

THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE REPUBLICAN DISCOURSE  
THROUGH INTERVENTIONS IN PUBLIC SPACE

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences  
of  
Bilkent University

by

ELİF ÇAĞIŞ

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF  
POLITICAL SCIENCE  
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY  
ANKARA

June 2004

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Political Science.

-----  
Assist. Prof. Alev ınar  
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Political Science.

-----  
Assist. Prof. Banu Helvacıođlu  
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Political Science.

-----  
Assist. Prof. Gven Arif Sargın  
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

-----  
Prof. Krřat Aydođan  
Director

ABSTRACT

THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE REPUBLICAN DISCOURSE  
THROUGH INTERVENTIONS IN PUBLIC SPACE

ÇAĞIŞ, Elif

M.A., Department of Political Science

Supervisor: Assistant Professor Alev Çınar

June 2004

This thesis is on the construction of the early republican discourse through the interventions in public space. These interventions are the construction of Ankara as the national center and the two monuments, The Victory Monument in Ulus and the Güven Monument in Kızılay, located at the center of the nation. Through the analysis of these two monuments it is argued that the construction of monuments is a way of producing and communicating the symbols of the basic premises of the Republican discourse and therefore it contributes to the reproduction of the discourse, to the process of the construction of the nation and the self-construction of the state.

Keywords: Güven Monument, Victory Monument, Republican Discourse, Nationalism

## ÖZET

### CUMHURİYET SÖYLEMİNİN KAMUSAL MEKANA MÜDAHALELERLE KURULMASI

Çağış, Elif

Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yard. Doç. Alev Çınar

Haziran 2004

Bu çalışma erken cumhuriyet dönemi söyleminin kamusal mekana müdahaleler yoluyla kurulması üzerinedir. Bu müdahaleler Ankara'nın milletin merkezi kurulması ve milletin merkezine yerleştirilmiş iki anıttır, Ulus'taki Zafer Anıtı ve Kızılay'daki Güven Anıtı. Bu anıtların analizi yoluyla, anıt dikmenin Cumhuriyet'in temel prensiplerinin sembollerini üretmenin ve iletmenin bir yolu olduğu ve bu nedenle cumhuriyet söyleminin yeniden üretilmesine, ulus kurma sürecine ve devletin kendini kurmasına katkıda bulunduğu savlanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Güven Anıtı, Zafer Anıtı, Cumhuriyet Söylemi, Milliyetçilik

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2: POWER AND DISCOURSE.....	10
2.1 DISCOURSE.....	11
2.1.1 The Definition of Discourse.....	11
2.1.2 Discourse and the Constitution of the Object.....	20
2.1.3 Power and Discourse.....	23
2.2 POWER.....	29
CHAPTER 3: NATIONALISM, STATE CONSTRUCTION AND SPACE.....	40
3.1 NATIONALISM.....	41
3.2 STATE CONSTRUCTION AND NATIONALISM.....	47
3.2.1 Nation as the Object of Discourse.....	48
3.3 NATIONAL CENTER AND COLLECTIVE SYMBOLS.....	51
3.3.1 The Center of the Nation.....	55
3.3.2. The Symbolic Construction of the National Center through Binary Oppositions.....	58
3.3.3. Ankara and Urban Planning.....	60
CHAPTER 4: INTERVENTIONS IN URBAN SPACE: TWO MONUMENTS.....	64
4.1 MONUMENTS.....	65
4.2 ULUS SQUARE AND THE VICTORY MONUMENT.....	70
4.3 KIZILAY SQUARE AND THE GÜVEN MONUMENT.....	83
4.4 THE MONUMENTS AND THE REPUBLICAN DISCOURSE.....	93
4.4.1. Individualization, Totalization, Panopticism.....	95
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	100
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	107
APPENDIX.....	110

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In his book “The Development of the Modern State” Gianfranco Poggi explains the historical development of the modern state in Europe. In that book Poggi elaborates on the transition from feudal system of rule to the absolutist system of rule. Feudalism was the system in which feudal lords ruled their own territory. Fragmentation of large systems and increasing autonomy of feudal units were the defining characteristics of feudalism. In absolutism, “the rule rested solely with the monarch” (Poggi, 1978: 68). In order to institutionalize the transition to absolutism and his own rule, the monarch “had to increase his own prominence, had to magnify and project the majesty of his powers by greatly enlarging his court and intensifying glamour” (Poggi, 1978: 68). One of the ways to do this was the physical setting, that is, the architecture, the arrangement and ordering of space. Together with other representations of the monarch in the public space, the physical settings conveyed the image of “splendor, grace, luxury, and leisure.” (Poggi, 1978: 69) The glorious presence in front of the eyes of the public was a part of the new system of rule and contributed to the legitimization of absolutism.

Although in this thesis I refrain from using Europe/West centered theories of modernization and development, the aforementioned association between the

legitimization of rule and representation in public space can be applied to the Turkish case. This thesis is about the interventions of the state in public space in the early Republican era. It will be argued that the construction of Ankara as the capital city and the two monuments, the Victory Monument in Ulus and Güven Monument in Kızılay, in two centers of Ankara can be read as the embodiments of the republican discourse. Constructing the city and erecting those monuments, the state produced and reproduced the republican discourse. In that sense literal and symbolic construction of Ankara as the new center of the Turkish nation, gathering the symbols of the premises of the republican discourse at that center are the self-constitutive acts of the new Republic.

All the changes, adjustments done after the proclamation of the Republic can be named as the republican project. There were mainly two motivations of this project: to construct a Turkish nation and to modernize the economic, political, social and cultural spheres. The state constructed itself as the agent to realize these aims and the interventions to these ends were the self-constitutive acts of the state.

The founders of the Republic started a nation building process, however they did not call it as such. Instead, they referred to it as the awakening of the nation. This was because of their specific conceptualization of nation and definition of Turkish nation. The nationalist discourse of the early republican era has the basic premise of an already existing Turkish nation. Accordingly, those people living in Anatolia had their roots in Central Asia. The construction of history in that specific way is a part of the construction of the nation as an imagined community. Benedict Anderson argues that nation is “an imagined political community” (1991: 6) in the sense that

those bonds that link people each other are imaginary. In that sense the construction of collective history plays an important role in the creation of imaginary bonds. The reforms done after the War of Independence aimed at constructing such ‘imaginary bonds’ between people living in Anatolia and had in fact different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. The Turkish History Association was founded in 1931 with the name “Turkish History Investigation Society” (*Türk Tarihini Tetkik Cemiyeti*) (Yılmaz and et al. 1998: 213-214). The underlying assumption in the formation of this institution was the claim that Turkish nation existed before the Ottomans, Turkishness was much older than the Ottomans and Islamic culture. Another ‘reform’ designating the break with the Ottoman Empire was the Language reform and the foundation of Turkish Language Association. The aim of these was to ‘purify’ the Turkish language, to get rid of the Persian and Arabic words, and make Turkish the national language.

The importance of history and language should be acknowledged in the construction of nationhood. Language is the means through which the people communicate and produce their own symbols. Those collective symbols and the meaning attached to them are essential in the construction of community. Therefore the control over the language and the symbols means controlling the bonds that tie people into a single national community. As far as nationalist discourses are concerned, those bonds are the collective history and the collective future imagination. In this sense, the construction of history along the lines of republican premises contributes to the nation building project. The establishment of the Turkish History Association and Turkish Language Association served this function and were two of the crucial steps toward the building of the Turkish nation.

The modernization project of the early Republic is inseparable from nation building. In fact it is the continuation of Westernization movements during the late Ottoman Empire. In the early Republican discourse, ‘modern’ was defined as the West, particularly Europe. Europe was taken as the social, cultural, economic and political model of modernity. What is important here was the universality claim attached to the European experience: the political, economic and social institutions in Europe were taken as universal forms regardless of the historical processes that laid the foundations for them. The European civilization was not considered to be a specific case; rather it was taken as the universal norm. Atatürk’s statement on the issue can be an example of the association of Western experience and universality in the republican discourse:

There are a variety of countries, but there is only one civilization. In order for a nation to advance, it is necessary that it joins this civilization. If our bodies are in the East, our mentality is oriented toward the West. We want to modernize our country. All our efforts are directed toward the building of a modern, therefore Western state in Turkey. What nation is there that desires to become a part of civilization, but does not tend toward the West? (*Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri [Atatürk’s Speeches and Lectures]*, v.III, p.91) (cited in Çınar, 2005: 7)

The changes in judicial and educational systems, the alphabet, calendar, measurement system adjustments, reforms in clothing and attire are all elements of this modernization effort. The modernization and nation building processes were founded on contradicting assumptions. On the distinctive features of Eastern nationalism Kadioğlu quotes from Chatterjee: Eastern nationalism is “both imitative and hostile to the model it imitates. It is imitative in that it accepts the value of the standards set by the alien culture. But it also involves a rejection... of ancestral ways which are seen as obstacles to progress and yet also cherished as marks of

identity”(Kadıoğlu,1996: 179). For the Turkish case, on the modernization side imitation of the West and admiration of Western life style were the central premises. Nation building, however, was dependent on the self-confidence of the society as a whole vis a vis the West. The decline of the Ottoman Empire decreased the self esteem of the community. After the victory in the battlefield in the War of Independence, the ‘psychological’ victory was needed to carry out the necessary reforms. Therefore the glorification of the Turkish nation vis a vis ‘others’ and the admiration to West went hand in hand.

These two points were not the only contradicting aspects of the republican project. However these premises are accepted as they are, as if there is not any inconsistency. How is it possible that the Turkish nation and the state are founded on such paradoxes? It is the republican discourse that enabled these inconsistencies. The republican discourse, like all other discourses in the Foucauldian sense, is an arbitrary unity of statements, events, and interventions<sup>1</sup>. It has its own definitions of the nation, state, citizen, women, men, history, victory, masculinity and femininity. These definitions are made by the authority positions<sup>2</sup> of the republican discourse: the Republican elite consisting of politicians, scientists, intellectuals. The state as an institution supported and directed the production of these definitions. These definitions and therefore the founding discourse were institutionalized through the interventions of the state which were named as reforms/regulations at that time.

---

<sup>1</sup> This point is discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

<sup>2</sup> Authority positions are the ones produced by the discourse and they contribute to the reproduction and institutionalization of that discourse. The positions and their interrelations constructed by the discourse are discussed further in Chapter 2.

The educational, cultural and social reforms were not directly linked to formal political institutions and the routine functioning of the state. However, they contributed to the institutionalization of the republican discourse out of which they themselves came. Those reforms were the representations of this discourse in particular areas: adaptation of laws in judiciary, unification of education, the new pedagogical methods and curriculum in education. Through the penetration of these reforms to minor details of individual and social life, republican premises were internalized. This socialization into the republican discourse, supported by the newly created institutional basis contributed to the legitimization of the new regime. The republican discourse regulated social life through interventions: what to wear, how to speak and write, proper ways of worship, the limits and conditions of the existence of women in the public sphere and other such practices were defined and set by the discourse. The republican discourse also intervened in private life: the civil code, the family law, the definition of the new citizen. These all contributed to the production of new subjectivities. These interventions produced and reproduced the republican discourse and constructed the Turkish nation and Turkish state; the state made those reforms which in turn contributed to the institutionalization of the republican discourse. It is this republican discourse that situates the state in the authority position vis a vis the public.

In this thesis I choose to use the term ‘intervention’ instead of reform and regulation to emphasize the difference between the two and the underlying assumptions of using the latter ones. These ‘regulations’ may be taken-for-granted for those people living under the rule of modern state. Those areas considered as the legitimate spheres of state regulation were not controlled and standardized by the

state in the Ottoman rule in particular, and before the emergence of the modern state in general. The word ‘intervention’ connotes the idea that the act in question is beyond the actual limits of the subject. A person intervenes in an area that does not belong to him/her. This is the case for the modern regulations of the state. Since the construction of the new nation, and thus the state, necessitated the creation of the new Turkish citizen, the intervention in areas like education, social relations, dressing, alphabet, were taken as regulations (of the own sphere of the state). The use of the terms regulation and reform legitimizes the intervention of the state into a sphere which does not belong to it. Therefore, the use of regulation and reform also connotes that these spheres belong to the state. That is to say, the intervention is natural. Since in the early republican period, the control and regulation of the state in the capillaries of the society was a new phenomenon, this act will be referred to as an intervention.

The intervention of the state in the public space is similar in terms of its role in this self-constitution. Starting from the first years of the republic, reforms in public space had started. For villages, “ideal village models” (for further information Bozdoğan 2002, 114-121) were designed not only to modernize the Turkish village, but also and more importantly, to create the notion of the Turkish village. In cities, the project of planning was started, taking capital city Ankara as the starting point as well as the national model for the building of other cities. The notion of planning was an innovation, and the modernist premises of rationalization, efficiency, and a new understanding of aesthetics were inherent in the new paradigms of urban planning.

Apart from these different forms of intervention in public space and urban planning, their content are also a part of self- construction of the state. The creation of the city center, embellished with the symbols of the Turkish nation, served to the individual and collective identity construction. Especially the monuments, with their compositions epitomizing the history, features and desired future aims of the nation, represented and contributed to the institutionalization of the republican discourse, and thus the construction of the Turkish state itself.

The second chapter of this thesis focuses on the concepts of discourse and power. Relating the concepts of discourse and power, this chapter constitutes the theoretical and conceptual basis of this thesis. Discourse is defined as the arbitrary unity of dispersed events with underlying assumptions. These underlying assumptions are unity, continuity, modernity in the case of the construction of the Turkish state. The discourse constitutes its objects and the relations between these objects. Those relations defined and regulated by the discourse are power relations. Therefore the intervention in the public space by the state is a power relation between the authority position (the state) and the subjugated positions (the public).

The third chapter focuses on the relationship between state construction, nationalism and space. The creation of the national center in Ankara is important because it is the starting point of the interventions in space in terms of shaping, ordering, and regulating. Nationhood is constructed through the imaginary bonds, and in this case space becomes the ‘common language’ through which symbols are communicated. Ankara was constructed as the capital city and the center of the nation. This center was embellished with the symbols of the premises of the Republic.

The fourth chapter analyzes two specific symbols of the republican project: the Victory Monument in Ulus Square and the Güven Monument in Kızılay Square. Victory Monument was erected in 1927 and is the first monument in Ankara. It is the embodiment of the founding discourse of the Turkish Republic. It has the theme of War of Independence which is thought to be turning point in the history of the Turkish nation in the Founding discourse. The second monument analyzed is the Güven Monument in Kızılay Square. It was erected in 1934 with the themes of internal security and self-confidence. The difference in the representation of women, men, Atatürk in these two monuments gives insights about the changes in the republican discourse.

## **CHAPTER 2: POWER AND DISCOURSE**

In this chapter I will pose the question of how Foucault's concept of power can be used in the analysis of the relationship between power and public space. Foucault conceptualizes the notion of power through its relationship with discourse. It is discourse that constructs its objects and the relationship between them. What is important in these relations is the inherent hierarchy between the objects. These hierarchical relations are power relations that are the focus of this thesis. The discourse in question is the founding/republican discourse of the early republican era. The Turkish state, through its institutions, is both the producer and the subject of this discourse. The state produces the discourse and the relations this discourse constructs puts the state in the authority position in its relations to the public. Here public, the subjugated position in its relation to the state, refers to the people who are named, labeled, categorized and whose knowledge is used to intervene to their lives. State intervenes in the public space; this intervention takes place in the cases of developing plans for cities, building squares, erecting monuments and constructing the space people live in. I argue that, this construction is a part of state's self-constitutive acts; these interventions are one of the ways for the state to produce its founding discourse which in return places the state in the authority position. The representation of the

symbols of this discourse in the public space contributes to the reproduction of this discourse and thus the power relation between the state and the people. These interventions are one of the ways the state produces and reproduces its power. In order to analyze this relationship, first the concept of discourse, then its relation with power and lastly self-construction of the state discourse through public space will be examined.

## **2.1 DISCOURSE**

To define the term discourse in the Foucauldian sense is a difficult task, since Foucault himself does not have a unique definition of the term. To begin with a general definition, discourse is the totality of an institution, professionals ‘speaking’ and acting in the name of this institution and taking their authority from it, a body of knowledge and practice, and the relations between these elements that construct the objects and the arbitrary relations between. This explanation includes some aspects of the concept of discourse; and therefore it excludes many of them. In the following pages, I will try to explain these aspects.

### **2.1.1 The Definition of Discourse**

In the book *The Order of Things*, Foucault explains how the discourses on living things, economy and literature had changed in the nineteenth century (1970). His analysis of these bodies of knowledge is the foundation of his theory of discourse. Two concepts are central in his study of these bodies of knowledge:

discontinuity and arbitrariness. Foucault explains how these notions of discontinuity and arbitrariness lay at the foundations of the discourses of natural history, analysis of wealth and literature and their 'transition' into the bodies of knowledge of biology, political economy and grammar respectively.

Foucault, in his Preface to *The Order of Things*, quotes a passage from Borges. This is taken from a Chinese encyclopedia and is on the classification of animals. This example of classification is a summary of many claims that are made in that book, but here the focus will be on arbitrariness. This frequently quoted passage is as follows:

...animals are divided into: (a) belonging to the Emperor, (b) embalmed, (c) tame, (d) sucking pigs, (e) sirens, (f) fabulous, (g) stray dogs, (h) included in the present classification, (i) frenzied, (j) innumerable, (k) drawn with a very fine camelhair brush, (l) et cetera, (m) having just broken the water pitcher, (n) that from a long way off look like flies (1970: xv)

In this classification, the arbitrariness is obvious for us, for a person that –is not familiar with that period's discourse on animals. However, this was the way animals were grouped in those times. It is difficult to find the criteria these categories are founded upon. Nevertheless, they are linked together here. If this paragraph is taken as a discourse on animals in a particular period of time, in China, then the centrality of the concept of arbitrariness to discourse becomes clearer. These categories can be considered as objects of discourse. They do not have natural, intrinsic relations between themselves. Apart from this categorization, it is highly unlikely to see these placed side by side. Discourse creates these categories, and lists them as if they are in relation to each other. The arbitrariness then implies that

events, facts, statements that are not essentially related to each other are gathered under an arbitrary umbrella of meaning attached to them through arbitrary links.

What is important for this arbitrariness is that this togetherness is perceived as a unity having continuity on its own. This unity and continuity refers both to the production of knowledge on the objects of discourse and on the construction of these objects. When the categories are like the ones in the example from the Chinese encyclopedia, it is easy to understand the discourse as a 'togetherness of unrelated events'. However, when the discourse in question is one of those that we 'accept' today, such as the classification of animals, this may raise questions - whose answers may challenge the arbitrary unity of unrelated events-: how a cat is different from a dog, a bird from a bat? How a penguin and a pigeon can be in the same category? In the classification of fish, frog, reptile, bird and mammals, what is the founding criterion that leads this classification? Since the answers given today are different than the ones that were given two centuries ago and probably different from the ones that will be given in the following two centuries, and because of the shaky grounds on which these classifications rise, every classification in the name of unity and continuity is arbitrary.

At the beginning of the first chapter of *Archeology of Knowledge*, The Unities of Discourse, Foucault argues that the concept of discontinuity poses theoretical problems especially in the history of knowledge or of science (1972a: 21). It is problematic because it challenges the theme of continuity. The theme of continuity is dominant in the history of sciences. Tradition, influence, development, evolution,

and spirit are among the notions that are used unquestionably. All of these concepts have an underlying assumption of continuity. For example, explaining successive events with the notion of development or evolution implies that these events follow a particular line of succession and are governed by the same essential principle. The notion of spirit has a similar effect: it implies that there is “community of meanings, symbolic links, an interplay of resemblance and reflection” (Foucault, 1972a: 22) among the events of a given period. In these cases, continuity is a claim that hides the arbitrary togetherness of the events.

What Foucault means by discontinuity is the challenge to those assumptions of continuity. Accordingly, those events that are explained with the concepts of development and/or spirit do not have a coherent, collective organization. They are dispersed events: they do not follow each other because of a core principle. It is discourse that gathers these dispersed events and groups them. Moreover, taken-for-grantedness is a central feature of discourse: its premises and claims of unity and continuity are not questioned and accepted beforehand. Discontinuity is a challenge in that respect: it provides questioning what is being presented as a coherent whole, not accepting before examination. In this way, the claim of continuity arbitrarily imposed on dispersed events comes out.

The arbitrariness is masked also with the unity claim of the discourse. This claim implies that discursive events, explanations and all the others included in a particular discourse form a unity. Foucault explains the concept of unity by giving examples of the unity of a book and oeuvre of an author. Accordingly, a book may seem simply the total of the covers and the pages. However, it is much more than that; it transcends itself through the references given to other sources and through its

relations to others. This raises the question that “what are the limits of the unity of the book?” If the book has a unity of its own, then it should have limits defining that unity. However, there are references in a book to other sources, and other texts make reference to that book. Since the total of the cover and the pages are in constant relation to other texts, its unity cannot be determined easily in a fixed way. Therefore, the “unity is variable and relative” (Foucault, 1972a: 23).

The unity of oeuvre raises similar questions to the ones raised by the unity of a book. The unity of a book can be challenged by questioning the limits of that text. The unity of an oeuvre can be challenged by asking what should be included. Is it all texts of the author, or all the ones that were published? Should one include the incomplete texts or the first drafts? These questions raise another problem regarding the unity of discourse: can unity be a complete whole? Like the unity of a book, the unity of an oeuvre is relative and variable: it depends on the person/authority making the definition of unity.

The taken-for-grantedness aspect of discourse plays an important role in the notion of unity, too. The unity claim is valid as far as it is not questioned. If the limits of ‘unity’ are questioned, “it loses its self-evidence, it indicates itself, constructs itself, only on the basis of a complex field of discourse” (Foucault, 1972a: 23). The book is no more a unity as soon as the references and other links are acknowledged. The oeuvre does not have a unity when its content is questioned.

Taken-for granted unity and continuity on the one hand, arbitrariness embedded in the discourse itself on the other hand contribute to each other. The unity and continuity claims hide the constructed aspect of the discourse. The togetherness of the dispersed events is considered as a natural unity and a part of a coherent continuity. Since the unity and the continuity seemingly embedded in the discourse itself, they are not questioned and considered as an inherent characteristic. What Foucault suggests here is not totally rejecting the pre-existing unities. Instead, he accepts them for the time being and formulates a new theory on that basis. For example, he does not reject medicine, grammar or political economy. He suspends the questions concerning the validity of these pre-existing continuities although they have taken-for-granted unity and continuity claims based on arbitrary organization of the events and the field. Then, he suggests formulation of a theory that can explain these “unities”. In order to come up with such a theory, the events, the facts with which a particular discourse is dealing should be regarded in their own individuality. For example there are a group of dispersed events, facts which are explained by a particular discourse as a part of a harmonious whole and as a step in the development process. Since these claims are imposed on these discursive events, what should be done is not to take the unity as it is, but take pure events, facts and analyze how they have become a part of an arbitrary whole. These parts of discourse should be analyzed on their own to explain the unities they form, how they have become a part of that unity, what laws govern this unity and continuity. In this way, the field is freed from the claims imposed on it.

Foucault defines the material a discourse is dealing with as discursive events. These discursive events form a finite grouping. They may be innumerable; they may

not be recorded, memorized or read totally. However, this group is always limited and finite. What is important in the analysis of these discursive events is their togetherness. The pure description of these events poses the question that “how is that one particular statement appears rather than another?” (Foucault, 1972a: 27). This question underlines the arbitrary organization of the field: there are always other alternatives in terms of the unity of the discourse: those included and excluded may change. Since the content of a discourse is not essential to it, it may be structured some other way.

Before coming to Foucauldian discourse analysis, it is necessary to explain what Foucault means by an event. An event is not necessarily something concrete or abstract. Its relations to other events constitute its conditions of existence. On this note, Foucault says,

Events are not corporeal. And yet, an event is certainly not immaterial; it takes effect, becomes effect, always on the level of materiality. Events have their place; they consist in relation to, coexistence with, dispersion of, the cross-checking accumulation and the selection of material elements; it occurs as an effect of, and in, material dispersion. (1972b: 231)

Foucault’s discourse analysis starts with a pure description of discursive events. The event must be grasped in the specific conditions of its occurrence and existence. Its inclusive and exclusive relations to other events must be considered. The discourse analysis on the basis of dispersed events has mainly three interrelated purposes. First of all, through the suspension of all given unities it becomes possible to “restore to the statement<sup>3</sup> the specificity of its occurrence” (Foucault, 1972a: 28). The discursive event is unique, it is in relation to other events and the conditions both that gave rise to it and that it causes. Its arbitrary coexistence with others and

---

<sup>3</sup> Foucault uses statement and event interchangeable as a part of a particular discourse.

classification can be eliminated when it is analyzed as a unique event rather than an element contributing to a unity or than a step in development. While this first purpose underlines discontinuity, the second and the third ones emphasize arbitrariness.

Secondly, the suspension of unities enables one to “grasp other forms of regularity, other forms of relations” (Foucault, 1972a: 29). Discourse, through naming, grouping, labeling defines its discursive events. These events are in relation to each other and these relations are governed by the discourse. These relations may be causal ones if the discourse has a theme of continuity in terms of development or evolution. Furthermore, these relations may be hierarchical ones regulating the interaction between the objects of discourse. For example, the discourse of medicine regulates the relation of the doctor and the patient through the authority position attached to the former and the subjugated position attached to the latter. Questioning the unity, therefore, enables one to be aware of the arbitrariness of these relations and to formulate other ways of relations within the discourse itself. In this way, the taken-for-grantedness of the given explanation becomes evident, and the possibility of other forms of explanations appears. This opens the way for a search for alternatives.

The third purpose is a related one: it is a challenge outside the given unity: the recognition of the possibility of other unities comes out. However, this alternative unity is not founded on arbitrariness which is masked by taken-for-grantedness. Rather, it is possible “by means of a group of controlled decisions” (Foucault, 1972a:

29). If arbitrariness is eliminated and the conditions of togetherness and even unity are defined clearly, an alternative unity is possible. This third purpose goes beyond the level of “pure description of discursive events”. In this way, the discourse analysis which has started with defining dispersed events can lead to another unity, yet not arbitrary.

In search for legitimate grounds for the unity of discourse, Foucault criticizes basically four hypotheses regarding the founding principles of discourses. Accordingly, reference to the same object, the form and type of connexion, a system of permanent and coherent concepts, the identity and persistence of themes cannot be legitimate grounds for the unity of discourse. In all of those, what appears is a system of dispersion in which regularity cannot be detected: there is not “an order in their [event’s] successive appearance, correlations in their simultaneity, assignable positions in a common space, a reciprocal functioning, linked and hierarchized transformations” (Foucault, 1972a: 37). But there are series full of gaps, interplay of differences, heterogeneity that should not be linked together, and overall a system of dispersion. When the two conditions of first the unity claim and second the seemingly unity of dispersed events combine, what Foucault calls, discursive formation emerges. In this case, there is the togetherness of discursive events on the one hand and the unity, continuity assertions on the other. The elements of discursive formation are subject to rules of formation which are “conditions of existence (but also of coexistence, maintenance, modification, and disappearance) in a given discursive division” (Foucault, 1972a: 38).

### **2.1.2 Discourse and the constitution of the object.**

Discourse constitutes its object. Foucault gives the example of the relationship between medicine and mental illness as the object of medicine: “mental illness was constituted by all that was said in all the statements that named it, divided it up, described it, explained it, traced its developments, indicated its various correlations, judged it, and possibly gave it speech by articulating, in its name, discourses that were to be taken as its own” (Foucault, 1972a: 32). Discursive formations produce the object about which they speak. The object of discourse is not outside that discourse. Its conditions of existence as an object of a particular discourse depend on its involvement by the discourse through naming, classification and construction of hierarchical relations.

Foucault explains the relationship between a particular discourse and the formation of the objects of this discourse using the example of the discourse of psychopathology and its objects as “minor behavioral disorders, sexual aberrations and disturbances, the phenomena of suggestion and hypnosis, lesions of the central nervous system, deficiencies of intellectual or motor adaptation, criminality”(1972a: 40). These situations are not essentially a part of a coherent unity, that is psychopathology. The discourse of psychopathology names and defines these situations. Psychopathology also has its definition of a normal behavior and a normal mental condition. Then, the mentioned conditions and types of behavior become abnormal compared to the definition of normal of the discourse of psychopathology. Discourse analyzes, cures, redefines these conditions. All of these processes make

those mentioned the objects of discourse. Discourse names, analyzes, classifies dispersed events and forms a “unity” out of that. Furthermore, discourse constructs arbitrary, yet hierarchical relations between its objects. It is power that emerges in these relations which will be explained later in this paper.

Minor behavioral disorder, for example, gains an existence as a specific abnormality as the discourse names, analyzes and categorizes it. This activity, also defines the limits of discourse, and produces its “unity”. Foucault mentions authorities of delimitation as those that decide the content of discourse and the limits of its unity. These authorities are the institution with its own rules, group of professionals taking their authority from the institution, the body of knowledge and practice, and an authority recognized by public opinion. These elements and the relationship between them determine the content of discourse and its functioning with regard to the formation of objects.

The process of naming and categorizing is, however, a complex one which can be examined in detail in terms of the relations that are at work. According to Foucault, the formation of objects is “made possible by a group of relations established between authorities of emergence, delimitation and specification” (1972a: 44). The object becomes the object of discourse through “the positive conditions of a complex group of relations” (Foucault, 1972a: 45). This means that the object does not have an existence on its own beforehand. These relations can be summarized in three steps. In the first one, the object starts to appear: when anything

can be said about the object and at the same time different things can be said on the basis of resemblance, proximity, distance, difference and transformation.

Secondly, the relations outside the field of that particular discourse are at work. “The relations between institutions, economic and social processes, behavioral patterns, systems of norms, techniques, types of classification, modes of characterization” (Foucault, 1972a: 45) define the conditions of emergence of the object of discourse. It is these relations that define the relations of the object to others. They mark the object, define how it is different from the others and place it in a position vis a vis others.

Discursive relations, which constitute the third step, are different from the ones that are totally independent from the discourse itself, that is, primary relations. Foucault also mentions secondary relations as the ones in the discourse itself. Discursive relations that characterize the discourse as a practice are at the limits of discourse. They are not related to the inner functioning or the limitation of discourse, rather they “determine the group of relations that discourse must establish in order to speak of this or that object, in order to deal with them, name them, analyze them, classify them, explain them”( Foucault, 1972a: 46). Those relations between the subject positions constituted by the discourse are hierarchical, and they can be explained better with the introduction of the relationship between power and discourse.

### **2.1.3 Power and Discourse**

The relations that are established by discourse are very important in the conceptualization of power in Foucauldian terms. According to Foucault, power does not have a substance and it exists in relations. He differentiates relations of power from other types of relations like communication and exchange. What is important in power relations is the position of the parties to each other. The positions of the parts of power relation are determined by the discourse dominant in that field. The parts, which appear in binaries that define each other in their relation to each other, can be defined as the authority position and subjugated position. Authority position is the knowing subject, the doctor in her relation to the patient, the teacher in his relation to the student, the guardian in her relation to the prisoner. Subjugated position is the one that is being defined, classified and positioned in a hierarchically lower status. However, what is common to both sides is that they are both the subjects of discourse; their positions are defined by the discourse. Yet, discourse favors the authority position, and hinders the other one. In that respect, authority position contributes to the production and reproduction of discourse and the subjugated position may challenge it.

The authority position can be examined in two aspects: the speaking subject and the institution. The speaking subject is the person who is accorded the right to use the discourse in the name of 'truth'. That person has competence and knowledge granted by the institution: s/he has the right to claim the truth and to practice knowledge, and extend it. The speaking subject is also subject to differentiation and

relations. Its relations to other speaking subjects and its position in that hierarchical order define the position of the speaking subject. Speaking from that position, the authority position is 'accepted' as the bearer of truth in its specific field. Accordingly, the statements which are regarded as truths cannot come from anybody. The existence of statements as taken for granted truths "cannot be dissociated from the statutorily defined person who has the right to make them" (Foucault, 1972a: 51). The institution is another authority position. Foucault describes institutional sites as the authority from which the speaking subject makes his/her discourse, and "from which this discourse derives its legitimate source and point of application" (1972a: 51). The hospital, school, state can be the examples of institutions from which a particular discourse derives and relies on.

In his article, *The Discourse on Language*, Foucault explains the procedures of control of discourse. These procedures are essential to the relation between power and discourse.

The production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, and organized and redistributed according to a certain number of procedures, whose role is to avert its powers and its dangers, to cope with chance events, and to evade its ponderous, awesome materiality. (Foucault, 1972b: 216)

These procedures are rules of exclusion, rules of limitation and rules of appropriation. Among these procedures, rules of exclusion are important in terms of the relation between power and discourse. The rules of exclusion come into being in three different notions: prohibition, division and rejection, and the opposition between true and false. Prohibition is of three kinds "covering objects, ritual with its surrounding circumstances, the privileged or exclusive right to speak of a particular

object” (Foucault, 1972b: 216). These complementary types form a web which controls discourse from outside. A person cannot speak of anything at any time, at any condition. What prohibits this is the controlling procedure of exclusion. Speech on its own may appear to be innocent and neutral, however, when the things that are prohibited and therefore excluded are recognized –or the existence of exclusion is acknowledged- the relationship between discourse and power becomes obvious. What determines the prohibition, the proper thing to say and not to say is the relations of power that define, construct and are inherent to discourse. Therefore, the discourse becomes an arena of conflict: “speech is no more verbalization of conflicts and systems of domination, but it is the very object of man’s conflicts” (Foucault, 1972b: 216).

Division and rejection are the second form in which the system of exclusion is embodied. Foucault gives the opposition of reason and folly. How is the division between reason and folly made? What are the criteria, and what/who decides on those criteria? Furthermore, based on division, how is it the case that one side of the division is rejected and other is accepted? The answers to these questions are related to the power relations and the arbitrariness inherent to discourse. The notion of arbitrariness, combined with naturalness/taken-for-grantedness makes the divisions seem as neutral, free from power relations. Foucault gives the example of the words of a mad man. There are times that his words are totally ignored and conversely, times that his words are credited and praised. The words may even be the same. Furthermore, what makes him labeled as mad is his words. Then, the division of mad and sane, the rejection of the former are made on questionable grounds. And when

these ground are questioned, like the grounds of prohibition, power relations that construct and are constructed by discourse come to the fore.

The opposition between true and false as the third system of exclusion is closely connected to the previous ones. Foucault argues that, as opposed to the previous systems that are “arbitrary in origin” and “supported by a system of institutions imposing and manipulating them”, the opposition between true and false is historically constituted. Foucault bases the roots of “true” and the value attached to it in the works of sixth century Greek poets. True discourse was respected and it dominated all. These derived from true discourse’s predicting the future, or rather self-realization. The true discourse was the one that predicts the future: by “not merely announcing what was going to occur, but contributing to its actual event, carrying men along with it and thus weaving itself into the fabric of fate” (Foucault, 1972b: 218).

The historically constituted division between true and false explains the will to knowledge. Accordingly, the changes in science in terms of its content and methodology in particular, and in terms of its conceptualization and status in general can be considered as the embodiments of new forms of will to truth. Emergence of science, then, depends on the realization of that will to truth. Will to knowledge defines the objects of science: observable, measurable, classifiable. Will to knowledge defines the status and the functions of the knowing subject: “look rather than read, verify rather than comment”. And will to knowledge imposes the conditions of existence of science, that is, “the technological level at which

knowledge could be employed in order to be verifiable and useful” (Foucault, 1972b: 218). However, the emergence of science and the status it has are made possible with the institutional support. The institution is the producer of knowledge and the one that claims its truth. Furthermore, institution is the one that constitutes itself as the only legitimate source of knowledge, as the only bearer of truth.

With the institutional support, the will to knowledge “tends to exercise a sort of pressure, a power of constraint upon other forms of discourse” (Foucault, 1972b: 219). Foucault gives the examples of Western literature, economic practices, Penal code as rationalizing their content and justifying their existence through scientific discourse which claims the truth. In that respect, any discourse that does not ground itself on true discourse and its sole bearer science has no authority, no reliability. This explains the authority position of scientific knowledge and its status in society and among other discourses. Will to truth as the third system of exclusion assimilates others “in order both to modify them and to provide them with a firm foundation” (Foucault, 1972b: 219). This last system invades the previous two; while those are becoming more fragile, the will to truth gets stronger and deeper. Through its institutionalization, through leading the systems of exclusion, will to truth becomes the embodiment of the power relations. It is true discourse that constructs power relations and in return, power relations maintain and reproduce that discourse.

In one of his lectures, Foucault elaborates on the relationship between power and discourse (1980: 93). There is a reciprocal interaction among them and therefore Foucault hesitates to take the traditional view that discourse of truth fixes the limits

to the rights of power. Rather he asks the question that “what rules of right are implemented by the relations of power in the production of discourses of truth?” (1980: 93). According to him various relations of power infuse in, define and construct the social body and its relations. The production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse is what establishes, consolidates and implements power relations. “There can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth which operates through and on the basis of this association” (Foucault, 1980: 93). Discourse defines and constructs its objects and the relationship between these objects. The hierarchical relations between the objects of discourse, that is between authority and subjugated positions, is power relations.

Simultaneously, power contributes to the production and reproduction of discourse. Authority position maintains that status as long as it contributes to the reproduction of the discourse. It is through producing knowledge, defining, dividing, classifying and intervening in objects that power relations come into being. Therefore, Foucault notes that “we are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through production of truth” (1980: 93).

Discourse surrounds us and we get used to it so that it becomes invisible and natural. The arbitrary gathering of dispersed events under the claims of unity and continuity thus becomes possible. Discourse names, defines and in this way constitutes its object and its relation to other objects. This point illuminates the indivisibility of power and discourse. Power exists in relations that are constructed by discourse. And the production and reproduction of discourse and its naturalness depends on the functioning of these relations.

## 2.2 POWER

The first part of this chapter was on the concept of discourse and its relationship with power. In this second part, the focus will be more on the concept of power itself and the functioning of the relations of power.

The concept of power is the central issue of political science. The conceptualization of power lies at the foundation of state theories, authority, legitimacy, and freedom. Traditional conceptualizations of power assume that power has a substance of its own: it is something that exists independently of the one(s) who exercise it and the one(s) over whom it is exercised. Hobbes in his *Leviathan* argues that “The POWER of a Man, (to take it Universally), is his present means, to obtain some future apparent Good” (Hobbes, 1985:150). The greatest power is that of the commonwealth which is formed through the transfer of everyman’s power to the sovereign and renounce their right to govern themselves to the sovereign. Locke has a similar conceptualization of power:

Political power, then, I take to be a right of making laws with penalties of death, and consequently all less penalties, for the regulating and preserving of property, and of employing the force of the community, in the execution of such laws, and in the defense of the commonwealth from foreign injury, and all this only for the public good. (Locke, 262)

In these conceptualizations of power, and in the political science literature that derives from these sources, power is theorized as something that can be owned. In this conceptualization the main concern is, then, who owns the power, to what extent that person or group owns that power. The ownership or lack of power locates the interacting parts in fixed positions. The state, the sovereign, however one names it, has the power and it exercises this power over the ruled ones. The relationship

between these fixed positions is considered to be either a continuous struggle or harmony depending on the underlying assumptions on human nature, and the essence of political activity. The existence or the absence of human nature, whether it is taken as good or evil at the outset are important in the way power is theorized. These macro-level theories about the formation, institutionalization and legitimization of political power aim to establish the conceptual basis of the state and the rule of authority over people. This notion of power is applicable to macro level analysis, that is, the relation of the state with the people.

The shortcomings of this notion are not very much recognized when the relation in question is between the state and the people, because by its nature the state exercises power. However, if one tries to deepen this analysis and expand its scope to other relations, the inadequacies become more evident. With this notion, one cannot explain the relations that are not regulated by law, that are not between the state institutions and their counterparts. Furthermore, this conceptualization does not explain the dynamics behind the power relations. It does not question the conditions of existence as the authority and subjugated positions.

Foucault's conceptualization of power is different. According to Foucault, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, power does not have a substance. It does not have an existence independent of the context it emerges from: "Power exists only when it is put into action" (Foucault, 1982:219). This implies that it is not something one can own or lack. The positions of authority and subjugated emerge during this relation, and are special to that specific situation. Since power exists in power relations; it is something that emerges in the course of a kind of relationship. However, not all relations are power relations; power relations are "specific, that is, they have nothing

to do with exchange, production, communication, even though they combine with them”(Foucault, 1988: 83). What is peculiar in a power relation is the discourse that constructs this relation. Discourse, as explained in the first part of this chapter, constitutes its objects and the relationship between these objects. It constitutes the authority and subjugated positions which are filled by the ones involved in these relations. Therefore, any kind of communication or exchange is not a power relation: the parts of the relation and their position vis a vis each other are defined by the discourse in that field. For example medical discourse constitutes its objects as illness, patient, and the doctor, and defines the relationship between them. Here, hierarchy comes out as an inherent component of this relation. The interacting parts are not equals; within the limits of functioning of a particular discourse, the positions are constructed in such a way that one side –the authority position- has the authority to label, analyze, intervene into the other side –the subjugated position-. Intervention, influence and determination of one side – authority position- to the other side- subjugated position-. Power is something that is “not only exerted over things but also gives the ability to modify, use, consume, or destroy them”(Foucault, 1982: 217).

The ‘essence’ of power, its relational core, means that both sides reciprocally contribute. The contribution of the authority position to the relationship is the rationalization, categorization -based on the knowledge power has inherent in it-, imposing those categories on the ones in subjugated position through disciplinary methods. “The means of correct training, that is, hierarchical observation, normalizing judgement and their combination in a procedure that is specific to it, the examination”(Foucault, 1979: 170), and panopticism are the methods through which

the power position intervenes into the subjugated position. Acting and speaking through the discourse coupled with the institutional support, the authority position names, analyzes, categorizes and at the end legitimizes its intervention. The contribution of the subjugated position to the relationship is resistance. Without the contributions of power position that will not be a power relation, and the same is valid for resistance. If the subject does not resist, that is force being exerted, not power. The aim of resistance is “to attack not so much ‘such or such’ an institution of power, or group, or elite, or class, but rather a technique, a form of power.”(Foucault, 1982:212)

According to Foucault the mechanisms of the modern state are borrowed from an older power technique, the pastoral power. Pastoral power is a technique, which originated in the church. Pastor is the religious leader, the first meaning of the word, and he is the shepherd taking care of the flock. The role pastor plays is the combination of those two meanings: the shepherd/religious leader directs the flock in the name of religion, in the name of a sacred goal. The pastor is in relation to the flock and the individual –as a part of the flock- at the same time. “The shepherd gathers together, guides and leads his flock” (Foucault, 1988: 61), and is devoted to the salvation of the flock. This sacred aim legitimizes the rule of pastor over the people. In his relation to the individual, the pastor deals with the individual for a lifetime and in every detail. Through the practice of confession, the pastor has the knowledge of each individual, again in the name of a sacred mission: individual salvation. In order to be able to lead the people, the pastor needs the individual and total knowledge of them, and obedient individuals that will make up the community. In his relation to the pastor, a person is both an individual – who confesses, and in

line with this confession imposed an individual salvation path by the pastor-, and a part of the flock –who must also follow the collective salvation path. This two-dimensional relationship is the basis of two principles of pastoral power that are inherited by the modern state; simultaneous individualization and totalization.

The individualization of the subject emerges in the course of its relation to power position. The state, the one in power position – has the knowledge of a person as that particular individual. The discourse constructs subjectivities and its taken-for-grantedness makes people accept them. For example, the state has the knowledge of every individual living within the borders of the country. Their gender, birth date, birth place, family information, address, occupation, income, education and numerous details about the capillaries of life are recorded by the state. Power, having the knowledge of each individual, “categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize him”(Foucault, 1982: 212). This individual is made a subject as he is tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge, and being tied to himself, the individual submits him to others in this way. Accepting the definition of the power position for her/him self, the person places her/him self to the subjugated position and this way those positions are legitimized.

The individualization is based on the recognition of the difference of the individual both by the power and the individual. The individual recognizes his peculiarity in the course of resistance to power. The struggles against power question the status of the individual; that is, the position of a person in a particular discourse.

In doing so, they maintain the right to be different thus, “underline everything which makes individuals truly individual.”(Foucault, 1982: 212). As power is relational, the subjugated and authority positions emerge during the relationship. The different ways of one’s resisting to power, or involving in power relation as the subjugated position distinguishes one person from another. The one in authority position uses this individual identity to exercise power; power categorizes the individual, and those categories are value laden: being sane and healthy are normal and good, and the opposites are abnormal and should be corrected. The means of correct training are necessary for the exercise of power, and the marked subject is a precondition for means of correct training:

In a system of discipline, the child is more individualized than the adult, the patient more than the healthy man, the madman and the delinquent more than the normal and the non-delinquent. In each case, it is towards the first of these pairs that all the individualizing mechanisms are turned in our civilization; and when one wishes to individualize the healthy, normal and law-abiding adult, it is always by asking him how much of the child he has in him, what secret madness lies within him, what fundamental crime he has dreamt of committing. (Foucault, 1979: 193)

As far as power is able to mark the individual by his own peculiar “deviance”, it is able to intervene in the name of normalization. The individual accepts the identity imposed on him, and in this way is subject to power. Through the manipulation of those identities, power is able to maintain its position. The refusal of what we are is the solution to this; we should refuse to be attached to those identities to which we are subjected.

The totalization function of power takes place at the same time with individualization; Foucault describes this in the following way:

Interest at the level of consciousness of each individual who goes to make up the population, and the interest considered the interest of the population

regardless of what the particular interests and aspirations may be of the individuals who compose it, this is the new target and the fundamental instrument of the government of population: the birth of a new art, or at any rate of range of absolutely new tactics and techniques(1991: 100).

The state has the knowledge of people as a totality, deals with the population as the collectivity of individuals. Having the knowledge of every individual, the modern state uses the knowledge in a “globalizing, quantitative” way, “concerning the population”( Foucault, 1982: 215). Using statistics, the modern state utilizes the knowledge: this “reveals that population has its own regularities, .... Statistics make it possible to quantify these specific phenomena of population”(Foucault, 1991: 99). As the pastor directs the flock as a whole in the name of a sacred end, the state invents itself an end that will legitimize its rule over that population. To that end, the creation of collective identities is needed. Any kind of technique that creates the feeling of totality can be regarded as totalization. Addressing those people as if they form a whole, public education, rituals that foster the feeling of collectivity and belonging are the ways through which the categories founded by discourse are produced and reproduced. Power, like in the case of individualization, invents categories and fills them with the qualifications. On the basis of collective identities, people recognize themselves as members of a group, a nation, and a state. It is through the acceptance and internalization of such collective identities, that the exercise of power over those people at the same time is possible.

The individual, both subjected to individualization and totalization, is fabricated by a specific technology of power: discipline. “Discipline ‘makes’ individuals; it is the specific technique of a power that regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise.”(Foucault, 1979: 170) Authority position/speaking subject, using knowledge, constantly makes division between

normal and abnormal, those labels that are taken for granted. Its authority within that discourse and the taken-for-grantedness of the discourse enable this. Through division and rejection, discourse has categories in the form of binary oppositions. One side of this opposition is regarded as the norm and the other side as the abnormal, outside the norm that should be brought within the definition of the normal. The application of ‘binary branding’ and the “techniques and institutions for measuring, supervising and correcting the abnormal”(Foucault, 1979: 199) are the two essential components of disciplinary mechanism.

In order to explain disciplinary society, Foucault uses the prison model developed by Bentham, panopticon. In this model of prison, there is a ring shaped building and a tower at the center of the ring. The ring shaped building is for the prisoners, and the tower is for the guardians. The ring shaped building is divided into cells each of which has two windows: one looking the inner side of the ring, and the other to the outer side. This design of the cells allow the daylight to pass through whole cells, and make all the prisoners easily seen by the ones in the tower at the center. The guardian, ‘overseer’ in the tower is then able to observe all the prisoners in the Panopticon. The prisoners in the cells cannot see if there is someone in the tower watching them. The invisibility of the overseer creates the feeling that they are being watched continuously. “And this invisibility is a guarantee of order” (Foucault, 1979: 200). The prisoners internalize the gaze of the guardian; they always act as if they are being watched. The aim in designing such a prison was to produce an effective system of supervision, in fact, to be able to observe the maximum number of prisoners, with a minimum number of overseers. Internalizing the effects of surveillance, the prisoners turn into compliant men of system. The naturalization of

the discourse and submission to the premises of the discourse and acceptance of the subjugated position are achieved. This internalization enables compliance without using force, or without the existence of an actual overseer.

Disciplinary power functions through the implication of the technique of panopticism. “The Panopticon must be understood as a generalizable model for the functioning; away of defining power relations in terms of every day life of men.”(Foucault, 1979: 205). Panopticism relies on surveillance and the internal training to ‘produce’ docile individuals, those accept the individual and collective identities imposed on them. Since the individual accepts, internalizes, no physical force or violence is needed, the subject disciplines himself. Therefore, the naturalness of the discourse and thus its functioning are closely linked to the institutionalization of those premises of the discourse. In that respect, panopticism is the technique maintaining the power relation in the absence of the authority position.

Hence the major effect of the Panopticon: to induce in the intimate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power. So to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action; that the perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary; that this architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it; in short, that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers (Foucault, 1979: 201)

For the functioning of all those disciplinary techniques, individualization and totalization, the legitimacy of authority position is needed. Since the exercise of power starts with the internalization, and this occurs at the intellectual level, power is in fact the relation between the minds of individuals: the taken-for-grantedness of the discourse is essential to its functioning.

When the early republican period is analyzed from this perspective, the republican discourse and the power relations can be understood better. With the nationalist, modernist premises, the republican discourse aimed at the construction of the state and the nation. It had its own claims of unity: ‘the characteristics’ of the Turkish nation, of the Turkish women and the Turkish men, and the people living in Anatolia, the founding premises of the Republic, the norms and taboos of the new regime are defined in such a way that those had never existed together before. They all formed an arbitrary unity. The republican discourse constituted a particular definition of femininity and womanhood including the roles and obligations of women in the new Republic and the conditions of existence of women in the public sphere. This discourse constructed the category of ‘Turkish man’ and defined it. What a Turkish man does and does not, the proper ways of his relations with other subjectivities are also defined by the discourse. All of these are constructed and gathered as a unity by the republican discourse.

Also republican discourse had its own continuity claim employed through the theories of modernization, development and nationalism. On the modernization side, the assumption was the transition to the universal civilization through the republican project. It was supposed that this project would ‘elevate’ the nation to the level of contemporary civilization, that is the West. Continuity claim was also embodied in nation building project. The efforts to root the Turkish nation in the Central Asia, and the construction of history had the underlying premises of providing ‘mobility’ and continuity to the Turkish nation throughout time. In this way Turkish nation becomes a timeless, eternal community.

The Turkish state is both the producer and one of the subjects of republican discourse. Furthermore, it is both the speaking subject and the institution as an authority position. There are numerous ways for the reproduction of the discourse and thus the maintenance of the power relation. This power relation is between the state, the founding elite as the authority positions and the public as the subjugated position because of the intervention in public sphere. The organization of space in general; the existence of the symbols of the republican regime, of the premises of the founding discourse in public space in particular are among the ways in which the republican discourse is produced and reproduced. In the next chapter, the intervention of the state into the public space as a means of reproduction of the founding discourse will be examined.

## **CHAPTER 3: NATIONALISM, STATE CONSTRUCTION AND SPACE**

The aim of this chapter is to focus on the relationship between state construction, nationalism and center. The newly founded Turkish Republic had the claim to be a nation-state. This claim was founded on the assumption that there already exists a Turkish nation. However, at that time, the idea of Turkish nationhood was not institutionalized. The construction of the Turkish Republic necessitated and included the construction of the Turkish nation that would legitimize the new system of rule and the authority position of the state. One the reforms, regulations, interventions that were done to institutionalize republican discourse with the nationalist premises, was the intervention in space in order create a national center.

The creation of a national center is crucial in this nation building process because the center emphasizes the idea of unity and it designates the Turkish nation as a whole. Thus, the national center contributes to the nation building process through the symbols, such as monuments, located in it. In that sense, the making of the new capital city in Ankara is important as the creation of a new national center and the beginning of the interventions in space in order to institutionalize the republican discourse. This chapter firstly elaborates on nationalism and the nation in

order to clarify the difference between how nationalism was understood, conceptualized in the republican discourse and how this thesis approaches to the issue. The essentialist approach of the republican project is analyzed from a modernist perspective arguing that Turkish nation is not an essentialist category, but the product of the republican/nationalist discourse of the early republican period. Then the creation of the national center as an intervention contributing to the production and reproduction of the republican discourse will be explained. The emphasis of this chapter on the importance of the national center constitutes the contextual background of the next chapter which is on the analysis of the two monuments in two central squares of Ankara.

### **3.1 NATIONALISM**

Before starting to analyze the reproduction of the nationalist discourse through the interventions into the public sphere, it is necessary to conceptualize the terms ‘nation’ and ‘nationalism’. There are various approaches to explain these concepts depending on the underlying assumptions of the possibility of truth and the constructed nature of reality. For example, if a theory on nationalism is founded on the assumptions that value-free, objective truth is possible in social sciences and that social reality has an essence of its own –meaning that it is not constructed- , then it would be an essentialist one defining the nation as if it has a distinct essence of its own. Therefore, the two basic approaches to nationalism are crucial to mention in order to position the basic premises of this thesis.

The first approach on the origins and character of the 'nation' is called primordialism or essentialism. The underlying assumption of this approach is that "nations are primordial entities embedded in human nature and history" (McCrone, 1998: 10). There is the assumption that something like human nature and the nature of a nation exists with distinct features. Culture, language, religion, race are considered to be the criteria through which the distinctiveness of a nation can be argued. The argument that a nation has essential characteristics has its own political connotations in terms of self-determination. In the long run, the argument that a nation has unique characteristics legitimizes the desire for political self-determination and the claim that it is inevitable.

Turkish nationalism was founded on this kind of a primordialist approach. The underlying assumption was that Turkish nation is a primordial entity and has its roots in the Central Asian civilizations. Turkish nation has a distinctive culture, and language. When all of these were combined with the collective history of the Turkish nation, the 'necessity' to found a new state that would rule the nation for the sake of it was legitimized. According to the republican discourse, there already exists a Turkish nation and the new Turkish state is founded to liberate and save the nation from the 'backward', 'unjust' rule of the Empire. On the relationship between the state and the nation Atatürk notes "When we say state, first of all the existence of a collectivity, of a nation is meant." (cited in Genelkurmay, 1983:3) this statement can be the example of the republican discourse that is founded on the assumption that the nation precedes the state.

On the contrary, in this thesis I argue that there was not a Turkish nation prior to the construction of the Turkish republic. The nation-building process was a part of the state construction because it contributed to the legitimization of the rule of the new regime. Having this modernist approach, I argue that the interventions in space, that is the creation of the national center and the construction of monuments- were a part of the nation building process and thus were among the self-constitutive acts of the state. At this point, it is necessary to clarify the modernist approach employed in this thesis.

Contrary to the claim that nations are “natural” collectivities whose existence is independent of any external conditions, the second approach to the origin and character of nation is modernists. The basic assumption of modernists is that “nationalism is a cultural and political ideology of ‘modernity’” (McCrone, 1998: 10). There are variations in the approach depending on the definition of modernity and the issues emphasized in the conceptualization of modernity. The novelty of the concept of nation, therefore, may be associated with the emergence of the modern state, the development of print-capitalism (for example Anderson, 1991), or with the change in the codes of the society formulated in terms of the transformation from “traditionalism” to “industrialism” economic development. These can all be the grounds upon which nationalism is founded. The important point in this approach is the counter-argument to primordialists, that is, the nation does not have essential characteristics of its own, but it is a product of specific conditions in the history.

Modernist approach to nationalism has mainly three arguments. First is about the relationship between nationalism and religion: “nationalism superseded a

religious view of the world, and derived its legitimacy from the will of the people rather than from God” (McCrone, 1998: 10). The primacy given to the will and consent of people instead of the king –the sultan in the case of Turkish nationalism- as the embodiment of the will of God is important in the emergence of the concept of nation. The concept of collective will implies that there is a collectivity. This inference functions as an imagined link enabling the construction of ‘national consciousness’. For example the statements of Atatürk such as “Sovereignty belongs to the nation”, “Power is one and a unity, and it belongs to the nation” (cited in Genelkurmay, 1983:5) involve the assumption that there is a Turkish nation whose existence and collective will is crucial for the Turkish state. The emphasis on national sovereignty implies that the nation should be ruled by itself, better to say, by a regime that considers the benefits of the nation as a whole. The otherization of the rule of the Ottoman Empire is crucial in that sense in the construction of the Turkish nationalism: the Ottoman rule is defined as self-centered, insensitive to the problems of the people, backward and unjust. As opposed to these, the republican discourse defines the rule of the new Republic as the embodiment of the national will.

Secondly, the emergence of the modern state as a distinct political unit with its ‘national market’ and ‘national polity’ contributed to the emergence of nationhood. The claim that the modern state has a national polity governing the homogenous collectivity –nation- is the foundation of the association of the concepts of nation and state, of the introduction of the concept of nation-state. This also can be applied to the analysis of Turkish nationalism: the spread of the state apparatus across the borders, the central administration, the idea that the nation governing

itself, national education system, compulsory services across the borders all contributed to the idea of national unity in the early republican period.

The third argument of the modernist approach is central to the argument of this thesis: Benedict Anderson argues that the development of print capitalism enabled the construction of nations as imagined communities. On this point he notes that “the convergence of capitalism and print technology on the fatal diversity of human language created the possibility of a new form of imagined community, which in its basic morphology set the stage for the modern nation.” (1991:46). The general theory of Benedict Anderson will be mentioned later in this chapter, however what is important to emphasize here is that print-capitalism as an artefact contributes to a common language through which symbols of the nation are produced, reproduced and circulated. Anderson’s emphasis on print-capitalism may be replaced with other kind of artefacts that function in the same way. Literature in general in the form of newspapers and novels, architecture in general in the form of monuments and city planning, media, and education system, that is any ‘modern’ form of creating collective symbols and communicating them, can serve to the creation of “imagined bonds”. In the case of this thesis, it is the public space and monuments that function as the producers and communicators of the symbols of the Turkish nation.

Having defined the general approach to the conceptualization of nations, I will continue with a more detailed analysis. As a starting point, Brubaker’s definition would be useful: “ ‘Nation’ is a category of practice, not (in the first instance) a category of analysis.” (cited in McCrone, 1998: 3). Accordingly, nation cannot have

an abstract definition of its own. The practical uses of the category ‘nation’ should be understood to figure out what a nation is. The particular ways nationalist discourses constructed the nation as a discursive object should be analyzed to have a definition of a nation as a case. The nationalist discourse may claim its legitimacy through its ‘glorious’ past or through the rejection of past as a scapegoat. However its basic premises are formulated, each nationalist discourse employs a definition of *the* nation as *the* only definition. In that sense nationalist discourses are primordialist: the argument that those people forming the nation belong to the same race or have the same language, religion and physical or material interests.

In order to reach the particular definition of the Turkish nation in the early republican era, the analysis of the nationalist discourse is necessary. As mentioned above, the category of Turkish nation is created and its content and limits were set by the nationalist discourse, and thus the category became a discursive object. The interventions in space, that is the making of the national center and the construction of the monuments, can be means through which the republican discourse analyzed. These interventions are the embodiments of specific ideologies and political decisions. Therefore they carry the symbols of these ideologies. Thus, the analysis of these interventions in space reveals the insights of the republican discourse. Since republican discourse constructed the category of Turkish nation as a primordialist and essentialist one, through the examination of the basic premises of this discourse, one can reach the particular definition of the Turkish nation of the early republican era.

The claim that there are features that are claimed to be national, common to all of the members of the nation is crucial in the construction of the idea of

nationness. However, the constructedness of the nation does not deny its existence. Nations, the collectivity of those people who define themselves belonging to a nation, do exist. What is shared in these communities is not necessarily language or religion but claims for a common past and a common future. The construction of a common history is central to the imagination of the collectivity as the nation.

### **3.2. STATE CONSTRUCTION AND NATIONALISM**

State construction is not only a matter of construction of the state apparatus like the legislative, executive, judiciary branches and the bureaucratic structure. In fact, institutionalization of the basic premises of the state is that much important. The nation state has a founding ideology that underlines the necessity of a new system of rule different from the former one. The nation state not only offers novel forms of economic and political activity and social-cultural changes but also introduces a new concept: nation. The new label of the ruled legitimizes the rule of the new system. Therefore the construction and institutionalization of national consciousness is central in the construction of the state.

Following that line of reasoning, the creation of the Turkish nation was crucial both in the institutionalization of the founding ideology of the Turkish state and the transformation of this ideology to the republican discourse. The specific definition of the nation as a category was made by the authority positions: the state and the founding elite. Making this definition and making people accept this category along with the other ones (re)produced the republican discourse and located the state in the authority position vis a vis the people. In this case people are in subject

position because they accept the categories constructed by the authority position, they define themselves with these categories, and they are exposed to the interventions of the authority position in their sphere such as the ‘regulation’ of private lives or the ordering of the space they live in.

The theoretical framework introduced in the second chapter of this thesis, that is the conceptualization of power relations as the ones constructed by a particular discourse, is necessary to underline and re-emphasize at this point. The republican/nationalist discourse constructs its objects such as nation, citizens, Turkish woman and man, the history of the nation, the collective will of the nation and common future of the nation and so on. The state is one of the actors of this discourse and is also the institution that contributes to the production of this discourse. The relations of the state with the other actors –such as the people that are being defined and intervened- are power relations. The Turkish republic constructs itself through the institutionalization of these power relations. As will be mentioned later in this chapter, the making of the national center is one of the ways of building such relations of power.

### **3.2.1 Nation as the Object of Discourse**

Nations are the objects of nationalist discourses: as mentioned in the previous chapter, the discourse constitutes its objects and the relations between these objects. The nationalist discourse constructs the category of nation and defines it. “‘Nations’ have no independent existence outwit the discourse of nationalism”. (McCrone, 1998: 25) Therefore, the concepts of arbitrariness, continuity and unity are important

in terms of conceptualization of nationalism as a discourse and the importance of ‘history construction’ in that discourse. In terms of the unity claims, which events are included and excluded in the history of a particular nation are important because both the included and the excluded contribute to the specific definition of a nation. For example a war that was lost would not be emphasized as a victory or might not take place in some textbooks of a nation that defines itself through the past victories and as a warrior. The construction of a common past is crucial for continuity claims of the nationalist discourse. The common past enables the continuity claim of a nation through time. The construction of the history contributes to the imagination of the nation through defining the roots, the origins of that community. Therefore, all the events and the relations between those events that make up the history of a nation are brought together arbitrarily in line with unity and continuity claims. Using the terms of Ernest Renan, the content of “collective remembering” and “collective forgetting” are constructed arbitrarily.

Benedict Anderson, in his book *Imagined Communities* explains the origins and spread of the concept of nation. He says, nation “is an imagined political community –and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.” (1991:6). It is imagined because the supposed communication between the members, the bond linking these people together is in the minds of the members. Nation is imagined as a limited community and this argument fits the unity claim of discourse. As mentioned in the second chapter, discourse is an arbitrary unity in the sense that the limits defining that unity are arbitrary. Likewise, nations are limited, yet with arbitrary boundaries. The definition of a particular nation contains who are excluded and included from that unity. For example, when the issue is Turkish nation, the

members are limited in the sense that it does not include the whole mankind. However, some questions may rise against this unity claim: Do all people living in Anatolia belong to the Turkish nation? Can we also include those people living outside Anatolia, but defining themselves as a part of Turkish nation? The boundaries of a nation, beyond which lie other nations, are arbitrary and imagined. The nation is also imagined as sovereign meaning that the religious authority and its legitimacy were transformed to the imagined community.

In the definition of nations, the common grounds with which the members define themselves are not essential features like religion, language, and race. Rather, what is common is the feeling of belonging, the collective history and future. These are defined and constructed by the discourse. Nation-wide education system, compulsory military service, the mass media, and any kind of ‘communicator’ carrying the symbols of the imagined community contribute to this construction. This thesis is concerned with the construction of national center and monuments as the carriers and producers of the republican discourse.

As Benedict Anderson argues, nations are imagined communities (Anderson,1991) that is, the bond which is supposed to link those people is an imaginary bond. The nationalist discourse is produced and reproduced through the representation of the image of the imagined –community-. According to Anderson, the spread of print-capitalism is important in the imagining of the community; in the construction of nationalism because “... these forms provide the technical means for ‘re-presenting’ the *kind* of imagined community that is the nation.” (Anderson, 1983, p.25) Print-capitalism makes people think about themselves, and relate themselves to

others through addressing to everyone individually, but as a member of the imagined community. Not only publications, but also the components of public sphere serve, in the way Anderson describes as media through which the nation is imagined, by addressing everyone both as an individual and as a member of the nation.

It is necessary for the nation state to build such a bond between people that would make them feel the members of the same community. This bond of nation legitimizes the rule of the state over those people, it derives from the assumption that those people living in that territory have a common past, common culture, they want to live together in the future, and the state is the apparatus that will provide such a future and regulate everyday life to that end. In her book, Bozdoğan explains the role of architecture and sculpture in the process of nation building; “ Early republican history offers ample evidence of the creative zeal with the republican leaders, intellectuals, and artists imagined the nation through symbols, rituals, and spatial practices, including architecture” (2002:262). According to her, architecture had a political and ideological role in the construction of nationalism in Turkey.

### **3.3 NATIONAL CENTER AND COLLECTIVE SYMBOLS**

The creation of collective symbols is of great importance in the construction of the nation. Nas defines a symbol as “an object, act or other form of expression-representing something else, generally an idea of rather abstract nature” (1993: 3). It is a form related to a specific meaning. The collective symbols of the nation are, then, the expressions that emphasize the idea of collectivity and the characteristics of that collectivity. National symbols can be monuments, squares, buildings, the

organization of the city, or the capital city itself. They address to the people as the members of the nation, and therefore create that imagined bond, and the content of these images identify the characteristics of that nation, that is, the centrality and degree of importance of democracy, capitalism, the ideal Turkish woman and man, and soon. The unity claim of the nationalist discourse is embodied in these symbols: what is included in and excluded from the image of the nation can be found through a critical reading of these symbols. Nas argues that urban symbols can be “deliberately used to legitimize local and national authorities or groups, and express values that are upheld by the elite in power” (1993: 3). It is the powerful elite, and the urban and national administrations who take care of the official symbols. This follows that symbols function in the legitimization of power, symbols are manipulated by authorities, and they are important for group formation and identification.

Here, the symbolic importance of the national center becomes more evident. The modern state needs a center not only for the superficial, everyday functioning of the rule, that is, the making and implementation of laws, etc. Modern state needs a center for the legitimization of this rule, that is, the symbolic importance of the center. Through this function the state intervenes in the center.

Bitusikova’s study on the role and the functions of the city center in Banska Bystrica, Slovakia can be an example of the case showing how the state intervenes in the urban space and the importance of the symbols at the center (1998: 614-622). As the dominant ideology changes, the state organizes the square differently and this is the indicator of the close relationship between power and public sphere. As the

power changes in Slovakia, the content, the arrangement, and the name of the square changes. For example during socialist rule, the statue of a religious icon was put away from the center, and after communist rule, it is relocated. Bitusikova argues in the article that, the city population is heterogeneous, and the city square- the center- is the place where this heterogeneous population can meet and thus it contributes to the integration of urban population. This integration means the creation of collective identities, and abandoning the particular ones. (1998: 616)

The content and the organization of the center are important. The ones that decide the content and organization of the center are the speaking subjects, the authority positions of the nationalist discourse. They give these decisions through the position they occupy in the nationalist discourse. Therefore, the organization, (that is which building is at the center, the position of the objective expressions to each other) and the content (what is included and excluded from the center) of the urban space symbolize the basic premises of the founding discourse of the state. The nation is created through the creation of collective symbols, that address both the individual and the collectivity (the nation). Those imaginary bonds are constructed as far as an individual defines him/her self with the identities represented by those symbols. In this way they become 'subjects' and occupy subjugated positions in the nationalist discourse. Thus the best place to put those symbols is the center that belongs to no one and thus everyone.

The importance of center comes from its un-possessibility: it does not belong to anyone. It is the common thing for those people defining it as the center. Therefore, to some extent it is everyone's, and to some extent it is no one's. This is

true for the national center, as well. The center of the capital city is the center of the nation. The center does not belong to any person, that is, it is not the real procession of people living in that city or country. This follows that it is everyone's; that is if no one can claim the ownership, then everyone has the right over that center. This is the main point that increases the symbolic meaning of the center. Those symbols located at the center address everyone not only living in that city, but also the people living in the borders of that country. And people are able to identify themselves with the symbols in the center.

The buildings, parks, monuments located at that center, the names of the streets, or any kind of public space, the organization of all of those are collective symbols that promote a common identity which is "based on subjective feelings of some sort of continuity with preceding generations, memories of specific events which have been turning points of in the collective history, and a sense of a common destiny." (Colombijn, 1998, p568) Ankara became the center in which all those symbols were gathered in the process of state creation and nation construction.

Apart from its un-possessibility the concept of the center is important in terms of its relation with the whole. The center designates the whole: its presence implies that there exists a literal or symbolic unity around it. Therefore the nation state needs a center in the construction of the nation as a unity. Embellishing the center with the symbols of the discourse contributes to the reproduction of it. The examination of the symbolic and literal construction of Ankara, therefore, is necessary to understand the republican discourse.

### **3.3.1 The Center of the Nation**

In the republican project, the interventions in space as a means of the self-construction of the state starts with the relocation of the capital city from İstanbul to Ankara and the building of the capital. The symbolic construction of the center is crucial for the construction of the state and nation building process. The interventions in space are a part of the institutionalization of the founding discourse of the state. This section focuses on the notion of national center in general and Ankara in particular to show the importance of the creation of a center for the nation.

The process that Ankara became the capital city and national center is necessary to mention in order to reveal the insights of the republican discourse. During the nationalist struggle Ankara emerged as the negative definition of the center of the Ottoman Empire, İstanbul. As the counter center, Ankara was the symbol of the nationalist struggle in Anatolia. The republican discourse constructs Ankara as the representation of the will of the Turkish nation, independence, national unity, loyalty to the nationalist struggle as opposed to İstanbul representing the cosmopolitan, heterogeneous Ottoman Empire and its ‘disloyalty’ to the Turkish nation during the War of Independence.

In fact the decision of Ankara’s being the capital city is a two-stepped decision; in the first step Ankara became the center of Independence War and the war was won, and in the second step Ankara became the center of the newly established Republic. And the second step is closely linked the success of the first step. (Tekeli, 2000: 318) Apart from the security and easy communication, Ankara’s capital city status aimed some other purposes. Economy may be one of those ends

that were aimed. The powers of Europe had established an exploitative control through the ports during the Ottoman Empire, it was aimed to break this control, which in the end will serve not only in economic terms but also defense against military interventions. (Tekeli, 2000: 321) The integration of the regions in Anatolia would serve to the integration of economies and the emergence of a national economy. As mentioned above, the creation of national economy is crucial in the construction of nationalism and the relation between the state and the nation. In that respect, the relocation of the capital city and more importantly the creation of the national center serve the construction of the nationalist discourse.

The ‘Ankara project’ cannot be elaborated without the introduction of the relation between urban development and power relations. According to Tankut, urban development is a political phenomenon. The building of Ankara was a state enterprise and it was identified with the republican regime. The construction of Ankara is the embodiment of Atatürk’s modernization principle. Therefore, the study on the building of Ankara between 1929-1939 would be the political analysis of Turkish Republic. (Tankut, 1990: 1-2) As mentioned above, the content and the organization of the center are important because the authority positions decide on these issues through the position they occupy in the formal discourse. When the construction of Ankara is taken as the process through which republican process is produced and reproduced, the authority and subjugated positions constructed by this discourse are necessary to emphasize. According to Tankut, the members of the parliament as the ones making laws and deciding on macro level policies and principles; members of the Directorate of Public Improvements as the ones making the plans and supervising; the municipality as the one providing infrastructure, the

planners and the users of these plans were the actors of the construction of Ankara. (Tankut, 2001: 9) The first four actors can be defined as the authority positions of the republican urban discourse. They define the proper capital city, decide on its content and form, and construct the city according to the premises that constitute the foundation of the discourse that –in turn- defines their authority position. The last actor, that is, the users of this plan, is the subjugated position. They are exposed to not only this construction and intervention but also to the symbols and therefore the premises of the republican discourse. The representation of the symbols in the public space is one of the ways of the institutionalization of the formal discourse. Thus, this institutionalization contributes to the subjugated position of the people using that space.

One of the defining features of the modern-state is its capital city. The importance of the capital city can be analyzed in two ways, it is the administrative center, and secondly, it is the center where the symbols of the founding principles of the state are located. Tankut argues that capital cities are constructed as the symbols of the leaders' world views. (Tankut, 1990:2) In that respect the analysis of this symbolic construction reveals the insights of the founding discourse because the leaders are the authority positions producing and reproducing the discourse and furthermore their positions are defined by that discourse.

More important than those functions regarding the everyday working mechanisms of the state, the capital city has a symbolic importance: it is the spatial representation of the formal discourse of the country. Through the capital city, and the formal and informal activities, the state produces and reproduces itself. Every

state has basic principles on which it has been founded; these principles may be equality, freedom, democracy, free market, socialism, or communism. Whatever the founding principles are, these should be internalized by the people living in that country. The symbolic function of the capital city works in this way; the symbols of the main principles are located at the center. These symbols can be the planning of the center, the notion of planning itself, the organization of the city, the institutions that are put in the center, the monuments, street names, official ceremonies, and so on. For example, if the central principle is democracy, then the parliament is located at the center, its architecture gives clues about other founding principles. However, as the time passes, the principles may change, free market may become more important, and then the city becomes centered by a trade center or another organization of economic activity. Locating the symbols of the founding principles at the capital city the construction of new capital cities are especially done when a state or a group of people faces a turning point. Changing the capital city of the former regime which is aimed to be erased from the collective memory, may be a strategy for the new regime to legitimize, produce and reproduce itself. The other thing to do is to construct a new center, around which the nation can unite. It is the symbols located at the capital city that tell people around what and how they should unite and form a nation.

### **3.3.2. The Symbolic Construction of the National Center through Binary Oppositions**

Founding a new state and a new set of ideas that would dominate the public and private lives of people, Republican elites had some premises in their minds. The

Republican reforms were based on a positivist ideology that explained the social change in a linear process, following the determined steps which in the end result in modern Western lifestyle, politics, and culture. Positivism has its roots in the Enlightenment, and one of the basic premises of the Enlightenment thought is the necessity of the “other”. Modernity puts an “other” as opposed to its civilization, and legitimizes itself in this way; the dichotomies of tradition-modern, illiteracy-enlightenment, anachronism- progress are used by the republic to form its old- new polarity and the legitimization of the new in this way. New- Ankara- is not appreciated only because of the concept of progress inherent to it, it was also its opposite –old, İstanbul-, and the connotation of backwardness associated with it, that made new-Ankara- more valuable. In the first republican period, Ankara and İstanbul were put in a dichotomy of new versus old, modern versus traditional and national versus cosmopolitan. It was Ankara now, in the center, and İstanbul was the “other”. İstanbul, the center of the Empire and the religious authority for five hundred years, was now the “other” of Ankara, an object used for the legitimization. Ankara was pure, morally superior, and the ideal, as opposed to İstanbul and Empire, associated with dynastic traditions, cosmopolitan - that is non-pure -, degenerated. For example in 1940’s when nationalism and anti-cosmopolitanism was at peak, it was said that “Ankara is the city of future, and İstanbul the city of past” Bozdoğan, 2002:82).

The national center is important in terms of its symbolic value. The political purpose under this title is a twofold one. Firstly, the state needs a center to govern, to locate the core administrative organization. Secondly, in this way the government in Ankara would release itself from the image of the Ottoman, it would refuse the empire. Another symbolic importance may be of cultural purpose; the cosmopolitan

culture of İstanbul would be refused, and a new set of values would emerge around Ankara as a concept representing the new order. İstanbul was not only rejected because of the backwardness associated with it. It was also the cosmopolitanism, the togetherness of different cultures and religions that made İstanbul the other of the new Republican culture. The Republican project aimed at creating a homogenous society made up of individuals who are expected to be modern, rational, defining themselves as the members of Turkish nation through the criteria defined by the Republican elite. The ideal city where the ideal citizen would live was designed with those assumptions in mind. Ankara was the structured form in which those acceptable life styles and culture can flourish. Apart from being a school for the ones living inside, Ankara became the model for modern, Western urban planning. Besides its functions of gathering the symbols of the founding principles of the Republican regime, the making of Ankara symbolized the successes of the republican project.

### **3.3.3. Ankara and Urban Planning**

The construction of the capital city in a short period of time and with a disciplined plan is a phenomenon that is peculiar to the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In her book, Tankut gives the examples of Canberra, Brasilia, and Islamabad along with Ankara to argue that the construction of the capital city is a political act. In these four examples, the capital city is supposed to serve as a symbol of the new political system, with the underlying assumptions of independence, national unity, and modernization. In that respect, Ankara constitutes the ‘the modern décor of the Turkish Republic’ (Tankut, 1990:8-20)

Ankara was intended to serve as the national model for modern town planning, and the issue in time became a matter of national pride. Ankara was a part of the Republican project; however it was different from the rest: its scope was not just confined to one specific field like urbanization, nationalization of education or economy, or to a more general concept like modernization. The project of making of Ankara involves the combination of all the ends of the broader project. First of all, apart from the approach that was taken in the planning of Ankara, the notion of planning itself is very important.

‘The city is planned by the state.’ Today, in the twenty-first century Turkey, this phrase may not surprise anyone. Further, state’s direct intervention in the planning of the city space is gradually becoming an updated phenomenon, since now municipalities, civil society organizations, and the market forces are becoming the dominant actors in the design of the cities. However, the emergence of Ankara as the capital city is a good example of the importance of the notion of planning in modernity. The authority positions acting and speaking within the nationalist and modernist discourse make the plans of the city. Following the modernist discourse, the planning of city means that the elite, planner knows how the city space can be used with maximum efficiency. There is also the importance of the concept of efficiency becoming central in the design of urban space. The concept of planning is a modern one in itself and the adoption of it on its own has modernist implications.

Apart from the general concept of planning, the principles of this urban project are also important. The significance of efficiency becomes more evident in

the principles: “clustering similar land uses within the same part of the city, constructing wide and efficient inter and intraurban transit paths, situating the administrative core at the intersection of such major thoroughfares, erecting memorials and building parks and squares were new to Turkish urban landscape” (Kezer, 1999: 136). Apart from the monuments and squares that are the materials of collective visual consumption and of leisure time, the rest of the design principles aimed at efficient use of space. The republican leaders as the authority positions had a particular image of modernity, rationalism and progress which they tried to embody this through intervening in space. Ankara was the little model of the broader republican project. On this issue, the planner of Ankara, Herman Jansen said “the new Ankara developed according to a modern plan and built with up-to-date construction materials and techniques”(cited in Kezer, 1999: 136). In the literal construction of Ankara, the republican discourse with its premises of modernity was embedded even in the materials and techniques used. The symbolic construction, that is situating Ankara in binary oppositions vis a vis İstanbul, the symbols built and erected at the center are themselves the embodiments of the republican discourse which contribute to its reproduction.

The construction of Ankara became a model for other Anatolian towns. Also, Ankara was a ‘project’, the success of which will be the success of Republic. Falih Rıfki Atay, who served for several years as the honorary chairman of the Ankara Master Planning Commission said that

This was not a small town, it was one of the most backward towns in Anatolia. No roads, no water, no trees, nothing... And like the rest of Anatolia it had to be reconstructed, it had to be reinvented. Everything we did in Ankara was going to be an exploration. If we succeeded in Ankara,

we were going to know we had succeeded in uncovering the secrets of rebuilding Anatolia.” (cited in Kezer,1999: 137-138)

The meaning of construction of Ankara was not only confined to urbanism. It was a part of nation building because it provided the center for the nation to gather around. Ankara with its roles in the War of Independence became an important element in the construction of Turkish history. Ankara, as the center embracing the symbols of the republican discourse contributed to the institutionalization of the Republican regime.

The republican project was composed of nation building and modernization. The republican elite, as the authority positions constructed by the republican discourse, had a definition of Turkish nation in their mind. After the victory of the War of Independence and the proclamation of the Republic they started the republican project. For the construction of the Turkish nation, collective symbols and the location of these in the center was needed. Ankara became the center of the nation designating the unity of the Turkish nation and holding it together. This chapter focused on the relationship between nationalism, state construction and space. In that sense this chapter prepares the contextual background for the next chapter. The next chapter elaborates on the two monuments in Ankara, Victory Monument and Güven Monument, as the embodiments of the republican discourse.

## **CHAPTER 4: INTERVENTIONS IN URBAN SPACE: TWO MONUMENTS**

The third chapter of this thesis focuses on the relationship between state construction, nationalism and space. The nationalist and the modernist principles of the founding discourse shaped the city in such a way that Ankara became the symbol of the Republican project. Likewise this chapter focuses on two monuments in Ankara arguing that the construction of monuments is a way of producing and publicizing the symbols of the basic premises of the Republic and therefore contributes to the reproduction of the discourse and the construction of the nation and the self-construction of the state.

One of these monuments is the Victory Monument in Ulus Square. I have chosen this monument because the theme is the War of Independence which designates an important turning point in the history of Turkish nation constructed by the founding discourse. The construction of history, that is, the exclusion and the inclusion of the historical events in the history of those people living in Anatolia was an important part of the founding discourse. These exclusions and inclusions can be

seen in the Victory Monument. The second monument I have chosen is Güven<sup>4</sup> Monument in Kızılay Square. The theme of this monument is self-trust of the Turkish nation and security within the borders of the country. After the decline of the external threat, the internal threat such as competing nationalist ideologies or religious insurgency, became an important issue in Turkey during 1930's. Security within the borders, then, became important in the dominant discourse. Furthermore with the acceleration of the modernization project and the intensifying relations with the West, the issue of self confidence became important in terms of the self positioning of Turkish nation vis a vis the West. The Güven Monument is the embodiment of these concerns of the Early republican period.

#### **4.1. MONUMENTS**

Monuments are the gathering of idealized images to form a discourse, to address one or more principles of a discourse to the public. As mentioned in the second chapter, discourse is an arbitrary unity that gathers some events, statements, and principles together on the basis of certain underlying assumptions and principles. These assumptions are unity and continuity claims in general, and the basic principles of the Turkish republic in particular. Turkish republic is founded upon principles of modernity and nationalism. The basic claims were the total break with the Ottoman Empire and some features of that era(Ottoman) that were otherized during the foundation of the republic.

---

<sup>4</sup> "Güven" means "trust", "confidence" or "security" in English. Since the Güven Monument involves both of these themes I will not use the English translation.

Monuments are built to praise and glorify the important events, persons of a community. When this is examined from the perspective of the relationship between discourse and public sphere it becomes more apparent. What is included and excluded from the content of the monument are defined by the discourse that is dominant in that era; dominating, directing the relations of the people with the community they live in and with themselves. Those people who decide the content, form and the location of the monument are the authority positions created by the discourse. For example when the monuments of the first republican era are taken into consideration some basic principles/points come to fore. The break with the ancient regime, the continuity claim of the Turkish nation, the heroic, brave, patriotic characteristics of the Turkish men, helpful, brave, self-sacrificing Turkish women are the themes dominant in that era. The founding discourse of the Turkish republic gathers these claims together and constructs the principles upon which the state is founded and the nation is defined. These are arbitrary unities. However, once this founding ideology is institutionalized in and through the public sphere, they become taken-for-granted. The role of monuments is important toward this end. They contribute to the taken-for –grantedness of the claims of the founding discourse through producing and communicating the symbols of this discourse. They address the community as a whole and convey to them the principles of the discourse. In this sense such monuments can be thought of as ‘discursive objects’

The conceptualization of monuments as discursive objects is more reasonable when the authority and subjugated positions are included in the analysis of the monuments. The authority positions are the ones who contribute to the definition of the Turkish nation, that is, the characteristics and the history of the Turkish nation.

They are the scientists, politicians, intellectuals that produce and whose positions are constructed by the discourse. They intervene in the city along the lines of these principles of the discourse. Furthermore, they build monuments or decide on the monuments to be built. Competitions are organized for these monuments and they choose the monument to be built among alternatives. On the basis of these principles they intervene in the public sphere where people walk by, see the monuments which are the symbols of the discourse that constructs the subject positions. The construction of monuments are interventions in the public sphere because through them the founding ideology takes an undeniable and solid presence in the everyday lives of citizens.

The subject positions are those that are subjected to and created by these monuments. Those people living on the land that is called as Turkey are defined as Turkish nation. Certain characteristics are ascribed to these people and they are defined in that particular way as citizens. The nationalist discourse constructs a common history and a common future for them which are the essence of the imaginary link between these people. Because of the naturalness of the discourse they define themselves in that way and take their place in the subjugated positions of the discourse. In that respect monuments act as the mirrors through which people see the ideal models of the discourse, identify themselves and thereby become the subjects of the discourse.

Apart from other objects of the public space like buildings, parks, and squares, monuments have a special purpose. They are built to emphasize something that should be remembered forever. A monument is something with the function(s)

of bringing to the notice of, reminding, or telling of. It stimulates the remembrance of a person or an event. According to Butterfield,

Monuments provide an enduring physical demonstration of the fact of the existence of a person or an event. It marks a spot and it says who. And it says so forever. It is an object that serves as the locus of the memories of a person or a group, and it makes those memories tangible-literally so. Hence the most basic component of a monument is its marker: the physical object erected to mark a locus in perpetuity. Owing to the emphasis on permanence, survival, and continuity, the marker is made of the most durable materials- stone and metal. (Butterfield, 2003:28)

Butterfield argues that there are three constitutive elements of a monument. The first one is that monuments “serve as the center for the group and as the group’s point of contact with two other realms of being, the immortal and the dead” (Butterfield, 2003:29). He argues that a group builds monuments for the values that are eternal for that group. The second constitutive element of monuments is related to memory in a particular way: it is not the specific person or event that is to be remembered forever, but the meaning and the values attached to them. Monuments, in that respect are the symbols of the dominant discourse defining the subjectivities and relations in that group.

The third constitutive element of monuments is their location. They are erected in sites that the greatest number of people can see them and remember the values, important junctures in the history of the group. Squares are the best example: “they are places where individuals can go to experience membership, to re-establish their identity as parts of a special and distinct social body.” (Butterfield, 2003: 31) This fits with the theoretical relationship between the discourse production and monuments. It is the totalization function of power that is mentioned in the second chapter. Those people that are in a power relationship are treated as a totality regardless of their differences. Authority position speaking and acting within the –

limits of- discourse defines, labels them as a totality. It is the arbitrary unity claim that provides this totality. The taken-for-grantedness of the discourse legitimizes the intervention of the authority position into the field/sphere of the subjugated positions'. The latter are, in fact, located in that position with the intervention of the authority position. Monuments carrying the symbols of a nation constructed by the nationalist discourse, serve as the means for totalization: discourse defines the collectivity and its characteristics –arbitrarily-, monuments are the embodiments of these premises and their existence in public space is an intervention. When the existence of these monuments in public spaces is not questioned, it means that the taken-for-grantedness is achieved.

Butterfield explains how the individualization and totalization functions of power are embedded to each other and realized simultaneously:

A monument is both a personal experience and a collective experience. 'Collective sentiments can become conscious of themselves' Durkheim instructed, 'only by fixing themselves upon external objects'. A monument is one of the means by which aggregate of individuals transforms itself into a community that feels bound together by a common moral experience and a common historical framework. It is proof that the past is real, and that the past is still present. (Butterfield, 2003: 32)

Founding discourse of the Turkish Republic has mainly two components: the past and the collective characteristics of the Turkish nation. Both of these components serve the unity and continuity claims of the founding discourse. Monuments are the means by which the symbols of these premises are produced and communicated. In that way they serve to the self-construction of the state as the authority position. Furthermore they serve as the means of totalization and individualization functions of power with the collective identity they construct.

Apart from these functions, monuments are similar to panoptic tower mentioned in the second chapter in terms providing the institutionalization of subject positions and power relations. The images of Atatürk serve as a means of panopticism. The important thing in the functioning of the panoptic tower is the invisibility of the watcher. In this way the ones being watched feel the effects of surveillance continuously and internalize the rules which they should obey according to the discourse governing the institution they are in. The images of Atatürk are ‘invisible’ because of their existence everywhere in the daily lives of Turkish citizens. Therefore the images of Atatürk in the two monuments of Ankara constantly remind the citizens the premises of the Republic and their existence in details of everyday life serve the institutionalization of these premises.

#### **4.2. ULUS SQUARE AND THE VICTORY MONUMENT**

As mentioned in the third chapter, the importance of Ankara and its primacy as the alternative capital city increased during the nationalist struggle. Ulus square was the place where this struggle was concentrated because of the location of the parliament in one of the buildings in Ulus and because of the demonstrations in that square. In order to understand the importance of the Victory monument as the producer and the communicator of the symbols and the premises of the founding discourse, it is necessary to understand the spatial and chronological existence/location of the monument.

The history and the composition of the Ulus square is a good example for the relationship between power and public space. Since the second half of the nineteenth

century it had been the sphere in which the symbols of the dominant discourse are located. ‘Representations in space’ is one way for the dominant discourse to produce and reproduce itself. The objects of discourse, the definitions, norms and premises of the discourse are introduced and normalized in this way. When Ulus square is analyzed with this perspective, it is seen that Ulus square turned into a discursive topography (Yalım, 2002:170) after the second half of the nineteenth century.

The area that we call Ulus square was not a square before 1890’s , that is, before the construction of Taşhan as a hotel in that area. With the construction of Taşhan the center of the city moved to that area and these changes were done under the Westernization project of the Ottoman Empire. After Taşhan, a new bazaar – *Karacaoğlan Çarşısı*- , administrative center and the gateway to a new railway were constructed in the Square. These are the indicators of the modernization projects in economics and political/governmental spheres. Then the building of Society of Union and Progress was constructed near Taşhan and it was used as the first parliament building during the War of Independence. Between 1918-1923 Taşhan Square was the place from which the War of Independence was directed. This place became the area where people gathered to watch the demonstrations or to rally them against the enemy. These gatherings contributed to the formation of the ‘imaginary bond’ between these people and thus to the formation of the national community. This Square became the central place for the expression of national belonging. Therefore it was started to be named as *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* (National Sovereignty). (Yalım, 2002: 171-177)

After the War, and the foundation of the republic there was the second parliament building, Ankara Palas and İş Bankası in the square which are all symbols of different aspects of the republican discourse. First of all, this new center was the spatial representation of the break with the Ottoman Empire. The center of the Ottoman Empire was rejected and a new ‘blank sheet’ was chosen as the center appropriate to the young and fresh republic. The second parliament building represented the political discontinuity with the Ottomans and the political premises of the republican discourse. The *Sultan* was the sovereign in the Ottoman Empire. As opposed to this, in the new Republic the nation was the legitimate source of sovereignty and the parliament building was the embodiment of this premise. Ankara Palas was built as a guest-house for the official guests. It was the place where the modern life style was experienced. In that respect it was the embodiment of the cultural and social premises of the republican discourse. İş Bankası represented the economic aspect of modernization and nationalism being Turkey’s first private bank founded with state support in 1924 to finance industrial development. (Çınar,2005:13).

The Victory monument becomes more meaningful when contextualized in this respect. Its construction started in 1924. What is important in this construction process is the way this monument had been financed. The competition for the monument and the financial aid was coordinated by the committee lead by Yunus Nadi who was the owner of “Hakimiyeti Milliye” and “Yenigün” newspapers. (Vakıfbank : 15) It is important because it was not organized by the state, but was a civil initiative. On the front wall of the pedestal it is written that “With the initiative

of Yeni Gün and contributions of the entire nation”<sup>5</sup>. The competition was won by Heinrich Krippel and the monument was completed in 1927 and was called the “Victory Monument” (Zafer Anıtı).

The monument is composed of three figures that are located at the corners of a hypothetical triangle. There is a pedestal in the middle of them –in the triangle- upon which there is the statue of Atatürk on a horseback. One of these figures is a soldier in his uniforms and a rifle in his hand. He is watching –for- the enemy. This figure represents the soldier “with all of the equipment of Turkish Independence armed forces carefully watching the horizon line” (Vakıfbank: 15). He is careful, vigilant, cautious, and observant. The second figure is another soldier in his uniforms and a rifle in his hand. With his other hand up he is in a position to call the other – hypothetical- soldiers to war, fight. This soldier represents the “heroic and fervent Turks when they are in a position to defend their country” (Vakıfbank: 16). These two soldiers are the symbols of the Turkish armed forces and the Turkish men and Turkish nation. For each of these groups, these two figures have messages to convey to the public. These two soldier figures address to the public the characteristics of the armed forces and the Turkish men. The underlying message is that Turkish men are brave, fearless, careful and responsible for the protection of the country against the enemy. They are ready and willing to fight if the country is at danger. The important point in these figures is the construction of the nation together with gender roles. The nationalist discourse constructs the nation along with gender identities simultaneously. This will be examined in detail throughout this chapter.

---

<sup>5</sup> “Yeni Gün’ün girişimi ve bütün milletin katılımı ile: Zafer Anıtı”

The third figure is a woman carrying a cannon. She is in her traditional clothes representing the Anatolian women. She is symbolizing Anatolian women who had contributed to the War of Independence. The existence of women in or behind the battle field is considered as a contribution with the underlying assumption that the war is the domain of men. She is symbolizing the self-sacrificing, patriotic characteristics of the Turkish women.

The simultaneity of the construction of national and gender identities also shows itself in the definition of the Turkish women. On the association of gender and nation Mostov argues that “Gender and nation are social constructs which intimately participate in the formation of one another: nations are gendered, and the topography of the nation is mapped in gendered terms (feminized soil, landscapes and boundaries, and masculine movement over these spaces)”(Mostov, 2000:89). The founding discourse ascribes particular roles to women during and after the War of Independence. Women were the self-sacrificing helpers of men during the war. After the foundation of the Republic, the role of women as the reproducers of the Turkish nation and as the carriers of the burden of the “task of being tight-rope walkers between tradition and modernity” (Kadioğlu, 1996: 178) was emphasized. The role of women as the physical and cultural reproducers of the nation attaches them the “symbols of virtue, fertility, strength and continuity” (Mostov, 2000: 91). Furthermore, women serve as territorial markers: “they designate the space of the nation and are, at the same time, the property of the nation. As markers and as property, mothers, daughters and wives require in turn the defense and protection of patriotic sons”(Mostov, 2000: 90). The image of woman as mother can be seen in

both of the monuments analyzed in this chapter. However, the theme of women representing the nation in need of protection can be seen in Güven Monument.

The reliefs in the monument contribute to the theme of Independence war. These reliefs are on the walls of the pedestal. There are also the words/ epigrams Atatürk on the walls of the pedestal written in Arabic since the Alphabet reform had not been done at that time. The Turkish translations of these are later added to the monument. On the front face of the pedestal, which is between the soldier figures, there is a relief of the rising sun. This symbolizes the foundation of the Turkish republic with reference to the Ottoman Empire. Ottoman Empire is depicted as the dark night. The dark represents backwardness, Ottoman Empire's cosmopolitan/heterogeneous character, traditional values, Islam and all the features of the 'ancient regime' that are claimed to be responsible for the unfortunate experience of the Turkish nation. The founding discourse of the Turkish republic frames some events and features of the Ottoman Empire such negative categories. That is to say, Ottoman Empire is represented as the period through which the potentials of the Turkish nation had not been fully realized. The Turkish Republic, rising like a sun above the Turkish nation, would make that potential realized through the modernization and nation building projects.

At this point an important differentiation between the project names of the early republican period and the ones in this thesis should be mentioned. The nationalist discourse of the Turkish republic is based on the assumption that there already exists a Turkish nation. That's why the reforms/interventions of the period are not referred to as nation building. However in this thesis it is argued that the

process of state building and the interventions in the public space should be considered as a whole as a nation building and modernization project.

At the top of the pedestal there is a statement by Atatürk regarding the Victory Monument. This reads “Turkish nation found the best expression and the most meaningful symbol of the liberation and independence struggle and great civilized reforms in this real monument”.<sup>6</sup> With this sentence Atatürk confirms that the figures in the Monument represent the two important components of the founding discourse: the independence war and the modernization project.

On the front wall of the pedestal, there is another sentence by Atatürk: “From now on I will work as a warrior in the hearth of the nation”.<sup>7</sup> This is the date when Mustafa Kemal resigns from military which is under the authority of the Istanbul government. As the leader of the independence movement, Mustafa Kemal’s initiatives annoyed the Istanbul government. As a response to this he resigned and this resignation was a turning point in respect to the clarification of the attitude of the Anatolian movement representing the new Turkish state against Istanbul government representing the Ottoman Empire. From then on he was not serving to the Ottoman army but the Anatolian movement for independence (Atatürk, 1999: 65). Therefore, this statement on the pedestal represents the break from the Ottoman government and its administrative principles.

---

<sup>6</sup> “Türk milleti, kurtuluş ve bağımsızlık mücadelesi zaferinin sonucunu ve çok büyük modern devrimlerini, en anlamlı bir sembolle en iyi anlatacak şekli, yukarıda gerçekleşen simgede bulur. 1927”

<sup>7</sup> “Artık milletin gönlünde savaşçı bir birey olarak çalışacağım. 8 Temmuz 1919”

There are two reliefs on the right side wall of the pedestal. These compositions are about the Independence war and Atatürk. The one at the top illustrates the last big battle in the war of Independence, *Başkumandan* Battle, at the end of which Greeks were defeated. The *Başkumandan* Battle was the indicator of victory of the War of Independence. On this side of the pedestal there is the famous word of Atatürk: “We have got rid of the core of the enemy. Armies, your next mission is the Mediterranean. Forward, march!”<sup>8</sup>. The second relief illustrates Atatürk and his friends/ other soldiers in the War of Independence.

These two reliefs together with the epigram of Atatürk emphasize the importance of the war of Independence in the history of the Turkish nation. This war is important because it is the turning point which designates the break with the Ottoman Empire. According to the nationalist discourse, this war was not only fought against the external enemy, but also against the internal enemy, that is the Istanbul government trying to impede the Independence struggle. The definition, labeling and accusation of the Ottoman Empire are central to the founding discourse of the republic. The war of Independence was a decisive event in terms of the definition of the ‘other’ of the new Republic.

There are also two reliefs on the left side wall of the pedestal. The relief at the top illustrates the occupation forces –the enemy- saluting the Turkish flag (Vakıfbank, : 17). This means that the enemy accepts the victory of the Turkish nation and acknowledges its power. Given the weak position of the Ottoman Empire which is projected as a ‘sick man’, this relief gains more importance. The War of Independence was not only about the land; rather it was also about gaining back the

---

<sup>8</sup> “Düşmanın esas kuvvetleri kökünden yok edilmiştir. Ordular ilk hedefiniz Akdenizdir. İleri. 1 Eylül 1922”

very deserved honor of the Turkish nation, which was lost under the Ottoman rule. The enemy saluting the Turkish flag gives the message that Turkish nation has achieved a respectful status in the eyes of the enemy and the West through the War of Independence.

The second relief on the left side is about the Anatolian people in the War. There are peasants carrying arsenal/weapon store to the battlefield. In this composition there is an old woman, an old man and a young boy with rifles in their hands. Another woman is carrying guns with an oxcart. She carries a baby, also. The image of baby is a common feature of the monuments in Kızılay and Ulus. It represents the hopeful future of the Turkish nation which could be maintained with the victory in the War of Independence. The baby figures also symbolize the innocent and vulnerable aspect of the nation in need of protection. This image depicting woman with her baby contributing to the nationalist struggle is important for the conceptualization of womanhood in the founding discourse. These two, motherhood and contribution to struggle, appear to be national duties a Turkish woman should fulfill.

The sentence by Atatürk on this part of the pedestal reads “We will suffocate the enemy in the innocent/virtuous breast of the country and will win our liberation and independence”<sup>9</sup>. Atatürk said this on August 6, 1921. This is an important date in the War of Independence. On August 5, Turkish Grand national Assembly decided that Mustafa Kemal becomes the chief commander of Turkish Armies and that his orders are binding as law. With the authority he took from the Turkish Grand

---

<sup>9</sup> “Düşmanın ordusunu anayurdumuzun temiz ve kutsal tutulan bağrıda mutlaka boğarak kurtuluş ve bağımsızlığa ulaşacağız. 6 Ağustos 1921”

National Assembly, Mustafa Kemal published 'ten commandments' to help and guide the army. One of these commandments was about the foundation of the National Aid Organization (Milli Yardım Kuruluşu) in every province and district across the country. The mission of this organization was to collect stockings, underwear, shoes for the Turkish army. This organization confiscated all types of grains across the country, and 40 % of the income of merchants, on the condition to pay back later. This aid enabled the victory of the War of Independence. This is one of the reasons why Anatolia, Anatolian people/ peasants are so central in the founding discourse of the Turkish Republic. Anatolia and Istanbul were considered in binary oppositions: Anatolia was poor yet eager to give all for independence. As opposed to this Istanbul was rich and cooperating with the enemy, was ignorant about the struggle going on in Anatolia. This duality again serves to the construction of the leadership of the War of Independence as the true representation of the nation as opposed to the Ottoman government in İstanbul.

On the back side of the pedestal, that is, on the wall behind the figure of Anatolian woman, there is the relief of a plane tree (Vakıfbank, :17). In the relief, the roots of the tree are firmly embedded in the soil. However, the body of the tree is broken, meaning that it has fallen over. There is a branch springing up from the roots. This relief explains how history and the Ottoman Empire were conceptualized in the founding discourse of the Turkish Republic. Plane tree is a big tree and lives very long. The shell that covers the tree is shed periodically and new shell replaces it. With these characteristics, the tree symbolizes the Turkish nation.

The plane tree figure addresses the public the message that Turkish nation is an old and strong collectivity firmly rooted in history. The roots are not the Ottoman Empire or Islamic past since they are responsible for the broken part of the tree. The central Asian past and the Anatolian civilizations are the roots of the Turkish nation. The fallen part of the tree symbolizes the Ottoman period in the history of the Turkish nation. That part is not shown in the relief but there is the broken body piece representing the total break with the Ottoman Empire. The new branch springing from the roots is the Turkish Republic. The roots of the Turkish Republic and the Ottoman Empire are the same: the Central Asia and Anatolia are the areas where the Turkish nation is rooted. However, the rule of the Ottoman Empire disabled the plane tree –the Turkish nation- to fully realize its potentials, to grow up in a sound way. It is this new branch that would enable this. The shell changing/renewing characteristic of the plane tree symbolizes the propensity of the Turkish nation to adapt new changes in the modernization project.

On this part of the pedestal, there is the sentence by Atatürk: “There will be someone to save the unfortunate mother”<sup>10</sup>. This was the date after the victory of the first regular battle between the Turkish army and the Greek army. With this victory of the regular army and the disloyalty of Çerkez Ethem<sup>11</sup> the trust of the people in the regular army had increased. The juxtaposition of the woman figure carrying the bullet and this sentence is illuminating the conceptualization of women in the nationalist discourse. The unfortunate fate of the Turkish nation is embodied in the image of a mother. The mother /woman represents the vulnerability of the nation in

---

<sup>10</sup> “Bulunur kurtaracak talihsiz anneyi. 13 Ocak 1921”

<sup>11</sup> A commander in the nationalist struggle. He and his unit served to the nationalist struggle until the formation of the regular army. Afterwards because of his problems with the hierarchical structure of the military he caused troubles and then cooperated with the Greeks.

need of protection. Since the child represents the future of the nation, mothers are of great importance as the ones responsible for the physical and cultural reproduction of the nation. This makes individual woman responsible to the collectivity: “the gendered national imagery recognizes women as a symbolic collective.

The nation as mother’ produces an image of the allegorical mother whose offspring belong to the entire country’s guardians, heroes and martyrs. Individual mothers are celebrated primarily as instances of this collectivized image. Their pain, suffering and sacrifices are recognized only as a part of the nation’s sacrifice; their individual plights are relevant only to this extent. (Mostov, 2000:91)

Therefore, as those holding the future of the nation, women are very important. Their existence draws the borders of the nation which should be protected by men.

The two wolf heads that are located at the bottom of the monument complete conceptualization of Turkish history. In the epics of the Central Asian Turks, the wolf is very important. In the Ergenekon Epic which is about the creation and spread of the Göktürk people, Turks descend from a wolf, that is, the tribe is reproduced by a man and a female wolf. Also in this epic the wolf directs the people to escape from an area where they were stuck. The existence of the two wolf heads in the monument, thus, connotes the Central Asian roots claim of the founding discourse.

At the top of the pedestal, there is the statue of Atatürk on a horseback. Atatürk is here in his military uniform. This makes an emphasis on the militaristic/warrior characteristic of Atatürk. Similar images of Atatürk in public space will be discussed further later in relation to the Güven Monument. However, in the composition in Victory Monument the horse is also important. The ears of the horse stand upright showing that the horse is alert and ready to move. The testes of

the horse are big making emphasis on masculinity. In the founding discourse the authority position is masculine; the founders, protectors, leaders of the nation are men. Thus, the big testes of the horse Atatürk rides contributes to the construction of authority as masculine. Women are the vulnerable, in need of protection part of the nation defining the borders within which the characteristics of the nation prevail. In the case women contribute to the nationalist struggle or the modernization project they are defeminized, that is, their feminine characteristics are repressed. Those women who had contributed to the War of Independence are brave, and strong. Likewise the modern Turkish woman is a citizen deprived of the feminine characteristics. Her appropriate existence in the public sphere represses and excludes her femininity.

With its theme of the War of Independence and the symbols of the nationalist discourse on the construction of Turkish history, the Victory monument communicates the central premises of the founding discourse to the people. The aim here is that those people would identify themselves with the figures in the monument, would accept the constructed history and therefore the future through this monument, accept the naming of themselves under the same collectivity- Turkish nation. In this way the symbols of the founding discourse are produced and inserted into public space, and the state –the speaking subject and the institution of the founding discourse- produces its authority position and constructs itself. The Victory Monument is located at the center of Ankara which is supposed to be the center of the nation. As the center designates the whole, the symbols in the Victory Monument designate the ‘imaginary bonds’ that enabled the construction of the Turkish nation.

### **4.3. KIZILAY SQUARE AND THE GÜVEN MONUMENT**

The Güven Monument is constructed on 1 November 1934, in Ankara's newly emerging center Yenisehir (New city), by the architect Holzmeister, and the sculptors German Anton Hanak and Australian Josef Thorak. The discourse reproduced by this monument and the messages this monument aim to convey can be understood better if the construction period, the location, and the compositions of the monument are considered altogether.

During 1930's the modernization project was carried out by the state with its intervention in everyday life in detail. These modernization efforts went hand in hand with the construction of Turkish nationalism. As Kadioğlu argues in her article, the project of social engineering was both to modernize the society and to construct the nationhood, since both required "achieving a balance between [the materiality of] the West and [the spirituality of] the East" (1996: 178). Apart from modernization efforts, in the realm of politics there had been some upheavals that the state elite could not predict. The democratization efforts under the leadership of Republican People's Party ended up with being an umbrella for the opposition. First the Progressive Republican Party (Ahmad, 1991:65-82) was opened with the initiative of RPP in 1924 and closed after the Seyh Said rebellion, being held responsible for the uprising. Later in 1930 the Free Party (Weiker, 1991: 83-98) was opened and lasted until the Menemen Event, like the previous democratization trial. The establishment of these parties was an important step towards democratization. The failure of the democratization efforts decreased the state's trust in democratic principles and the

notion of the ‘internal disorder’ appeared. Being constructed in a period following these rebellions, the monument has traces of the response of the state toward the revival of internal disorder and threat which involves more authoritarian governance. This is the reason why security within borders and the ‘omnipresence’ of the state across the borders were emphasized in this period of the Republic.

The place of Güven Monument is also important. It is located at the center of the capital city, Ankara, in a park. As mentioned in the third chapter, Ankara became the new capital of Turkish Republic in 1923, symbolizing the refusal of both Istanbul -as the capital of the Ottoman Empire- and everything Istanbul represents such as Ottoman rule, Islam, tradition and backwardness, in the eyes of the founding elite. Furthermore, the monument is at the center of the newly constructed Yenisehir (*New city*), the center planned and built by the state. The planned, rational appearance of Yenisehir is the representation of the modernization and nationalist discourses. Yenisehir was at that time the residential area for the new Republican elite and civil servants. Therefore the location of Güven Monument is about the construction of citizenship. The Güven Park, where the monument is located in, is designed for people to rest, to walk by, and to spend their time. In this way it directly addresses to the people living in city, using the city center, and this contributes further to the message of the monument. Because of the location of the monument, the citizens exposed to the new ideals of the Turkish nation on a daily basis. The monument is located at the heart of the Yenisehir, and what it represents is the core of modernist, nationalist discourse.

Before starting the analysis of the monument, it is better to clarify Hanak's (the sculptor of the monument until he dies in 1934) image of the monument and the Turkish nation. This is necessary, in fact, because his Austrian origin may rise doubts about his competence on the premises of the republican discourse, yet the quotation below would nullify them. Hanak says,

There must be a sign addressing to the people and guiding them into the future. It must express the fundamentals upon which the new Turkish Republic was built. Moreover, the form of the monument must be similar to this. A stone work with two giants stemming from a volcano and shining like burning metal. The symbol of a thousand year old Turkey. And the symbol of new Turkey, rising on the unshakable principles of the country.” (Ertuna, 2004)

The monument is composed of mainly two parts; the first part is named as “Atatürk and Turkish Nation” (Figure 1), and second as “the Security Forces and the Turkish nation”<sup>12</sup> (Figure 2). Both parts are composed of two relief groups at each side, and a sculpture group in between these reliefs.

The first part, “Atatürk and the Turkish Nation” addresses to the public the message that Turkish nation should be proud of and should trust itself. Two relief groups at the bottom and the main relief in the middle explain the reasons for this message. The relief on the right side is called “Creative and Constructive Genius ” (Figure 3). There are six naked muscular men dealing with a kind of manual work. The first man is sitting and making pottery on a pottery loom. The second man stands, holding something in his hands; he is an artist making drawings, figures on a wall. The third man is sitting with one of his hands at his cheek and the other at his back, he is in deep thought. His eyes are on the owl in front of him, standing next to

---

<sup>12</sup> Dividing the monument on the basis of themes and naming parts accordingly are done by the writer of this thesis, these titles are not quoted from an official document.

his knee. At the top of the owl is a bust of a bearded man wearing a hat. Next, there is a man sitting with a plate in his arms, writing something on it. The other two men are working on iron. The first of these, a metal worker, holds a tool with which he pours melted iron. He is standing and between his legs there is a wheel. The last man is also standing and has a big hammer in his hand. He is giving shape to the melted metal. Between these two metal workers is an oven.

This relief group supports the message of ‘Turkish nation! Trust yourself!’ by symbolizing the constructive and creative side of the Turkish nation. They should show trust in themselves because they are creative, smart, talented, and they have the necessary genius to catch up with contemporary civilization. All of the men are naked, there is no reference to time; meaning that the constructive and creative genius of Turkish society, (and so the Turkish nation itself) is ahistorical, ie is an eternal part of their true nature. The man making pottery is the symbol of traditional handicrafts. He has the transformative power and transforms the soil –the nature- into some functional thing. The metal workers are also the symbols of the transformative aspect of human labor. These men indicate that the Turkish nation has the industry in itself to catch up with contemporary civilization, the central premise of nationalism and modernization in Turkey. The wheel between the legs of the metal worker represents the engineering, technology aspect of the work. The man sitting with one hand at his chin, the man’s bust and the owl symbolize the intellectual ability and wisdom of the Turkish nation. The thinking man can be an ordinary person. However, it is clear that the bust belongs to an important or famous intellectual. The bust image is important in that it only takes the head part of the body into

---

consideration. Making emphasis on the head, the bust gives the impression that the owner of the bust is important in terms of his wisdom and intellectual achievements. The man in the bust has a long beard, which is the symbol of age and wisdom. The sculptor might have designed this bust in reference to a specific Turkish thinker; however, the impression it creates is that he is an anonymous thinker representing the wisdom of the Turkish nation. Another important thing about the bust is the hat the man is wearing; it is not a *sarık* worn by the Islamic thinkers, therefore implies the intellectual articulation of the pre-Islamic times of Turks. The owl can be read in two different ways and this affects the theme of the first relief group generally. The owl is the bird of the goddess Athena who is the symbol of wisdom. Whoever has the owl on her/his head knows everything. Then in the relief, the owl at the center symbolizes the wisdom of the Turkish nation. The thinking man looks at the owl, meaning that through his mind he reaches knowledge. The owl is also situated under the bust, so wisdom is the root of Turkish thinkers. Using the Greek myths in the explanation of Turkish nation's wisdom means that Turkish nationalism is constructed on the roots of the civilizations that were located on Turkish Republic's land before; Anatolia and some part of Aegean region. Also this may be using the same reference with the Western world in terms of locating cultural roots in history.

The left hand relief group can be named as "Anatolian People" (Figure 4). In this composition there are seven people and none of them is naked nor have well-built, strong bodies. At the back is a woman carrying a basket, which is full of fruit like things, on her shoulder. She has a scarf covering her hair, not her face and she wears a long skirt. In front of her legs there is a child, the woman touches his shoulder, meaning that he is her child. In front of them is a man wearing a *kasket*, a

kind of hat worn by the rural men in Turkey. He holds straw in his one arm, and in his other hand he holds a sickle. In front of this man, there are two women; hairs are covered, with long skirts. One of them carries a lamb. The other woman carries an earthenware jug in her arms and in front of her there is a child holding her skirt. Next to these women stands a man with a bag hanging from his shoulder; he has seeds in that bag, and he is sowing them, throwing them with one hand to the soil. Also there are two men and two oxes plowing the farm. One of these men is near the oxes and the other is holding the plow. Behind these people there are houses, trees, windows and roofs showing that this is a village.

This composition gives the message that ‘Turkish nation! Trust yourself, because your roots, essence is in Anatolia, and in Anatolian culture. You have a strong past’. It is the example of the importance of Anatolia, that is, the village people and their way of life, in the construction of Turkish nationalism. Turkish nationalism defined its roots as Anatolia and the core population as village people. As Göle argues “ As far as the principle of nationalism was concerned, it fundamentally relied upon the populism of Anatolia in opposition to the elitist cosmopolitanism of the Ottomans.”(1996, 62) The replacement of Ottoman past and Islamic culture with Anatolian past and culture is the basis of exclusion of Ottoman and Islam – those deemed obstacles to modernization- from the imagination of Turkishness.

Between these two groups of relief, there is a higher wall on which there are the statues of Atatürk and four young men. This composition is “Atatürk and Turkish Youth” (Figure 5). Atatürk stands in between those men. He is frowning, wears a

long jacket, and his right arm is bended from elbow, his hand on his breast. He is in a position of guarding himself, the ones near him and the Turkish nation. Atatürk is frowning with a strict expression on his face. He is a step in front of those men, and is at the center of the composition. The four men next to him are half naked and fit in shape. The ones on the right hand of Atatürk symbolize unity. One of them put his arm on the other's shoulder and they shake hands. The other two symbolize security in the modern age with their naked swords. Atatürk, being one step in front preserves them, opens then the path they should follow. The four young men, with their muscular bodies and ready to fight impression, protect Atatürk and the path he opens and they should follow. All of these five men stand with legs wide open, meaning that they stand secure, it is hard for them to fall or change position. This composition conveys the message that “ Trust yourselves, because there is your leader and youth that will elevate you to modern civilization”. These five men defend the premises of the Republic and the nation. Thus the nation appears to be something in need of protection, which is the theme of the other side of the monument.

Under ‘Atatürk and Turkish youth’ there is a date written in Roman numbers; MCMXXXV. This may have two meanings. Taking Roman numbers as the symbol of modernity, universal Western culture, this may make reference to the desired level of civilization. The second reason may be the worry to create a timeless, ahistorical image. Although the time of the monument is written on it, the Roman numbers, by not being understandable to everyone, make it ironically time-less.

On the other side of the monument, again there are two relief groups<sup>13</sup> and between them on a wall there are the statues of two men. This side of the monument gives the message that “Turkish Nation! You are secure”. This relief groups and the statues represent the security forces and Turkish nation. The relief composition on the right is named as “The Police” (Figure 6); it tells the police force and the people. Here, the context is about the arresting of a man who committed a crime by the police. There are two women standing, hairs are covered, wearing long dresses, with a sad impression on their face. One of the women has a - naked-, child in her arms, that child leans on her and the other woman carries a baby. Next to them there are two policemen and another man. The policemen in this composition wear uniforms, caps and carry guns. One of the policemen holds the man- who is wounded or dead. The wounded man is naked and thin. The other policeman next to the wounded man carries a cloth like thing, giving the impression that he is going to cover the man. Next to them, there are, again, two policemen and a man. The police are walking one after the other, and the one in front carries a long, thick stick, probably a rifle. In front of these police, there is a man, handcuffed. He is naked but does not have a fit, strong body. In this composition, between the police holding a cloth to cover the man and the police walking behind the criminal there are apartment like cubic shapes indicating that here is a city. This tells us that, the police provides and assures order and justice in city. The security forces not only deal with the criminal, but they also take care of the victim.

---

<sup>13</sup> Hanak describes these relief groups as follows: “two giant figures describing: defense forces determined to guard the property and sacred temples of the Turkish people. Two reliefs to be placed on the right and left of the two giant bronze figures describing: Policemen and gendarmes working in danger for the security of the people” (Ertuna, 2004)

The relief on the left side, “The Gendarme” (Figure 7), is similar to the other one, but the story takes place in a rural area. Here the gendarme and the rural people are depicted. There is a man handcuffed, walking. He wears a *kasket*, he is not naked and between his legs there is a sheep. This tells us that, here is a rural place, a village. Behind him, there are two gendarmes, one carrying a rifle. The gendarme in this composition wears uniforms and caps, however different than the police. Next to these people, some houses and trees are seen on the background, and there is something like flame over them, giving the impression that the village is burning. On the front, a gendarme holds a woman. She is not naked, is old and her hair is covered. She is about to fall, or has just fallen and the gendarme tries to get her stand. Near them, there is a child on his knees; his head has fallen in front. Next to them, a gendarme is holding a man. This man may be wounded or suffering from the criminal and the gendarme is trying to comfort him. One of his knees is bended; he may be leaning on the gendarme. Also, the man may be a friend or someone close to the victim and perhaps he wants to take revenge, because he is directed to the criminal, and the gendarme is in a position to stop him, to calm him down so as to allow justice be served by the state. Next to them there is a man- the victim- between the two gendarmes, his arms are at the shoulders of the gendarmes, and the gendarmes are carrying him. Here, the security forces represent the justice and the safety of the people. They arrest the criminal, take care of the sufferers and the victim, and also prevent any illegal act – preventing the man from taking his revenge-.

Between these two relief groups, there is a wall on which the statues of two men named as “continuity of security” (Figure 8) takes place. One of these men has a beard and appears relatively old compared to the other man. He leans on the wall

behind them with one of his hands and holds a rifle like gun with the other hand. However, he is not in a position to shoot the gun, but about to put it on the ground. The other man seems younger than the first, has a more fit body, his muscles are more apparent and he holds the rifle with two of his hands, not directed to the public, but to the wall. So he is ready to shoot, if it is necessary. These two men symbolize the security forces. The young and the old one create the feeling that the old one is about to give his duty to provide security to the other, security continues and the nation is always safe. These two men, together with the strong masculine images, represent the power and the continuity of power of the state.

Under the statue, Atatürk's words "Turk, be proud, work, and trust" is written. Atatürk, addressing the Turkish nation, advises or orders them to be proud of themselves because they have won the Independence War and founded the new Republic. This boasting is important for the nation to have self-confidence. Turkish nation should also work hard; the success that brings the proudness is not enough, there is more to achieve. Turkish nation should also trust in itself. This saying is actually the core of the first part of the monument; "Atatürk and the Turkish Nation".

In order to locate the symbolic meanings derived from the monument in the analysis of nationalist discourse, clarification of some concepts is necessary. The name of the monument and the park it is in is *Güven*. The Turkish word *güven* has two meanings in English; trust/confidence and being secure. Although both sides of the monument 'Atatürk- Turkish nation' and 'Security forces-Turkish nation' can be titled in Turkish with the same word *güven*, English translation needs to be clarified. 'Atatürk and Turkish nation' part of the monument, that is, the reliefs of village,

creativity, and the statues of Atatürk and the Turkish youth, emphasize *güven* in the sense of having trust in yourselves. Turkish nation has the necessary ability and genius in itself to achieve the goals of contemporary civilization; Atatürk is there to lead the nation, thus the Turkish nation should have trust in itself. The second part of the monument, ‘Security forces and Turkish nation’ has another meaning of *güven*, being secure; security forces are always ready to provide justice and order in society, Turkish people are secure .

#### **4.4. THE MONUMENTS AND THE REPUBLICAN DISCOURSE**

In the monument, women are represented as a one fixed type; their heads are covered, they are always wearing long skirts and are either carrying a baby or with a child. There are no women in the relief composition showing the creativity and constructiveness of Turkish nation (Figure1), neither women are in a position to defend something, neither. In this way the gendered division of labor contributes to the construction of nationality. The monument is a good example of the statement that “Gender and nation are social constructions which intimately participate in the formation of one another; nations are gendered, and the topography of the nation is mapped in gendered terms.”(Mostov, 2000: 89) Together with their representation with the child, the Turkish women are responsible for the physical reproduction of the society; they are represented in a way that their mental and physical abilities do not constitute an important place in the ‘development’ of Turkish society. Compared with the other monuments of the first Republican era, women are underrepresented in this monument. The one in Ulus attaches importance to the role of Anatolian women in the Turkish War of Independence. Also there are, again, no women in the statue of

Atatürk and the Turkish youth; meaning that it is men that will protect the Turkish nation and be lead by Atatürk. The representation of women in the security forces reliefs are also important; in these reliefs women represent the sufferers of the crime, internal disorder and the society that is vulnerable and in need of protection. On this note Mostov states that

The vulnerability and seductiveness of women/borders (space/nation) require the vigilance of protectors or border guards [security forces in this case]. Thus, just as the territory of the nation must be protected by male soldiers and national leaders, women's bodies must be protected by fathers, husbands and the (national) state." (2000: 91)

The image of the Turkish nation that continuously needs protection because of the insecurity of the internal conditions is given through the sad, helpless women left with their children. The security forces, all of them are male, are always there to protect, cure the problems, disorders of the feminine, helpless society.

The representation of men in the monument and the emphasis on masculinity are important indicators of gendered construction of Turkish nationalism. The images of strong, well-shaped men in the relief "creativity", in the statue of "Atatürk and Turkish youth" and "the continuity of security" indicate gendered division of labor in the society. Men are assigned to creative and constructive activity and the protection of the nation, maintenance of internal order. They are, as the representatives of the state, the ones to lead and elevate the nation. The emphasis on their strength is due to the masculinity of the state - as opposed to the femininity of the nation and its borders-. In her article explaining the relationship between masculinity and nationalism in Israel, Mayer argues that the emphasis on masculinity is borrowed from German experience; first of all gymnastics constitutes the link between masculinity and the construction of nationalism, and then the connection is

strengthened through the construction of weak, helpless other(Tamar, 2000: 283-287). The muscular, all-ready to defend images of men exist with their ‘other’ in the monument, the internal enemy.

Another feature differentiating the Güven Monument from the other monuments that were built during the early Republican time is the emphasis on internal disorder and threat. The other statues usually address to the enemy outside the borders and it is the soldiers that protect the country. In the Victory Monument, for example, Atatürk is dressed in military uniform, stressing his military leadership, and the War of Independence against the external enemy. Emphasizing the internal disorder and locating the security forces at the center are unique aspects of the Güven Monument, due to the internal upheavals. 1930’s is the period when the democratization trials failed and the trust of the state in the ability of people to govern themselves decreased. Güven Monument depicts the nation as helpless, in need of protection and governance. As opposed this subjugated position, the state appears as all-dominant, ‘omnipresent’, all-ready authority position with the image of the security forces working in both urban and rural areas.

#### **4.4.1. Individualization, Totalization, Panopticism**

The Republican project needs new individuals, and this requires the creation and definition of new categories constructed by the republican discourse. There are the definitions of Turkish woman, Turkish Youth and Turkish Man in these monuments. Turkish women participated in the Independence War, they contributed to the struggle and the foundation of the republic. They are the chosen symbols of

responsibility for the upbringing of new generations, new Turkish citizens. However, the Turkish woman and her children are the victims of internal threat and they should be protected. The vulnerability and helplessness of Turkish woman is more evident compared to the figures defining the Turkish man. Turkish man is strong; his strength is evident in his muscular, fit body. He has a creative and constructive genius, and is ready to serve his country. He is the one who defends his country against the external enemy – the soldiers in the Victory Monument-, and the internal enemy – the security forces in Güven Monument-. Another individual category may be Turkish youth who follows the path opened by Atatürk and defends him and his republic. With those individual identities, the monuments address the individual in his/her own personality. A person looking at that monument sees the figures of women, identifies herself with those women, and the identity of Turkish woman is created and imposed in this way. The reproduction of power is through the internalization of those identities of the nationalist discourse

Besides their constitutive function toward the making of the individual national subject, the monuments serve the constitution of the collective subject. In this case, they address everybody looking at them, regardless of gender or age. The aim is that the person looking at those monuments should feel that s/he is a part of Turkish nation. The Victory Monument does this through the theme of Independence War. The figures and the relief groups explain how the Turkish nation fought in and won that war. Addressing the Turkish nation, the Victory Monument conveys the message that ‘you belong to a nation that had very difficult days in the past, but was able to cope with those problems as a nation’. Güven Monument directs messages related to the future, that the nation has a common future; that is , the elevation to the

level of contemporary civilization. They promise that the nation would altogether work hard and achieve this common goal. These monuments create collective identities that enable the nationalist discourse and reproduce that power relationship. It is through the creation of these bonds between people the state is able to rule them in their collectivity.

Besides the totalization and individualization functions, the monuments serve as panoptic towers. The main thing in the panopticism is the invisibility of the power. The one in the tower is invisible, so prisoners feel that they are always under surveillance. The same invisibility can be argued for Atatürk images. Atatürk led the foundation of the republic and he became the symbol of the premises of the new state. After his death, his symbol is used by the republican elites to maintain the functioning of the republican project. Today, we see the pictures of Atatürk everywhere: in all government offices, his picture is hanged, designating the source of authority. In public and private schools, above the board in class, the portrait of Atatürk is hanged between his Address to the Turkish Youth and National Anthem, as the sacred texts students should follow and respect. At the entrance of every institution, a saying of Atatürk related to that institution is written, seeking legitimacy for its existence in the words of the authority. For example, at the entrance and brochures of Turkish Drivers Association writes the words of Atatürk: “Turkish driver is the man of the most noble emotions”<sup>14</sup>. His picture is on the money used in everyday life; which is the indicator that he is the only permanent symbol of the Turkish state. Apart from those, his pictures are on the walls of restaurants, photocopy rooms, t-shirts, that is, in every detail of daily life. These all

---

<sup>14</sup> “Türk şoförü en asil duyguların insanıdır.”

make the image of Atatürk invisible. Since it is everywhere, we do not recognize it. It appears something as natural, normal part of the walls of our life. The image carries its meaning with itself. The taken-for-granted is not only the image of Atatürk, but also the meanings it implies. Atatürk is the symbol of the modernization and nation-building efforts of the republic. All the premises of this discourse are embodied in the image of Atatürk. Therefore, the republican discourse appears as something that does not have any alternative, that is the only path to be followed. The invisibility, yet omnipresence of the symbols of power and the power itself functions like the panoptic tower. They create the feeling that people are always being watched, and they internalize the premises of the republic.

The image of Atatürk in those monuments is a part of panoptic functioning. The figures of Atatürk are as if watching the public from above. Although the act of watching is not realized, in terms of its effects, those monuments are the panoptic towers. They are one of the means of internalization of the categories of normal. Through this internalization, actual observation becomes unnecessary. Also the figures of muscular men are the symbols of state power, and they strengthen the monuments' representativeness of the state. Furthermore, the soldiers and the security forces are the symbols of omnipresence of the state in the borders of the country. The combination of all those images renders the monuments the personifications of the state power.

Turkish nationalism, like all other constructions of national consciousness, is constructed with gender identities. In the imagination of nation, women and men are assigned different roles and the identities associated with gender roles are used to

explain the “omnipotence” of state power, the vulnerability of the nation. Güven monument serves to the imagination of Turkish nation as having the necessary creative, artistic and constructive genius in itself to achieve the contemporary civilization. Taking Anatolian people as the core population, the monument represents the official approach to Anatolia, and excludes Ottoman past and Islamic culture. The need for protection and helplessness, being the sufferer of the internal threat are represented as the basic characteristics of the nation, through the image of women defining the boundaries of it. On the other hand, the relationship of the nation and the state authority is constructed through the image of strong men and security forces. Güven Monument, being located at the center of the new capital city, contributed to the reproduction of the modernist and nationalist discourses of Turkish Republic. Likewise, Victory Monument is the embodiment of the construction of past in the founding discourse in the early republican era. With its theme the War of Independence, the Victory Monument designates an important turning point in the construction of past: the break with the Ottoman Empire. Through the images otherizing the Ottoman Empire and the features attached to that era, the Victory Monument contributes to the construction of the early republican discourse. Considering these two monuments together enables us to see the changes in the emphasis of the republican discourse. While the Victory Monument focuses on external threat by constructing the past, the Güven Monument emphasizes internal threat and the authority of the state against it.

## **CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION**

This thesis is mainly about the construction of the republican discourse in the early republican era through interventions in space. It builds on the analysis of the two monuments, Victory Monument in Ulus and Güven Monument in Kızılay. The symbolic and literal construction of Ankara, and the content and form of the monuments are helpful to understand and analyze the premises of the republican discourse.

The second chapter of this thesis provides the theoretical framework within which the relationship of the state and the public in the early republican era is analyzed. It does this through the conceptualization of the relationship between power and discourse in Foucauldian sense. Discourse can be defined as the totality of an institution, speaking subjects taking their authority from that institution, and a body of knowledge and practice constructed by them. This body of knowledge and practice constitutes the objects of discourse and the arbitrary relations between them. Power emerges in the hierarchical relations of subjectivities constructed by the discourse.

Discourse constructs arbitrary relations between dispersed events with the underlying assumptions of unity and continuity. The claims of unity and continuity in return hide the arbitrariness of the discourse. These basic premises and the arguments deriving from them are not questioned and are considered as natural. The institutionalization of the discourse enables this.

In the case of construction of the Turkish republican discourse the unity claim is embodied in the construction of subjectivities and the past. The construction of Turkish woman and the association of motherhood, vulnerability, helplessness with the subjectivity of womanhood; the construction of Turkish man and the association of strength, braveness, patriotism, military capabilities, being the guardian of the nation with the subjectivity of manhood are among the elements of this arbitrary unity. The construction of the past with arbitrary exclusion and inclusions is also a part of republican discourse. Accordingly, the ‘awakening’ of the Turkish nation starts with the War of Independence excluding the period under the Ottoman rule. What is to be included and excluded from the imaginary of Turkishness are defined according to the founding principles of the republican discourse. Therefore, it is not surprising that Greek , Anatolian civilizations, the Central Asia were included in the contextualization of the roots of the Turkish nation, but the Islamic and Ottoman past was excluded.

The theme of continuity also prevails as an underlying assumption in the republican discourse. Although the republican project constructs itself as modern in contrast to tradition attached to Ottoman Empire, the emphasis on Anatolia and its culture constitutes the embodiment of continuity claim. The incorporation of

Anatolia and Central Asia in the imagination of Turkishness provides the foundations for the continuity of the Turkish nation and its chronological mobility. Also the arguments of development and modernization in the sense that catching up with contemporary civilization following the linear path of European experience are a part of continuity claim of the republican discourse.

These claims are imposed on dispersed events which are defined and categorized by the discourse as a harmonious whole and as the steps in the development process. In order to reveal the arbitrariness and taken-for-grantedness of these claims that constitute the basis of the discourse, the dispersed events should be analyzed on their own individuality. This is the reason why I have chosen the monuments as the producers and communicators of the symbols of the republican discourse. These monuments are the embodiments of the arbitrary unity of the republican discourse: through their symbols they convey the republican premises. The detailed analysis of the images in these monuments enables one to grasp the constructedness inherent in them.

The third chapter of this thesis aims at a spatial contextualization. In this chapter an introduction to the concepts of nation and nationalism employed in this thesis is followed by the explanation of the symbolic construction of Ankara as the national center. The symbolic construction is the values and meanings attached to the literal construction and to Ankara in binary opposition to and as a counter center of İstanbul. In the construction of the republican discourse and the Turkish Republic, the construction of the nation and national center are very important because this center designates the whole and shelters the symbols of the nationalist discourse.

Nations do not have essential characteristics of their own, but are the products of specific conditions in history. Language, race, religion cannot provide firm grounds upon which the national consciousness can be founded. Rather, the construction of collective history and future provides these grounds. What is common among the members of a national community is the feeling of belonging created by these grounds. The republican discourse creates its objects like Turkishness, femininity, masculinity, patriotism, citizenship, modern individual, internal and external threat, the Ottomans and Islam as the other of the Republican Turkey and so on. It also creates the symbols of these. The institutionalization of the discourse is, then, possible through the taken-for-grantedness of the definitions and categories of the discourse. The representation of the symbols of the premises of the discourse is a way of achieving this.

The nation is imagined through the representations of the symbols of imaginary bonds. In the case of this thesis, the monuments are the producers and communicators of the symbols of the premises of the republican project. The location of these monuments at the center of the nation means that they are supposed to address the whole nation. Because of its unpossessibility and designating the whole, the center of the nation is a proper place to erect the monuments.

The fourth chapter is composed of the analysis of the two monuments in Ankara arguing that the construction of monuments is a way of producing and publicizing the symbols of the basic premises of the Republic and therefore it contributes to the reproduction of the discourse and the construction of the nation and the self-construction of the state. Monuments are built to praise and glorify important

events, persons of a community. Those people who decide on the content and form of the monuments are the authority positions. They determine what is important to that community and what should be remembered forever. Since authority positions are created by the discourse and they contribute to the reproduction of the discourse, the content and form of the monuments give the insights of the premises of the discourse.

The Victory Monument was erected in 1927. In these first years of the Republic, the main concern was the external threat and the exclusion of the Ottoman values from the image of the Turkish nation. The theme of this monument is the War of Independence which is considered as a starting point for the Turkish nation. The definition, labeling and accusation of the Ottoman Empire were central to the founding discourse of the republic. The War of Independence was a decisive event in terms of the definition of the 'other' of the new Republic. Furthermore, this war was not only about the land; rather it was also about gaining back the very deserved honor of the Turkish nation, which was lost under the Ottoman rule. Therefore, the existence of the figures depicting the War of Independence is crucial in the construction of the republican discourse.

The Güven Monument was completed in 1935. This was the period when the primary concerns of the Republic were replaced by the internal disorder and threat. This necessitated a strict response on the side of the state. The Güven Monument, with its emphasis on security within borders, is the embodiment of this concern. Furthermore, it includes symbols of self-confidence necessary for the achievements of the goals set by the republican project.

These two monuments contribute to the construction of the nation and gender. The construction of the definitions of Turkish woman and man are crucial in the nation building process. Women are represented as vulnerable, helpless mothers of the nation symbolizing the need of protection and governance of the nation and defining the symbolic borders. Men are represented as the guardians, leaders, intellectually and bodily capable side of the Turkish nation. Together with the images of Atatürk, they complement the masculinity of the authority position. The images of Atatürk, because of the ironic invisibility caused by their existence everywhere, function like the panoptic tower contributing the institutionalization of the discourse.

In this thesis, the emphasis is on the construction of gender and nationhood. Further research can be done on the construction of history, that is, the exclusion of Islam and Ottoman Empire from the imagination of Turkish nation and the inclusion of the Central Asia and Anatolia. The textbooks, documents of History Congress, can be the material to be analyzed. In this way, the construction of history which is central to the construction of nationhood would be examined in detail. The examination of the excluded and the included reveal the underlying assumptions guiding the construction of Turkish history and nation building.

Since the dominant discourse shapes the space, the changes in the premises of the republican discourse can be traced through the changes in the center and the symbols located there. In this sense, the changes of the central symbols in Ulus and Kızılay on the one hand, and the changes of the importance of Ulus and Kızılay as

the centers can be useful to define and explain the changes both within the republican discourse and of the dominant discourse itself.

This thesis is built on the analysis of the republican discourse through its embodiments in the public space. The important thing in the relationship between the power and the public space is the control of the power over the symbols. In this sense, other communicators of the symbols of the republican discourse like postage stamps, coins, newspapers, magazines, postcards, other artifacts like novels, poems, paintings may reveal other aspects of the republican discourse.

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmad Feroz, (1991) “The Progressive Republican Party”, in *Political Parties and Democracy in Turkey*, Metin Heper and Jacob Landau, eds. London: I.B. Tauris, 65-82
- Anderson, Benedict. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) New York: Verso.
- Atatürk, Mustafa Kemal. (1999) *Nutuk* (volume1) (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) Ankara: Tarih Kurumu Basımevi
- Atatürkçülük* (1983) Genelkurmay Basımevi
- Bitusikova, Alexandra. (1998) “Transformations of a City Centre in the Light of Ideologies: The Case of Banska Bystrica, Slovakia” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. 22:4, 614-622
- Bozdoğan, Sibel. 2002. *Modernizm ve Ulusun İnşası: Erken Cumhuriyet Türkiye’sinde Mimari Kültür (Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic)*. İstanbul: Metis.
- Burchell, G., C. Gordon, P. Miller (eds)(1991) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. London : Harvester Wheatsheaf
- Butterfield, Andrew. (2003). “Monuments and Memories” in *The New Republic*. 228: 4, 27-32
- Colombijn, Freek. (1998). “Canberra: A Sheep in Wolf’s Clothing” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*.22:4, 565-581
- Cumhuriyet Dönemi (1927-1938) Ankara’da Atatürk Anıt ve Heykelleri. Ankara: Vakıfbank
- Çınar, Alev. “Making the City, Imagining the Nation: Material Form as Symbol of Nationalism and Modernity,” in *Locating The City: Urban Imaginaries and the Practices of Modernity*, eds. Alev Çınar and Thomas Bender, forthcoming in 2005.
- Ertuna, Can (director). (2004). *The Trace on the Stone* (documentary)

- Foucault, Michel (1970) *The Order of Things*, London: Tavistock Publications
- (1972,a) *The Archeology of Knowledge*, New York: Pantheon Books.
- (1972,b), “The Discourse on Language” in *The Archeology of Knowledge*, New York, Pantheon Books.
- (1979) *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the Prison*, NY: Vintage Books
- (1980), “Two Lectures” in *Power/Knowledge*, New York, Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- (1982) “The Subject and Power” in H. Dreyfus *Michel Foucault, Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Brighton : Harvester Press
- (1988) *Politics Philosophy Culture: interviews and other writings of Michel Foucault*, New York: Routledge
- Göle, Nilüfer (1996) *The Forbidden Modern: Civilization and Veiling*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, p62
- Hobbes, Thomas. (1985). *Leviathan*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985
- Kadioğlu, Ayşe. (1996). “The Paradox of Turkish Nationalism and the Construction of Official Identity”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, 32:2, April
- Kezer, Zeynep. (1999) “The Making of a National Capital: Ideology and Socio-Spatial Practices in Early Republican Ankara.” Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley
- Locke, John. (1993). “The Second Treaties of Government: An essay Concerning the True Original Extent, and End of Civil Government” in John Locke: Political Writings. London : Penguin Books
- Mayer, Tamar “From Zero to Hero: Masculinity and Jewish Nationalism” in *Gender Ironies of Nationalism: Sexing the Nation*, Tamar Mayer (ed.), London ; New York : Routledge, 2000, p283-307
- McCrone, David. (1998). *The Sociology of Nationalism*. New York: Routledge
- Mostov, Julie. (2000). “Sexing the nation/desexing the body: Politics of national identity in the former Yugoslavia” in *Gender Ironies of Nationalism: Sexing the Nation*, Tamar Mayer (ed.) London ; New York : Routledge, 89-110
- Nas, Peter J.M. (1993) “Introduction” in *Urban Symbolism* 1-12
- Poggi, Gianfranco. (1978). *The Development of the Modern State- A Sociological Introduction*. Stanford, Calif. : Stanford University Press,
- Tankut, Gönül. (1990) *Bir Başkent'in İmarı Ankara: 1929-1939*. Ankara: ODTÜ

- Tankut, Gönül (2001) “Ankara İmar Planı Uygulamasının 1929-1939 Arasındaki Dikkati Çeken Verileri” in *Tarih İçinde Ankara 2*, Yıldırım Yavuz ed. Ankara: ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Yayınları 9-15
- Tekeli, İlhan (2000) “Ankara'nın Başkentlik Kararının Ülkesel Mekan Organizasyonu ve Toplumsal Yapıya Etkileri Bakımından Genel Bir Değerlendirilmesi” in *Tarih İçinde Ankara*, Ayşıl Tükel Yavuz ed. Ankara: ODTÜ Ankaralılar Vakfı.317-335
- Yalım, İnci. (2002). “Ulus Devletin Kamusal Alanda Meşruiyet Aracı: Toplumsal Belleğin Ulus Meydanı Üzerinden Kurgulanma Çabası” in *Ankara'nın Kamusal Yüzleri: Başkent Üzerine Mekan-Politik Tezler*, Güven Arif Sargin ed. İstanbul: İletişim. 157-214
- Yılmaz, Mustafa and et al. (1998). *Atatürk ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*. Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Weiker, Walter, (1991)“ The Free Party” in *Political Parties and Democracy in Turkey*, Metin Heper and Jacob Landau, eds. London: I.B. Tauris, 83-98

## APPENDIX

**Figure 1: “Atatürk and the Turkish Nation”**



**Figure2: “Security Forces and the Turkish Nation”**



**Figure 3: “Creative and Constructive Genius”**



**Figure 4: “Anatolian People”**



**Figure 5: “Atatürk and Turkish Youth”**



**Figure 6: “The Police”**



**Figure 7: “The Gendarme”**



Figure 8: "Continuity of Security"

