 139). But this is only possible if it is presented as a choice to the woman rather than as a career in itself (Beauvoir 482).

Together with marriage, motherhood is also presented to woman as a career which most of the time prevents her from having a professional life outside the house. Margaret A. Simons asserts that "In *The Second Sex* Beauvoir glorifies most men's activities as "transcendence" and demeans women's domestic work as "immanence." Motherhood is evidence of woman's "enslavement to the species," a burden that society must lessen if women are to emerge as autonomous individuals" (Simons 501). It is true that Beauvoir praises the transcendence of the male work over the immanence of the female work at home, and this is not to blame the female sex as passive, but rather to blame society for keeping the woman in this immanent situation. Thus she suggests that women pursue professional careers to claim their own power and individuality. According to Beauvoir, motherhood is only something biological, and the only reason for the woman to want to be a mother is that she needs someone to justify her existence and to be superior to:

> Like the woman in love, the mother is delighted to feel herself necessary; her existence is justified by the wants she supplies; but what gives mother love

> its difficulty and its grandeur is the fact that it implies no reciprocity; the mother has to do not with a man, a hero, a demigod, but with a small, prattling soul, lost in a fragile and dependent body. The child is in possession of no values, he can bestow none, with him the woman remains alone; she expects no return for what she gives, it is for her to justify it herself. This generosity merits the laudation that men never tire of conferring upon her; but the distortion begins when the religion of Maternity proclaims that all mothers are saintly. For while maternal devotion may be perfectly genuine, this, in fact, rarely the case. Maternity is usually a strange mixture of narcissism, altruism, idle daydreaming, sincerity, bad faith, devotion, and cynicism. (Beauvoir 513)

For Beauvoir motherhood is not as sacred a thing as it is claimed to be. She asserts that the woman wants to have a child only because she wants to be superior to someone else. And she has a supreme domination over her child. Because the woman is in an inferior situation to her husband, and stuck with the household work everyday, she feels a necessity to give birth and have a baby to justify her existence. In a masculine society the only production possible for a woman is her children. While the man is authorized to produce and be active in the social life, the woman is only encouraged to give birth and to regard this as a sacred activity. However, Beauvoir believes that the story of maternity as a sacred thing is also a man-made concept designed to keep the woman in her immanent state. Thus for her there is nothing saintly about motherhood. It is even

sometimes dangerous for the child because the mother is a dissatisfied and unhappy individual:

> The great danger which threatens the infant in our culture lies in the fact that the mother to whom it is confined in all its helplessness is almost always a discontented woman: sexually she is frigid or unsatisfied; socially she feels herself inferior to man; she has no independent grasp on the world or on the future. She will seek to compensate for all these frustrations through her child. When it is realized how difficult woman's present situation makes her full self-realization, how many desires, rebellious feelings, just claims she nurses in secret, one is frightened at the thought that defenseless infants are abandoned to her care. (Beauvoir 513)

Beauvoir believes that the psychological condition of a woman who is restricted within the boundaries of the home and dominated by a husband is not actually safe for a defenseless baby. For her, the mother can be trying to take her revenge on her baby because it is her only way to prove that she can also be productive. Furthermore, as seen previously, motherhood is part of the male-constructed idea of the 'real woman' and thus contributes to her ultimate enslavement.

As with Simone de Beauvoir, Duygu Asena also criticizes motherhood as an enslavement of woman to the man. She repeatedly talks about the traditional doctrines of marriage and maternity imposed on the woman. She points out that in a patriarchal society the woman is taught that marriage and motherhood are sacred, and the most important thing for a young girl is getting a good husband and bearing children. Asena's

main character, as she rebels against the other norms in society, also fights against the commonly held beliefs about motherhood:

> Why I did not take precaution; why you, foul man, were not careful; I was just about to bear this child, and thus I was going to be your slave. I was going to be the slave of both this life and this bastard. My mother said, "You should not have an abortion, motherhood is the most sacred duty of a woman." Is motherhood to stay imprisoned within a home with two children without being able to leave the man who is deceiving you like you did? Is sacred motherhood to say that if I did not have you, I would not live like this; I would not be able to divorce because of you? Is motherhood bringing a child into this shit world and always blaming him/her? Is motherhood to be imprisoned within the four walls of the house, not to eat but feed, not to get clothed but have the others clothed, to be unhappy and to live with worries, fears and pains? Where are you my dear mother, who are you? What have you done for yourself until now? Where are your hopes? Did you have any hopes? What do you mean by sacred motherhood… (Asena 68)

Motherhood is criticized by Asena because it is not a choice for the woman but a necessity. If a woman does not get married and have children, that means she is lacking something crucial because without a husband and children people suppose that a woman cannot achieve anything. If the woman is married with children, she does not need to do anything else to satisfy her existence. However, Asena asserts that motherhood forces a woman to become the slave of her husband whether she loves him or not. The most

important point the main character emphasizes here how her mother was deceived by her husband and how she could not do anything. The mother appears as a typical traditional woman who is brought up to believe that she always needs a man's protection to be safe in the world. Since she cannot believe in her own power and does not have economic independence, she cannot act against her husband. Another factor here is the children; most women in Turkey will not divorce for the sake of their children. They believe that if they divorce, their children will be unhappy; they prefer to be unhappy themselves than to see their children unhappy. This is what Asena criticizes strongly throughout the book: a woman, she asserts, should not devote herself completely to her husband or to her children. Although she is traditionally taught to think about them before herself, she should not comply, and should plan her own future before anything else. She should think about her own desires and independence, and only have children out of free choice.

> We did not have an abortion Gürkan, I did. Although I wanted that baby, we did what you wanted only because you are a man. Yes, I wanted that child because I supposed it was necessary, we had been taught that it was necessary… you will get married, you will immediately have a baby, you will have a home and a family, you will be a happy woman... you will pretend to be a happy woman. I thought that as soon as one gets married, one needs to have a baby without realizing that this man might become a stranger in the future, without believing that one day she might want to leave him. Because this had been taught us… The unique and most sacred duty of a

> woman is motherhood. Only the women who could not become a mother want to glorify themselves by being included in the professional life, and by competing with men to recover their deficiencies. And these women, after they discover that they do not have a penis like men, if they cannot overcome this jealousy, try to prove themselves always with a feeling of deficiency. Professional life is a good opportunity for them; therefore, they always try to be in competition with men. Didn't the scientists even say the same thing? (Asena 103)

Asena criticizes the belief that once a woman gets married, she will live with the same man during her life whether she loves him or not. Especially if she has children, her slavery is doubled, and it becomes more impossible for her to divorce. However, in Asena's belief, living with the same person during a lifetime might not be possible most of the time; therefore, if the woman feels that she no longer loves her husband or wishes to live with him; she should immediately leave without thinking twice. The most important thing for the woman should be her own emotions and desires; otherwise, she will be enslaved forever. Asena also struggles against the belief in society that the woman who cannot get married and have children tries to have a profession to satisfy herself, and to compete with the man. However, this should not be the case in contemporary society; a woman should first pursue her own career and claim her independence. She should decide what she wants to do individually, and she should disregard the traditional norms the patriarchal society enforces. If she still wants to have

children, she should absolutely do it, but she should not forget herself and become completely devoted either to her husband or to her children.

2.4. The Independent Woman

In the last chapter of The Second Sex, Simone de Bauvoir defines the situation of an independent woman and the problems she faces while trying to seek her individuality. As a result of the long-term oppression of patriarchal society, and the imposed doctrines about the differences between the two sexes, Beauvoir argues that a woman cannot avoid thinking that she is an inferior being to the man and she can never become as successful as him. Further still, the woman is made to believe that she actually does not need to transcend because the man is already providing her with enough money and safety. The problem with the independent woman, Beauvoir explains, is that she still does not have enough trust in herself, and sometimes prefers the passivity of her life within the home to the dangers of the outer world.

> We must not lose sight of those facts which make the question of woman's labor a complex one. An important and thoughtful woman recently made a study of the women in the Renault factories; she states that they would prefer to stay in the home rather than work in the factory. There is no doubt that they get economic independence only as members of a class which is economically oppressed; and, on the other hand, their jobs at the factory do not relieve them of housekeeping burdens. If they had been asked to choose between forty hours of work a week in the factory and forty hours of work a week in the home, they would doubtless have furnished quite different answers. And perhaps they would cheerfully accept both jobs, if as factory

> workers they were to be integrated in a world that would be theirs, in the development of which they would joyfully and proudly share. (Beauvoir 680)

The most important thing for a woman to achieve her independence is to pursue her professional career; however, this is not as easy as to simply find a job outside the home. The difficulty in this lies in the fact that even if a woman works as hard as the man and contributes to the expenses equally, this is not enough to change the distribution of the domestic work between the partners. Although his wife is as busy as he is in the outer world, the man still believes that he is the head of the house and he does not need to help her with the housework or child-rearing because these are female responsibilities. As a result of this, the woman who seeks her own career is actually not happy with her situation because this makes her burden doubled and she is torn among various responsibilities. As Beauvoir points out, if the working woman is given a choice between the housework and the career, or if she is given a balanced distribution between the two, her preferences would easily change. The relief in becoming economically independent from the husband and socially included in the world will make her discover her own individuality.

The independent woman, Beauvoir asserts in the 1940s, was just newly born into the world of men and was unfortunately subordinated by them; thus she is still too occupied with searching for herself (Beauvior 702). During her childhood and teenage years, the woman is made to believe that she is secondary to the man, and as a result she has been made to accept it. However, for the independent woman, the most important thing to do is to overcome this inferiority complex and be self-confident.

> In so far as a woman wishes to be a woman, her independent status gives rise to an inferiority complex; on the other hand, her femininity makes her doubtful of her professional future. This is a point of great importance. We have seen that girls of fourteen declared to an investigator: “Boys are better than girls; they are better workers.” The young girl is convinced that she has limited capacities. Because parents and teachers concede that the girls’ level is lower than that of the boys, the pupils readily concede it also... (Beauvoir 699)

Jo-Ann P. Fuchs states that, for Beauvoir, the sexist oppression has converted woman into an “imperfect being” which means thus she has become intellectually, metaphysically and also psychologically inferior to the man (Fuchs 306). Although this inferiority is not concerned with the biological facts, the male oppression in the society has constructed this myth as a reality. As a result, the woman has become a creature that believes in her inferiority and passivity; as Sonia Kruks writes, Simone de Beauvoir believes some of the “independent women” try to resist this independence because they see woman’s situation as a bad faith and do not believe that a woman can succeed in overcoming this fate in a man’s world (Kruks 101). As a solution to this problem, Beauvoir claims that a woman should stop seeing herself as inferior, and begin searching for her own grasp in the world:

> The restrictions that education and custom impose on woman now limit her grasp on the universe; when the struggle to find one’s place in this world is too arduous, there can be no question of getting away from it. Now, one must

> first emerge from it into a sovereign solitude if one wants to try to regain a grasp upon it: what woman needs first of all is to undertake, in anguish and pride, her apprenticeship in abandonment and transcendence: that is, in liberty. (Beauvoir 711)

The root of the problem, for Beauvoir, is that the male superiority and female otherness is deadlocked in the consciousness of each human being, both male and female. The meaning of woman is defined by the male dominance in society; thus the woman is doomed to dependence and deprived of liberty (Felstiner 248). Beauvoir strongly suggests that women give up their identity as subordinate beings, because as long as they accept this submission, they will be forced to live as the Other. In order to attain her liberty, the woman should first of all be proud of her sex, believe in her own power, and struggle to prove her power in the so-called man's world. And the way to manage this is to break the boundaries of the home, and open herself to the world to seek individuality. Jean Leighton believes that the solution is actually obvious enough:

> At any rate, the solution is radical. All women must make themselves completely independent of men through work. The more interesting and challenging the occupation or profession the better of course. But even factory workers while they might find their children and their hearth more rewarding should "liberate" themselves and stick to their lathes. Any compromise is evasion and self-deception. To become an authentic human being woman must work in the same whole-hearted and total way that men do – for money. Then at least there will be a real symmetry between the

> sexes and man will no longer be able to regard woman as “the other;” the humiliating dependence upon man, psychological as well as economic, will be abolished. For perhaps the worst thing woman has had to bear is the sad fact that she needs men more than they need her. This is one of the melancholy strains of the book. (Leighton 37-38)

The dependence of woman on man mostly stems from her economic situation. Thus economic independence is the first thing all feminists encourage women to reach. If woman can obtain her economic independence with a successful professional career, this does not provide her only with enough money but also with a better social status and more equal opportunities in society. Woman is taught that man does not need her as much as she needs him, and as Leighton emphasizes, this is among the worst things the woman has had to tolerate. However, this is only a man-made story to maintain male dominance over the female sex. Man does need woman as much as she needs him, and it is in woman’s hands to prove this reality by working and liberating herself from male oppression. Duygu Asena also gives priority to the career, and she creates a very successful professional protagonist to show that woman can achieve independence only if she trusts herself:

> I am not working to be good in the boss’ eyes. You have never understood anything. I am working to be powerful; I am working to prove that I do not have any deficiencies. I do not want to be dependent on anyone. This is the thing I am most afraid of; I am thinking of my mother, aunt Şermin, aunt Mualla... They were all dependent; they all lost their identities as if they were

> not living. I do not want to be like them, I do not want to be dependent on anyone else, male or female, I will not have to be with someone I do not want, and for this purpose money is necessary, money is independence. No, I do not want a rich husband, either; because then I cannot have the independence to leave him, and I also want to be useful, I want to use my brain, as long as I remember the dull looks of these women like my mother and the other aunts, I keep working and I will keep working in the future as well. Don't you understand that I want to be myself? I want to be called with my own name, and I want only friendship from men and marriage. Don't you understand that both friendship and respect can only be found in equality? If there is no equality, there is no friendship and no respect. (Asena 144-145)

The character created without a name by Duygu Asena has always been aware of what is happening between the two sexes since her childhood. When she is a child, she sees that boys have priority over girls, and then she realizes that her father is the head of the home and can dominate her mother only because he has money. Only because of the money, she thinks as a child, her father has the right to be superior to both his wife and his children. When she becomes an adult, she rebels against the patriarchal doctrines of society, she wants to get educated and struggle for a good career to earn her own money and to be independent. She asserts that she wants to work because working means money and money means power. Power is the only possession man has and woman does not; so he pretends to have the right to oppress and control her. However, the woman has

her own power, but it is suppressed by the masculine society, and only she can succeed in proving herself the equal to man.

She does not want to find a rich husband, as society suggests, and be called by his name. She wants to have her own name. She says she wants to be herself, she does not want to resemble her elders who have been imprisoned within the four walls of their homes, and have devoted themselves to their husbands and children. She wants to think about her own desires and plans before anyone else's. Her only expectation from marriage is friendship and love, but not money and protection; she believes she can earn her own money and she can protect herself. However, the only way to obtain friendship and love in marriage is through equality and equality is only possible if woman struggles for it. If there is no equality, there is no respect between the partners, there is only submission and domination; what she wants is to transform the concept of marriage from an unequal social contract into an equal relationship of love and respect. To achieve this equality, the woman should rebel against the teachings of society and fight for her liberty even though she might be condemned by the patriarchal society:

> When we go out for a meal, the man is paying for both of us. Even if I go out with my friends, even if the men I am together with are penniless, even if there is much more money in my purse than theirs, men always pay the bill. But I have had my friends adjusted to share the bill. The others are paying the bill taking their wallets out of their pockets under the table without letting me see it (in cooperation with the waiter). Since they pay for me, they think they get the right to want something from me. Anyway, I have begun to insist on

> paying either the total or half of the money. They get so surprised and angry as if they were insulted. “But I invited you.” “No, it was valid for your first invitation, today we have decided to go out together!” “But it is not possible, the man pays the money.” “Why does man pay? I am also earning at least as much money as you do, why will you pay my money, could you give me a logical explanation for this?” (We have made you the master by allowing you to pay our money. We have become your slave. Who do you think you are that you are trying to pay my money each time as if I was a helpless creature?) (Asena 166)

Economic independence is what the man depends on to ensure his domination over the woman. He has the money and thus he thinks he can obtain everything. However, as emphasized by Asena’s main character, woman has become the slave of the man by letting him provide her with money, by paying for her and by feeding her. As mentioned above, even if man has less money than the woman, he cannot let her pay because this means a loss of prestige for him. However, the unnamed character cannot tolerate this and does not let it happen because she does not want to feel dependent on a man; she does not want him to think that she has to do whatever he wants only because he pays for her. The myth that man always pays the money is another teaching of the patriarchal society for her, and she does not want to obey this because if she does, she will be enslaved forever. On the contrary, she proves that if a woman wants it, she can challenge the rules and create her own.

> This is a happy morning, I know what I want. I trust myself. I love myself. I will live, I will learn a lot of things, and I will fight. Contradictory, well, I will be contradictory. I will not cheat myself, I will not obey them, who are they, who has taught them these rules, who has decided to label us, who has convicted us to live under them, for them, in accordance with their rules… If love is the principle of my life, I will live for love, if excitement is the core of my life, I will not stay without it, if it is fame, I will be famous, if it is profession, I will reach the top in my occupation, if it is money, I will be rich, if it is not submitting, I will not submit, if it is all, I will do all. They will not be able to put me in certain patterns good for their benefits, they will not be able to label me as they wish, I will not stay under their protection, I will not have any deficiencies compared to them, I will prove this, I will not be anyone's assistant… (Asena 160)

For Asena, the independent woman is the one who acts upon her own desires and wishes. If a woman wants to live for love, she should but without devoting herself only to one person; if she wants to be famous, she should struggle hard for it; if she wants to be rich, she should work hard to earn more; if she does not want to obey, then she should not; and if she wants to do all these things together, she should because she can succeed if she believes in her individual power and ambition, if she loves herself, and if she becomes proud of her sex.

Likewise, freedom is the ultimate goal for the independent woman in Simone de Beauvior; however, it requires a profound struggle for women to achieve it:

> Freedom is a crucial theme for Simone de Beauvoir, who asserts that "freedom will never be given; it will always have to be won." It cannot be won unless we make the body (which is our prime instrument of action and grasp upon the world) our intimate ally by learning to know and use it better. And this also means freeing ourselves from damaging body habits that social structures and life contingencies have imposed on us. (Shusterman 111)

Man obtains freedom without any struggle since their boyhood; however, for the woman the situation is totally different. The woman is not given freedom and she will never be. If she obeys the doctrines of society in which she lives, she will always have to be dependent on a man. Society is constituted in an unequal structure which gives different duties and responsibilities to man and woman. However, these responsibilities never supply the woman with the same opportunities with the man; on the contrary, she is made the second sex, imprisoned within the home, and doomed to immanence. First of all woman should fight for her liberty to overcome the unequal structure of society, and this fight should include belief and pride in herself. She should be able to tolerate the condemnations and scorns of society when she does not obey its rules.

Simone de Beauvoir believes that if women seriously want to gain their independence, they should have a mass movement. Individual attempts and struggles only are not enough to change the structure of the patriarchal society which reduces women to dependent creatures. For Beauvoir, the solution for gaining independence is to be politically and economically included in the social world. She says "in mass action, women can have power," (Bair, 160) meaning that it is important for women to

encourage the other women and to make them realize their inferior and dependent status to fight against it.

Beauvoir also asserts that when women seriously decide to fight for their independence, they will be increasingly included in politics because liberation is a democratic notion, and women will need radical changes in their lives to get liberated. Nevertheless, Beauvoir does not think that women should gain more power than men because she believes that what creates inequality in society is power itself; thus rather than trying to become more powerful, women should become equal to men.

> I believe that both parties must consider each other reciprocally as subjects. I do not think that women should take up power against men, thinking that they will be able to avoid what men did to women. I believe that they must find a reciprocity. It is what I stated in The Second Sex… At any rate it does not seem to me very realistic to think that women will be able to reduce men to objects. Nor do I believe that it would be ideal. I think that nobody should try to reduce the other to an object: neither a woman another woman, nor a man another man, nor a woman a man, nor a man a woman. (Simons, Benjamin 344)

As discussed above, both in Duygu Asena and in Simone de Beauvoir, the reason for male dominance is his power, and both authors claim that women should assert their own power to be equal to men. However, this does not mean that women need more power than men to suppress them. The ideal is that no sex oppresses the other; in other words, the ideal is an absolute equality between the sexes. Both Duygu Asena and

Simone de Beauvoir believe that women should act together to abolish the patriarchal rules of society, and to claim their own names not as a second sex but as an equal sex. The ideal society for both authors appears to be a society in which both sexes have their own independence as two separate subjects without reducing the other to an object.

CHAPTER 3

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF JOHN STUART MILL'S THE SUBJECTION OF WOMEN AND DUYGU ASENA'S THERE IS NO LOVE, EITHER

3.1. The Subjection of Women: Sex Roles in Marriage

In his essay The Subjection of Women, John Stuart Mill compares the relationship between the husband and wife to a master-slave relationship. Because of the reigning patriarchy throughout history, marriage has become an institution in which the roles of men and women are distributed according to gender. The division of labor in marriage has been based upon the sexes and their roles in society, and these roles of the sexes were not actually determined naturally but socially and culturally. That is why Mill argues in his essay that the relationship of the wife and husband was historically based on the discrimination between the males and females, and that is not the right way to distribute the roles between the sexes in society; therefore he argues that equality should take place both in the domestic and social life between the genders. However, it is necessary to first establish equality within the family and then go on with the social life; thus he says that the discriminative sex roles in the domestic life should be replaced with a more equally shared family life because the inequality has never been proved to be natural.

> That the principle which regulates the existing social relations between the two sexes – the legal subordination of one sex to the other – is wrong in

> itself, and now one of the chief hindrances to human improvement; and that it ought to be replaced by a principle of perfect equality, admitting no power or privilege on the one side, nor disability on the other. (Mill 1)

According to Mill, one of the important obstacles to the improvement of humanity is the inequality between the sexes because this inequality is based on the so-called superiority of the male gender which is not naturally correct. The only reason for male superiority over the females is that men are naturally stronger than women; however, this power should not be extended to unequally distributed roles in society. Thus Mill emphasizes that the privileged status of men over women both in domestic and social life does not actually have a reasonable basis. As Mill states,

> The adoption of this system of inequality never was the result of deliberation, or forethought, or any social ideas, or any notion whatever of what conduced to the benefit of humanity or the good order of society. It arose simply from the fact that from the very earliest twilight of human society, every woman (owing to the value attached to her by men, combined with her inferiority in muscular strength) was found in a state of bondage to some man. Laws and systems of polity always begin by recognizing the relations they find already existing between individuals. They convert what was a mere physical fact into a legal right, give it the sanction of society, and principally aim at the substitution of public and organized means of asserting and protecting these rights, instead of the irregular and lawless conflict of physical strength. (Mill 5)

The cause of the subordination of women to men is that women are biologically weaker than men, and always felt in need of a man who is stronger than them. However, the muscular strength of men should not have necessarily become a reason for taking women under the control and oppression of men. Behind the inequality of the female gender in society lies no logical or reasonable explanation, and as Mill suggests, this discrimination against one sex does not mean that this is the normal order for social well-being and happiness. This inequality brings happiness to only half of society and subordinates the other.

The subordination of women to men shows itself more clearly in the domestic life. Within the marriage, men and women obtain specific roles determined by the patriarchal society according to their sexes, and these roles open the way for men to be more social and professional while they force women to be restricted to the housework, childbearing and rearing within the boundaries of the home. Duygu Asena focuses on the roles of the sexes in her novel There is No Love, Either, and she tries to analyze how these sex roles within marriage affect the lives of men and women. According to her, the laws and rules within marriage are based on a double standard in favor of men.

> However, the double dimension of the rules within marriage is both reverse and unjust. Why do men wander freely in the outer world while women are imprisoned within four walls? Why do moral laws blame women for some attitudes while they always praise men for the same ones? Why is everything free for one sex while everything is forbidden for the other? (Asena 96)

As Asena mentions, the rules of marriage are unjust because they are constructed upon the so-called superiority of the male gender over the females. According to the traditional order of domestic life, all the burden of the house is put upon the shoulders of women. They have to take care of the house, do the housework, cook, and bear and rear the children. Shortly, all the work regarding the well-being of the house, husband and children are the primary responsibilities of women and they actually do not have a personal life based on their own interests. All they have to do is deal with the interests of the husband and make his life easier and happier. Deniz Kandiyoti says that whatever the distribution of workload among the sexes is, it is always men who take control of both the public sphere and also the specialized activities that are considered socially significant (Kandiyoti 59). So, the insignificant housework which actually does not contribute in any way to the personal improvement of the females is left for the wives who are supposed to stay at home and deal with them at all time. Mill describes this situation of domestic life for the females and says that men do not want only a slave but "a favorite" who can do all these things with love and respect:

> All causes, social and natural, combine to make it unlikely that women should be collectively rebellious to the power of men. They are so far in a position different from all other subject classes, that their masters require something more from them than actual service. Men do not want solely the obedience of women, they want their sentiments. All men, except the most brutish, desire to have, in the woman most nearly connected with them, not a forced slave but a willing one, not a slave merely, but a favorite. They have

> therefore put everything in practice to enslave their minds. The masters of all other slaves rely, for maintaining obedience, on fear, - either fear of themselves or religious fears. The masters of women wanted more than simple obedience, and they turned the whole force of education to affect their purpose. (Mill 14-15)

Mill also focuses on the fact that the master-slave relationship between the husband and wife is not actually the same as real master-slave relations because in a real master-slave relationship, obedience to the master is enough and the master does not look for a sentimental relation with the slave. Actually, the sentiments of a slave are not important for the master as long as the slave obeys the master. However, marriage relations are not the same. In a marriage, as Mill suggests, the husband looks for a sentimental and willing slave who obeys her master not out of fear but out of love and respect. So, patriarchal societies educate the females to pursue the goal of being loving, respecting, and obedient to the husband. On the other hand, men are also educated in being accustomed to their superiority over women and their right to have obedience from them. Duygu Asena makes the same point and shows how males and females are educated in opposite ways:

> The most important problem is that; in other words one of the biggest differences between men and women – and this difference is the most important contrast between men and women for me – food is very important for men. For most of them, the type of food, its quality, what it is or how it is made is not actually important, what is important is that they have something

> ready to eat every evening because they got used to it, or they were made used to it. Their mothers whose first responsibility was to serve them never left them hungry. When they came late at night, their mothers took a nap on the coach and waited for them because they did not want their sons to be devoid of a pot of hot meal. When they woke up early in the morning, their mothers always woke up at least one hour before because they did not want their sons to leave home without having two cups of hot tea and two slices of toasted bread. Their mothers prepared food for their sons no matter what happened… (Asena 58)

Here Asena shows how boys are socialized in the patriarchal Turkish society to get used to female obedience. Since their childhood, their mothers served them, and they were never allowed to serve themselves. So boys get used to be served by a mother figure that will be replaced by a wife when they get married. Asena criticizes this way of socializing boys because it encourages them to regard themselves as superior to women, and think that they have the right to subordinate them. As a result of these traditional domestic habits, when they get married, men expect a willing obedience from their wives in the same way their mothers had to their fathers and also to themselves. On the other hand, the socialization of a girl within the domestic context always teaches her how to become a talented housewife working towards the husband's well-being. Concerning the girl's socialization Asena asserts that:

> However, they did not show the same care for their daughters. Did they not struggle for their daughters and feed them? No no… They also prepared food

> for their daughters but this food waited in the fridge. When their daughters came late at night, they told them to take their food from the fridge, heat it and eat it. Moreover, if their daughters came late together with their brothers, their mothers wanted them to prepare the food for their brothers as well. Then while these mothers were choosing girls for their sons, they checked if they could be good housewives or not and if they could cook or not… (Asena 58)

By describing the domestic education of the boys and girls, Duygu Asena points out an important reality in Turkish society. While boys are taught to overpower girls, girls are taught to be obedient wives for their future husbands. As in the example above, although mothers cook both for their sons and daughters, if a daughter comes home late, she is supposed to prepare her food on her own while if the same thing happens to the son, the mother stays awake until her son comes and gives him his food. The girl is also supposed to serve her brother if they come late together because it is her duty to serve her father or brother at home in the same way she will serve her future husband. John Stuart Mill approaches the same subject in the same way as Asena and he claims that all women are brought up to believe that their first duty is submission to the control of others, especially fathers, brothers and later husbands:

> All women are brought up from the very earliest years in belief that their ideal of character is the very opposite to that of men; not self-will and government by self control, but submission and yielding to the control of others. All the moralities tell them that it is the duty of women, and all the

> current sentimentalities that it is their nature, to live for others, to make complete abnegation of themselves, and to have no life but in their affections. And by their affections are meant the only ones they are allowed to have – those to the men with whom they are connected, or to the children who constitute an additional and indefeasible tie between them and a man. (Mill 15)

Mary Lyndon Shanley, one of Mill's theorists says;

> In his speech on the Reform Bill of 1867, Mill talked of that "obscure feeling" which members of Parliament were "ashamed to express openly" that women had no right to care about anything except "how they may be the most useful and devoted servants of some man." To Auguste Comte he wrote comparing women to "domestic slaves" and noted that woman's capacities were spent "seeking happiness not in their own life, but exclusively in the favor and affection of the other sex, which is only given to them on the condition of their dependence (Shanley 231).

Both Mill and Asena, although they wrote at very different times, mention how men have become the privileged sex as a result of the teachings of patriarchal societies. Women are always taught that their nature requires them to be good wives and mothers; therefore the natural sphere of a woman is her house. However, as Mill emphasizes, the interests of women are always ignored and they are always supposed to devote themselves to the well-being of their husbands and children without paying attention to their own interests. Mill believes that man's general opinion is that the natural vocation

of a woman is that of a wife and mother. However, the reality is that they are not given any freedom of choice and they do not have any other opportunities (Mill 27). According to Mill, marriage is a Hosbon's choice for women: "that or none." Even when we look at contemporary Turkish society, it is obvious that marriage is presented as the best choice for a woman. Today in Turkish society, which could not succeed in solving the basic problems of women in most parts of the country, it is actually not important for most families whether their girls are educated or not, because the most important responsibility of a girl is to find a good husband and produce children; in other words, to be a good wife and mother is what is expected from them.

A normal woman obeys her husband, bears and rears her children and takes care of the house; otherwise, she can be easily regarded as abnormal. Leta S. Hollingworth, while analyzing how women are impelled to childbearing and rearing, notes that:

> Thus has been evolved the social type of the "womanly woman," "the normal woman," the chief criterion of normality being a willingness to engage enthusiastically in maternal and allied activities. All those classes and professions which form "the radiant points of social control" unite upon this criterion. Men of science announce it with calm assurance (though failing to say on what kind or amount of scientific data they base their remarks). (Hollingworth 22).

In a patriarchal society, the traditional norms describe a normal woman as being willing to deal with activities that are related to the responsibilities of women as mothers and

wives. In other words, women who want to deal more with the other activities that are not related to their primary responsibilities are considered abnormal:

> Thus the desire for the development of interests and aptitudes other than the maternal is stigmatized as “dangerous,” “melancholy,” “degrading,” “abnormal,” “indicative of decay.” On the other hand, excessive maternity receives many cheap but effective rewards. (Hollingworth 24)

However, while distributing these roles to women, their interests are not taken into account. It is not even doubted that a woman should be eager to be successful at her predetermined responsibilities. Aksu Bora argues that women’s subjectivity is defined within the boundaries of the house and states that womanhood is defined on the basis of the “home” and on reproduction. Thus, the house and housework are among the key areas to establish a female subjectivity (Bora 21). The sanctity of the house prevents inequality from being observed; or even if it is observed it is ignored because the home is a sacred place and what happens in it only interests the husband and wife, not anyone else.

> Seeing the house as an innocent and clean place far away from the muckiness of the outer world, and the fact that men leave women and children behind in this clean place while opening themselves to the “outer” world is one of the most, maybe the first, determinative and strong patterns of the culture in which we live. Sanctifying the house and family in this way served to make what happens there completely invisible. Thus, inequalities within the family,

> violence, exploitation and pressure are ignored because they are the problems of the "private" area… (Bora 59-60)

What Asena criticizes in Turkish society, as in all other patriarchal societies, is that women are forced to desire their responsibilities as devoted wives and mothers; however, Asena claims, what is important is not what society decides for the female gender but what these women want to be or become. Marriage for a woman should not mean that she has to be restricted to the housework and childbearing. However, the traditional understanding of a marriage is that the woman takes care of the house, food and children while the man opens himself up to the outer social world. As Bora mentions, the home becomes a sanctified place for the women while men have every kind of right to be included in any activities outside the house. As long as they have a wife at home taking care of the food and house, there is no need for men to be interested in housework; however, if a woman does not do her job at home, men can easily get depressed and angry as if this was a compulsory duty for the women.

According to Asena, the unequal rules of patriarchal society should be replaced by more equally distributed roles for the sexes in marriage. She believes that it is not always a duty for women to take care of the housework and cooking. If she likes doing it, of course she can, however, she cannot be forced to do it by any male power. In her words:

> Cooking is not my duty, however, if I want, I cook. My duty is not attending the soirees together with him but if I want, I go; my duty is not tidying the

> bed, however, if I want, I do; my duty is not preparing the breakfast but if I get up early, I do. What a simple thing. (Asena 54)

Asena's picture of a good housewife conflicts with that of the patriarchal society. She argues that a woman is not a servant to her husband; in other words, marriage does not mean that a woman becomes a servant of the man with whom she is going to share her life. Sharing life means sharing everything and if all the housework becomes the responsibility of the wife, this means that the husband and wife are not sharing their life. If it is not the duty of men to tidy their own beds or clothes, it is not the duty of women to tidy their husbands' beds or clothes either. However, because of the habits of the patriarchal society of Turkey, even the well-educated men cannot understand that women have their own interests and lives; therefore, they must learn to contribute to the house and children if they want to live together happily. Otherwise, it is only the man's well-being and happiness, not woman's. As Mill says, housework is regarded to be chosen by women when they get married, as if they were choosing a profession for themselves:

> Like a man when he chooses a profession, so, when a woman marries, it may in general be understood that she makes choice of the management of a household, and the bringing up of a family, as the first call upon her exertions, during as many years of her life as may be required for the purpose; and that she renounces, not all other objects and occupations, but all which are not consistent with the requirements of this. (Mill 48)

Duygu Asena actually tries to prove what Mill theorizes by claiming that household management is not chosen by women themselves but it is given to them by society as a sacred responsibility. The problem is that since men have become accustomed to this way of life, they cannot accept that women do not necessarily have to do all this work on their own. Unfortunately, as Asena emphasizes in her book, even the most cultured and well-educated men in Turkey cannot tolerate women as imperfect or disobedient housewives:

> Aydın is quite pleased with my staying at home, Aydın is not complaining about our order which resembles all other men's order, Aydın is living. At home Aydın has a smart and beautiful wife, or once smart wife, a small and cute baby, clean clothes, ironed shirts and suits that have been sent to dry cleaners. Now Aydın also finds food when he comes home. Aydın is free, he does whatever he wants, and neither his wife nor his baby is an obstacle for him, his order at home is a natural order. Like everybody's. Aydın is free and he supposes that we are all free. Aydın is at ease. (Asena 126-127)

In <u>There is No Love, Either</u>, Aydın is a well-educated man who seems to think that women should be as free as men when they get married. However, after he gets married, it becomes obvious that his patriarchal education affects his behavior towards his wife. In the quote above, Aydın's wife is saying that after she leaves her work to stay at home because of her baby, Aydın becomes much happier than he was before because now he has a 'beautiful and clever' wife at home who deals with the housework, cleaning, cooking and childrearing. When he comes home, his food is ready and his clothes are

always cleaned, and according to him, this is the normal order of things. Aydın is happy with the ordinary patriarchal way of domestic life, and he thinks that this is absolutely normal.

As well as rejecting the traditional responsibilities given to married women by the patriarchal society, Asena also complains about the fact that after women get married, nobody calls them with their own names but with the names of their husbands. She thinks that this is insulting for a woman who tries to prove herself in the social life as well as in the domestic life:

> In a party, the old theatre artist who gives the party introduces us to the other guests, and he says "Mr.Aydın and his wife" to everyone. I get bored and mumble my own name to some of them. The man consistently calls me Mr.Aydın's wife again. It is unbelievable that according to these men I do not have any other functions on earth except being Mr.Aydın's wife. Besides it is written in the same way on the invitation cards as well: "Mr. and Mrs.Aydın." Alright, who am I? Does not my name have any importance? Eventually I cannot tolerate any more and say: "Mr.Mahir, I do have a name, and it is that, I suppose you do not know." He immediately gets offended and begins telling my name to the other guests with an exaggerated emphasis. (Asena 54)

Women are not only restricted to the housework and childrearing within the boundaries of the home, they are also represented only by their husbands outside the house, and they appear as if they have already lost their own identities. Under the name of their

husbands, the names of the wives lose importance, and women are no longer called by their own names and surnames. Although this is very insulting according to the wife, the husband thinks that this is a very natural and ordinary thing which should not be taken seriously:

> Aydın says, "Why do you care about such things, this is the custom," and he makes me very angry. With an allusive smile, "Dear Aydın, I am proud of being your wife, however, I am not myself as your wife, I am also an individual and at least I do have a name. Believe me my attitude is not because I am a well-known person, even if I was an unknown housewife… Merci Aydın! People do have names, why should not a woman have one?" (Asena 54)

After women get married, as Mill asserts, they become slaves or servants of their husbands at home, and outside the home, they are always called by the name of their husbands as their wives. This destroys the identities of women and creates new identities for them as wives. Under the control of their husbands, women cannot be themselves and they lose their identities. Asena strongly struggles against the tradition of calling women after their husbands' names because she believes that this is an insult to women's existence. Under the name of their husbands, women cannot be themselves. Mary Lyndon Shanley discusses the same issue and asserts that,

> If "one flesh," then, as Blackstone put it, "by marriage, the husband and wife are one person in law." And that "person" was represented by the husband. Again Blackstone was most succinct: "The very being or legal existence of

> the woman is suspended during the marriage, or at least is incorporated and consolidated into that of the husband." (Shanley 232)

If marriage means taking women under the control of men, Asena does not accept it because she thinks women do not need to be under anyone's control. They can control themselves; therefore they should not necessarily get married only to be subordinated to men. As mentioned above, after marriage, man and woman are traditionally supposed to become one person, and this unity is always represented by the powerful male, and the woman does not have the right to represent herself in public. However, as Asena emphasizes, women do have their own identities, and they should have the right to prove and represent their own identities without the name of their husbands. On the other hand, men believe that by marrying a woman, they can possess her; marriage becomes an act of possession rather than having a partner to share one's life with. Asena criticizes the idea that when men get married, the woman belongs to them. The following is a dialogue between a Turkish man and woman; the man wants to get married to the woman thinking that through marriage, he can *save* her from other men:

> "I do not know what will happen to us but I want you to wear this, when your finger is empty, it is as if… Is not it as if you were too free? However, when you have this ring on your finger, you are my woman"
>
> "Am I your woman?"
>
> "Yes, I want you to be my woman… You wash my clothes; you cook for me, and are always with me… So if you need to go somewhere alone, the other men will understand that you have an owner."

> "Do I have an owner?"
>
> "Yes, do you not understand how I love you, I fell in love with you, I do not want you to do anything without me from now on, I am jealous; therefore you should wear this ring my darling so that they will not think that you do not have an owner. You should be mine. I should care for you, I should protect you, I should defend you… The corrupt men should not dare to come near you… I am with you now. And I have the most beautiful woman in the world… This is love…" (Asena, 189-190)

As we see from this passage, men think marriage means that the woman they love will stay at home, she will cook for him, she will wash his clothes, she will produce children for him, and she will bring up the children, and she will take all the responsibility for the husband, children and the house upon her own shoulders. While their wives are struggling with all this work at home, they will work outside, cover the financial expenses of the house, and do whatever they want outside the house. They think that there is nothing abnormal with this situation because they have been brought up to think that women do all these things *willingly* and *eagerly* and that they do not need to have a separate personal life outside the home. Their lives should always be dependent on the husband, children and house. Their well-being actually means the well-being and happiness of their husbands.

First of all, in order to deconstruct the patriarchal structure of married life, it is necessary to destroy the male belief that when they get married, they possess the woman. Woman is not a commodity to possess, she is an existing individual who has her

own character and identity; therefore marriage should not mean to be one only under the name of the husband while destroying the female identity. The only way of changing the concept of traditional marriage is to replace the discrimination within the home with equality between the sexes. On this point, Mill suggests that,

> I believe that equality of rights would abate the exaggerated self-abnegation which is the present artificial ideal of feminine character, and that a good woman would not be more self-sacrificing than the best man; but on the other hand, men would be much more unselfish and self-sacrificing than at present, because they would no longer be taught to worship their own will as such a grand thing that it is actually the law for another rational being. (Mill 42)

Equality between the husband and the wife is the only way for both partners to live happily. The inequality based on the masculine power of the husband only causes the happiness and well-being of the husband while preventing the wife from being independent and happy. Traditionally, the house is the sacred place for the woman while the housework and childbearing are her major responsibilities. However, this is not a natural but socially constructed way of life; therefore as Asena emphasizes, it is important to understand that the females have their own identities which they can represent themselves and they do not need the protection or control of their husbands. If the partners are in need of happiness and well-being, they should create an equal domestic and social life without regarding men superior and women inferior.

Patricia Hughes analyzes Mill's ideal marriage on equality:

> He censured marriage as “the only actual bondage known to our law,” protesting that the power relation which often characterized marriage was not a necessary condition of it; one person did not always have to be in control. People in a voluntary relationship should divide the power to make decisions between themselves… (Hughes 526)

Mill emphasizes that the relationship between the husband and wife is based upon the male power and thus women have always been subjected to their husbands. In order to demolish this unjust discrimination against one sex, it is necessary to create an equality between the husband and wife in which power does not determine who will be dominant in the relationship. As Mill asserts, one does not necessarily need to have all power and control in his hand; since marriage is supposed to be a voluntary relationship, the control and power should equally rest in both hands and there should be a just division of labor between the sexes.

3.2. Freedom of Choice: Women and Professional Life

Considering the traditionalist stance, in his article dated 1975, William T. Blackstone claims that the traditionalists believe everything is right the way it is because women are different from men; they are inferior, passive and submissive in many ways which results in different roles. For the traditional sex differentiating labor, sex stereotyping, and the restriction of females in opportunities and roles do not stem from the oppression, but are the fulfillments of the female nature, and are necessary to familial and social life. According to these traditionalists, women's liberation and equality can only be found within these restrictions (Blackstone 243). In this perspective, it is easy to restrict women to the home and say that it is women's nature that determines these restrictions. These restrictions contribute to the well-being of the women, family, and society.

However, as John Stuart Mill asserts in his The Subjection of Women, these restrictions that prevent women from opening themselves to the social life outside the house only derive from the fact that men do not want to lose their control and superiority over women; therefore they keep the woman in the house busy with the housework and childbearing so that she cannot liberate herself and begin looking for her own individual rights. According to Mill, the so-called disabilities of women are only imposed on them in order to maintain their subordination and subjection to their husbands in domestic life. Mill even states that most men cannot tolerate the idea of living with an equal (Mill 49). Actually, all these restrictions which subordinate women to men are not natural but socially constructed by the male sex to keep women under control and oppression. Since

men cannot tolerate living with someone who is equal to them, they have created the myth that the sacred placed for a woman is her house. However, there is no natural or reasonable explanation behind this division of labor between the sexes. It is not natural that women are born to stay at home dealing with the house while men can do whatever they want outside the house with any kind of professional or social activities. Both men and women have the capacity to realize their full potential outside the house, but since women are not most of the time given the freedom of choice, they have been made to believe that it is better and safer for them to stay within the house. Mill asserts that although women are capable of success outside the house as well, men have made them believe that they are incapable, so they had better stay at home in peace. In Mill's own words:

> In the present day, power holds a smoother language, and whomsoever it oppresses, always pretends to do so for their own good: accordingly, when anything is forbidden to women, it is thought necessary to say, and desirable to believe, that they are incapable of doing it, and that they depart from their real path of success and happiness when they aspire to it. (Mill 49-50)

When men prevent women from doing something, they pretend to do it for women's sake. If they do not let them work, this is not because they want to oppress them but because they know they cannot be happy and successful because they are not capable of it. Although the reality is that women can become as successful as men outside the house, men do not want their willing and loving servants at home to be liberated. Deniz Kandiyoti notes that Turkish men do not want their wives to work outside the house

because they are afraid that if they do, they will not be able to deal with the house; so men's comfort will be disturbed:

> The reason for this resistance tends to be uniform as well. Outside employment may mean neglect of home and family, enhances the dangers of promiscuity through contact with unrelated males, and may involve increased economic power that challenges male authority. (Kandiyoti 66)

As Kandiyoti asserts, one of the most important reasons why Turkish men do not want their wives to work outside the house is that when women begin working in other fields, they will neglect their homes and families, and as a result of this, the man's comfort and well-being will be disturbed. Also when women obtain their economic independence, they will more easily react against male authority and they will look for more freedom and equality between the sexes. Since men do not want their authority to be threatened, they try to keep women at home without economic or social independence. In There is No Love, Either, Duygu Asena encourages all women to attack all the restrictions around them. She creates a major female character who is not named, and who is obsessive about her individuality and rights as a female. She works very hard, she does not accept the traditional understanding of marriage and she fights against all injustices against women in society. Below are the thought of this character about the restrictions of women by their husbands:

> I tell all women to get out of the four walls. However, they say that they cannot be as lucky as me. Yet each woman creates her own chance. Not to give up, not to be lazy, and not to be satisfied opens many chances in front of

> people. The last months have made me think… I just realize how most women live. I cannot do, but I am a married woman, my husband knows, I have a child now, who will hire me after this age, what can I succeed at, my husband does not want it, I think I can but, who will deal with the housework… I always think about what can be done for these women to prevent them from giving up, to make them trust themselves, and believe that they can succeed. There is a terrible reality and nobody is aware how terrible it is. "My husband does not want it" women say, and since their husbands do not want it, they do not do, go, see and hear. The woman wants to work but she does not because her husband does not want it, she wants to visit her friend but she does not because her husband does not want it, she wants to go to the theatre with her friend but she does not because her husband does not want it, she likes cinema but she cannot go because her husband does not want it, she wants to write but she cannot because her husband does not want it, she wants to wear a mini skirt but she cannot because her husband does not want it… One person wants to do something but another person prevents her… And they call this unity, or home … When will these homes become real homes which are independent… (Asena 145-146)

Asena struggles against the traditional rules women are supposed to obey after they get married. According to her, marriage should not mean restricting the female life within the boundaries of the home. It is illogical that women in Turkey cannot do the things they want to do only because their husbands do not want them to do. Women cannot

work because their husbands are afraid that they will have economic and social independence; women cannot go out with their friends because their husbands do not want them to be alone outside the house without male protection; women cannot put on the clothes they want to because their husbands are jealous… All of these examples, so typical in Turkey, can be added to a much longer list of restrictions generated by society. On the other hand, men are in no way restricted by their wives in either domestic or social life. In the house, man is the provider, and thus has control of the house. He does not necessarily help with the housework, but he brings in the money, and that is his only responsibility. He works outside the house; he is free to attend any kind of social activity while his wife makes his life easy and comfortable within the domestic boundaries.

In order to change this inequality between the sexes into equality, Mill asserts that women should be given freedom of choice. The reason why women are in the situation of being the servants of their own houses is that they have not been given the right to choose their own path in life. On the contrary, they have been taught that the only path for them is the path leading to domestic life. Thus, Mill believes that if women were given the freedom of choice, there would not be any differences between men and women because these differences are not inherently there to begin with:

> No one can safely pronounce that if women's nature were left to choose its direction as freely as men's, and if no artificial bent were attempted to be given to it except that required by the conditions of human society, and given to both sexes alike, there would be any material difference, or perhaps any difference at all, in the character and capacities which would unfold

> themselves. I shall presently show, that even the least contestable of the differences which now exist, are such as many very well have been produced merely by circumstances, without any difference of natural capacity. (Mill 56)

Since women are not given the freedom of choice and they are compelled to stay at home taking care of the house and children, they could not prove themselves as successful individuals in the professional or social life. Mill says that it is possible for a woman to become a Homer, an Aristotle or a Beethoven if she is given the necessary choices and opportunities (Mill 53). Opening the doors to professional life to the females is not only advantageous to women, but it also presents many advantages to society. By giving women the opportunity to become successful in social life, society will benefit from their success as well as men's. As Mill puts it,

> The second benefit to be expected from giving women the free use of their faculties, by leaving them the free choice of their employments, and opening to them the same field of occupation and the same prizes and encouragements as to other human beings, would be that of doubling the mass of mental faculties available for the higher service of humanity. (Mill 83)

As a supporter of Mill Mary Lyndon Shanley says, "Access to education and jobs would give women alternatives to marriage. It would also provide a woman whose marriage turned out badly some means of self-support if separated or divorced" (Shanley 235). If women can open themselves to the outer world, they will have the chance to prove their

capacities and individual rights. In this way, the traditional belief that women cannot be happy and successful outside the home would be dissolved. Having this opportunity for social inclusion and professional success, women will be more independent from their husbands. On the other hand, as Mill claims, this will serve society and women's successes will help the improvement of humanity. Duygu Asena claims that in order to become self-confident and successful outside the house women should begin paying attention to their own interests rather than staying self-sacrificing and obedient to their husbands. Asena's main character that is not named states that:

> Nothing happens effortlessly, self-sacrifice is necessary, but you should do this self-sacrifice to yourself in order to benefit from it, maybe others stay where they are by sacrificing themselves for the others, this is taught to them, especially to women, not especially, only to women… You should be self-sacrificing, you should treat men warmly, you should deal with him, you should always be behind him, and there is always a woman behind every successful man. Who is behind every unsuccessful woman then? I stayed at home and worked on the hot summer days, but I did this for myself, I made progress in my profession, now I am more powerful, now I can cope with loneliness more easily, I take one more step towards not depending on someone. Happiness and indepence do not come leaving oneself to the flow of life and getting worried. (Asena 87)

Nobody can become successful unless he/she is self-sacrificing; in other words, success requires that you devote yourself to it. As Asena notes, women are generally taught to be

self-devoting to their husbands and children, and their own identities are ignored for the sake of a happy marriage. However, this happiness can only be one-sided because it cannot make women as happy as their husbands. Every woman is brought up to be a good housewife and mother as if these were the compulsory duties for her, as if women would not be as successful in the other fields as men can be. However, Asena points out that women should be self-sacrificing for their own success, not for their husbands' success. The fact that there is always a woman behind a successful man results in unhappy women inside the house. Her husband's success cannot and also should not be enough for the well-being and happiness of the wife. The wife should struggle for her own success and happiness without sacrificing herself for the sake of her husband or marriage. Asena creates a strong female character that works hard to prove herself as successful as her male colleagues. Asena emphasizes that success does not come easily, especially for a woman in a patriarchal society, it is very difficult to become professionally successful because as well as working hard to be successful, women also have to fight against the traditional patriarchal beliefs that a woman cannot be as successful as men.

According to Mill, one of the reasons why women stay behind men and cannot become as successful as them is that they do not have enough time to devote themselves to their own interests and successes while they are holding all the responsibility of the house on their own shoulders. In his words:

> There are other reasons, besides those which we have now given, that help to explain why women remain behind men, even in the pursuits which are open

> to both. For one thing, very few women have time for them. This may seem a paradox; it is an undoubted social fact. The time and thoughts of every woman have to satisfy great previous demands on them for things practical. There is, first, the superintendence of the family and the domestic expenditure, which occupies at least one woman in every family, generally the one of mature years and acquired experience; unless the family is so rich as to admit of delegating that task to hired agency, and submitting to all the waste and malversation inseparable from that mode of conducting it. The superintendence of a household, even when not in other respects laborious, is extremely onerous to the thoughts; it requires incessant vigilance, an eye which no detail escapes, and presents questions for consideration and solution, foreseen and unforeseen, at every hour of the day, from which the person responsible for them can hardly even shake herself free. (Mill 73-74)

Women are considered not to have the same capacities as men to be successful outside the house, however, as Mill asserts, one of the most important factors that has prevented women from becoming successful outside the house is that they cannot have any free time to deal with or think about the other things except their homes, husbands and children. If women were given the same opportunities as men, they would become as successful as them. Thus, the liberation of women from the dependence on the husband and house is vital for the equality of choices.

> The liberation of women, in other words, required not just legal reform but a reeducation of the passions. Women were to be regarded as equals not only

> to fulfill the demand for individual rights and in order that they could survive in the public world of work, but also in order that women and men could form ethical relations of the highest order. Men and women alike had to "learn to cultivate their strongest sympathy with an equal in rights and in cultivation." (Shanley 239)

Women should have the opportunity to choose what they want to do so that the unequal status of the domestic life can be substituted with equality between the couple. Mill's ideal marriage which includes an equal lifestyle for both the husband and wife can be realized only by destroying the restrictions imposed on women. Mill believes that women's liberation can succeed through good education and the intellectual inclusion of the females in social life. If women are offered as high an intellectual status in society as their husbands and then given the right to choose, the result will be a happy and just life for both the husband and wife:

> The great accession to the intellectual power of the species, and to the amount of intellect available for the good management of its affairs, would be obtained, partly, through the better and more complete intellectual education of women, which would then improve *pari passu* with that of men. Women in general would be brought up equally capable of understanding business, public affairs, and the higher matters of speculation, with men in the same class of society; and the select few of the one as well as of the other sex, who were qualified not only to comprehend what is done or thought by others, but to think or do something considerable themselves, would meet

> with the same faculties for improving and training their capacities in the one sex as in the other. In this way, the widening of the sphere of action for women would operate for good, by raising their education to the level of that of men, and making the one participate in all improvements made in the other. (Mill 83-84)

In order to let women be included in the social life outside their houses, it is necessary to improve the education of the females to a higher intellectual level. Instead of teaching women how to be subordinate to their husbands at home, what is needed for a more equal society is the education of women at the same level as men. As Mill says, if women are brought up to know more about business and public affairs, they can improve to the intellectual level of the males. However, it is not logical to expect women to be as productive and successful as men in public affairs if we restrict their knowledge to domestic affairs and motherhood. Meanwhile, another important factor is that women should be willing to be successful and devote themselves to their public successes if they do not want to be impelled to stay at home looking after their children.

However, the equality of opportunities between the husband and wife does not always please the husband. Because of the traditional habits men obtain throughout their lives, they have difficulty tolerating an equal and successful wife who not only sacrifices herself for the sake of her husband or children but also for her own sake and interests. Since men are used to being selfish and expect their wives to be self-sacrificing, when their wives do not act according to the traditional norms, they tend to become depressed and unhappy. Another fact is that although women work a lot and become an equal

provider of the house, men often do not want to accept this situation and only consider the wife's income as a small extra. Joan Z. Spade claims that as a result of his investigations, she found that men do not easily want to give up their provider-role, especially if their incomes are high (Spade 173). The reason for this is actually clear enough, since men do not want to lose their status as the head of family and as the controller, they cannot accept their wives as successful providers for the house. Two critics of the status of women in Turkey, Oya Culpan and Toni Marzotto, mention how the education or success in professional life do not change women's status in the domestic life:

> For example, research in the area of socioeconomic development has emphasized the modernizing influence of education, urbanization and, industrialization on the role of women in developing countries. The increasing number of women attending universities, entering and remaining in the work force, and obtaining highly visible positions inside and outside government has encouraged new speculation about the changing nature of sex roles in the occupational world. However, the movement of women into the labor market does not necessarily lead to concominant attitudinal and behavioral changes in the domestic sphere. (Culpan, Marzotto 338)

Although the status of women is continuously improving since the foundation of the Turkish Republic, and women get higher education as well as better positions in professional life, the domestic responsibilities deriving from the patriarchal essence of society do not change. No matter how successful and hardworking women are outside

the house, this does not change the unequal status of the husband and wife within the boundaries of the home. Women are still supposed to meet all their responsibilities as wives and mothers. Another critic of women's status in Turkey, Aksu Bora, reveals the results of her investigation on how working women are evaluated in Turkey, and suggests that even if the husband does not have a job, and the wife is the only provider of the house, women themselves consider this as something out of the traditional norms and they do not want to accept that they are the provider of the house:

> I talked to women who were working as servants, and whose husbands were either unemployed or had irregular jobs. Although it was difficult for these women to begin working, they were still the only means of livelihood. When I tried to understand if this case caused any change in the perception of social gender, I realized that women tended to perceive their husbands' unemployment as temporary. They perceive the fact that they look after the household as a situation out of the norms even if it lasts for years. Thus there appears to be no change in their traditional female roles. In this way, while they support the family, they also have to deal with the housework. Besides, the last word about the important issues concerning the family still belongs to the husband, and domestic violence is still part of their lives. (Bora 101)

Bora's investigation is on the women who are working as cleaning ladies at the houses of wealthier families. These women have either little education or none, but they are the providers of the household. Despite this, they cannot call themselves the provider of the house because they have been taught that the provider of the house must always be the

husband. They tend to evaluate this situation as a temporary one. And the fact that they are working full time outside the house does not change the sex roles in the domestic life. They are still supposed to do the housework, deal with the children. The important decisions are still made by the husband. Another researcher of the working women's status and the changes in the sex roles at home, Hale Cihan Bolak, comes up with the same conclusion as Aksu Bora and she says that men's failure to fulfill his role as provider increases the potential for conflict. She asserts that in most household, although the women are the major providers, the husband's participation in domestic affairs remains occasional (Bolak 425).

Duygu Asena criticizes the same situation through a different perspective. She focuses on the fact that even well-educated husbands cannot tolerate their wives' successes in the professional field because they lose their own self-confidence when their wives are more successful than they are. As a result, men become depressed and unhappy, and this has negative effects on the relationship between the husband and wife. The strong and successful female character Asena creates complains that her husband becomes depressed about her success.

> Once when I was extremely popular and famous, Aydın could not even have sex with me. He seemed to be happy and deal with me when we were outside the house; however, within the house he cut all his emotional ties with me. I exceeded Aydın so much that he did not like this in his deep, musty, secluded and slobbery subconscious. He did not even realize that he did not like this; however, he was expressing his discontent by not having an emotional

> relationship with me. Now Aydın seems to be content. He is a man, and men do not need to admire their wives. It is enough for them to stay at home, not to deal with the things except the house, and know something not to make their husbands who have high authority embarrassed. (Asena 127)

Asena criticizes that no matter how educated or successful the man is, he cannot tolerate his wife's success and fame in the professional field. He thinks that this is an insult to his role as the head and provider of the house. As seen in the quote above, when the wife becomes more successful than the husband, the husband becomes unhappy and this affects the relationship; however, after the wife gives birth and begins staying at home, he becomes happy again. Asena criticizes the fact that man does not need to admire and be proud of their wives' successes. However, when a man becomes successful, his wife feels proud of him; she will almost never feel depressed and inferior. Being superior to women is so crucial for men that they do not look for a wife who is clever and knowledgeable. What men look for is a woman who knows to stay behind her husband and be satisfied with his success rather than pursuing her own career.

> In order to make them happy, you will always stay one step behind, and they will be rich, successful and famous. When you go somewhere, they will attract attention… The woman can attract attention only with her beauty and clothing… However, she should attract attention from a distance. The woman has invisible ropes around her, these ropes should never be exceeded. (Asena 88)

Men are used to seeing women behind themselves, inferior, subdued, and subordinate to them. When they remain in the traditional status which divides the sex roles unequally, they are happy and content with their situation because only they will take control and make the important decisions. A woman can be successful at home and she can attract attention with her beauty; however, as we so often see in Turkey, as soon as she follows her own desires to be included in the social life successfully, her husband gets annoyed with the situation because the wife should not exceed the husband's public success.

On the other hand, although men are disturbed by it, recent research shows that women have already begun working outside the house not only for financial reasons but also for their own careers. Oya Culpan and Toni Marzotto reveal the results in their research of 1982 about the working women in Turkey, and they show how the habits have already begun to change:

> We found that male and female respondents held distinctly different views concerning what a married woman would be likely to do if her husband's salary made it unnecessary for her to work. Fifty-two percent of the males in our sample thought that their future wives would choose to concentrate on family if economic constraints were removed. Whereas only 15 pecent of the females thought that they would not work under these circumstances. Although a majority of the female respondents expected to be married with children in fifteen years, they apperantly do not intend to retire to the home after marriage. Women see work outside the home as a fulfillment of career objectives and perhaps psychological needs rather than strictly as a response

> to economic pressures. Males, on the other hand, expressed more traditional expectations of what women would do if economic need were not a factor. (Culpan, Marzotto 350)

As it is proved in the research made by Culpan and Marzotto, the number of women who are working in their own careers is increasing. Women have already begun overcoming the restrictions around themselves. The standards created by the patriarchal society are now beginning to change. However, this situation generally does not please the male sex that is so fond of its superiority. Since men are happy with female obedience and subordination, they do not want to lose their comfort. As Mill asserts, men cannot tolerate living with an equal whom they cannot control or dominate; that is why they want the more traditional norms to be respected. On the other hand, what women need is equality and this equality can be obtained only through equal access to social and professional life.

CHAPTER 4

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF VIRGINIA WOOLF'S A ROOM OF ONE'S OWN AND DUYGU ASENA'S NOTHING CHANGES

4.1. The Myth of the Female Inferiority

In A Room of One's Own, Virginia Woolf has a two sided approach to the problem of female inferiority in a masculine society. First of all, she expresses her anger against the forced status of woman as inferior and submissive, and then she tries to offer a solution based on conciliation for the problem of inequality between the two sexes. As Alex Zwerdling states, she is motivated by an "urge to vent her anger about the subjection of women, and the urge to conciliate the male audience she could never entirely ignore" (Zwerdling 68). First, focusing on her anger against the male created myth of female inferiority, she discusses how the woman is determined to be inferior as a sex by the male power:

> Whatever the reason, the professor was made to look very angry and very ugly in my sketch, as he wrote his great book upon the mental, moral, and physical inferiority of women. Drawing pictures was an idle way of finishing an unprofitable morning's work. Yet it is in our idleness, in our dreams, that the submerged truth sometimes comes to the top. A very elementary exercise in psychology, not to be dignified by the name of psychoanalysis, showed me, on looking at my notebook, that the ketch of the angry professor had been made in anger. Anger had snatched my pencil while I dreamt. But what

> was anger doing there? Interest, confusion, amusement, boredom – all these emotions I could trace and name as they succeeded each other throughout the morning. Had anger, the black snake, been lurking among them? Yes, said the sketch, anger had. It referred me unmistakably to the one book, to the one phrase, which had roused the demon; it was the professor's statement about the mental, moral, and physical inferiority of women. My heart leapt. My cheek had burnt. I had flushed with anger. (Woolf 36-37)

Her anger is actually generated by the anger of the male professor who has written on the inferiority of the female sex. Woolf reveals her anger against him as a product of the general male sex itself that fabricates its own truth disregarding the other sex. "There was nothing specially remarkable, however foolish, in that. One does not like to be told that one is naturally the inferior of a little man…" (Woolf 37). Here Woolf states that she is unable to make sense of this ridiculous claim against her own sex. After she overcomes her initial anger, she becomes curious about the background and reasons of this claim which actually does not make any sense scientifically or biologically. She wonders what the reason could be behind the fact that the male sex has created a myth of inequality between the two sexes. Eventually she comes up with the idea that all the books that have been written on the inferiority of the woman are not concerned with reality, but with the emotions of the male sex:

> Whatever the reason, all these books, I thought, surveying the pile on the desk, are worthless for my purposes. They were worthless scientifically, that is to say, though humanly they were full of instruction, interest, boredom,

> and very queer facts about the habits of the Fiji Islanders. They had been written in the red light of emotion and not in the white light of truth. Therefore they must be returned to the central desk and restored each to his own cell in the enormous honeycomb. (Woolf 38)

All these books, regarding woman as the inferior sex, are worthless because they are not based on any scientific or biological facts. As Woolf emphasizes, they are not based on facts but on the emotions of the male sex. Marilyn R. Farwell explains that the man has always been represented by light, reason, and the sun since the beginning of history while the woman, on the contrary, has been represented by darkness, flesh, and the moon (Farwell 439). In other words, the relationship between the two sexes has always been based upon the self-other relationship in which the male has become the self, and the female has become the other. In this way, the male has always been defined as the positive and good while the female has been considered to be the negative and bad.

Similar to Virginia Woolf, Duygu Asena also talks about the female sex as it has been defined by the male power in her novel Nothing Changes, and she gives examples of the descriptions made of the woman:

> Then the Greek thinkers had bad opinions of the woman. For example Pitagoras said, “The bad principle created the chaos, darkness and woman.” In the early times of Christianity, the priests of the church and scholars considered the woman as seductive, tempting, and the trap of the devil. Even a saint decreed that, “Among the wildest animals there is none as dangerous as the woman…” And do you know what the famous Napoleon

> said: “Nature created women as our slaves. The husband has the right to tell his wife, ‘Madam, you belong to me both physically and spiritually.” (Asena 115)

Asena asserts that in early history woman was superior and respectful because of her skills in child bearing and rearing, protecting them from dangers and training the animals while her husband was out hunting. Because of these skills, men accepted that she was superior; thus this period was called matriarchal. However, as soon as wars broke out, men had acquired possessions and money, they began regarding themselves as superior, and reduced the woman to a mere tool, a womb that produces more children for the her husband’s clan. Later, society had become patriarchal, and man dominated and oppressed the woman as the weak and passive sex. The main reason behind this is that man does not want to lose his economic and social independence at all. To maintain this independence, man needs to keep the woman dependent and the dependence of woman can be achieved only by the way of describing her as a creature that needs to be protected and fed because she cannot succeed on her own.

Virginia Woolf, while attempting to find the reason for the so-called inferiority of the female sex, also asserts that man has created this myth to prove himself as a superior being:

> Possibly when the professor insisted a little too emphatically upon the inferiority of women, he was concerned not with their inferiority, but with his own superiority. That was what he was protecting rather hot-headedly and with too much emphasis, because it was a jewel to him of the rarest price.

> Life for both sexes – and I looked at them, shouldering their way along the pavement – is arduous, difficult, a perpetual struggle. It calls for gigantic courage and strength. More than anything, perhaps, creatures of illusion as we are, it calls for confidence in oneself. Without self-confidence we are as babes in the cradle. And how can we generate this imponderable quality, which is yet so invaluable, most quickly? By thinking that other people are inferior to oneself. By feeling that one has some innate superiority – it may be wealth, or rank, a straight nose, or the portrait of a grandfather by Romney – for there is no end to the pathetic devices of the human imagination – over other people. Hence the enormous importance to a patriarch who has to conquer, who has to rule, of feeling that great numbers of people, half the human race indeed, are by nature inferior to himself. It must indeed be one of the chief sources of his power. (Woolf 40-41)

The inferior status of a woman interests the man so much because this necessarily means that man is the superior being; thus, Woolf claims, man has considered the female sex as inferior only to prove himself superior. His power and by extension his superiority is the most valuable treasure for a man because it gives him the right to control everything and to experience an independent life. Thus he has to save this treasure to maintain his life; and the only way to save it is to get rid of the female sex as a potential threat. If a woman believes that she is equal to man, she will seek her own power and independence. As a result, when the woman gets liberated, man will lose his superiority,

power, and control over the woman; thus he forces her to see her own condition as inferior and dependent.

John Burt states that one of the interesting aspects of Woolf's theory of the cause for the subjection of women is that that subjection does not stem from man's will-to-power over women, but from man's doubts and insecurities (Burt 891). To prove this he quotes Woolf saying that the woman has always been a mirror which shows man in double size:

> Women have served all these centuries as looking-glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size. Without that power probably the earth would still be swamp and jungle… that is why Napoleon and Mussolini both insist so emphatically upon the inferiority of women, for if they were not inferior, they would cease to enlarge. That serves to explain in part the necessity that women so often are to men. And it serves to explain how restless they are under her criticism; how impossible it is for her to say to them this book is bad, this picture is feeble, or whatever it may be, without giving far more pain and rousing far more anger than a man would do who gave the same criticism. For if she begins to tell the truth, the figure in the looking-glass shrinks; his fitness for life is diminished. How is he to go on giving judgement, civilizing natives, making laws, writing books, dressing up and speechifying at banquets, unless he can see himself at breakfast and at dinner at least twice the size he really is? (Woolf 41-42)

As Woolf explains, woman has always served the man as a magical mirror which shows him as a powerful and superior giant. Although man does not actually have these features, thanks to the woman, he has become a superior power; thus as John Burt asserts, man is afraid of himself because if woman gives up mirroring him in this way, he will end up being equal to the woman. In this case, the male fear is not only about himself but also about the female sex, because if she begins seriously thinking about her own power and independence, this means the end of male domination in the world. The woman as a mirror becomes a necessity for the man. If woman keeps staying submissive and dependent, man also keeps being superior and independent; however, if things change and the woman realizes her own individuality, man will immediately lose his position as a ruler. The power he holds depends on reducing the woman to an inferior being. This allows him to make the rules, the judgments, and write the books. But if the woman begins criticizing him rather than mirroring him as something he is not, he will not be able to control the world with his own laws. Since he fears this eventuality, he forces the female sex to live as a dependent and inferior creature.

Duygu Asena also looks at the issue from the same perspective claiming that although the man tries to show himself as strong and fearless, the reality is just the opposite:

> A certain number of qualities have always been ascribed to women. Woman is emotional; woman is gutless, woman is coward, woman needs protection. It is said that if you say to one person that he/she is crazy forty times, he/she really becomes crazy, and women have eventually begun believing what is

> said about them… It is not understandable why especially the qualities of being gutless and coward cannot be attributed to men… In fact men are problematic and shy. When they need to take immediate decisions, they become panicky. Instead of finding permanent solutions, they choose temporary ones. That is why men falter against the women who are clear enough to know what they want. Moreover since they suppose that they have every right, they never accept that they are shy and problem-ridden, and they pretend to be powerful. Thus they become funny! (Asena 100)

An idiom in Turkish says that if you repeat the same thing forty times, it comes true. In the case of the male-female relationship, man has repeated the same prejudiced descriptions about the woman more than forty times since the beginning of patriarchy; thus even woman herself has been made to believe the negative definitions of women. As a result of saying that woman is a coward and she is in need of male protection, man has forced the woman to believe in this situation; however, Asena claims that the case is just the opposite. Although man never accepts that he is a coward and timid, he actually is and he cannot decide firmly and quickly when he needs to. Thus, when facing a strong-minded and stable woman, he gets frightened because he is afraid of exposing his weak side. The myth of female inferiority is created only as a cover for male fragility.

As previously mentioned Virginia Woolf tries to conciliate the two sexes as well as expressing the female anger against her inferior status. Although anger still exists, a possible way of solving the problem according to Woolf is to have an androgynous mind. It is possible to divide the mind into two parts as male and female, however, if this

division is emphasized, there occurs a self-other relationship which causes one sex to dominate the other. Yet, what is necessary for a healthy egalitarian society is conciliation between the sexes. As an illustration of an androgynous mind, Woolf gives the example of a man and woman being in the same cab, and from this example she asserts the importance of conciliation:

> The obvious reason would be that it is natural for the sexes to cooperate. One has a profound, if irrational, instinct in favour of the theory that the union of man and woman makes for the greatest satisfaction, the most complete happiness. But the sight of the two people getting into the taxi and the satisfaction it gave me made me also ask whether there are two sexes in the mind corresponding to the two sexes in the body, and whether they also require to be united in order to get complete satisfaction and happiness? And I went on amateurishly to sketch a plan of the soul so that in each of us two powers preside, one male, one female; and in the man's brain the man predominates over the woman, and in the woman's brain the woman predominates over the man. The normal and comfortable state of being is that when the two live in harmony together, spiritually cooperating. If one is a man, still the woman part of the brain must have effect; and a woman also must have intercourse with the man in her. Coleridge perhaps meant this when he said that a great mind is androgynous… (Woolf 113)

Woolf, as a solution for the problematic relations between man and woman, takes Coleridge's idea of androgynous mind as an example and claims that the biggest

satisfaction and happiness can be obtained through cooperation. If a man and woman constitute a union, this will solve the problems deriving from self-other relationship between the sexes. And this union is even possible in the minds of people. According to Coleridge, a mind has both male and female parts; however, in the male mind, the male part dominates the female and in the female mind, the female part dominates the male. The reason for the division between the sexes is that man prefers using the male part of their brain to oppress the female and set up his domination over her in the social life. However, this creates an unbalanced society in which the two sexes, which are actually equal, live under completely different conditions. The only thing necessary for absolute happiness for both male and female is cooperation.

> As Judith M. Bardwick claimed in a psychological context, the androgynous mind would be free from the confining sex stereotypes which society now imposes but would not therefore be asexual or unisexual. Annis Pratt defines this “internal androgyneity” as “that delightful interchange of the aggressive and the gentle, the adventurous and the nurturing faculties residing in each personality.” (Farwell 435)

In each person, there are both aggressive and calm features, when one can coordinate them; he/she achieves a more balanced character. However, if one part dominates, the personality becomes unstable. This resembles the relationship between man and woman in the sense that if equality between the sexes is sought out, it is necessary to cooperate. If one sex dominates the other and defines it, equality is not possible at all. In the idea of

androgynous mind, the most important feature is that such a mind must not produce stereotypical definitions about one of the sexes; only then conciliation can be achieved.

> Woolf's wish to avoid alienating the men in her audience was not entirely a matter of strategy, however. As in the first feminists, there is a strong conservative streak in her temperament that makes her reluctant to give up the ideal of women and men working in harmony for the same goals. Her bottled-up anger, her persistent concessiveness, are also expressions of her wish and need to look at the "aggressor" as simply another human being, educated from childhood to pursue destructive (and self-destructive) goals. She is usually careful to separate the learned qualities of "masculinity" from the biological fact of maleness. And she consistently idealizes a future world in which the sexes are no longer at cross purposes. (Zwerdling 80)

While she is revealing her anger against the male gender, Woolf also seeks not to alienate her male readers. Although some critics consider this as a fear, as Alex Zwerdling claims, it actually stems from her desire to have cooperation between the two sexes. She believes that man and woman can live in harmony pursuing the same goals. Masculinity is man-made; however, maleness is as biological as femaleness; thus if man succeeds in giving up his masculine attitude, equality between the sexes can be easily obtained. She does not want man and woman to continue being at cross purposes because if this goes on, absolute satisfaction and happiness cannot be obtained.

In the same way, Duygu Asena asserts that while the woman is struggling for equality with the man, she does not mean that she wants to take up more power against them and replace the masculine domination with the feminine one:

> I think men do not understand this. Women do not want to get what men have in their hands while struggling for equality and justice… They only say, "This fight, even exploitation, between the two sexes is unnecessary, our only difference from the male sex is our lack of physical strength, we want to live under equal conditions by completing each other's deficiencies." (Asena 116)

Both authors highlight the same objective of the women's movement against the domination of the male sex in society. The woman does not desire to take over the male power and replace it with a female dominated society. On the contrary, the purpose is to create an equal society in which none of the sexes tries to dominate and subordinate the other. Man should understand that the woman is not trying to take what he possesses, but to obtain the equal rights and opportunities and live in a happier harmonious world. The fight between the sexes is absolutely unnecessary, and it creates disorder for both; thus the best solution is to put a stop to this fight.

4.2. The Sex Roles in Society and the Importance of Economic Freedom in Female Independence

The most important aspect of Virginia Woolf's A Room of One's Own is that she questions why woman has not been able to be as productive as man since the beginning of history. She focuses on fiction, and why even the most gifted woman could not produce as many works as man did. First of all, she draws attention to the family life and the economic situation of the woman as a clear explanation to this problem. According to her, woman, since she does not have a room of her own and enough money, has not been given the opportunity to exploit her creativity.

> A woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction; and that, as you will see, leaves the great problem of the true nature of woman and the true nature of fiction unsolved. (Woolf 4)

When considering the history of fiction, it is obvious that man has always been ahead, producing more works and becoming more famous. In the past, it was even forbidden for a woman to write and publish; therefore, there were many female authors who published their works with a male name. The reason for this was that man believed that woman could not do what he did, or even if he did not believe this, he fabricated it as a truth to prevent the female improvement. He restricted the woman within the boundaries of the home putting the responsibility of the housework and childcare upon her shoulders to become more independent and dominating in the social world. As a result of the female work at home, man has always been free outside to do whatever he wants, to work more, to produce more and to enjoy himself more. He has never cared about the

home and children because he has had the woman slaving at home, thereby facilitating his social and profession advancement. Thus, the woman's situation as a slave at home has actually contributed to the subjectivity and success of the man as an individual. Meanwhile, the woman stayed at home dependent on her husband economically, and could not achieve anything other than doing the housework and bearing more children. The economic dependency of the woman has resulted in a poor situation for her, preventing the development of her productive abilities as a potentially successful professional, artist, or author.

> Making a fortune and bearing thirteen children – no human being could stand it. Consider the facts, we said. First there are nine months before the baby is born. Then the baby is born. Then there are three or four months spent in feeding the baby. After the baby is fed there are certainly five years spent in playing with the baby… Certainly our mothers had not provided us with anything comparable to all this – our mothers who found it difficult to scrape together thirty thousand pounds, our mothers who bore thirteen children to ministers of religion at St Andrews. (Woolf 25-27)

It has always been the man who had the money and the fortune because he has had the opportunity to work and earn his money; however, the woman has never had the same opportunities. As a result, she has been dependent on him for money and this prevented her from asserting her individuality. Money is the power man has and thanks to this power, he has been able to dominate and rule his wife. That is why the man holds the best professions in society and becomes famous and successful, and the woman stays as

a passive object in her home. As a passive object, she serves her husband and children, she is supposed to bear lots of children to maintain her husband's clan; thus she can never have either time or money for herself to be a successful individual. Her individuality is always depended on the welfare of her husband and children. As Woolf emphasizes, women have always served as a mother and housewife, they have never had time, money or an individual place to be alone to produce. Their only production was her children, and society has forced them to stay as passive subjects to sustain the male authority. Thus, the ultimate goal for a woman should be to earn her own money and to have her own room space if she wants to obtain her independence and become successful in the social or professional world:

> However, as I say, my aunt died; and whenever I change a ten-shilling note a little of that rust and corrosion is rubbed off; fear and bitterness go. Indeed, I thought, slipping the silver into my purse, it is remarkable, remembering the bitterness of those days, what a change of temper a fixed income will bring about. No force in the world can take from me my five hundred pounds. Food, house, and clothing are mine forever. Therefore not merely do effort and labour cease, but also hatred and bitterness. I need not hate any man; he cannot hurt me. I need not flatter any man; he has nothing to give me. So imperceptibly I found myself adopting a new attitude towards the other half of the human race. It was absurd to blame any class or any sex, as a whole. Great bodies of people are never responsible for what they do. They are driven by instincts which are not within their control. (Woolf 44)

Virginia Woolf focuses on the importance of a fixed income for a woman, and how it would change her life. As soon as woman has her own money, she will not be dependent on her husband or her father for food, clothing or shelter. Thus money is the most important thing which opens the ways towards female independence. As long as the woman has her own money, the man will not think that he has the absolute right to dominate and rule her. If the woman had her own economic independence, the man could not justify his dominance with the fabricated truths of female inferiority and passivity. As Woolf asserts, it is a natural human instinct to claim superiority over dependents; therefore the only one who can solve the problem of female dependence is the woman herself. As soon as she allows the man to claim dominance and superiority, he will not give it up, but if she becomes serious in asserting her own individuality, only then can she dismantle the patriarchal dominance in society.

Duygu Asena also argues that resulting from man's claims about female inferiority and passivity, the Turkish woman herself has been made to believe that it is not her duty to work outside the home and become successful; she sees herself as incapable of success. Although there is nothing real about all these claims, man has succeeded in keeping the woman within the boundaries of the home and impeded her individual success:

> They have always said, "You cannot do it, you cannot succeed, you should stay at home, we will look after you…" Eventually they have made women believe that it should be like this. Women have been so oppressed that they could not do anything… And then they have claimed, "Here you see, are

> there any famous geniuses, explorers, authors or scientists among women? So they are really backward." (Asena 7)

Believing that they cannot be successful in the so-called man's world, many Turkish women have come to believe that they need to be fed and protected first by their father and then by their husband. Man has always repeated that she cannot overcome the difficulties outside the home; as she cannot protect or support herself, he can justify her enslavement. As a result of this oppression, women would not even try to compete with men in the professional field; and so this further justifies man's claims about the inferiority and passivity of the female sex. However, as Asena states, the woman is as capable as the man and she can manage to overcome the difficulties of the outer world and become successful, but she has not been given the chance and the choice.

> Let's give a look to what has been happening in Turkey and in the world recently, who has been failing, who have been creating all this nonsense, failures, lies, deceits, scraps, terrors… Women? Be strong, trust yourself, and give a chance to your wife, daughter, sister who are staying at home, and see how they are going to succeed. (Asena 8)

Asena believes that if a woman is given the choice and the same opportunities as a man, she can perform even better than him. She also implies that man does not allow her to be included in the social world because he is actually afraid of losing his dominance, prestige, and power. If he overcomes his own fears and allows woman to assert her own individuality, the woman can become a successful member of the social and professional world. By imprisoning her within the house, man tries to retain his superiority over her.

Man claims that woman fails if she steps into the social life; he claims that she cannot protect herself; he claims that she cannot make laws; he claims that she cannot rule a country; he claims that she cannot manage a company; but as Asena states, it is man who fails, it is man who creates war, it is man who corrupts society, and it is man who cannot rule the country to make all the citizens happy; and she believes if a woman is given the chance, she will not do as badly as the man is doing now.

Nevertheless, woman is not given the opportunity, she is not taught to fight against the difficulties of the social and professional life; she is only taught self-sacrifice for her husband and children. Woman is always the one who devotes her time and energy for the well-being of her husband, and she always sacrifices herself, her life, and her abilities in favor of her man. Asena questions the idea of female sacrifice in the patriarchal society:

> Could you tell me what self-sacrifice is? I am thinking of the women I have known together with my mother. It is really a great self-sacrifice, but to whom, and why? To whom it might be, of course to the husbands… Why it might be… Because of the philosophy, "I am not important; it is enough if he is happy." I have been observing the women I see. They have devoted all their lives to their husbands, and they have been taught that they should be self-sacrificing to their husbands since they learnt to speak. They have lived for their husbands and children during the lifetime; and as a result of this, they have never been "themselves." Is this the consequence of the self-sacrifice? Hundreds, and even thousands of women who have lost their

> identities, who have not eaten but fed, who have not made sad but been made sad, who have not smiled but made them smile, who have loved but not been loved? (Asena 40)

No one has ever taught woman how to stand on her own two feet, how to support herself, how to struggle against the dangers and difficulties of life. She has only been taught only to become a good slave of her husband, she has been taught to cook well, to iron well, and to clean well because she is supposed to become a good wife facilitating the success of her husband. She was never supposed to become successful in the male world because the place of a woman should always be her home. Asena asserts that a woman can never succeed in being herself. Rather, she is expected to be the good housewife and mother (to be for someone else). In order to serve the male needs, the woman has always sacrificed herself. Man claimed his superiority only because of the woman who accepted to serve him like an inferior even though she is an absolute equal to him. A self-sacrificing woman serves and contributes to the success of her husband and children while forgetting her own existence.

> What if I beg you…? Will it be beneficial? Please do not make the "Other" the only goal of your life, please do not pity yourself only because of them, please do look at yourself with your own eyes, not with theirs, please do something, create your own world, and stay alone in this world, go into and get out of the "Other's" world, but do not be stuck within it. If you can achieve setting up a world only for yourself, you will not look into their eyes dully and unhappily… (Asena 40-41)

Asena strongly encourages woman to create her own individual world not to be dependent on man. Just like Virginia Woolf suggests that woman should have a room of her own to write, she wants the woman to have a separate world of her own in which she does not devote herself to the needs of her husband and children, but to her own goals and desires, in which she can only think about her own life and future. If she succeeds in setting up such a world for herself, Asena believes she will no longer be in need of a man's protection or support. The woman should look at herself from her own perspective because as long as she continues looking at herself from the male perspective, she will not give up the idea that a woman is doomed to inferiority and submission. To this end both Asena and Woolf come up with the same solution which is the economic independence of the female sex. The only reason behind male authority is the power deriving from the money the man has; thus if a woman earns her money on her own, she will no longer be a slave of a male master. By that way she will become a successful individual in both social and professional arena.

In A Room of One's Own, Virginia Woolf gives the example of Shakespeare's sister, and claims that although she has the same skills as Shakespeare, she could not write even one word, or even if she did, she would not do it publicly. What Woolf suggests is that even though a woman had the same skills as a man, since she was not given the same opportunities, she would not become as productive and creative as a man. Woolf suggests that women have their own money and room to be creative in fiction; however, she does not want her to produce only a female work. She prefers

androgyny to sexist discrimination. Woolf claims that a man's writing, though it is good, is too egoistical and it represents only the male side of the brain:

> But after reading a chapter or two a shadow seemed to lie across the page. It was a straight dark bar; a shadow shaped something like the letter 'I'. One began dodging this way and that to catch a glimpse of the landscape behind it. Whether that was indeed a tree or a woman walking I was not quite sure. Back one was always hailed to the letter 'I'. One began to be tired of 'I'. (Woolf 115)

A man's writing is good and it shows the situation of the man as a well-educated and free minded individual. However, it is full of 'I's, and this makes the reader tired because of the dominant and egoistic style. Even in his writing, Woolf argues, the man only uses the male part of his mind and he makes clear how his desire for power and dominance prevails in his life. Anne Fernald discusses the usage of 'I' in male writing:

> A happy accident of English allows Woolf to compare "I" to a great tree, whose trunk the letter "I" resembles. The problem with "I" is that it comes to dominate, and ultimately obscure, the subject it purports to describe; "I" wants to be its own subject. Thus, the egoistical "I" quickly becomes an authoritative one. In the end, it is less personal than many third-person forms. Personal writing, as Woolf shows throughout her essays, is nervous about and critical of the authoritative voice. (Fernald 175)

As Anne Fernald points out Woolf is critical of the dominant and authoritative voice in male writing, and although she encourages the woman to write, she does not want her to

be like a male author. She suggests an androgynous mind which balances between the male and female parts of the brain. Frances L. Restuccia says that one might imagine a tiny man and woman making love in the artist's mind according to the idea of androgynous mind (Restuccia 256). The solution for the problems between the sexes, in Woolf's opinion, is to have an androgynous mind which means one should be able to think in a woman-manly or man-womanly way:

> All this pitting of sex against sex, of quality against quality; all this claiming of superiority and imputing of inferiority, belong to the private-school stage of human existence where there are 'sides', and it is necessary for one side to beat another side, and of the utmost importance to walk up to a platform and receive from the hands of the Headmaster himself a highly ornamental pot. As people mature they cease to believe in sides or in Headmasters or in highly ornamental pots. (Woolf 122)

The fight between the two sexes is based on using only one side of the brain in Woolf's idea of androgyny. The male claim that he is superior to the inferior female is actually caused by the male dominant usage of the brain; thus, if a person can balance the sides of his/her brain, he/she can have a more equal approach to the other sex. In this way, the discrimination against the other sex will theoretically disappear. This idea of androgyny is not important only for fiction, it is actually a solution offered by Woolf for the struggle of the sexes, especially the male sex, to be superior and dominant. Marilyn R. Farwell, a critic of Virginia Woolf's androgyny notes that:

> In some social science circles, the patterning of males and females into stereotyped roles is coming under scrutiny; the ideal human, claim many, the androgynous human being, will be one who is free to choose from a number of different roles, free to move back and forth between roles traditionally segregated into masculine and feminine categories. In Annis Pratt's terms, angrogyneity is a "delightful interchange" between qualities usually set in opposition to one another. The gentleness that is stereotypically feminine will give way to and at times be qualified by the more masculine aggressiveness and vice versa. In Woolf's terms, we will have a man-womanly and a woman-manly. (Farwell 442)

If androgyny is achieved, the determined sex roles in society would be substituted by different choices for the two sexes. What Virginia Woolf, like all other feminists, is pursuing is an equal society for both sexes, and this equality includes neither male nor female superiority. Pure equality requires no struggle for power between the sexes, although Woolf encourages woman to earn her own money to obtain subjectivity, this does not mean that woman should have more power against the man to subordinate him as he has always done to her. Money is necessary for a woman to be independent from the man, and to have her individual rights like him. However, this does not mean that woman should be more powerful than man to be independent; on the contrary, this means she should have equal rights and equal power with him. Thus, androgyny is expected to destruct the traditional norms about the jobs and responsibilities of both

sexes. Both should be able to think man-womanly and woman-manly so that they can share the responsibilities of their lives without subordinating and dominating the other.

Duygu Asena, although she does not call it androgyny, also offers similar solutions to the problem of inequality between the sexes in a patriarchal society. She also supports the idea that women get a world of their own to be able to pursue their own careers and desires; this does not suggest that women should try taking over the power men hold, but struggling for individual independence. She does not mean that woman should be like man in the sense of domination and authority. What she wants is also an absolute equality of status and opportunities between the male and female. Woman should have the same rights as the man to claim her name in the social and professional arena, without being reduced to an object by a superior power. For there to be absolute equality in society, one should give up the idea of more power and superiority against the other sex, and this is only possible with, as Woolf and Asena suggest, a more balanced mind between the male and female sides.

CONCLUSION

WHY IS DUYGU ASENA'S FEMINISM MISDIRECTED?

The feminist works that have been explored in this thesis have questioned the female problem from more or less the same perspective. When we consider John Stuart Mill, Virginia Woolf and Simone de Beauvoir, they discussed the female problem in the Western world in regard to education, marriage, motherhood, professional and social life from the late 19th to the early 20th centuries. However, the same problems were only discussed publicly in Turkey by Duygu Asena in the late 20th century, and they still need to be discussed because the problems have not been successfully solved. In other words, it is more accurate to suggest that the female problems have only been partially solved. This is because modern Turkey is actually comprised of two separate realities. One of these realities is represented by western Turkey, which includes the big metropolitan cities, and the other reality is represented by eastern Turkey, more rural and less modernized.

First of all, it is better to reiterate the main points that have been discussed in all of these prominent western feminist works as well as in Duygu Asena's literature concerning the female status in a patriarchal society. The main discussion of these works is that woman is given her social destiny as a female as soon as she is born. This femaleness is not biological but socially constructed, and is imposed on all women in the same way. In other words, the definition of being a woman in a patriarchal society is defined neither by biological nor scientific truths, but by the dominating masculine power. This power determines the characteristics of a so-called "true-woman." The

most important aspect of Duygu Asena's feminism, which has been very influential in contemporary Turkey, is that she criticizes the structure of the patriarchal Turkish society, and struggles against the prejudices against the female sex. For Asena, the easiest way to achieve male domination is to prevent the woman from becoming an independent individual who trusts herself and her own power. Thus, first the man has created his ideal woman who would become a good slave at home to facilitate his liberty in the social world. Then, with the power of patriarchy, he has made the woman believe that she is a dependent creature from birth, and she has to be a "true-woman" to be protected and afforded by a good husband if she wants to survive. Thus, the woman has been imprisoned in the home by the male power while the man has been working, earning his money, and enjoying his independence together with his success in the social and professional arena.

In all her novels, Asena fights against the concept of 'true woman' determined by the male authority. According to her, Turkish women have always been expected to become good wives and mothers; however, they have never been given the same opportunities with men to be independent individuals who become successful as a result of their studies and works. She contends that most men in Turkey, considering the patriarchal background they have been brought in, think that women do not need to work and succeed in the social world; they should support their husband's success, help them from within the home and be happy of their successes. Asena strongly emphasizes that in Turkey, boys and girls are brought up according to the standards of the masculine society; thus, men believe that the ultimate female responsibility is to serve her husband

and children while the man has the social and professional responsibilities. The traditional doctrines of the masculine Turkish society have made women to believe in their fabricated fate of passivity and submission.

Asena asserts that the only solution to the female submission is that she needs to be economically independent from man. The man believes that he has the right to dominate and subordinate his wife because he has the money, and automatically the power, and he is the one who supports the woman financially. Asena belives that women have become the slaves of the men by staying financially dependent on them; thus economic freedom is crucial in her feminism because it means power, and power means not to be oppressed. The first step for economic freedom is to overcome the restrictions of masculine society and open the ways to social and professional life. If a woman becomes economically independent from her husband, she can destroy the traditional norms about her role and status as a female in society, and she can change her life. In the late 20th century in Turkey, Duygu Asena actually made almost the same arguments which were made by Mill, Beauvoir and Woolf in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. She discussed all the important issues about female subordination in the patriarchal society in regard to education, marriage, professional and social life. She argued that the woman should be independent from the man and create her own power and subjectivity. The importance of Asena's feminism in Turkey is that she had the courage to talk about the long-term traditions and customs of the masculine Turkish society. She believed in the power women had; thus she encouraged them to struggle for their own subjectivity and independence. However, the time when she discussed all these topics in Turkey was

in fact much later than the western critics, and the fact is that Turkey is still struggling with the same problems because they have not been completely resolved.

As I have mentioned above, the female status today in Turkey faces two realities; one of which is positive and improving and the other is negative and relatively stable. To analyze the woman's situation in Turkey, it is necessary to divide Turkey into two parts: the western part and the eastern part. For the western part of Turkey, it is easier to assert that the educational, social, familial and professional problems for the female sex are relatively solved when compared to the eastern part in which women do not have the same opportunities. In western Turkey today, women have more access to education, social life, and individual improvement. On the other hand, in eastern Turkey, the case is not the same for girls; since they do not have the same rights to get educated as the boys, and they are usually supposed to stay at home with their mothers to help her with the housework. As such, they are supposed to learn how to be a good housewife and mother in the future because in eastern Turkey, the girls get married at an early age to a man of the parents' choosing. They do not have any rights to oppose the decisions taken by her parents for her.

In western Turkey, the woman is closer to having own subjectivity, and she pursues her career without being oppressed or dominated her husband. She has more rights both in education and in professional life. However, in eastern Turkey, even if the woman works outside the house in the farm as much as her husband, she neither gets paid nor gets help with the housework and childcare. Even if the wife works somewhere else and gets paid, she has to give all her money to her husband and although this work

doubles her burden, it does not give her equality with the man. Thus it is not possible for Turkey to claim that equality between the two sexes has been achieved. Although western Turkey has individually and economically more independent women, eastern Turkey is still struggling with the problems of education and early marriage for young girls.

In fact, Duygu Asena has been the most important and also influential Turkish feminist critic discussing female inferiority in masculine Turkish society. Her focus on the individual, social, educational, and professional inferiority of the Turkish women has enabled many women to realize that they have been deceived by the man-made truth about the female character. She encouraged women to believe in their own power to claim their own subjectivity and independence; thus her feminism has become such an effective one in Turkey. However, on the other hand, one aspect of her feminism has overshadowed her successful arguments about the major female problems in Turkish society, and it is her emphasis on the sexual freedom for women. Although all of her other arguments about the female inferiority and subordination are applicable to Turkey as a whole, her excessive focus on sexual relationship alienates eastern Turkey from the text. The reason for this is that in such a place where women cannot even realize that they have their own individualities, we cannot expect the idea of sexual freedom to work to solve their problems.

In all of her works, Asena focuses on sexuality more than she needs to if she is writing for Turkey as a whole. The sexual independence she emphasizes all the time is not possible for Turkish women to achieve while they are still struggling with the more

basic problems of education, social recognition, and professional life. Asena strongly suggests that a woman should not be dependent on only one man during her lifetime. She thinks marriage is not a good institution because it forces the partners to be with each other for a long time; what she wants is a more independent sexual life. She suggests that women ought to pursue their passions and sexual desires; however, this cannot be a solution for the female condition in today's Turkey. We have much deeper problems which have not been solved, and though some of these problems have been somewhat overcome in the western part of Turkey, the case is totally different in the eastern part. Thus, if a feminist critic wants equality not only for the privileged women, but for the ordinary women as well, she needs to consider the general problems rather than focusing on the problems of already mostly independent women.

Asena's desire for absolute independence in the sexual life for women is something that can be discussed only by a small group of women who have already claimed their individuality and success in the male world. It is not possible to talk about a free sexual life to the girls who are not allowed even to go to school in the eastern Turkey, or even if you do mention it, you cannot get a logical answer because most probably it will not make any sense to them. Asena's books, although they also focus on the social problems of women, are full of emphasis on sexual intercourse and the satisfaction a woman might get from it. She presents detailed scenes about sexuality, and her characters are so independent that they want to be able to have a free sexual life with whomever and as many as they like. The emphasis on sexuality in her books takes the reader's attention away from all the other issues she discusses; female inferiority and

subordination are somehow ignored by the reader. Thus, I claim, even if a well-educated intellectual can read her books and understand that they are not actually pornographic that they have something more important to say, it is not possible for a village woman to read and understand the real problems discussed in them. As a result, her feminism becomes misdirected because of her more than enough emphasis on sexual relationship.

One of the contemporary columnists in Turkey Ayşe Arman paid homage to Duygu Asena after her death in 2006. One of the comments she made about Asena's influence on her life attracted the most attention: "She taught millions of women who thought like her how to have sex without feeling guilt and compunction, without being oppressed by responsibility, and how to have sex as an individual right" (Arman 1). There are two ways of looking at this comment concerning the female status in modern Turkey. Obviously, Turkey is still a patriarchal country, although officially it is not accepted, the traditional beliefs and customs affect a woman's life deeply. In that sense, man is always considered to be more independent than the woman in every aspect of life. Socially, educationally, domestically, professionally or sexually, man always has more freedom than the woman does. If we only think about the western women in Turkey, it is easier to talk about sexual life and satisfaction for the female sex. It is a fact that in Turkey when a man has a sexual intercourse with a woman out of marriage, he is not scorned, insulted or labeled as a bad man while if a woman does the same thing the case is just the opposite. The woman who has a sexual life without getting married to a man is seen as a bad woman in the patriarchal society. If we only consider the more developed parts of Turkey in the feminist issues, we can assert that there is an absolute

double standard: discrimination against one sex and only praise for the other. Truly enough, if we want an absolute equality between the sexes, the different approaches to the same action by the different sexes should be corrected with an equal approach. If one thing is bad for one sex, it should not be different for the other. There are no differences in goodness and badness based upon sex. What is bad for a woman should also be bad for the man, and what is good for a woman should also be good for a man.

However, this is only a small group of women that can discuss about these *sexual* prejudices against women because most women in the larger eastern part of Turkey could not even reach this amount of independence to be able to struggle for a more equal sexual life. These women are still imprisoned in the home as slaves, cleaning, bearing and rearing the children, cooking, cleaning her husband's and children's clothes and even working on the farms; and they still have no rights, or opportunities, or independence, or subjectivity. The lives of these women are completely dependent on their husbands, and without them, these women cannot survive, or it is better to say they do not believe that they can survive. These women are the most obvious examples of female self-sacrifice to the male. They cannot even imagine an individual life in which they only care about their own goals and desires. They are designed to be good slaves for the male masters and they cannot even think that they can resist male oppression. They honestly believe that this is their destiny, and they have to bear it if they want to have a good life. The concept of a good life is completely different for these women than it is for the more independent women in the western part of Turkey. They are made to believe that marriage is the most important thing for them in life; they have been

programmed to dream of a good marriage and many children since their childhood. If a person is not taught about independence and individuality, how would it be possible for her to dream about it? This is the case for the women who have been enslaved by their husbands in the eastern part of Turkey. Unfortunately, they cannot even think that there is something wrong about their situation; and as a result, they cannot attempt to struggle for their independence. In their opinion, independence only belongs to the male sex, and the place for a woman is the home where she is being made an object by a superior subject.

Now, when we think about the situation of all these women in eastern Turkey, which eclipses western Turkey, it becomes obvious why Duygu Asena's books do not apply to this large group of women. If these women do not know anything about male oppression or female inferiority, and they believe that this is how things are supposed to be, how then would it be possible to even mention to these women that they should have the same rights to a free sexual life as men do? First of all, these women should understand that they are subjected to men for no logical reasons as John Stuart Mill argues. Then they should understand that they are not born, but rather made a woman in masculine society as Simone de Beauvoir asserts. And finally, they should also understand that a woman should have a room of her own and economic independence to realize her own individuality and potentiality as Virginia Woolf suggests. Before anything else, a good feminist critic should be able to show these women -- the majority of Turkey's women -- that they can have the same rights to an independent individuality as men, and they can be subjects rather than becoming the objects of their husbands. A

good feminist critic should make them realize that they have a hidden power that can lead to success and liberty; however, they should first struggle to obtain it. As long as these women cannot realize that their current reality is not their fate, but only the fabricated truth of the male sex to subordinate them, they cannot attempt to change their lives. They should take away the curtain put in front of their eyes by the male power to prevent them from seeing the reality, and develop the self-confidence necessary to individuality and independence. If they continue believing that they need a man to survive, it is not possible for them to seek any changes in their individual or social status.

Before seeking liberty in sexual life, these women should understand that they are not born but rather become a woman which means the patriarchal structure of society forces them to have certain characteristics to serve the male sex without the consent of the female herself. In Turkey, nobody asks a woman what she wants to do, or what she wants to become, but it has been decided by this masculine power that she should become a good wife and mother. Thus, the women in the eastern part of Turkey should understand that their subordination is only caused by the male desire for power and superiority, and if they become serious to rebel against this subordination, they can obtain their rights in every field of life as men do have. Biologically man and woman do not have any differences coming from birth except their sexes, and physically the only difference is that man is more physically powerful than the woman. However, this physical power does not permit man to dominate and subordinate the woman. And it cannot be a logical reason for the forced submission of the female sex.

While we are still talking about the individual and social injustices against women in Turkey, it is not possible for us to exaggerate our discussion to a liberal sexual life between the sexes. Turkey's essential problem with the female status is still decades behind the Western world. We are still dealing with the problems of women not having their basic individual rights in eastern Turkey; in other words, we are still discussing the problems treated by Mill, Beauvoir, and Woolf a long time ago. It is perhaps normal for the Western world, which has already addressed the essential problems women face in a masculine society, to discuss equality in the sexual intercourse between the sexes. However, if one is talking about such independence in Turkey, she is either ignoring the essential problems most women have in the country, or she is only trying to focus on the problems of an elite group.

Thus, I believe, Duygu Asena's feminism is misdirected because her emphasis on free sexual intercourse overshadows the more essential problems which have not yet been solved in most of Turkey. As this thesis has demonstrated, nobody can deny that Asena has very good arguments about the social, economic and domestic status of the women in Turkey; however, her focus overwhelming on sexuality at this point is irrelevant to the uneducated and ordinary women in eastern Turkey. And if we want to solve the problems of women all over Turkey, it is necessary to make sure that all these women will find something crucial about themselves in these books; otherwise, the books are doomed to be read and appreciated by only a small group of elite women who are already far ahead in claiming their individual independence. It is somehow tragic,

that because of this misdirection, so many of Duygu Asena's enlightened feminist views might never reach the audience that needs them the most.

WORKS CITED

Acuner, Selma. "90'lı Yıllar ve Resmi Düzeyde Kurumsallaşmanın Doğuş Aşamaları." in 90'larda Türkiye'de Feminizm. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002. 125-158.

Akkoç, Nebahat. "Diyarbakır Ka-Mer'in Kuruluş Hikayesi ve Yürüttüğü Çalışmalar." in 90'larda Türkiye'de Feminizm. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002. 205-216.

Arat, Necla. Her Yönüyle Türkiye'de Kadın Olgusu: Kadın Gerçeğine Yeni Yaklaşımlar. İstanbul: Say Yayınları, 1992.

Arat, Yeşim. "1980'ler Türkiyesi'nde Kadın Hareketi: Liberal Kemalizm'in Radikal Uzantısı." in Her Yönüyle Türkiye'de Kadın Olgusu: Kadın Gerçeğine Yeni Yaklaşımlar. İstanbul: Say Yayınları, 1992.

Arman, Ayşe. "Nur İçinde Yat Duygu." Hurriyet 2 August 2006. http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/yazarlar/4852589.asp?yazarid=12&gid=61

Asena, Duygu. Aslında Aşk da Yok. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2004.

---, Değişen Bir Şey Yok. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2004.

---, Kadının Adı Yok. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2006.

Bair, Deirdre. "Simone de Beauvoir: Politics, Language, and Feminist Identity." Yale French Studies 72 (1986): 149-162.

Baykan, Ayşegül, and Belma Ötüş-Baskett. Nezihe Muhittin ve Türk Kadını. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1999.

Bergoffen, Debra B. “Marriage, Autonomy, and the Feminine Protest.” Hypatia 14.4 (1999): 18-35.

Blackstone, William T. “Freedom and Women.” Ethichs 85.3 (1975): 243-248.

Bolak, Hale Cihan. “When Wives are Major Providers: Culture, Gender, and Family Work.” Gender and Society 11.4 (1997): 409-433.

Bora, Aksu. Kadınların Sınıfı – Ücretli Ev Emeği ve Kadın Öznelliğinin İnşası. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2005.

Bora, Aksu, and Asena Günal. 90’larda Türkiye’de Feminizm. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

Burt, John. “Irreconcilable Habits of Thought in A Room of One’s Own and to The Lighthouse.” ELH 49.4 (1982): 889-907.

Butler, Judith. “Sex and Gender in Simone de Beauvoir’s Second Sex.” Yale French Studies 72 (1986): 35-49.

Culpan, Oya, and Toni Marzotto. “Changing Attitudes toward Work and Marriage: Turkey in Transition.” Signs 8.2. (1982): 337-351.

Çaha, Ömer. “Türk Kadın Hareketi: “Kadınsı” Bir Sivil Toplumun İmkanı?” Kadın Çalışmaları Dergisi 1.3: 6-15.

De Beauvoir, Simone. The Second Sex. Trans. and ed. H.M. Parshley. New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, Inc, 1989.

Dengler, Ian C. “Turkish Women in the Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age.” in Women in The Muslim World. Ed. Lois Beck, and Nikki Keddie. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978. 229-243.

Doltaş, Dilek. “Batıdaki Feminist Kuramlar ve 1980 Sonrası Türk Feminizmi.” in Her Yönüyle Türkiye’de Kadın Olgusu: Kadın Gerçeğine Yeni Yaklaşımlar. İstanbul: Say Yayınları, 1992.

Farwell, Marilyn R. “Virginia Woolf and Androgyny.” Contemporary Literature 16.4 (1975): 433-451.

Felstiner, Mary Lowenthal. “Seeing “The Second Sex” through the Second Wave.” Feminist Studies 6.2 (1980): 247-276.

Fernald, Anne. “A Room of One’s Own, Personal Criticism, and the Essay.” Twentieth Century Literature 40.2 (1994): 165-189.

Fuchs, Jo-Ann P. “Female Eroticism in The Second Sex.” Feminist Studies 6.2 (1980): 304-313.

Green, Karen. “The Other as Another Other.” Hypatia 17.4 (2002): 1-15.

Heinämaa, Sara. “Simone de Beauvoir’s Phenomenology of Sexual Difference.” Hypatia 14.4 (1999): 83-95.

Hollingworth, Leta S. “Social Devices for Impelling Women to Bear and Rear Children.” The American Journal of Sociology 22.1. (1916): 19-29.

Hughes, Patricia. “The Reality versus the Ideal: J.S. Mill’s Treatment of Women, Workers, and Private Property.” Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue canadienne de science politique 12.3. (1979): 523-542.

Işık, S. Nazik. “1990’larda Kadına Yönelik Aile İçi Şiddetle Mücadele Hareketi İiçinde Oluşmuş Bazı Gözlem ve Düşünceler.” in 90’larda Türkiye’de Feminizm. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002. 41-72.

Kandiyoti, Deniz. “Sex Roles and Social Change: A Comparative Appraisal of Turkey’s Women” *Signs* 3.1 (1977): 57-73.

Kardam, Filiz, and Yıldız Ecevit. “1990’ların Sonunda Bir Kadın İletişim Kuruluşu: Uçan Süpürge.” in 90’larda Türkiye’de Feminizm. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002. 87-108.

Koçali, Filiz. “Kadınlara Mahsus Gazete Pazartesi.” in 90’larda Türkiye’de Feminizm. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002. 73-108.

Kruks, Sonia. “Gender and Subjectivity: Simone de Beauvoir and Contemporary Feminism.” Signs 18.1 (1992): 89-110

Kümbetoğlu, Belkıs. “Kadınlara İlişkin Projeler.” in 90’larda Türkiye’de Feminizm. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002. 159-181.

Leighton, Jean. Simone de Beauvoir onWoman. New Jersey, Cranbury: Associated University PRESS, Inc, 1975.

Libal, Kathryn. “Staging Turkish Women’s Emancipation: Istanbul, 1935.” Journal of Middle East Women’s Studies 4.1 (2007): 31-52.

McCall, Dorothy Kaufmann. “Simone de Beauvoir, “The Second Sex”, and Jean-Paul Sartre.” Signs 5.2 (1979): 209-223.

Mill, John Stuart. The Subjection of Women. Wheeling, Illinois: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1980.

Moi, Toril. “Ambiguity and Alienation in The Second Sex.” Boundary 2 19.2 (1992): 96-112.

Moi, Toril. What is A Woman? New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Parvulescu, Anca. “Beyond Marriage: The Couple.” Discourse 26.3 (2004): 3-17.

Restuccia, Frances L. ““Untying the Mother Tongue”: Female Difference in Virginia Woolf’s *A Room of One’s Own.”* Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature 4.2. (1985): 253-264.

Shanley, Mary Lyndon. “Marital Slavery and Friendship: John Stuart Mill’s The Subjection of Women.” Political Theory 9.2. (1981): 229-247.

Shusterman, Richard. “Somaesthetics and *The Ssecond Sex*: A Pragmatist Reading of a Feminist Classic.” Hypatia 18.4 (2003): 106-136.

Simons, Margaret A. “Sexism and the Philosophical Canon: On Reading Beauvoir’s The Second Sex.” Journal of the History of Ideas 51.3 (1990): 487-504.

Simons, Margaret A., and Jessica Benjamin. “Simone de Beauvoir: An Interview.” Feminist Studies 5.2 (1979): 330-345.

Spade, Joan Z. “Wives’ and Husbands’ Perceptions of Why Wives Work.” Gender and Society 8.2. (1994): 170-188.

Tidd, Ursula. “The Self-Other Relation in Beauvoir’s Ethics and Autobiography.” Hypatia 14.4 (1999): 163-174.

Timisi, Nilüfer, and Meltem Ağduk Gevrek. “1980’ler Türkiye’sinde Feminist Hareket: Ankara Çevresi.” in 90’larda Türkiye’de Feminizm. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002. 13-39.

Unat, Nermin Abadan. “Kadın Araştırmalarının Neden, Amaç ve Kapsamı.” in Her Yönüyle Türkiye’de Kadın Olgusu: Kadın Gerçeğine Yeni Yaklaşımlar. İstanbul: Say Yayınları, 1992.

Veltman, Andrea. “The Sisyphean Torture of Housework: Simone de Beauvoir and Inequitable Divisions of Domestic Work in Marriage.” Hypatia 19.3 (2004): 121-143.

Vintges, Karen. “Simone de Beauvoir: A Feminist Thinker fro Our Times.” Hypatia 14.4 (1999): 133-144.

White, Jenny B. “State Feminism, Modernization, and the Turkish Republican Woman.” NWSA Journal 15.3 (2003): 145-159.

Woodsmall, Ruth Frances. “Turkey Achieves Modern Education For Girls.” in Moslem Women Enter A New World. New York: Round Table Press, INC, 1936. 217-224.

Woodsmall, Ruth Frances. “Turkish Women and Their New Economic Indepepndence.” in Moslem Women Enter A New World. New York: Round Table Press, INC, 1936. 253-263.

Woolf, Virginia. A Room of One’s Own. London: Penguin Books, 2004.

Zwerdling, Alex. “Anger and Conciliation in Woolf’s Feminism.” Representations 3 (1983): 68-89.