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Abstract

Gender Roles in Historical Reformation is a study of Orhan Pamuk’s memoir Istanbul: Memories and the City from a transnational- postmodern feminist perspective. In the memoir, the theme of melancholy is very much prevalent. It often seems, it transcendence the personal territory of the author and frames it to a national level. The Diasporic nature of Turkish national culture problematizes it farther. It is rather a fascinating phenomenon of culture where the home culture sprouts a third space within its own. Therefore, the gender identity becomes critical than usual. The nation as a whole takes role in the binary play of hegemony and makes the gender role much more critical. It is the gender identity of the author, which makes this narration more interesting for a nationalist feminist reading.
Introduction

“Conrad, Nabokov, Naipaul – these are writers known for having managed to migrate between languages, cultures, countries, continents, even civilizations. Their imaginations were fed by exile, a nourishment drawn not through roots but through rootlessness. My imagination, however, requires that I stay in the same city, on the same street, in the same house, gazing at the same view. Istanbul’s fate is my fate. I am attached to this city because it has made me who I am.”

— Orhan Pamuk, Istanbul: Memories and the City

Culture is the part of the history we live. Culture is the tool through which history nourishes the mind of people living in a particular area, during a particular time period. Culture radically combines, eradicates and confuses different experiences and events, thus forming a whole new experience or reforming the existing ones. Culture is a method of forming meaning of different matters. Therefore, culture is a connective, it connects us with our surrounding. Culture is the process through which the perspectives come into play. Culture is the ground for perspectives and politics. If culture is a process then perspectives are the filters which decide what will enter and what will not; perspective decides things, which will be “allowed” and things which will “not be allowed.” Through gradual process, within a matter of time, these dos and don’ts become the “norm” of a society, guiding and shaping the thought process of the beings living within. Culture is the true psychological periphery set by the authority to guide and shape the thoughts and behavior of people. Culture is more of a verb than of a noun, this is continuous
process of selection and reselection to shape and model our consciousness as Karl Marx had said in his prominent piece *Base and Superstructure*,

“It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary it is their social being that determines their consciousness.” (Storey 193)

Considering the continuous process of selection and reselection, eventually, through this culturing process some new lines will be drawn whereas, some old lines will be erased or maybe few existing lines will be redrawn. In addition, our modeled, remodeled consciousness will decide what will be excluded or included. This very phenomenon of cultural evolution also provokes us to question the authenticity with regards to the choices we make in our everyday life. Because as a matter of fact, the process of exclusion or inclusion will always involve certain authority. The process of selection cultural elements and tools will inevitably involve power play. Hence, culture has spoken and will always speak for the dominating bodies, or in other word, for the hegemony. It does not only propagate certain perspectives of the influential’s, it also creates new perspectives and affirms it through different cultural tools in order to protect the authority of the hegemony. In his essay titled *Cultural Marxism and Cultural Studies*, Douglas Kellner says,

“The economic base of society for Marx and Engels consisted of the forces and relations of production in which culture and ideology are constructed to help secure the dominance of ruling social groups. This influential "base/superstructure" model considers the economy the base, or foundation, of society, and cultural, legal, political, and additional forms of life are conceived as “superstructures" which grow out of and serve to reproduce the economic base.” (Kellner 1)
Indeed, this is the ‘invisible hand’\(^1\) of the superstructure that dictates the norm of a society.

However, this continuous evolution process also makes it difficult for us to be connected to our own roots. Hence, phenomenon of rootlessness in the contemporary world becomes an unavoidable result. Fragmented identity, alienation of self, fractured memory become inevitable elements of the nation culture. As a matter of fact, the gender role within a society is also becomes questionable as it is an integral part of the identity. Often, dominating body does not only set the gender role, it also shapes the existing ideas associated with gender, which it does according to its personal specifications. I do recognize gender more of a political tool of the governing bodies of the society. By associating attribute such as ‘tool’ I also, indicate the fluid nature of the gender role. It is fluid nature of the gender role which turns it into a tool, it can be shifted, shaped, reshaped, modeled, remodeled in order to place it within a required social structure. By social structure, I also point toward the nation structure and eventually, the national identity of a sovereign or non-sovereign state. It is rather fascinating the way nationalism and nation culture has used the shield of gender role in order to shape the ideas of people regarding the matter of identity. I could not agree more with Nira Yuval-Davis when she says,

“Gender relations are perceived to be at the heart of the discourse on nations and nationalism.” (Yuval-Davis 1)

The term, “gender” often become process and often becomes an adjective to be attributed to certain body of people or matter under the nationalist discourse. Nationalism “gendered” the national identity by associating the national territory with the imagery of mother through

\(^1\) “Invisible hand” is a term introduced by Adam Smith in 1759 to indicate the resulting socio-economic benefits from individual action. See Joyce Helen, *Adam Smith and the Invisible Hand*. <https://plus.maths.org/content/adam-smith-and-invisible-hand>
different historical events. Hence, strengthening the bond of loyalty of the civilians towards the nation’s ruling authority. This idea of nationalism did not only intensify the bond rather intensified many other social issues alongside. Gender rather becomes a powerful phenomenon, especially, during the time of national and cultural transition. Gender dictates the level and longevity of change taking place during different transition point of a society. Whether it is a reformation, a revolution or a rebellion - gender will specify the creation, restoration and reaffirmation of ideas. Through the course of time, culture turns these newly emerged ideas into norms hence, ensures the existence of such ideas by turning into a part of identity for the civilians. These phenomena are clearly visible during different historical reformation process of different nation states. However, when we place gender role in the heart of national identity, this becomes rather more problematic. National identity is more of a collective identity rather than being an individual one. Amena Mohsin confirms this idea in one of her essays, she says,

“The nation state predicates itself upon the conception of a collective identity that is the nation.”(Ahmed 18)

When we are bringing issues such as fractured identity, gender fluidity, or fragmented memory, we are not dealing with such issues on individual level rather we dealing them on the national level. I would like to understand how the fragmented identity, fractured memory or gender fluidity play their individual or collective role in the national level when we place them in any national or cultural transition period. To make it more specific, I would like to understand these whole phenomena in the context of Turkey.

*Istanbul: Memories and the City*, an autobiographical memoir, by Orhan Pamuk. It was translated into English by Maureen Freely in 2005. This is a narration of individual on behalf of
his community, the *Istanbullus*. He, like many others, is a part of the modern Turkish nation. He is the child of modernization. He is the outcome of what the nation father wanted the Turkish to become. However, his narration in the memoir is deeply melancholic in nature. The melancholy in his narration often transcends his personal territory and often frames the grievance in communal level. *Istanbul: Memories and the City* by Orhan Pamuk is a tale of transformation and the people who went through the transformation.

Turkey is a nation, which has seen more changes than its neighboring nations. It is a nation sitting on the borderline of Europe and Middle East, belonging to none of them neither devoid of the cultural influence from both sides. This nation has been the heart of two powerful theocentric empires, one is the Byzantine, and other is the Ottomans. Both have been on the pick of their power centering Turkey. One has been the embodiment of the peak of Christian rule and another has been the embodiment of Muslims rule. The rich history of Turkey stretches from the Byzantine rule to the Ottoman Pasha rule. The city has experiences drastic changes during the period of paradigm shifts of these archetypes. Many churches were transformed into mosques and Friday congregations replaced the Sunday prayers. Even in the current time, city bears the marks of the changes in its architectures and infrastructures.\(^2\) In this memoir, Orhan Pamuk talks about another transition period of Turkey. He talks of the modernization of turkey. The modernization began in the hands of the founder of the modern Turkish nation Mustafa Kemal Ataturk. The reformation began with the demolition of the Ottoman empire in 1924. The reformation took place by initiating a new constitution, which replaced the old constitution

initiation by the Ottoman rulers. The constitution involved massive inclusion of European jurisprudence, which was the basic requirement of the new republic. The process began with the secularization of the administration, which was theocentric during the Ottoman Pasha rule, and it particularly focused on the education system. He narrates of the continuous battle between modernity and tradition, which exists until today, in the nation of Turkey. He talks about the cultural changes and its implications in the life of people. Mostly, he talks about his family history, interior of the Pamuk house; he then connects it with the public arena. Above all, this book is a narration of Bosporus and Istanbul's history and is a story of the transformation affecting the general people and their lives.

In this paper, I will explore the ideas of culture, nationalism, historical reformation and their relation with the gender role through different Marxist, feminist and Freudian theories. I will look into the narrations of Orhan Pamuk’s *Istanbul: Memories and the City* to understand how the sexual politics was played in national level to enforce a reformation. I want to see how much this transformation has affected the individual gender identity as well as the cultural identity. Above all, I want to understand how the transformation affected the Turkish patriarchy on individual and national level.
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Chapter 1

A War between the Two Patriarchies

“*The impression forces itself upon one that men measure by false standards, that everyone seeks power, success, riches for himself and admires others who attain them, while undervaluing the truly precious things in life.*” – Sigmund Freud, “Civilization and its Discontents”

“*Civilization is a book to be written internationally: Each chapter containing the culture of a single nation.*” - Ziya Gokalp

In the turn of nineteenth century, the German nationalist youth movement started with the aim of ‘reconstructing the Volk along more genuine and natural principles than modernity had presented. It played a stronger role in constructing the face of German nation as the youth immediately accepted these ideas as part of their identity. Ayse Kadioglu mentions in her essay, “In an analysis of the intellectual origins of the Third Reich, George Mosse maintains that the discovery of such ideological pre-suppositions of the German youth is much more important than the search for some individual precursors of National Socialism such as Herder, Wagner or Nietzsche.”( Kadioglu 179)

Possibly, the most intriguing of all the ideas put forwarded by them was the ‘distinction’ between the culture and civilization. Mosse mentions it ‘was always on the lips of its adherents' (Mosse).
In this proposed idea, the culture was considered as a soul whereas the civilization was considered artificially constructed ideas. Raymond William states with this regard, “‘Civilization’ and ‘culture’ were in effect, in the late eighteenth century, as interchangeable terms. Each carried the problematic double sense of an achieved state and of an achieved state of development” (Williams 14). During this time, there were attacks on civilization being as ‘superficial’ and totally as a form of divergence from the ‘natural state’ of men; all these ‘external’ traits were cultivated as against more human ‘needs’ and ‘impulses’ (Williams 15). The immediate effect came upon culture. Now culture was being associated with “general process of inner development” (Williams 15), which meant, matters as art, religion, family, personal life were put against civilization and society in broad-spectrum. At this instant, culture was positioned binary opposition to civilization and society. However, religion, family were part of the social institutions. Hence, the division was brought forth between the social institutions. Raymon William says, “Its (culture) relation with ‘society’ were the problematic, for those were evidently ‘social’ institutions and practices but were seen as distinct from the aggregate of general and ‘external’ institutions and practices now commonly called ‘society’.” (William 15)

However, these people opted for the option, which will enrich them spiritually rather than enriching them materially. Mosse says, “The acceptance of Culture and the rejection of Civilization meant for many people an end to alienation from their society.” (Mosse). The sense of true German identity was the core idea behind this revolutionary movement. Ayse Kadioglu quotes Mosse in her essay saying, “The word 'rooted-ness' occurs constantly in their vocabulary. They sought this in spiritual terms, through an inward correspondence between the individual, the native soil,
the Volk, and the universe. In this manner the isolation they felt so deeply would be destroyed.” These people opted for 'a spiritual revolution which would revitalize the nation without revolutionizing its structure', that is, 'a revolution of the soul'.(Kadioglu 179)

Nevertheless, these German-French revolutionary movements intrigued the idea of nationalism and nation-states among people. Many eastern nations adopted the idea of combining the western and eastern model hence, structuring the ideal nation states for themselves. However, such attempts were deeply contradictory and often veiled the nation with the identity of the subalternity. Chatterjee proposes this idea that the very idea of merging two distinctive ideologies is often very ‘hostile’. He says,

“It 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." (Chatterjee)

Historically, such attempt was adopted by the Turkish nation in the name of ‘Modernization’. Like Indian subcontinent, the idea of modernization of Turkey is rooted in the idea of merging the western materialism with the eastern spirituality. In other words, Turkish patriarchy considered merging the best of two, like other reformers, in order to create an ideal Turkish nation. However, in the beginning, the result was not as it was expected. Civilization is the field of patriarchal ideas therefore; severing the nation from the Ottoman root was not as fruitful as it was thought it would be. In this chapter, I will discuss how the modernization fractured the Turkish patriarchy, which gave birth to the communal Melancholy as mentioned in Orhan Pamuk’s Istanbul. I will also discuss how Subalternity was imposed upon the culture by de-
culturing the nation in the name of culturing upon the modern ideas. I will try to understand where does the Turkish culture stands in the tug of war between the two patriarchy of Western ideological hegemony and Turkish cultural hegemony, based upon the narration of Orhan Pamuk in his memoir *Istanbul: Memories and The City*.

Writing creates a stream of consciousness, which helps us to explore our inner self through words. Writing is often a way of walking back to the memory lane in order to connect ourselves to the present. Like many other times, Walter Benjamin has rightly addressed the matter that “memory is not an instrument for exploring the past, but rather a medium.” (Walter 576). Narratives in *Istanbul* are certainly a stream of consciousness of Orhan Pamuk. It seems, he is recalling the memories to understand the present condition of his life, which is strongly connected to his community. He confirms it in the memoir where he says,

“...when I was twenty two, I seem to have begin writing novels without knowing why.”. I’d have liked to write my entire story this way - ...as if it were a dream in which I felt my voice fading and my will succumbing to enchantment.” (Pamuk 8)

However, this memoir is not only about the reminiscing Orhan’s past. It seems often that this narrations are trying to reason with the current condition of author’s life. That is similar to walking down the memory lane and noticing things which went unnoticed previously in order to find answers to the questions which always nudged the subconscious. Melancholy is a major theme of this memoir- perhaps from Orhan’s part, it is an attempt to rationalize and trace back the reason of melancholy. He mentions that throughout his life he has been battling with the
melancholy; he confirms this idea that this melancholy pervades the individual psyche and it has a broader and bigger effect upon the whole nation of Turkey.

Orhan Pamuk’s *Istanbul* is a narration of a ruin. It insinuates a tale of a forgotten city which the world has forgotten after the fall of Ottoman empire. ‘Poor’, ‘Shabby’ are the often used words to define the current condition of the city (Pamuk 6). Orhan Pamuk says,

“Gustave Flaubert, who visited Istanbul 102 years before my birth, was struck by the variety of life in its teeming streets; in one of his letters he predicted that in a century’s time it would be the capital of the world. The reverse came true: After the Ottoman Empire collapsed, the world almost forgot that Istanbul existed...For me it has always been a city of ruins and of end-of-empire melancholy” (Pamuk 6).

Lady Mary Wortley Montagu’s letters certainly does not disagree with Flaubert. In her letters, she described Turkey with adjectives such as ‘civility’ and ‘beauty’ (Montague). During her visit, she was very impressed by the civility of people and the rich culture of Turkish nation in Ottoman Empire. She specially mentioned of the baths and smallpox vaccination facilities in Ottoman Empire. She was impressed by the innovative and cultured lifestyle of the Ottomans. Later, the knowledge she took with herself to London and ‘improvised’ it with help of doctors, which she mentions in her letters (Montague). However, Orhan Pamuk refers of the constant melancholy existing in Turkish culture in current times, which he has been ‘battling’ against throughout his life (Pamuk 90). And, sometimes making this melancholy his ‘own’ like ‘all Istanbullus’ (Pamuk 90). *Melancholy* seems to be such an influential element of the Turkish nationality for which he has dedicated special chapters as an effort to trace back the memory that
may help him find the answers. And eventually, might assist him in this constant struggle against this constant Huzun\(^5\).

He defines melancholy as “deep spiritual loss” (Pamuk 90). He defines it from two different aspects and perspectives (Pamuk 90). In one hand, Huzun arises when one indulges himself in the worldly pleasures and material gains; the other is defined from the Sufi perspective that one experiences by distancing one’s self from God. In other words, one experiences such melancholy due to the spiritual crisis. He says that individual suffers because “he has not suffered enough” (Pamuk 91). However, understanding the history of Turkey, it seems, the melancholy lies in the sense of rootlessness of the Turkish nation. Modernization, in Turkish context, was more of a de-culturing process than a culturing process. The identity of the Turkish nationality is trapped in the binary of western and eastern culture and civilization. He quotes an interesting old article on the matter of ‘way of walking’,

“Taking our inspiration from an article on the proper way to walk in a city that appeared recently in the celebrated Parisian magazine Matin, we too should make our feelings clear to people who have yet to learn how to conduct themselves on the streets on Istanbul and tell them, “Don’t walk down the street with your mouth open” [1924]” (Pamuk 141). The confusion of the identity has become prominent in these lines. No longer, Turkish nation feels comfortable in their own skin; there is a constant struggle for approval. There is a continuously growing anxiety to separate themselves from the “Old ways” (Pamuk 143). This alienation from their own roots was done in such a way that the Turks became stranger to their
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own culture. Perhaps, this is a significant trait of new historicism, of which Peter Barry talks about in his book on literary theory. He says,

“On the whole, new historicism seems to emphasize the extent of this kind of ‘thought control’, with the implication that ‘deviant’ thinking may become literally ‘unthinkable’ (on only thinkable), so the state is seen as a monolithic structure and change becomes almost impossible” (Barry 170).

During eighteenth century, in the name of modernization Turkish nation was severed from its cultural roots and civilization. Turkish modernization began during eighteenth century with the endeavor to understand the difference between Ottoman and European military system. Hence, the establishment played a significant role in the power play of Turkish revolution. With the course of time, the reformation started involving civilian matters more and more. However, later, modernization process trespassed the military arena and started affecting the public space. Ottoman political institutions were aimed for restoration according to the western standard. In order to carry on the reformation successfully, new group named Tanzimat Charter was formed under the supervision of Sultan Abdul Mecid. Ayse Kadioglu discussed such issues in one of her essays, she says,

“Between 1839 and 1908, the reforms increasingly involved civilian matters that resulted in the revamping of the civil and political institutions of the Ottomans." These reforms were introduced by the Tanzimat Charter, which was proclaimed by Sultan Abdul Mecid in 1839. Tanzimat reforms which involved a major reorganization at the levels of provincial administration, education, and the judiciary brought the Ottomans to a point of no return towards institutional modernization.” – (kadioglu)
However, in the early 1920s Turkish air became heavy with the slogans of Republican reform (Kadioglu). As expected, the dilemma of reaching a point of balance between the eastern spirituality and western materialism became a major priority. This dilemma to reach a balance between eastern spirituality and western materialism is common in the history of reformation. Indian subcontinent has experienced this dilemma of fragmented identity. The reformation created a group of people suffering from the “Black skin, White mask” syndrome which left us with a group of people, with ambivalent character traits, who neither belonged to India nor belonged to English empire. When we look into the narrations of Orhan Pamuk we notice, the dilemma of hybridity did not diminish with time rather it has been very much persistent in the culture and to some extent, has become a part of Turkish culture. Perhaps, this phenomenon of being severed from the root can be best explained by Freud’s theory of Uncanny. The concept of Uncanny originates in the German word Unheimliche which means unfamiliar. Freud says in his essay Das Unheimliche (The Uncanny),

“The German word 'unheimlich' is obviously the opposite of 'heimlich' ['homely'], 'heimisch' ['native'] the opposite of what is familiar; and we are tempted to conclude that what is 'uncanny' is frightening precisely because it is not known and familiar. Naturally not everything that is new and unfamiliar is frightening, however; the relation is not capable of inversion” (Freud).

This growing anxiety or the melancholy in the Turkish culture is due to the alienation of the self from the home-culture. This melancholy is due to the painstaking process of modernization, in other words, the process of de-culturing. With the passing days, it seems the sense of loss of the self has become more prominent in the culture. As Pamuk said that the battle against melancholy

---

6 Title of the book written by Martinique-born Afro-Caribbean psychiatrist Frantz Fanon, which was published in 1952. In the book he investigates the psychology of colonial domination.
is a continuous battle, which he has been fighting throughout his life alongside other Turkish civilians. This growing tension between the inward nature of culture and the outer force leaves the whole community in a fractured state, which Orhan Pamuk identifies as *Melancholy*.

*Melancholy* indicates the loss of home. It also indicates the inability of the self to associate itself with the newly declared cultural benchmark. Perhaps to understand this phenomenon clearly we need to look into the discourse of nationalism and national identity.

If we go back to the origin of the national identity and the ideas associated with it, then we see nation and national culture have always been associated with the feminine adjectives. We may refer to the case of the pre-colonial India when the national culture suffered for the continuous longing for a ‘personal space’ that will be free from ‘intrusion’ and ‘domination’ (Islam 153). The nation was ‘sacredly’ ascribed around the mother figure (Islam 153). Syed Manzoorul Islam mentions in his essay,

“It (nation) was somehow sacredly inscribed around the figure of the mother, and mother and space became interchangeable metaphors” (Islam 153).

Mobilization of the women and their sexuality has been a priority of the nationalist project. By mobilizing the female sexuality the nationalists could ensure the mobilization of the cultural, national identity, ethnic progress etc. Hence, mother figure plays an important role when it comes to associating different ideas with the nation state. Deniz Kandiyoti affirms this idea in her essay on identity where she says,

“Yuval- Davis and Anthias convincingly argue that the control of women and their sexuality is central to national and ethnic processes. Women bear the burden
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of being ‘mother of the nation’ (a duty that gets ideologically defined to suit official priorities), as well as being those who reproduce the boundaries of ethnic/national groups, who transmit the culture and who are the privileged signifiers or national difference.” (Kandiyoti 376)

As a matter of fact, to understand the gender role in the nationalist project we need to understand the dimension of the nationalist project. Yuval Davis in her essay on nationalist project discusses three different dimensions of nationalist projects related to the gender relations. She mentions of the genealogical dimension, which refers to the construction of identity around specific group of people. This dimension demonstrates the ‘homogenous’ nature of nation. Conversely, the second major dimension is structured around ‘cultural heritage’, which may include the language, religious institutions, and cultural customs. And the third dimension is the citizenship demonstrating direct relationship to the state’s sovereignty and geographical autonomy (Davis).

In the context of Turkish nationalist discourse, second dimension (the dimension demonstrating cultural heritage of language, religion and cultural customs) is our point of discussion. When western hegemony exercised “subalternity” upon the Turkish nationality, it actively manipulated this (the dimension demonstrating cultural heritage of language, religion, and cultural customs) most significant dimension of nationalist project. In this process of manipulation and subjectivity, the nation lost the sovereignty of self-identification. Interior culture of a nation, which consists of language, religion and cultural customs, is the matter which connects the citizen to the national identity. Sovereignty of a nation has to be exercised in all possible forms in order to establish a sovereign and independent identity of the citizenship. Yuval Davis mentions in her essay,
“If 'nations' are not to be identified with 'nation-states', one questions if there are any 'objective' characteristics according to which nations can be recognized. This question is not purely theoretical, given the wide consensus, affirmed by the United Nations, regarding 'the right of nations to self determination’” (Davis).

*Istanbul* certainly portrays the reality of the collision, where the civilians of this nation have lost their voice. They are all trying hard to synchronize their voice with the chorus of western ideology. By Orhan Pamuk’s narrations, it becomes clear that the country had lost its voice during the reformation process but the painstaking truth is that the voice is yet to regain and yet to reclaim by the Turkish nation. Orhan Pamuk says in the chapter *Under The Western Eyes*,

“Because the country is trying to westernize, what western writers say is desperately important, but whenever a western observer goes too far, the Istanbul reader, having gone to great lengths to acquaint himself with that writer and the culture he represents, cannot help but feel heartbroken.” (Pamuk 235)

In the 1930s Jacques Lacan developed the theory of *Mirror Phase*. Lacan proposed the idea of human being born prematurely unlike others in the animal world. Unlike others in the animal world, human has very little mastery over his motor skills, neither he can walk nor he can talk. As a result, there is an ‘ethological’ curiosity to mimicry. It asserts this idea that a human child learns the human behavior by mimicking others, in other words, by mirroring the behaviors of the matures (Leader,Groves). Lacanian *Mirroring* is so prominent in the case of Turkish modernization. When we look at the reformation of Turkey, we realize a mature civilization was pushed back to the *Mirror Phase* through the process of modernization. It seems, the nation has lost the originality of the identity and what is remaining of them is just mask, which everyone is trying hard to maintain. It is rather ironical that the nation sought power through alienation from
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their own culture and civilization. This is the phenomenon is well understood under the shadow of Gramsci’s *Hegemony* or Althusser’s ‘*Interpellation*’ or Foucault’s ‘*Discursive practice*’. These all ideas are indeed interconnected, which refer to a specific state of the civilians when they seek power in subjugation. Raymond Williams defined *hegemony* as, ‘the whole lived social process as practically organized by specific and dominant meanings, values and beliefs of a kind which can be abstracted as “world view” or “class outlook” ’ (Williams 170). It is rather an ‘internalized form of social control’ which makes the state of subjugation ‘natural’ (Barry 153). On the other hand, Althusser’s theory on *Interpellation* indicates similar belief of free choice. However, these choices are to be made from a fixed set of rules and laws. It is similar to what Henry Ford, the founder of Ford Motor company, had said when he introduced the first Ford motor car in USA market, “You can have any color as long as it's black.” Turks were never conquered by the western power neither they were invaded. They have always been a ‘free’ nation. However, their constant struggle to fit themselves into the ‘modern’ culture seems to speak otherwise. When Orhan Pamuk talks of their living room during the reformation or post reformation period, he addresses the living room as ‘Dark Museum’ and through the narrations; the point of “trying hard” becomes evident. He mentions that the living room was not for the family rather it was for the guest, who would come to their house and by seeing the western elements (Piano, photographs, furniture) in the living room they would approve of their westernization. Ayse kadioglu affirms this belief by putting the historical facts in her essay. She says,

“Crinolines, pianos, dining tables, and living-room furniture were new ideas which the official class soon adopted, and these were often seen as foolish luxuries by the section of the population that had lived on the modest standards imposed by traditional values.‘4 It
is obvious that a seemingly cosmetic Westernization adopted by the Ottoman elites was only skin-deep. Nevertheless, it generated criticism in the society that was crystallized in the Tanzimat literary tradition. Cosmetic Westernization was criticized as imitation of Western ways” (Kadioglu).

However, the issue has reached at a point when the outsiders have started defining the nation. No longer has the nation had its own standard and their ‘own’ way of doing things. Now the other’s ways have become the natural and cultural ways of doing things for Turks. They are living the opinion of those whose way they are trying hard to adopt. This phenomenon becomes more apparent when Orhan Pamuk explains the issue of ‘going too far’ in the chapter Under the Western Eyes, he says,

“Above all, no one can really say what counts as “going too far.” A city, it may be said, owes its very character to the ways in which it “goes too far,” and while an outside observer can take things out of proportion by paying excessive attention to certain details, these are often the same details that come to define that city’s nature.” (Pamuk 235)

He brings examples to make his point clear. He says,

“For example, when western travelers see cemeteries as part of the city’s everyday life, they are going too far. But as Flaubert noted, they would disappear as the city tried to become more western; today it is only by reading western travelers’ descriptions of cemeteries that we can understand how the city looked in their days.” (p235)

As it is been seen, the nation has reached a point when the outsiders have started defining home. In the context of the national discourse, culture takes the interior form. Often in the binary of
eastern and western ideology, eastern ideologies have been associated with spirituality. Consequently, national cultures of the eastern nations are of interior nature. National culture of pre-modernization period does not digress from other national culture of other eastern nations. During the time of reformation, national culture became a mere tool to mobilize the civilians towards a common destiny of ‘Ideal society’. Deniz Kandiyoti mentions in her essay, *Identity and Its Discontents: Women and the Nation*,

“In contrast, others expose state interventions as a sham by drawing attention to the purely instrumental agenda of nationalist policies that mobilize women when they are needed in the labor force or even at the front, only to return them to domesticity or to subordinate roles in the public sphere when the national emergency is over” (Kandiyoti 376)

The western hegemony took the advantage of the effeminate nature of the national culture of Turkey. Hence, when the beholder of the western hegemony realized that the incompatibility between the national culture of Turkey and of Western nations was too vast to merge them together, it exercised subjectivity in order to impose a “subalternity” upon the national culture of Turkey. The discrepancy was not possible to dissolve by the restructuring or adapting certain traits from here and there. Therefore, reformation process took a strong hold of the national culture and eradication of the ‘old ways’ seemed to be the only possible way to have a successful reformation of Turkey. It appears, the nation got caught by the tug of war between the two patriarchies (Western hegemony and Turkish cultural hegemony). But, in this case, the later brought it upon on itself. The loss of Turkish cultural patriarchy created a massive effect upon its subservient elements. This is similar to the phenomenon of *Independent Women* Simone De Beauvoir talks about in *The Second Sex*. She says,
“The independent woman – and above all the intellectual, who thinks about her situation – will suffer, as a female, from an inferiority complex; she lacks leisure such minute beauty care as that of the coquette whose sole aim in life is to be seductive; follow the specialists’ advice as she may, she will never be more than an amateur in the domain of elegance…it is necessary to be spontaneously offered prey….but the intellectual knows that she is offering herself, she knows that she is a conscious being, a subject” (Beauvoir 694).

Beauvoir’s words send us back to Althusser’s theory on Interpellation. There is not free choice, there was no free choice as a sovereign state. Like the intellectual woman, Turkish nation is well aware of the subjugation. However, the objective of modernization was to make this clear that it was no subjugation rather it was an adaptation of superior values. But, as a matter of fact, the process of adaptation eventually turned to the state of being subjugated. The very moment the nation considered to replace their old ways with the western values, in a way they affirmed to the idea of western superiority. This feminine nature of the modernization process indeed has shaken the core of Turkish patriarchy. The communal melancholy is an outburst of the mourning pain of the lost Turkish patriarchy. In the process of reformation, the individual Turkish identity has been fractured and it is yet to heal, which I will be discussing in detail in the next chapter.

As matter of fact, the modernization process created an unconditional hegemony over the Turkish culture; therefore, the process imposed eventual subalternity upon the culture. Through the process, the culture as a whole was cut out from their root of civilization. Civilization was pushed behind the door and Turks no longer could identify themselves with the Ottoman roots. Hence, the obvious effect of melancholy submerged the culture. Melancholy is no longer any individual emotion rather it has become a communal emotion. The whole nation suffers together.
The loss of voice, the loss of self, loss of masculinity of the national sovereignty and the loss of root – all these emotions are expressed through the word melancholy in the narration of Orhan Pamuk. The motherland was not invaded by the outsiders in the context of turkey rather it was fractured by its own people; they fractured the notion of motherland in the name of modernization. Possibly, modernization of Turkey is a strange phenomenon, which also Judith Batler’s theory of *Performitivity* cannot also comprehend. As it seems, the continuous performitivity accordance to the western ideas could not erase the uneasiness persistent in the culture. With the passing days, the uneasiness seems to become rather more and more apparent.
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Chapter 2

A Process of Gendering or De-gendering

“From a very young age, I suspected there was more to my world than I could see: Somewhere in the street of Istanbul, in a house resembling ours, there lived another Orhan so much like me that he could pass for my twin, even my double. I can’t remember where I got this idea or how it came to me. It must have emerged from a web of rumors, misunderstandings, illusions, and fears. But in one of my earliest memories, it is already clear how I’ve come to feel about my ghostly other.”

– Orhan Pamuk, Istanbul: Memories and the City.

In the mid 1840s Fatherland Notes, a Russian literary magazine centered in Saint Petersburg (who served the then rising Russian intelligentsia) published a novella written by Fyodor Dostoyevsky titled The Double. The narration revolves around a government official named Yakov Petrovich Golyadkin, who eventually turns lunatic. This is a story of a person engaged in internal psychological struggle. Through the course of narration, he encounters a person who is precisely, his double in appearance while being polar opposite in character traits.
Many critiques showed great interest towards Dostoevsky’s character portrait in the novella *The Double*. Many believe he introduced Freudian ideas of *Uncanny* through the course of story and in the character of Golyadkin. Uncanny relates to the state of fear of the unknown, or relates to what arouses fear. It is difficult to define the feeling of uncanny. It is only by juxtaposing the German origin of the word *Heimliche* (familiar) the *Unheimliche* (Unfamiliar) we can try to define this emotional state. Freud says,

“Yet we may expect that a special core of feeling is present which justifies the use of a special conceptual term. One is curious to know what this common core is which allows us to distinguish as 'uncanny'; certain things which lie within the field of what is frightening.” (Freud)

It is difficult to find sufficient subjects to define this term in a comprehensive manner. Uncanny is a branch of aestheticism, which prefers to concern itself only with the subjects of beauty and sublime rather than concerning itself with the feelings which are repulsive, negative in nature. Freud has suggested two ways to identify ‘uncanny’. He suggests,

“Either we can find out what meaning has come to be attached to the word 'uncanny' in the course of its history; or we can collect all those properties of persons, things, sense-impressions, experiences and situations which arouse in us the feeling of uncanniness, and then infer the unknown nature of the uncanny from what all these examples have in common.” (Freud)

As a matter of fact, both courses lead to the only result of the ‘uncanny’. Freud suggests that the uncanny, which is the frightening state, eventually leads back to what is known. He says,
“The uncanny is that class of the frightening which leads back to what is known of old and long familiar. How this is possible, in what circumstances the familiar can become uncanny and frightening” (Freud).

He explains such phenomena in the later part of the essay. He says, “The German word 'unheimlich' is obviously the opposite of 'heimlich' ['homely'], 'heimisch' ['native'] the opposite of what is familiar;” hence, often we feel the temptation to draw conclusion as such that ‘uncanny’ creates the state of fear simply because it ‘it is not known or familiar’(Freud). However, not necessarily everything new and unfamiliar will create the state of fear within a person and the ‘relation’ is not engage in the process of ‘inversion’ (Freud). Despite that, all unconventional unorthodoxy carry the possibility of being turned into something frightening, even so, ‘something has to be added’ (Freud) to what is unconventional to turn it into uncanny.

He implies the idea that it is going to be an act of over simplification if we juxtapose uncanny and unfamiliar in an equation. Therefore, he turns to linguistic meaning of ‘canny’ and ‘uncanny’. He explores different languages to trace the meaning of Heimliche and Unheimliche. And he refers to an array of words such as, uncomfortable, uneasy, gloomy, dismal, uncanny, ghastly; (of a house) haunted; (of a man) a repulsive fellow., strange, foreign), the house, not strange, familiar, tame, intimate, friendly, belonging to the house or the family, or regarded as so belonging Intimate, friendly comfortable; the enjoyment of quiet content, etc. These arrays of words certainly take us back to the matter of Melancholy and the attributes associated with it.

Orhan Pamuk is one of the many men who are emerging from the underground of Diaspora. Turkish nation’s Diaspora is of a very critical nature. They are alienation within their own homeland, which associates the traits of uncanny within the very nature of Diaspora. This sense of alienation is expressed through the melancholy, which has become an integral part of the
nation culture. The whole nation mourns on the death of their own culture, which has been replaced by the western hegemony. In the chapter on the four major Turkish authors Orhan Pamuk quotes one of them,

“When Abdulhak Sinasi Hisar mourns for things he calls “Bosphorus Civilization,” he sometimes stops and (almost as if he thought has just occurred to him) remarks that “all civilization are as transitory as the people in the cemeteries. And Just as we must die, so too must we accept that there is no return to a civilization whole time has come and gone. ” what unites these four writers is the poetry they made of this knowledge and the melancholy attending to it” (Pamuk 114).

Melancholy, outburst of the pain of the alienation, is the main theme of this memoir. It often seems, the narrator Orhan Pamuk is crawling through the narration. The ambiance of the narrative scene is dark, gloomy and often the mustiness of the narrated place can be sensed. I would bring the example of his narratives on his leaving room during his grandmother’s time. He titled the chapter as The Photographs in the Dark Museum House. This chapter represents the constant struggle of the regular Turkish people who are not certain about their personal identity and constantly struggling for the approval from other people, who will confirm to their ‘proper’ secularization/reformation. Hence, confirming this idea that they have achieved the western cultural benchmark and the fluidity of the nation identity has finally ceased to exit. He mentions of the piano (which was never played), he mentions of the Chinese porcelains and many other things, in his own narration,

“But it wasn’t just the unplayed pianos; in the apartment there was also a locked glass cabinet displaying Chinese porcelains, teacups, silver sets, sugar bowls, snuffboxes, crystal glasses, rosewater ewers, plates, and censers that no one ever touched…There
were unused desks inlaid with the mother-of-pearl, the turban shelves on which there were no turbans…to my childish mind, these rooms were furnished not for the living by for the dead” (Pamuk 9,10)

These artifacts or souvenirs were collected not with the passion for the collection rather for a display of their Turkish house with the western interior. It seems they were in exile inside their own home. The homeliness of home disappeared and diaspora sprouted inside the walls which Orhan Pamuk addresses as “Dark museum.” The house has become haunted, even with the living members living inside it. The uncanniness certainly appears in every corner of the house. The rooms were not for the comfort of the members of the house rather they were there to display they successful westernization. Orhan Pamuk continues by saying,

“Sit up straight!” Sitting rooms were not meant to be places where you could lounge comfortably; they were little museums designed demonstrate to a hypothetical, visitors that the householders were westernized.” (Pamuk 10)

Psycho-analytic theory is correct to point out the matter of repression or suppression in the nature of anxiety and this repression must recur to engender the state of uncanny within a person. On the other hand, we need to consider whether the state of uncanny is ‘originally frightening’ or it is the carried ‘affect’ of something else. In the context of the later one, uncanny is not considered being alien or new rather, it is something which is familiar or known. However, through the process of ‘repression’ the person becomes alienated from the known. In this matter, the uncanny is the consequence of the recurrence of the repressed matter or as Freud has put it, “the uncanny as something which ought to have remained hidden but has come to light” (Freud). Interestingly, this cosmic storm of cultural disability was brought upon the Turkish nation by the Turkish nation itself. In this sense, the reformation of Turkish nation represents the true nature of
hegemony, they willingly gave up their national identity; therefore, causing the alienation of the nation culture from the people, who are living within its territory.

In my previous chapter, I discussed the cultural consequence of rootless-ness through the narration of Orhan Pamuk in his memoir Istanbul. Rootless-ness is a major theme of the memoir and so is the theme of melancholy. When I look at the individual characters in the memoir, specially the character of Orhan Pamuk himself, it was realized that the cultural fragmentation left a deep scar in his life. The word- ‘Fragmentation’ is not sufficient to explain the effect of cultural fluidity. We might need to borrow words from Freud such as Uncanny, to explain the phenomenon.

Orhan Pamuk starts the memoir with a narration about himself. Where he states that he realized from a very young age that, there was more to see that the apparent scenario in the streets of Istanbul. There were unheard stories between the alleys and somewhat similar to his own life. He suspected there were more like him in the city, who are living the same life, who are struggling with the similar issues. I assumed, he recognized the individual issues being rooted in the communal problem. He says,

“From a very young age, I suspected there was more to my world than I could see: Somewhere in the street of Istanbul, in a house resembling ours, there lived another Orhan so much like me that he could pass for my twin, even my double. I can’t remember where I got this idea or how it came to me. It must have emerged from a web of rumors, misunderstandings, illusions, and fears. But in one of my earliest memories, it is already clear how I’ve come to feel about my ghostly other.” (Pamuk 3)
The reason I mentioned Dostoevsky’s novella, *The Double*, in the beginning of this chapter is that, often through the narrations, the narrator of the memoir, Orhan Pamuk, reflects certain traits of fragmented character. However, the intriguing matter in this case is that, the fragmentation is not individual rather it is a communal fragmentation of identity. When we refer to the fragmentation in the communal level, in that case, all the identities become fluid and including the gender identities consequently.

In my previous chapter, I mentioned of the invasion of the private space and public space. Hence, the line of domination between the interior and exterior become blur due to the existence of hegemonic power. Hence, when we talk about the doppelgangers in this context, then we have to look at a completely new idea of doppelganger. Through the idea of doppelganger we are not trying to narrate the story of Narcissus, who saw his own reflection and fell in love with himself. Neither are we talking about the evil twins. We are rather talking about the painful other in the case of Turkish nation. When Orhan Pamuk says,

> “There lived another Orhan so much like me that he could pass for my twin, even my double. I can’t remember where I got this idea or how it came to me. It must have emerged from a web of rumors, misunderstandings, illusions, and fears. But in one of my earliest memories, it is already clear how I’ve come to feel about my ghostly other.”(Pamuk 3)

He insinuates the idea of his ghostly other; consequently, he opens a whole new horizon of possibilities. Therefore, it will not be very superficial to assume that the line between the gender identities has been distorted by the rising communal melancholy. This memoir is not any individual narration rather it is a communal narration. In that case, we can call it rather a
narration of the private spare of Istanbul, a narration of the nation culture. In other words, this narration is more feminine in nature than the contrary. He confirms this idea of gender fluidity farther when he says,

“I’ve accepted the city into which I was born in the same way that I’ve accepted my body (much as I would preferred to be more handsome and better built) and my gender (even though I still ask myself, naively, whether I might have been better off had I been a woman). This is my fate, and there’s no sense arguing with it. This book is concerned with fate” (Pamuk 7).

The fragmentation and fluid nature of identity are not caused by exile, not in literal sense. Rather the whole phenomenon has been caused by the instability of the hegemony, by which I indicate the fluidity of the authoritative power, which eventually reflects upon the governed individuals. Michelle Zvedeniuk mentions in his essay on Dostoevsky’s novella The Double,

“Materiality Konstantin Mochulsky relates Golyadkin's madness to the mechanization and dehumanization of Nicholai I's rigid bureaucracy. Mochulsky contends that Golyadkin's personality is initiated into a split precisely due to his 'cog-like' nature within a regime that reduces people "into mere objects." To Mochulsky, this is the emergence of the first "man from the underground"” (Zvedeniuk).

Therefore, it is understood that the fragmentation of identity has direct involvement with the authoritative power. Our narrator reflects the case of Golyadkin in terms of being the pawn of a hegemonic power play. In addition, we also can say, this lies in the very nature of national identity that the citizens are reared with a built-in ‘common destiny’. To refer to Yuval Davis’s essay on the nationalist project,
“A vital ingredient emphasized by Otto Bauer (1940; Yuval-Davis 1987a) is that of 'common destiny'. It is oriented towards the future, rather than just the past, and can explain the subjective sense of commitment of people to collectivities and nations, such as in settler societies, or in post-colonial states, in which there is no shared myth of common origin (Stasiulis & Yuval-Davis 1995)” (Davis)

Nationalism’s nature of ‘common identity’ or ‘common destiny’ clearly explains the matter of common identity and in other words, it explains the gender fluidity caused by communal melancholy in Turkish culture.

To understand hegemonic role in the Turkish nation farther we need to look at some specific chapters of the memoir, namely, ‘Under the western eyes’. This title is borrowed from an essay written by feminist scholar Chandra Talpade Mohanty. In the essay, she discusses how the western colonization has colonized the ideas of the colonized nation, even in terms of the feminist movements. Western feminist movements are often defining the ‘third-world’ feminist agendas. Which is being done based on this underlying ideas that all the women are same under their skin, women issues are same around the world. Hence, this phenomenon has caused the western feminist movements to define the agendas and goal of the eastern feminist movements. Calling this phenomena as cross-cultural alliance would be an act of concealment. Chandra Talpade Mohanty clearly explains the phenomena when she says,

“Clearly, western feminist discourse and political practice is neither singular nor homogeneous in its goals, interests or analyses. However, it is possible to trace a coherence of effects resulting from the implicit assumption of ‘the west’(in all its complexities and contradictions) as the primary referent in theory and praxis.” (Mohanty)
Mohanty claims the western feminist movements as ‘monolith’ in the later part of the essay (Mohanty). The possibility of conversation between two feminist movements seems superficial, which is due to the hegemonic nature of the western feminist movements. By ‘introducing identical analytical principals’ in analyzing eastern women condition, the analysts are in a way confirming the western hegemony over the feminist academia. She argues, in order to have a horizontal communication between the eastern and western feminist discourse, scholars need to develop analytical tools and principals, which can be used in cross cultural level. Applying tools and principals, which are developed in the western hemisphere, will only confirm the hegemonic rule of western feminism over eastern feminism farther. In the name of freeing their ‘sisters’ they will be pushing them towards a subaltern state farther. Mohanty says,

“The necessary and integral connection between feminist scholarship and feminist political practice and organizing determines the significance and status of western feminist writings on women in the third worlds, for feminist scholarship, like most other kinds of scholarship, does not comprise merely ‘objective’ knowledge about a certain subject. It is also a directly political and discursive practice insofar as it is purposeful and ideological. It is best seen as a mode of intervention into particular hegemonic discourse, and as a political praxis which counters and resists the totalizing imperative of age old ‘legitimate’ and ‘scientific’ bodies of knowledge.” (Mohanty)

Continuously she argues for a ‘diverse representation’ of women issues. This similar trend of monolithic hegemonic presence is being noticed in Turkish reformation. Continuous confirmation from the western hemisphere has become a necessity for the Turkish cultural evolution. Repeatedly, Turks are looking back at the hegemonic figures to confirm their values and ideas. They are in continuous need of the criticism and confirmation from the western
authors and critics. When Turks considered introducing a reformation, the act was done based on this underlying assumptions that they will be taking the science from the west and the spiritual aspect of the culture will remain unharmed. But later the idea of merging ideas came into play. They considered merging western ideas with the eastern Turkish values hence, achieving best possible state a culture can achieve through ideological evolution. However, the founding fathers of modern Turkish nation forgot to reconsider this fact that the principles and values might start playing a hegemonic rule hence; they might overpower the existing system of belief. The rising ambivalence within the values and ideas was inevitable, which certainly started reflecting upon the living individuals within the social realm, hence, the melancholy. Orhan Pamuk, being part of this hybrid culture, speaks on this regard,

“To some degree, we all worry about what foreigners and strangers this of us. But is anxiety beings us pain or clouds our relationship with reality, becoming more important that reality itself, this is a problem. My interest in how my city looks to western eyes is—as for more Istanbullus — very troubled; like all other Istanbul writers with one eye always on the west, I sometimes suffer in confusion” (Pamuk 234).

Turks did not stop just by adapting the western values rather they embarked upon the journey of achieving the excellence. Orhan Pamuk talks of Ahmed Hamdi Tanpinar and Yahya Keman looking of an image of city in the travel literature in which the Istanbullus could see themselves (Pamuk 234). However, their study of the travel literature started getting concentrated among the western travelers. It seems, as though they were trying to look at themselves through the western spectacles and were trying to understand the prospects of turning into an ideal ‘western’ nation.
By considering the relationship of idea of dominance and subordinance, hegemonic relationship takes a new turn. Hegemonic power does not impose itself upon its subordinates rather it is the subordinates, who willingly, understanding the ‘greater good’ lies in the dominance of hegemonic power, submits themselves. Hence, it becomes an expression of higher level of femininity, which is certainly the case of Turkey. The gendering begins with their first consideration of introducing the reformation. The fragmented identities, doppelgangers, melancholy – these are all the outcome of the falling patriarchy of Turkey. Individuals suffer from the melancholy and the nation suffers in national level by indentifying melancholy being a part of the culture. Orhan Pamuk mentions of the ‘continuous’ struggle against this sadness. I assume, this continuous melancholy lies in the continuous process of ‘performitivity’\(^7\) of becoming a successful subordinate of the western ideas. Judith Bultler says in one of her essay, “When Simone de Beauvoir claims, "one is not born, but, rather, becomes a woman," she is appropriating and reinterpreting this doctrine of constituting acts from the phenomenological tradition. In this sense, gender is in no way a stable identity or locus of agency from which various acts proceede; rather, it is an identity tenuously constituted in time-an identity instituted through a stylized repetition of acts. Further, gender is instituted through the stylization of the and, hence, must be under- stood as the mundane way in which bodily gestures, movements, and enactments of various kinds constitute the illusion of an abiding gendered self.” (Butler)

If we consider looking into individual households, namely, Orhan Pamuk’s house hold, we see the reflection of what we have been discussion so far regarding being in continuous supervision of the western eye. His grandmother’s attitude towards the living room only being for the guest, who come to confirm their western values, reflect the ideas of and attitude of Ahmet Hamdi or

\(^7\) Judith Butler developed a theory on gender performitivity in the 1990s to resolve gender trouble.
Yahya Kemal. This continuous struggle for approval is their continuous performitivity upon the western values. Nevertheless, in the context of Turkish reformation, the national identity has become a performitivity issue. Turks are no longer Turks by birth rather they belong to their own culture based on how they act. It is a continuous process of performitivity to relocate themselves within their own culture and identity. However, the remaining ruins of lost architectures pushes them back to the past and the introduces ideas and values pushes them farther towards reformed identity, hence, in the tug of war of ideas the identity becomes fluid. The subordinate nature of national identity creates doppelgangers. These doppelgangers are not separated by gender identity. They are all equal in this continuous act of performitivity. Hence, Orhan Pamuk narrates that he wonders whether it would be better off being a woman. In his own words,

“I’ve accepted the city into which I was born in the same way that I’ve accepted my body (much as I would preferred to be more handsome and better built) and my gender (even though I still ask myself, naively, whether I might have been better off had I been a woman). This is my fate, and there’s no sense arguing with it. This book is concerned with fate” (Pamuk 7)

In terms of the gendering issue, the sexual politics in these whole phenomena of reformation is apparent. When I mention of sexual politics, I mean to say what Kate Millet mentions of the ‘interior colonization’, on her paper *Sexual Politics*. She addresses the society being a patriarchy. She says,

“This is so because our society, like all other historical civilization, is patriarchy. The fact, is evident at once if one recalls that the military, industry, technology, universities,
science, political office and finance – in short, every avenue of power within the society, including the coercive force of police, is entirely in male hands” (Millet).

When we understand the society being a patriarchal figure, we lay the ground for the gendering through hegemonic power. Colonization state reflects the ‘effeminate’ nature of the society. Colonization is a process of pushing a culture behind the veil by choking their voice to silence which results in subalternity. Kate Millet identifies the nature of sexual relationship in her paper. She identifies the nature of the subordinated group,

“The subordinated group has inadequate redress through existing political institutions, and is deterred thereby from organizing into conventional political struggle and opposition…a disinterested examination of our system of sexual relationship must point out that the situation between the sexes now, and throughout history, is a case of that phenomenon Max Weber defined as *herrschaft*, a relationship of dominance and subordinance.” (Millet)

When we are looking at the relationship between two patriarchies and their individuals, we are looking at the relationship from the perspective of domination and subordination. It is indeed the effeminate quality of a patriarchy to submit itself willingly to the hegemony. Gender fluidity in the psychological sphere of a culture is the effect of the subjugation of Turkish patriarchy by the western patriarchy. Hegemony does not have any space for adaption. There is always a binary of master and dominated. There is no horizontal ideological space in this context. When Turkey chose the ideological reformation, it gave itself up for subjugation, which is clearly being noticed in the narrations of Orhan Pamuk.
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Conclusion

Turkish reformation is a unique place for gender investigation. I started the paper with the intention to understand the gender position and the gendering process of through the process of modernization. I was aiming to achieve that goal by juxtaposing different narrations of different gender. However, my journey took different turns and I ended up looking at this gender phenomenon from Davis’s nationalist projects and. The theme of melancholy was farther understood through the Lacanian theory on Mirror Phase, Freudian Uncanny and Karl Marx’s theory of Base and Superstructure. As a matter of fact, I later realized through my research that the fragmented identity, fracture memory were better understood when I looked at them from idea of doppelganger, which was the outcome of the unstable hegemony. But the idea of western hegemony became farther clear and it was rationalized through the Foucault’s Discursive Practice and Althusser’s Interpellation theory. However, this memoir can be classed as a diaspora literature. However, this is a diaspora literature which was written by sitting inside his own home, inside his own homeland. This is rather the fascinating aspect of this memoir. Perhaps, this critical trait of diaspora aids to the gender fluidity of Turkey.
While writing this conclusion, it is my realization that the gender identity achieves a fluid state when the patriarchy struggles to adapt the feminine quality of subordinate. The gender of the Turkish patriarchy is questioned through the act of submitting itself to the hegemony. The very idea of recognizing certain body holding the ‘superior value’ put them in the subject tier. The melancholy blurs the line of gender where all the civilians stand in the same line of sufferings. The communal sadness creates doppelgangers of the individuals, where everyone is double of the other. The existence of true self is lost. When the patriarchy subjects itself to subordination, the gender role becomes confused in the state structure. The interior or exterior part of the society suffers equally. What we see in the history of Indian subcontinent, the women were put as a the torchbearer of culture and identity. The position of identity bearer becomes unnecessary when we talk about adapting a whole new identity. Therefore, in the case of Turkey, men become equally responsible to bear the modernization as women, and in some cases, more. In the process of adaptation, all the figures in the society try hard to put of the mask of modernization from their distinct places. Dress code, language, social norms – everything was adopted as per requirements where male and female presence were required equally. Here, no one was left behind with the old ways. Hence, the gender role comes out of the binary of domination. In fact, all the civilians are put on the dominated position in the binary against hegemony. We may call this phenomenon as a reflection of fractured identity, uncanny, melancholy or gender fluidity - they are all interconnected in this context.

It does not take any spiritual stance to understand the consequence of root being severed. Neither it takes scholarly understanding to understand that the melancholy can arise from aimless posture towards life which may arise from the unstable identity. However, it is often important to study literature through the spectacles of critics. It is important to train our minds and eyes to
understand and see beyond words. I agree with Michel Foucault when he called literature as the monument of history. This is rather a fascinating phenomenon of literature, which puts it beyond the dimension of time and space. Istanbul is an archeology of Turkish culture. This is the voice of the subalterns, which narrates the stories from the past, this is what connects us back to our root. Orhan Pamuk’s narrations add to that list of attempts. It is important for our feminist discourse to look beyond the binary of male and female. It is important that we understand the third space and the fluid state of gender, which is arising as a cause of fragmented identity and memory. Turkey is an exceptional case of diaspora, here the nation itself is in its own exile. Post-colonial feminist discourse needs to look at this recent phenomenon of unique nature of diaspora. Because, by understanding the current world politics and the rising crisis in many nations in the middle east and in other places, this unique trait of diaspora is presumably will turn into a common phenomenon.
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