

## ETIQUETTE RULES IN THE EARLY REPUBLICAN PERIOD

*Elif Mahir* \*

In the first two decades of the Republic, the revolutionary elites made great efforts to effect radical transformations towards the Europeanization of Turkish cultural life. Methods ranging from propaganda to coercion were used to shape the everyday lives of the citizens. One cultural method among these was the introduction of rules of etiquette for everyday behavior. In interwar era Turkey, etiquette was a symbol of modernization and it was used as a means of cutting the cultural ties with the Ottoman past.

Etiquette rules, which had been shaped and honed in Europe over centuries, were seen as a practical and effective way to show and emphasize the commonalities with the West and were promoted extensively by the Turkish elite. The rapid visual transformation of the clothing and behavior went before the intellectual evolution towards Westernization. Thus, rules about appearance and manners that could be applied with ease were at certain times utilized as a shield to hide the inconsistencies in the intellectual level. They showed that Turks were open to change towards Westernization, but also they determined the boundaries of this change by giving excessive importance to appearance. Second, and most importantly, for the newly emerging Turkish elites who lacked the economic capital to distinguish themselves from the masses, etiquette served as a means of cultural segregation. For this reason etiquette, which was considered to be one of the most apparent signs of modernization, found strong support among the Republican elites as it contributed to determining their social status. Certain intellectuals of the time criticized this tendency and declared that it was against the Republican ideology, which refused any kind of class distinction within the boundaries of Turkey.<sup>1</sup>

This article examines the discordance between the visual and mental in the actions of the Republican era by looking at the etiquette rules of the era. The primary aim is to demonstrate the building of new elite through the rejection of tradition and the Ottoman past using the segregation created by these new manners. This differentiation marks the change towards an internalized Orientalism that would shape the attitudes of Turkish intellectuals and politicians for decades to follow. In order to understand these dynamics, first the emergence of etiquette rules and their role in Western civilization will be assessed. The entry of these rules into the Ottoman Empire and the new role they were ascribed by the foundation of the Turkish Republic will be demonstrated through an examination of their effects on space, entertainment styles, dress codes, and most strikingly, family life.

### *Etiquette as a Symbol of Superiority of the Western Civilization*

The emergence of etiquette rules in Europe was related to the creation of new class dynamics in the 1500s in Europe among the palace nobility. The increasing power of the king made the nobility more conscious of their behavior and of their appearance in front of others. The concept of *civilité* acquired its meaning for Western society at a time when the age of chivalry and the unity of the Catholic Church were disintegrating.<sup>2</sup> Manners in this context served as a means of distinction and they

---

\* M.A. student, Atatürk Institute, Bogazici University.

were shaped by the rising status of the monarchy among its former equals, the church and the nobility.

Norbert Elias explains the dynamics of this change in *The Civilizing Process*. Since the first appearance of the term “civilization”, Elias argues, there has been almost nothing that cannot be done in a “civilized” or an “uncivilized” way.<sup>3</sup> This division has served more than one purpose, the first and more pragmatic being the separation of the king and the nobility from the uncivilized masses. This created fashions in behavior, which were accepted by the nobility immediately. For example, the first etiquette book, written by Erasmus in 1530, *De civilitate morum puerilium* (On Civility in Children), achieved enormous popularity; within the first six years after its publication, it was reprinted more than thirty times.<sup>4</sup> From then on, things which had been most natural to people in the Middle Ages became sources of shame, such as eating with the hands, urinating in public, blowing the nose, or spitting. Etiquette even changed attitudes towards sexual behavior, as the bedroom came to be viewed as one of the most “private” and “intimate” areas of human life.<sup>5</sup> By accepting these rules, the civilized men of the time gained superiority over those they considered uncivilized.

The second important dimension of the term “civilization” is its nationalist and pro-Western attribute. According to Elias, the concept of civilization since its creation has expressed the “self-consciousness of the West.” He writes that one can even take it as a form of “national consciousness” as it sums up all areas in which Western society of the last two or three centuries has believed itself superior to earlier societies or “more primitive” contemporary ones.<sup>6</sup> The civilizing process is then a process of building up a “super-ego.” Arguing that “in the name of the Cross, and later in that of civilization,” Western society has waged its wars of colonization and expansion, Elias demonstrates the particularity of the term to Western culture. Although the term is secular, it has the connotations of Christendom and the knightly-feudal crusade.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, it is possible to argue that the acceptance of etiquette rules by non-Western states implies cultural conquest. Accordingly, they found resistance in states like the Ottoman Empire that aimed to become modernized.<sup>8</sup>

#### *Ottoman “Âdâb-ı Muâşeret” and Republican Etiquette*

The entry of Western forms of etiquette into the Ottoman Empire occurred after the gradual acceptance of Western education, which did not emphasize civilization so much as Western technology. The increasing superiority of European armies in battle could not be ignored by the Ottoman elites, who first sought to acquire Western military technologies. This started with the reforms of Sultan Selim III under the name of *Nizam-ı Cedid* (the New Order), which was also the name of the new army, which was equipped and trained in European fashion.<sup>9</sup> The training of the army required the establishment of Western-style military schools and institutions for the training of bureaucrats. In this way, Western etiquette rules first gained importance in the palace. The Western style of living, which was called *alafranga* by the Ottomans, became popular among the Babiali bureaucrats in the nineteenth century. However, the traditional groups in Ottoman society resisted any change. The new manners that adopted by the elites who had contact with Europe were foreign to the majority of Ottomans, who continued to sit cross-legged on divans and eat from bowls shared in common. As Ekrem Işın argues, the Ottoman term “*âdâb-ı muâşeret*” (etiquette) was

created to replace the term “etiquette” as an intermediary expression that would reduce the friction between the traditional and modern patterns of life to a minimum.<sup>10</sup>

Ahmet Mithat Efendi’s book, *Avrupa Âdâb-ı Muâşeretî yahut Alafranga* (European Etiquette or Alafranga), was written for such a reason in 1894. The book was intended to instruct Ottomans who wanted to visit Europe about European manners and etiquette. However, this work had a larger mission. According to Doğan and Gurbetoğlu, Ahmet Mithat Efendi aimed to inform Ottomans about Europe and Europeans because he believed that Ottoman knowledge about these subjects was superficial and incomplete.<sup>11</sup> People either imitated everything European without question or rejected all that was Western.<sup>12</sup> Ahmet Mithat’s book was written to remove these prejudices and at the same time contribute to the development of a much more modern Ottoman society. Nevertheless, this reconciliatory effort of Ahmet Mithat’s had little success and the traditional style of living dominated up until the demise of the Empire.

After the Turkish Independence War, the Western style of living gained additional importance. The Turkish Republican elites favored Westernization and modernization in society and sought to turn the masses in this direction. Accordingly, Western etiquette rules became popular among the Turkish elites in the early Republican period. As Işın argues, following the First World War, throughout the West, two groups aimed to change Europe, soldier politicians and engineers. Thus, the development of a more civilized world was supported by military discipline and technology. This was true in Turkey as well. Atatürk, as the founder of the Turkish Republic, was himself a soldier as well, as were most of his colleagues. The new norms of daily life were affected by this identity. The Republican etiquette rules shaped by staff officers were quite formal compared to earlier attempts. These rules were aimed against aristocratic prescriptivism. They were simple, but meant to be disciplinary as their first aim was to shape large groups of people.<sup>13</sup>

At least in rhetoric, this new type of etiquette sought to reach not only the state bureaucrats who had become the elites of the new Republic, but all Turkish citizens, to unite different groups in the Republic under the same roof. For this reason, the appearance of the new nation played an important role in line with the general political rhetoric emphasizing the physical and spiritual integration of the people.<sup>14</sup> Etiquette thus remained practical and clothes gained excessive importance. Women started to dress in Western-styled fashions, houses were decorated in European or American style, and both in the street and at home Turkish people strove to present themselves as modern individuals. The origin of this movement would be the new capital city of the new Turkish Republic, Ankara, and its most adherent followers, the officers of the state.

#### *Ankara as the Origin of the New Etiquette*

Ankara, as the center of reforms of the new Republic, was important in the emergence of etiquette rules in Turkey. Ankara had been promoted from its status as a small town in the hinterland of Anatolia to capital of the new Republic. The region was arid and had little beauty for those coming from Istanbul, the capital of the Ottoman Empire. Ankara, however, symbolized the national independence of the Republic. Port cities like Istanbul were identified with the dependency of the Ottoman Empire on the European powers. According to Cantek, Istanbul was seen as

a place of reaction, ignorance, cruelty and bigotry, while Ankara represented intellectual ferment and new ideas that would build up the modern Republic.<sup>15</sup> Accordingly, the capital was constructed in a new fashion, which not only would reflect modernity and Turkey's cultural similarities with the West, but also would underline the national identity and the independence of the Turkish Republic.

In the press of the early Republican period, the planning and construction of the new city were followed as a matter of national pride. Ahmet Cevat, in an article in *Muhit*, depicted Istanbul as a city that had been constructed for the fun and comfort of foreign capitalists, while the "New Ankara" was being constructed as the capital city of the young Turkish Republic and was exceptional in the entire Near and Middle East. The "New Ankara," with its government offices, banks, schools, hotels, waterfalls, and houses, belonged to the true sons and daughters of the nation.<sup>16</sup>

In order to draw attention to the efforts of the Republican elites, the press published articles on the development of the city. One of them, written by Süreya, described the charm of Ankara in winter,<sup>17</sup> due to the acceleration of political activity and the resulting social life.<sup>18</sup> The exaggerated depictions of the city in the magazines of the time reflected the ideals rather than the reality, even for the founders of this narrative. After 1928, when Atatürk started to visit Dolmabahçe Palace more often, many bureaucrats began to spend their summers in Istanbul, returning to Ankara with the beginning of the political season.<sup>19</sup>

The effort to build up a "New Ankara" remained limited in scope and it did not reach the lower classes in the old and traditional districts of the city. A city plan drawn up by the European urban planner Jansen was to make Ankara one of the most beautiful cities in the Orient. The new buildings of the city were constructed in district called "Yenişehir" (New City), which started from Çankaya Pavilion and stretched to the district of Ulus.<sup>20</sup> Certain restaurants, hotels, ball rooms, confectionaries, cafés, and bars and in the case of other big port cities like Istanbul and Izmir sometimes beaches were very important for the Republican elites.<sup>21</sup> These places were used as if they were schools for teaching the new etiquette rules. There was, however, another Ankara outside the new one in which no form of "*âdâb-ı muâşeret*" was present. Some of these were districts of internal immigration from places like Erzurum, Sakarya, Aktaş, and Gümüşhaneli; others preserved the traditionalist aspects of the city, such as Altındağ, Samanpazarı, Hacettepe, and Hamamönü.<sup>22</sup>

These "other" forms of living disturbed the Republican elite, who established cultural fortresses in the city center such as restaurants and entertainment places in the Western style or as homes decorated according to the latest American fashion in which few inhabitants in the capital city had any interest. "*Âdâb-ı Muâşeret*" in this context served in drawing boundaries between the ordinary people and the Republican elite. These two groups developed different life-styles and remained estranged. Therefore, etiquette not only cut the ties with the Ottoman traditions, but also isolated the elites from the people they sought to command. This differentiation showed itself especially in table manners, entertainment styles, and clothing. The rules concerning these areas were much easier to apply. The rules and regulations on family, however, were more complex and they would reveal many more of the inconsistencies of the Republican ideology of modernization.

#### *Table Manners and Restaurant Etiquette*

In the “New Ankara,” modern restaurants and eating-places were few in number. As mentioned above, such restaurants were foreign to the natives of Ankara and those outside the Republican elite. These people preferred eating in “*aşçı lokantaları*” (chef restaurants), which were popular in the city. In contrast to these, Juri George Karpovitch’s restaurant, *Şehir Lokantası* (City Restaurant), but known as *Karpiç* (the nickname of its owner), was a true Republican school for learning the Western etiquette rules. The restaurant was supported by the municipality, and thus by the state. Karpovitch had been transferred from the kitchen of the Taşhan Hotel to his own restaurant, which had been established with the help of the Republican elites, who had declared that the city needed to surpass Ottoman cuisine and to have a European restaurant.<sup>23</sup> As depicted by Ünsal, this place offered delicious food from the different cuisines of the world at reasonable prices. It also served a la carte dishes for those on a limited budget. All gentlemen diners were obliged to wear respectable suits with ties and to conform to the table manners of the establishment.<sup>24</sup> This restaurant was indispensable to diplomats as well as for the press and information agents in Ankara,<sup>25</sup> most of whom frequented the restaurant at least once a week, especially during the World War Two. A second restaurant in the Western style was in a distinguished hotel called the Ankara Palas. The restaurant was run by Süreyya Bey, whose Russian name was Sergei Homya, and by Mösyö Jorj (later Rauf Soykut, after taking Turkish citizenship), who was known as the “chef of Atatürk.”<sup>26</sup>

Places such as these embellished the image of Ankara for foreign guests and diplomats and served the bureaucrats, intellectuals and artists who missed Istanbul during their obligatory stays in Ankara. For these cultural and political elites, eating in these restaurants was an escape from the traditional Ankara , and was a privilege that required carefully honed skills. In order to solve the problem of decorum in the restaurants, etiquette books were translated into Turkish. One of them was a book by Gottfried Andreas titled *Görgü: En Yeni ve İleri Muaşeret Usulleri* (Etiquette: the Latest and Most Advanced Social Manners). The chapter on table manners included everything from how to eat and talk in a restaurant to how to communicate with women or waiters. *Yeni Hayat Adamına Yeni Adabı Muaşeret* (New Etiquette for the Man of the New Life), written by Muhittin Dalkılıç, also presented the details of table manners and the rules of being a guest at dinner parties.<sup>27</sup>

The magazines of the period supported this trend of etiquette by giving tips about such things as how to kiss the hand of a woman and help her get into a car.<sup>28</sup> What must or must not be done in communications between men and women was explained in detail. For example, a man should not greet a woman by taking her hands or fingers, but should take off his hat; if his head was bare, he was to do this by bowing his head. A man should stand up while talking to a woman. To kiss the hand of a woman, the man was to bow his head and not raise her hand to his mouth.<sup>29</sup> The woman should act first in shaking hands. She should not leave her husband while he was paying the taxi driver or enter a house, café, or restaurant alone. She was not to talk to the waiters directly and was to express her wishes by using her husband as intermediary.<sup>30</sup>

Every minute detail was a matter of a social education that concerned the new elite. Everyday life had to be reshaped by these rules, in a mechanistic way, to fill in the void beneath the intellectual level of modernization. In line with this, it was believed that the regulation of breakfast, lunch and dinner hours was very important, as well as times to sleep, wake up and be at work.<sup>31</sup> These rules were internalized in the hotels of Western style in Ankara and in the other big cities of the time. Daily

activities were regulated according to rules and the new generation was to learn modernity by their application. Often, things that might be thought of as unrelated were mixed together under the category of etiquette and modernization. For example, the Kadıköy High School for Boys had a booklet prepared for students who wanted to join the *Muaşeret klübü* (Etiquette club). According to this booklet, members were obliged to take care of a red gillyflower as well as applying the rules on every aspect of life, from table manners to reading good books.<sup>32</sup> At the end of the school year, they were to grade themselves by evaluating their performance in all these categories. Just like these adolescents, the daily life of the new elite was programmed like an examination; the border between the details and the main rules were blurred.

#### *Entertainment Rules, Balls and Dances*

Restaurants were important places for learning how to act as modern people. Social occasions such as balls were also important because they provided occasions on which Turkish men and women for the first time could share the same space without being separated into two according to tradition. Nilüfer Öndin described a ball hosted by the French ambassador, M. Albert Serrault, in the early 1920s in Ankara.<sup>33</sup> 120 guests attended the ball in his home, which he had had decorated in a “little Versailles” style. This impressed Atatürk, who later attended balls and evening performances with his group of 30 people. Atatürk would order the first ball of the Republican Turkey in 1925 in İzmir.<sup>34</sup>

Balls were not new to Turkey. Elaborate dances had been held during the Ottoman Era at the end of the nineteenth century in the palace and had been attended by important men from the court, foreign diplomats, and foreigners living in Istanbul, and their wives.<sup>35</sup> In this epoch, when even by going to the market, taking a trip, going to a restaurant, hotel, concert or theatre could damage the reputation of a woman, these balls served a small circle made up almost entirely of non-Muslims.<sup>36</sup> The attendance of Muslim women at such social events, in open communication with men, gave the balls in the Republican era a revolutionary aspect.<sup>37</sup> Arzu Öztürkmen, in her article on Republican entertainment, quotes a conversation with Mina Urgan, who explained that the primary reason for these balls was not entertainment, but to teach people how to entertain. Urgan argues that it was very important to bring together the men and women of society.<sup>38</sup> Accordingly, Şenol claims that women had a special place at these balls. They reflected the Republican ideology to social life. Thus, they were to dress like European women, and were to should talk, dance, and drink like them and from now on were to learn to share the same physical space with men.<sup>39</sup>

During these balls and on various other occasions, dance was used as a symbol of how modern one had become. In the modern circles, not knowing how to dance was equated with being “backward” and failing to meet the standards of the time.<sup>40</sup> Dances like the tango, the swing, the charleston, the fox trot, and the waltz were popular and within a short time, dance schools were opened for adults.<sup>41</sup> The magazines of the time presented articles to teach gentlemen the etiquette of dancing.<sup>42</sup> Issues like the invitation to dance, the proper suit and gloves for balls, the manners during and after the dance were all explained in detail. Balls were occasions on which the wives and daughters of the new elite would show off the latest fashions as if competing to demonstrate their level of modernity.

*Dressing Rules and Body*

After the legislation of the Hat Law on 25 November in 1925, many Republican women abandoned the custom of veiling and dressed like European women in the street.<sup>43</sup> The Republican elites declared that the abolition of the rule of veiling was a reform that made women “free” in life. In line with this argument, one anonymous article in the magazine *Yarım Ay* (Half Moon) declared that women had become so free that they no longer needed to continue the *Kadınlar Birliği* (Women’s Association). The article also argued that with the efforts of the Republican elites, women of the time had become so competent that there was no door that they could not open or any profession that they could not start.<sup>44</sup> As a way of dealing with the changes of the time and in line with the European fashions, women tried to dress like men and cut their hair short in a style called “à la garçon.”<sup>45</sup> The changing lengths of the skirts also reflected such a trend. The new skirts of women were shortened allowing much more activity in everyday life. Hems did not come down until the Second World War.<sup>46</sup>

In contrast to the opening up of women’s clothing, limitations on femininity in dress became an issue of morality and decency and were an ongoing topic of discussion in the magazines of the time. It became a strict etiquette rule that others should not see one’s underclothing.<sup>47</sup> A revealing dress, however, might not be a sign of frivolity as those women who covered up all their bodies might also be immoral.<sup>48</sup> Nevertheless, women who were fond of adorning themselves were looked down on and the women of Anatolian villages who worked for the good of their families were idealized.<sup>49</sup> Thus, opening up went hand in hand with modesty, adding to the dualities that Turkish women encountered.

Also in the magazines were frequent articles on how the body of women should look. The ideal woman was neither thin nor fat.<sup>50</sup> According to Emine Saffet, who was one of the authors writing on this issue in the popular magazine *Muhit*, Turkish women were free to eat everything they wanted, because they could burn the calories they had eaten by movement and they could be fit without sacrificing meals. She emphasized the necessity of their time to be active outside home, unlike their ancestors who had sat at home, eaten all day and been fat.<sup>51</sup> Gymnastic, swimming and walking were advised as ways to become like the movie stars they admired. Fatness was shown as the main reason for hypertension, infertility or lack of menstruation, and deformities of the body.<sup>52</sup> These articles showed how the film stars were also mothers and they admonished women not to fear pregnancy or motherhood as these beautiful women were able to preserve their shapes after giving birth.

The issue of women’s bodies was one on which the internalized Orientalism of the Republican intellectuals showed itself most clearly. For example, Osman Cemil discussed large breasts as a deformity that should be controlled with the help of brassieres, massage or cold water compresses.<sup>53</sup> In another article in *Gelincik* (Corn-poppo), he emphasized the differences between the bodies of European and American women and those of Oriental women. He argued that women of Turkish, Egyptian, Iranian, and Indian origin were potbellied and fat because they were excluded from life outside the home and with their secondary position in society due to the pressures of religion, customs and tradition.<sup>54</sup> As can be understood from the aforementioned examples, the appearance of women in Western clothing was expressed as a form of emancipation and the Republican intellectuals in their narratives emphasized the responsibilities of women in preparing themselves to

become the healthy mothers of the new generations, which would be accomplished by reaching the standards of the European women in their body size.

*Regulation of the Family*

The change in the Civil Code in 1926 introduced important changes to family life. One of the most important of these was the abolition of polygamy. This code gave women status in the family, and made them more responsible at home. Duben and Behar argue that the clear goal of the 1926 Code was the Europeanization of Turkish institutions, and in particular of family and personal life. Mahmut Esat, the Minister of Justice of the time, declared that with this law Turkey would close the doors on an old civilization, and would take its place in contemporary civilization. According to Duben and Behar, the change was quite revolutionary, as it superseded the religious sharia code and the centuries of Islamic provisions for marriage and divorce, entrusting these entirely to the secular modern state.<sup>55</sup> However, there were certain limitations to the rights that women were given with the new Civil Code. In spite of the revolutionary aspects of the code, there were some articles that legitimized the patriarchal family and gave women a secondary status at home. In these articles, the husband was determined as the head of the family. He was responsible for the economic decisions within the family and was the breadwinner of the house. The wife had no legal right to work without the consent of the husband. These articles were important in the sense that they reflected the limitations of the state feminism of the time, which was thought of as a modernizing movement that would liberate Turkish women their rights.

There were many reasons behind the decisions that would tie women to their homes and make them housewives. One reason was the decrease in population after the long years of continuous wars. The new Republic needed women to bear and raise children. Accordingly, Selim Sırrı in *Aile Dostu* argued that although women had been given the chance to show their competence in science, literature and industry, but that their true responsibility was at home, because women first of all were mothers and governesses. While Republican Turkey had given women the rights that made them free, equal in the family, with access to education, and had permitted them to put aside their veils, what was necessary first were enlightened mothers. To become one of these exalted beings, a woman had to study hard.<sup>56</sup>

Sırrı was not alone in his argument. Generally, women were seen as the educators of society as mothers and teachers, or as caregivers.<sup>57</sup> The myth of the good mother was dominant in the magazines of the time. Being a mother was like being a hero. Everything beautiful that a woman could have was symbolized in motherhood. Stories and articles in the popular magazines and newspapers frequently idealized this institution. One story by Cihat Uçuk told of a young woman named Handan who dreamed of being a good mother, but could not because of a chronic illness. The young woman became an artist and fell in love with her mentor. This love relationship ended with her death. On her deathbed, she called her former lover to her and said "our child, sir," showing him a picture of a child that she had painted as the baby of her dreams.<sup>58</sup>

In an article written by Suad Derviş with the title of "*Analık Şefkati*" (Motherhood Tenderness), we are told that the foundation of the society is the relation of the mother and her child, because in primitive times men did not help women raise their children. Derviş argues that this is similar also for animals like

monkeys or dogs, claiming that without the tenderness of mothers, no human being could survive.<sup>59</sup> In another article, this time translated from a Western writer Kathleen Norris in *Muhit*, it was stated that women who did not give birth to children were demonstrably miserable human beings. Especially women married to wealthy men and who spent their time in entertainment and refused to have children were portrayed as victims. Their husbands told them that they could not have a child unless they could give their children the necessary education, which was expensive. In the article, women of this type in their forties were depicted as bored, oftentimes cheated on by their husbands with younger women.<sup>60</sup>

Girls were viewed as the mothers of the future, responsible for the formation of the new nation. This was portrayed as a matter of self-education as there was no model they could observe of an emancipated, modern Turkish woman. According to Feliha Sedat Oksal, while Turkish girls should inherit goodness, beauty, and truthfulness from their elders, there was a limit of what they should take. Oksal, as an educator, argued that the girls of the time had the difficult task of self-creation because in the street or in school life they had no antecedents to imitate. By developing themselves as modern women these young girls would bring about the democratic Turkish families of the future.<sup>61</sup> Consequently, the modern women of the Ottoman past were excluded from the narrative of Oksal as it was omitted in the rhetoric of the political elites.<sup>62</sup> The emancipation of women was a right that came with new duties and girls were first of all responsible to the new generations as mothers.

Families were seen by the Republican elites as the most important unit of modernization. The organization of the daily life at home was the first step in organizing the nation in line with modernity. According to Navaro-Yaşın, in the 1930s and 1940s doing housework and raising children were of the utmost concern of the Turkish nationalists, who were working to create the modern nation state.<sup>63</sup> For this purpose, girl's institutes to teach home economics were founded by the state. According to the elites, everything should be done in a practical way, with the least effort, and in minimum time.

In the magazines, housekeeping tricks and child rearing lessons were given to women. One example to these can be found at the "*Ev Hanımı Sahifesi*" (Housewife's Page) in *Muhit*. In this page, instructions for washing the dishes were given in detail so they would lose minimum time and would regard the work as less disgusting, thus much easier. The article gives description of the best soaps, the equipment needed, and the best height for the kitchen table on which to wash dishes for medium height women.<sup>64</sup> The housewife page also offered practical hints for cleaning woolen clothes, gloves, shoes, other clothing or household goods, renewing clothes, repairing furniture, making economical soups and peeling onions without tears.<sup>65</sup> Perfect cleanliness of the houses was obligatory. In articles translated from European writers or anecdotes by American gentlemen about the importance of the comfort and cleanness of the house, how to meet these standards were effectively demonstrated.<sup>66</sup>

In addition to articles about housework, there were also ones on parenting. According to these articles, childrearing was an art that required a fine-tuning of attitudes. Mothers were to learn this art as soon as possible in order to avoid negative consequences. One important area of this art was the punishment of children. In the article "*Çocukları Cezalandırmak Meselesi*" (The Problem of Punishing Children) in *Muhit*, corporal punishment is shown as an inefficient method. Instead, parents were

held responsible for the actions of their children and were charged with presenting all of the possible situations in which a child can cause harm to the household goods.<sup>67</sup> Both letting the children do or have anything they wanted, and punishing them for every mistake was wrong because they would deform the personality of the child. For that reason, other methods were explained by using anecdotes about childrearing.<sup>68</sup> According to their narrative, children were not to be just obedient servants of their parents. They were to be independent, self-aware and responsible at the same time. As body and spirit integration was essential for the founders of the Republic, children were to be raised using this formula. Not only were their personalities important, but also their bodies, which had to be robust to build up a strong nation. In one article, Nevzat Mahmut told parents to raise their children by a pedagogy that accepted the body as essential. They were instructed to have their children play in the open air and not put them under a great burden of lessons which would make them sedentary and harm their immune systems.<sup>69</sup> Furthermore, parents themselves should not tire themselves and should learn how to rest properly because they were responsible for their children, who needed their close care and attention after they came home from work in the evening.<sup>70</sup>

The proper behavior to raise children was out of the ordinary, thus detailed examples were needed to describe them. Short stories were a way to do this in an amusing and instructive manner. For example, in an anonymous article in *Muhit* titled “*Evin İdaresi ve Çocukların İdaresi*” (Housekeeping and Child Care), an exemplary mother was described in a short story. This mother teaches her stubborn daughter not go out to play without tying her shoelaces. The mother waits an hour and a quarter, insisting on this without shouting at her daughter or doing this task herself. At last her efforts result in success, the child internalizes the rule and applies it every day without crying. Also in the article, mothers were told to plan their time carefully rather than cut down on their own sleeping hours.

They were encouraged to ask for the help of their elder children and their husbands if they could not afford a hired maid. The article claims that there were some ideal husbands who prepared the breakfast while the women exerted themselves with their little naughty children. In the training of the child, a woman received the most valuable help and advice from her husband, who might have more authority over their children. However, to make use of this help, the woman had to wait for a suitable rather than stressful time for the husband.<sup>71</sup> While the ideal husband, one who helped bring up the children and helped with the housework, may have seemed unimaginable to the women of one generation before, this theme was being discussed in these magazines as a rational way of living.

There were, however, many other articles arguing the contrary. One such article gave advice to women from a book written by the Women’s Association of California in the United States. According to this book, woman should never ask for the help of her husband in order not to risk their marriages, even when the husband himself offered such help.<sup>72</sup> How many couples were ready to share housework? Did the women of the 1930s ask their husbands for help? Although the answers are difficult to find, the very existence of these arguments reflects the change in the family life of the early Republican period. Yet it is obvious that the women of the period were held responsible for the housework and that they were urged on every occasion to bear and raise healthy citizens for the new Republic. The incoherency that emerged in the lives of emancipated Turkish women was a result of the demographic problems as well as the inconsistencies of the Republican elite that

emphasized modernity in form, but omitted certain mental roots, as can also be observed in the etiquette rules of the time.

### *Conclusion*

The early Republican period experienced cultural changes in every aspect of life. The acceptance of Western etiquette rules was only one product of such a change. These rules served as the visual basis of the modernization process and found many supporters among the bureaucrats and intellectuals of the time. However, for many groups in society, especially for those who had no interest in applying these manners, etiquette had little place in their lives.

In this article, the Hat Law and its consequences were excluded from the discussion on etiquette. This was done because of the obligatory aspect of the law. Unlike the etiquette rules, the law was a part of the public experience, effecting millions of Turkish citizens. Most of the etiquette rules, however, would serve to create a distinction and segregation in contrast with the Republican rhetoric.

Women in the modernization process were used as symbols to stress the closeness of Turkish society to the West. Emancipation was equated with opening up and dressing in European fashions. Women were to become the mothers of the nation and were to raise healthy children as the “true sons and daughters” of the Republic. This narrative was quite similar to the one in the Italy of the time under the dictatorship of Mussolini. Obviously, the Republican elites were anxious to sacrifice tradition and the past, and they were ready to make radical reforms in culture. Etiquette rules, which had been accepted earlier by a limited group in the Ottoman Empire, were simplified and to a larger extent, became a part of daily life in the 1930s and 1940s. The acceptance of the superiority of Western manners was the result of the bold shift that the revolutionary leaders undertook in order to repudiate the Ottoman past and to find a new place in the international arena for the Turkish Republic.

---

### *Notes*

<sup>1</sup> For example, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, in his novel *Ankara*, criticizes those members of the elite who indulge in the Western style of entertainment to excess, forgetting their responsibilities to the nation.

<sup>2</sup> Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 42.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 43.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 134.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 42.

<sup>8</sup> For additional knowledge about Japan’s modernization process, see Selçuk Esenbel, “Türk ve Japon modernleşmesi: ‘Uygarlık süreci’ kavramı açısından bir mukayese,” *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 84 (Spring 2000), 18-36.

- <sup>9</sup> Erik J. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History* (London; New York: I. B. Tauris Publishers, 2003), 24.
- <sup>10</sup> Ekrem Işın, “Âdâb-ı Muâşeret,” *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 44 (August 1987), 32.
- <sup>11</sup> İsmail Doğan and Ali Gurbetoğlu, *Avrupa Âdâb-ı Muâşereti yahut Alafranga* (Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 2001), 49.
- <sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 53.
- <sup>13</sup> Ekrem Işın, “Abdullah Cevdet’in Cumhuriyet Âdâb-ı Muâşereti,” *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 48 (December 1987), 14.
- <sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.
- <sup>15</sup> Levent Cantek, “Hacettepe ile Yenişehir vesaireye dair hikâyat,” *Birikim*, no. 86/87 (1996), 120.
- <sup>16</sup> *Muhit* (December, 1928), 82.
- <sup>17</sup> Selim İleri also gives an article of Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar called “Ankara’nın Güzellikleri” (The Beauties of Ankara) as an example. See Selim İleri, “İki Ankara,” *Argos*, no. 19 (1990), 156-157.
- <sup>18</sup> *Muhit* (December, 1929), 1066.
- <sup>19</sup> L. Funda Şenol, “İktidar mücadelesinin savaş meydanı: Mekân Cumhuriyet’in ilk yıllarında Ankara’da eğlence mekânları,” *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 76 (Spring 1998), 100.
- <sup>20</sup> Cantek, 121.
- <sup>21</sup> According to Tanyeli, beaches were also important places because they reflected the ideal of a more sportive and healthy society, which was a rising trend in West in this epoch. See Uğur Tanyeli, “Mekanlar, Projeler, Anlamları,” in *Üç Kuşak Cumhuriyet*, ed. Uğur Tanyeli (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1998), 102.
- <sup>22</sup> Cantek, 122.
- <sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 121.
- <sup>24</sup> Artun Ünsal, “75 Yılda Yeme- İçme;” in *75 Yılda Değişen Yaşam Değişen İnsan: Cumhuriyet Modaları*, ed. Oya Baydar and Derya Özkan (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999), 161.
- <sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>27</sup> Muhittin Dalkılıç, *Yeni Hayat Adamına Yeni Adabı Muâşeret* (İstanbul: Suhület Kütüphanesi, 1932), 163-169.
- <sup>28</sup> *Muhit* (June, 1929), 620-621.
- <sup>29</sup> *Aile Dostu* (February, 1931), 10.
- <sup>30</sup> *Aile Dostu* (April, 1931), 10.
- <sup>31</sup> *Aile Dostu* (February, 1931), 24-25.
- <sup>32</sup> R. N. Ege, *Muâşeret Klübü* (İstanbul: Kenan Matbaası, 1944).
- <sup>33</sup> Nilüfer Öndin, *Cumhuriyet’in Kültür Politikası ve Sanat 1923-1950* (İstanbul: İnsancıl Yayınları, 2003), 212.
- <sup>34</sup> Doğan Duman, “Cumhuriyet Baloları,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 37 (January 1997), 45.
- <sup>35</sup> Şenol, 94.
- <sup>36</sup> Duman, 46.
- <sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 48.
- <sup>38</sup> Arzu Öztürkmen, “Zamanı Eylemek, Eğlenmek: Cumhuriyet Dönemi Eğlence Biçimlerini Yeniden Düşünmek,” in *75 Yılda Değişen Yaşam Değişen İnsan:*

- 
- Cumhuriyet Moaları*, ed. Oya Baydar and Derya Özkan (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999), 181.
- <sup>39</sup> Şenol, 95.
- <sup>40</sup> Öztürkmen, 182.
- <sup>41</sup> Şenol, 96.
- <sup>42</sup> *Aile Dostu* (July, 1931), 24.
- <sup>43</sup> Çağla Ormanlar, "Giyim Kuşam Modaları," in *75 Yılda Değişen Yaşam Değişen İnsan: Cumhuriyet Modaları*, ed. Oya Baydar and Derya Özkan (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999), 47.
- <sup>44</sup> "İçtimai Tenkit Sayfası: Gülünç Cemiyetler," *Yarım Ay* (February 14, 1935), 20.
- <sup>45</sup> Ormanlar, *75 Yılda Değişen Yaşam*, 48-49.
- <sup>46</sup> Muhaddere Taşcıoğlu, *Türk Osmanlı Cemiyetinde Kadının Sosyal Durumu ve Kadın Kıyafetleri* (Ankara: Akın Matbaası, 1958), 84.
- <sup>47</sup> "Muaşeret," *Aile Dostu* (March, 1931), 29.
- <sup>48</sup> "Namus Telâkkileri ve Kadın Kıyafeti," *Salon* (August 15, 1949), 729.
- <sup>49</sup> See "Süs Kadını," *Salon* (October 1, 1949), 785; and "Salon Süslerine Rağmen Asıl ve Asıl Kadınlarımız," *Salon* (December 15, 1949), 880-881.
- <sup>50</sup> "Moda Vücut," *Her Hafta* (August 23, 1947), 11.
- <sup>51</sup> *Muhit* (March, 1931), 70.
- <sup>52</sup> See "Şişmanlık ve Zayıflık Derdi," *Salon* (November 15, 1947), 41; "Şişmanlık," *Salon* (March 15, 1948), 147; and "Jimnastik," *Salon* (July 15, 1948), 275.
- <sup>53</sup> "İdeal Kadın Vücudu," *Gelincik* (February 2, 1949), 14.
- <sup>54</sup> *Gelincik* (February 11, 1949), 10-11.
- <sup>55</sup> Alan Duben and Cem Behar, *Istanbul households: Marriage, Family and Fertility 1880-1940* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 213-214.
- <sup>56</sup> *Aile Dostu* (February, 1931), 6-7.
- <sup>57</sup> Nüket Sirman, "Müsavattan Eşitliğe," in *Üç Kuşak Cumhuriyet*, ed. Uğur Tanyeli (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1998), 58.
- <sup>58</sup> "Ana," *Yarım Ay* (June, 1935), 6-7.
- <sup>59</sup> *Yarım Ay* (August, 1935), 10-11.
- <sup>60</sup> "Anne Olmak Bahtiyarlığı: Dünyada Anne Olmak Bahtiyarlığı Kadar Devamlı, Onun Kadar Tatlı, Onun Kadar Değerli Hiçbir Zevk Yoktur," *Muhit* (April, 1929), 408-414.
- <sup>61</sup> Feliha Sedat Oksal, *Genç Kız Yetişirken* (İstanbul: Kanaat Kitabevi, 1940), 7.
- <sup>62</sup> In order to have a better understanding of this argument, see Yaprak Zihnioğlu, *Kadınsız İnkılap: Nezihe Muhittin, Kadınlar Halk Fırkası, Kadın Birliği* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003).
- <sup>63</sup> Yael Navaro-Yaşın, "Evde Taylorizm: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin ilk yıllarında evişinin rasyonelleşmesi (1928-40)," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 84 (Spring 2000), 51.
- <sup>64</sup> *Muhit* (December, 1929), 1114-1115.
- <sup>65</sup> See *Muhit* (July, 1931), p.71; *Muhit* (December, 1931), 67; and *Muhit* (February, 1932), 69.
- <sup>66</sup> *Muhit* (December, 1931), 48.
- <sup>67</sup> *Muhit* (May, 193), 30-31.
- <sup>68</sup> See "Küçüklerin Terbiyesi," *Muhit* (April, 1931), 70-71; "Çocuk Terbiyesi Hakkında Umdeler," *Muhit* (May, 1931), 29; and "Ebeveynin Terbiyesi: Çocukların huysuzluklarından ana baba mes'uldür," *Muhit* (September, 1932), 38-39.

<sup>69</sup> *Muhit* (July, 1929), 664-665.

<sup>70</sup> “Yorgun Ebeveyn ve Çocuklar,” *Muhit* (June, 1932), 70.

<sup>71</sup> *Muhit* (March, 1931), 71.

<sup>72</sup> See “Evli kadınlara nasihatler,” *Aile Dostu* (August, 1931), 26.

---

*Bibliography*

*Primary Sources*

- *Aile Dostu* (1931).
- Dalkılıç, Muhittin. *Yeni Hayat Adamına Yeni Adabı Muâşeret*. İstanbul: Suhület Kütüphanesi, 1932.
- Ege, R. N. *Muâşeret Klübü*. İstanbul: Kenan Matbaası, 1944.
- *Gelincik* (1949).
- *Her Hafta* (1947).
- *Muhit* (1928-1932).
- Oksal, Feliha Sedat. *Genç Kız Yetişirken*. İstanbul: Kanaat Kitabevi, 1940.
- *Salon* (1947-1949).
- *Yarım Ay* (1935).

*Secondary Sources*

- Cantek, Levent. "Hacettepe ile Yenişehir vesaireye dair hikâyat." *Birikim*, no. 86/87 (1996), 120-125.
- Çiçekoğlu, Feride. "Asri, Modern, Çağdaş." In *Üç Kuşak Cumhuriyet*, edited by Uğur Tanyeli. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1998.
- Doğan, İsmail, and Ali Gurbetoğlu. *Avrupa Âdâb-ı Muâşereti yahut Alafranga*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 2001.
- Duben, Alan, and Cem Behar. *Istanbul households: Marriage, Family and Fertility 1880-1940*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Duman, Doğan. "Cumhuriyet Baloları." *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 37 (January 1997): 45-48.
- Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
- Esenbel, Selçuk. "Türk ve Japon modernleşmesi: 'Uygarlık süreci' kavramı açısından bir mukayese." *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 84 (Spring 2000): 18-36.

- Hiçyılmaz, Ergun and Burçak Evren. "Magazin Dergiciliği." In *Türkiye'de Dergiler Ansiklopediler (1849-1984)*. İstanbul: Gelişim Yayınları, 1984.

- Işın, Ekrem. "Âdâb-ı Muâşeret." *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 44 (August 1987): 31-38.

- Işın, Ekrem. "Abdullah Cevdet'in Cumhuriyet Âdâb-ı Muâşereti." *Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 48 (December 1987): 13-20.

- İleri, Selim. "İki Ankara." *Argos*, no. 19 (1990): 156-157.

- İlyasoğlu, Aylın and Deniz İnel. "Kadın Dergilerinin Evrimi." In *Türkiye'de Dergiler Ansiklopediler (1849-1984)*. İstanbul: Gelişim Yayınları, 1984.

- Ormanlar, Çağla. "Giyim Kuşam Modaları." In *75 Yılda Değişen Yaşam Değişen İnsan: Cumhuriyet Modaları*, edited by Oya Baydar and Derya Özkan. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999.

- Öndin, Nilüfer. *Cumhuriyet'in Kültür Politikası ve Sanat 1923-1950*. İstanbul: İnsancıl Yayınları, 2003.

- Öztürkmen, Arzu. "Zamanı Eylemek, Eğlenmek: Cumhuriyet Dönemi Eğlence Biçimlerini Yeniden Düşünmek." In *75 Yılda Değişen Yaşam Değişen İnsan: Cumhuriyet Modaları*, edited by Oya Baydar and Derya Özkan. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999.

- Navaro-Yaşın, Yael. "Evde Taylorizm: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin ilk yıllarında evişinin rasyonelleşmesi (1928-40)." *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 84 (Spring 2000): 51-74.

- Sirman, Nükhet. "Müsavattan Eşitliğe." In *Üç Kuşak Cumhuriyet*, edited by Uğur Tanyeli. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1998.

- Şenol, L. Funda. "İktidar mücadelesinin savaş meydanı: Mekân Cumhuriyet'in ilk yıllarında Ankara'da eğlence mekânları." *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 76 (Spring 1998): 86-104.

- Tanyeli, Uğur. "Mekanlar, Projeler, Anlamları." In *Üç Kuşak Cumhuriyet*, edited by Uğur Tanyeli. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1998.

- Taşçıoğlu, Muhaddere. *Türk Osmanlı Cemiyetinde Kadının Sosyal Durumu ve Kadın Kıyafetleri*. Ankara: Akın Matbaası, 1958.

- Toska, Zehra. "Haremden Kadın Partisine Giden Yolda Kadın Dergileri, Gündemleri ve Öncü Kadımlar." *Defter* (Spring 1994): 116-142.

- Ünsal, Artun. "75 Yılda Yeme-İçme." In *75 Yılda Değişen Yaşam Değişen İnsan: Cumhuriyet Modaları*, edited by Oya Baydar and Derya Özkan. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1999.

- Zihnioğlu, Yaprak. *Kadınsız İnkılap: Nezihe Muhittin, Kadınlar Halk Fırkası, Kadın Birliği*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2003.

- Zürcher, Erik J. *Turkey: A Modern History*. London; New York: I. B. Tauris Publishers, 2003.