

TOWARDS PRECARIOUS POLITICS:
ASSEMBLY, MOURNING AND LIVABLE LIFE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY
HATİCE MERVE AKSAN

IN PARTIAL FULLFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
GENDER AND WOMEN'S STUDIES

OCTOBER 2017

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Tlin Genz
Director

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

Prof. Dr. Aye Saktanber
Head of Department

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

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Cihan Ecevit
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Alev ınar (BilkentUni., POLS)_____

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Cihan Ecevit (METU, SOC)_____

Asst. Prof. Dr. Aret Karademir (METU, PHIL)_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Hatice Merve Aksan

Signature :

ABSTRACT

TOWARDS PRECARIOUS POLITICS: ASSEMBLY, MOURNING AND LIVABLE LIFE

Aksan, Hatice Merve
M.S. Department of Gender and Women Studies
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mehmet Cihan Ecevit

October 2017, 201 pages

This thesis aims to interrogate how political subjectivity of the precarious groups is marginalized discursively by the political power, and how this political marginalization becomes the source of both the resistance and the precarity of these communities. Regarding Judith Butler's framework on precarity, precariousness, and livability throughout the study, precariousness is defined as the required conditions which need to be met in order to sustain the life as a life, and it points out to living socially and politically, while precarity refers to the particular vulnerability imposed on certain communities. It is expected that these points could be seen in differential allocation of grief and mourning. Thus, this study first explores, in 2010's context of Turkey, how bodily appearance in the public space is used to resist the precarity. Secondly, this study aims to indicate how the hegemony of the political power in Turkey and the counter power of the precarious communities operate in the process of mourning, based on grievability. Therefore, this study aims to reveal power relations on grievability, hence livability. Lastly, this study reveals the clues of how a politics upon precariousness opens the door to alliance with other precarious communities and to what extent a politics on grievability could be considered as an operative resistance to precarity.

Keywords: Precariousness, Precarity, Grievability, Livability, Assembly, Mourning

ÖZ

KIRILGANLIK POLİTİKALARINA DOĞRU: TOPLANMA, YAS VE YAŞANABİLİR HAYAT

Aksan, Hatice Merve
Yüksek Lisans, Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Mehmet Cihan Ecevit

Ekim 2017, 201 sayfa

Bu tez kırılğan grupların politik öznelliklerinin nasıl siyasal iktidar tarafından söylemsel olarak marjinalize edildiğini ve bu politik marjinalizasyon nasıl hem topluluğun maruz bırakıldığı güvencesizliğin hem de gösterdikleri direnişin kaynağı olduğunu araştırmaktadır. Judith Butler'ın kırılğanlık, güvencesizlik ve yaşanabilirlik kavramlarından yola çıkarak, çalışma boyunca, kırılğanlık bir hayatın hayat olarak devam ettirilmesi adına karşılanması gerekli şartlar olarak tanımlanarak, sosyal ve politik olarak yaşamaya işaret etmek için kullanılmıştır. Öte yandan, güvencesizlik ise belirli topluluklara dayatılan belirli yaralanabilirliğe işaret etmek için kullanılmıştır. Bu noktaların, ayrımcı yas ve keder dağılımında görülebileceği öngörülmüştür. Bu nedenle, ilk olarak, bu çalışma 2010'lar Türkiye bağlamında, nasıl kamusal alanda bedensel görünürlüğün nasıl güvencesizliğe direnmek için kullanıldığını incelemektedir. İkinci olarak, bu çalışma Türkiye'deki siyasal iktidarın baskın iktidarı ve kırılğan grupların karşı iktidarının yas sürecinde yası tutulabilirlik üzerinden nasıl işlediğini incelemektedir. Böylece, bu çalışma yası tutulabilirlik, ve bunun üzerinden yaşanabilirlik üzerinden işleyen iktidar ilişkilerine işaret etmektedir. Son olarak, bu çalışma kırılğanlık üzerinden bir politikanın diğer kırılğan topluluklarla bir ittifakın kapılarını nasıl açacağı ve ne dereceye kadar yası tutulabilirlik üzerine bir politikanın güvencesizliğe direnmek için işleyen bir politika olarak ele alınabileceğinin izlerini sürmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kırılgnlık, Güvencesizlik, Yası Tutulabilirlik, Yaşanabilirlik,
Yas, Toplanma

To VEYSEL ATILGAN

*In The Name of All the People Who Lost Their Irreplaceable Lives While Following
Upon Peace on October 10*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Mehmet Cihan Ecevit for being there all the time, to support me not for only writing the thesis, but also his endless academic and personal support. Thanks for encouraging me to make believe to my intellectual capacity, my thesis, and more importantly myself and back me up when I am down and I know it was not rare. It is invaluable to know that there is a door to knock out when everything is too much. Thanks for apprehending me an academic candidate, all these intellectual conversations and promote me to maintain my studies. Once again thanks for everything.

I am also very thankful to Prof. Dr. Alev Çınar for her participation to my thesis committee, and for her invaluable and critical comments. I would like to thank you for your encouraging suggestions for my further studies. I am also very thankful to Asst. Prof. Dr. Aret Karademir for his participation to my thesis committee, for letting me to participate his very delightful classes and feel free me to knock the door and ask something about the thesis. Thank you for your sincere and critical suggestions for this thesis. Without Alev Çınar and Aret Karademir, this thesis will be lacking.

My family in Ankara, Sevgi Mancar, Melike Al, Umut Uzun, Eyüp Şen, Yasemin Bayramoğlu and İbrahim Öztürk. I know I can find your endless support, patience, and warmness any time in this hard process of writing the thesis. Thanks for this reliance, it means a lot for me. Thanks for our very precious talks, I cannot deny these talks' role for this thesis, thanks for finding myself in these hard times. Being a part of such a close and sweet friend group makes living in Ankara liveable for me. Thanks for the support for translations and proof readings of the thesis. Thanks for opening your houses to me anytime. Without you, I cannot imagine how this time can pass.

Irmak Sel, I am very grateful for passing most of this process with you. Thank you for our inspired conversations about life, our lives, women, and feminism in our library breaks. Thank you for freshening my self-belief every time.

Deniz Fenercioğlu, I cannot deny the role of our ecstatic conversational moments in school, home, concert halls, or forests for this thesis and this process. I would like to thank you for being such a lovely thesis buddy.

Gizem Kılıçlı, I would like to thank you for being with me all the time, especially in the hardest time of this process, for calming me and for your open-hearted friendship.

Çağla Dicle Engin, I wish you to see how your talks calm me and how I become more driven after your phone calls. I want to thank you for your joyful chats that always move me away from my troubles, your warm suggestions, and for your endless moral and material support.

Songül Dündar, it is hard to put the words the importance of our talks with you for this thesis and myself. Thank you for being such a close friend and for sharing your very precious ideas about life.

Gülşah Akçay, thanks for your warm friendship, positive perspective and unusual support. Thank you for making me feel at home again every once in a while.

Numan Demiral, I never anticipate receive such a close support from such a long distance. My old friend, thank you for your exertion for this thesis and ensuring me to believe my self.

Çağrı Zeplin, thanks for your unusual friendship and endless support. You pushed me to think otherwise about life, resistance, and art. Once again, thank you and all the kids who surf on the hopeful wings of the fairies.

Canan Büyükaşık Çolak, I cannot ever imagine how this process could be without you. I would like to thank you to help me to find my unknown sides, for listening me with such a patience and for all our meetings. I am so grateful to meet with you and your touch to my life.

I also would like to thank our lovely seminar group; Atakan Büke, Burcu Saka, Kübra Gökdemir, Mustafa Berkay Aydın, Merve Akbıyık, Cansu Dayan, Eda Süner, Fethiye Beşir, Tuğçe Çetinkaya, Nur Çöllü and Ülkü Baturoğlu. Thank you for your feedbacks

to my efforts about the thesis, your productive suggestions, and our lovely meetings at the weekends.

I also want to thank Spotify Inc. and YogaŞala Ankara to ease this process.

My lovely family. My beloved father, my precious mother, Zehra, Mustafa, Ayşegül, Esra, Ömer, Senem and sweet Eylül. Thank you for your endless and unquestioned support, your respect to all my decisions and your belief to me. Without you, I would not be me. Thanks for teaching me compassion, love and patience. I felt being part of a ‘we’ with you first time. It is very hard to put the words how this ‘we’ and this feeling are precious for me. Once again, thanks for everything.

Lastly, I would like to thank Judith Butler to make this thesis possible. Thanks for enabling me to taste such a thought experience and to attach this thesis with such a passion. This thesis changed the meaning of exertion for me and it is because of her.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ	v
DEDICATION	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. SUBJECT FORMATION WITHIN THE MATRIX OF CULTURAL INTELLIGIBILITY	16
2.1 Gendered Subject	18
2.2 Gender Performativity.....	21
2.3 Interpellation & Constitutive Outside	26
2.4 The Matrix of Cultural Intelligibility	32
2.5 Subject Formation & Subjection	34
3. THE DISCUSSIONS ON LOSS, MOURNING, AND GRIEF	39
3.1 Rethinking Grief as a Social Emotion: Affect	44
3.2 Mourning, Trauma, Temporality and Naming Act	46
3.3 Transformative Effect of Loss: A condition for a new political agency.....	49
3.4 After Politicization of Life and Death: The Politicization of Mourning.....	52
3.5 Precariousness and Precarity	56
3.6 Body and Its Public Dimension	60
3.7 Relationality and Community within the Context of Mourning	62
3.8 Differential Allocation of Grief	65
3.8.1 Why state of exception?	65
3.8.2 Grievability and Livability	67
3.8.3 Naming and Representing the Dead.....	76

4. METHODOLOGY	83
4.1 My Methodological Perspective: Reconsideration of Feminist Methodology and Embrace of Queer Methodologies	84
4.2 Discourse Analysis: Theoretical and Methodological Explanations.....	85
4.3 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).....	88
4.4 Selection of the Texts and Operationalization of CDA.....	93
4.5 Limitations of The Study.....	94
5. RESISTANCE TO PRECARITY	95
5.1 Calling of Labor, Peace, and Democracy.....	99
5.1.1 Power of Peoples Against Dictatorship.....	100
5.1.2 The Demand of Peace against the Politics of War	101
5.1.3 Key Ethical Demands.....	105
5.1.4 Precarity and The Conditions of ‘Livable’ Life	106
5.1.5 Reference to Previous Pains	107
5.1.6 Constitution of the ‘We’	108
6. COUNTER POWER ON GRIEVABILITY: FROM UNBEARABLE GRIEF TO UNCONTROLLABLE RAGE	112
6.1 The body of the ‘ungrievable’: Mortal vulnerability and mortal precariousness	113
6.2 The Experience of Familial Mourning	120
6.2.1 The Mourning for The Will to Peace	120
6.2.2 The Maintenance of ‘Speaking Subject’: The Emphasis on ‘We know the murderers’	126
6.2.3 The Transformative Effect of the Loss: A condition for the sedimentation of the political agency	129
6.2.4 Cherishing the Deceased as They were: The Constitution of the Political Subjectivity	133
6.3 The Experience of Organizational Mourning.....	136
6.3.1 Emphasis on Security Vulnerability within ‘We know the murderers’: Constitution of “Us-Them”	137

6.3.2 Reference to Previous Vulnerabilities and Sufferings: Constitution of Resistance to Precarity as Organizational History	139
6.3.3 Sustainment of Believing in Emancipation: Solidarity and Ethics of Cohabitation	140
6.3.4 The Spreading of the Rage: Funerals, Strikes, and Protests	144
6.4 Rethinking Mourning and Grievability	149
7. HEGEMONIC POWER ON GRIEVABILITY: CONSTITUTION OF SPEAKING SUBJECT	152
7.1 Constitution of Cohabitation	155
7.1.1 Reconstitution of Security Vulnerability or Precarity	155
7.1.2 Reconstitution of the Object of Violence	158
7.1.3 Reconstitution of Object of Violence: Emphasis on Forthcoming Elections	162
7.1.4 Constitution of subject of violence	165
7.2 Sedimentation of Constitutive Outside	167
7.2.1 From Marginalization to Constitutive Outside	169
7.2.2 Misrepresentation and Misrecognition of the emphasis on “We know the murderers”	172
7.3 Towards Conclusion: Rethinking on Grievability and Freedom of Assembly	175
8. CONCLUSION	178
REFERENCES	181
APPENDICES	190
APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET	190
APPENDIX B: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	201

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AKP	Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi
BTS	Birleşik Taşımacılık Çalışanları Sendikası
CHP	Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi
DISK	Devrimci İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu
EHP	Emekçi Hareket Partisi
EMEP	Emek Partisi
HDP	Halkların Demokratik Partisi
HTKP	Halkın Türkiye Komünist Partisi
IHD	İnsan Hakları Derneği
KESK	Kamu Emekçileri Sendikaları Konfederasyonu
MIT	Milli İstihbarat Teşkilatı
MP	Member of Parliament
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
PKK	Kürdistan İşçi Partisi
RTUK	Radyo ve Televizyon Üst Kurulu
SGDF	Sosyalist Gençlik Dernekleri Federasyonu
SYKP	Sosyalist Yeniden Kuruluş Partisi
TKP	Türkiye Komünist Partisi
TMMOB	Türk Mühendis ve Mimar Odaları Birliği
TTB	Türk Tabipleri Birliği
VPN	Virtual Private Network

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

When I was in high school, my father has been diagnosed with a fatal disease. Before the diagnosis, I had not thought about death. In that process, I thought about death, losing someone, hence life so much. When I was an undergraduate student, I lost my father. It was not unexpected, but I was ruined, so did my family. As a family, we have started to grieve for him. But, we were not alone. Fortunately, there were so many people around us to take care of us and to support us. I grieved for my father with my family and our relations. Despite all of this support, I did not get over his death for a long time. I felt like I am sick both physically and mentally for a long time. I thought so much about him, where he is gone, how is he now, or does he exist now, etc. It was like I lost not only him, but something else as well. When my grief ended, I was not like myself anymore. I know that I was not the first person who lost a close relative, and I will not be the last. It was obvious than anything else. I had the knowledge, all the people I know are going to die someday. If I will not grieve for them, they will grieve for me. Death connects us to each other in a different way. I organized my life and my relations with anyone in my life, in a different way, after I experienced such an unbearable grief. But, both the life and the death of my father was recognized in a sense.

Almost six months after I lost my father, Gezi Park Protests began, and I have resisted in Gezi Park. This experience has a significant place in my life. I differentiated both being part of a resistance, and I can be connected with the people I do not know. When I hear that some protesters lost their lives in the streets, I felt grief for them and I realized it is not an experience that is been held in the house and I may feel grief for the people whom I do not know. I realized that I must have a connection with them to grieve for them. Being on the ‘same side’ related us in a different level. There were people who do not grieve, even not sorry for their loss. There were people who think

that they deserve death. I imagined how the family, relatives, and friends of the people who lost their lives in the protests feel when they hear these things. Since these two experiences fall within the same period of my life, I realized that my will to sustentation a life is not established only with the people I know.

At October 10, I was not in the rally, but I was in Ankara. I did not lose anyone I know at the attacks. However, I do not remember being filled with such grief for the death of ones I do not know throughout my life. Listening to the explanations of the mourners of October 10 reminded me of my own experience of loss. I realized how their experience of loss is actualizing more difficult than my own experience. Because their lives are not ‘the lives’ that are fully recognized. What I have told so far has been told to show that the aim of this thesis is beyond a scientific inquiry. It is my question about life itself; How the ending of a life reveals the importance of that life in our lives? How can I feel grief for the loss of someone I know and feel nothing for loss of others? How can I feel grief for some who are strangers to me, but not others? How can we understand this differential distribution of what we feel? To what extent, could we say it is subjected to an order? These questions are becoming clear and partially answered in *Precarious Life* (2004) and *Frames of War* (2009).

This thesis aims to interrogate how political subjectivity of the community of October 10, of both the gatherers and the mourners, is marginalized discursively by the political power in Turkey, and how this political marginalization becomes the source of both the resistance and precarity of this community. Apart from that, I also want to indicate how the hegemonic power of the political power in Turkey and the counter power of the precarious community operate in the process of mourning of October 10, based on grievability. Therefore, this study aims to reveal power relations on grievability, hence livability, regarding the case of October 10.

Although main arguments of the thesis are concerned with grievability and livability, I also focus on October 10 as an assembly and aim to query how we can elaborate bodily alliance of the gatherers of Labor, Peace and Democracy Rally in the public space as a useful way to resist the exposure to precarity. I operationalize precariousness and precarity discussions to intersect assembly and mourning. Thereby,

I turn my focus to resistance through mourning from resistance through assembly and aim to indicate how the acts of mourning of October 10 become a way of non-violent resistance politics to ungrievability, therefore precarity. I search for the clues of how a politics upon precariousness opens the door to an alliance with other communities and to what extent a politics on grievability could be considered as an operative resistance to precarity when it compares to identity politics. Lastly, I search for the clues of how political power in Turkey marginalize the community of October 10 by discursive operations and how these operations expose the community to precarity, and how it constitutes their lives as ‘ungrievable’. I started to interrogate these points with an empirical assumption: I assume that the political power in Turkey produces, regulates and operates political marginalization to expose particular communities to precarity.

To briefly mention about the historical framework which October 10 has happened, I want to point out that I consider 2015 summer as a notable point to start to think about the political atmosphere of Turkey in recent years. So, after the ‘solution process’ was postponed, the tension in the Eastern part of Turkey has raised. The struggle between two forces, Turkish Army Force and PKK, causes loss of so many lives. Because of the fact that this fight causes the destruction of the residential areas of the civilians and Turkish government’s declaration of curfew for some areas takes a long time, the Turkish government is highly criticized by some political parties and communities because of its politics on the war on terrorism. This criticism also includes the claims that Kurdish civilians also have lost their lives in this fight and curfews restrict the civilians to meet vital needs. In other words, the government is criticized because it exposes the civilians who live in these areas to precarity. Moreover, Turkey went to the poll in June 2015 and AKP lost its chance to come to power alone because HDP, the party which is one of the actors in the ‘solution process’ and holder of the criticisms on the war on terror, went beyond the electoral threshold and entered the parliament.

In order to elaborate the violence in Turkey in recent years within a historical framework, although I do not know exactly where I should start, we can begin with ‘Uludere airstrike’ or ‘Roboski Massacre’. In 28th of December, 2011, 35 Kurdish

civilians, considerable majority of whom were children, were murdered in the airstrikes of Turkish Army Force in Uludere district, Şırnak. From the point of the fact that civilians lost their lives, the fact that all of them belong to an ethnic minority, ‘Uludere airstrike’ or ‘Roboski Massacre’ is worth being mentioned in this discussion. By the decisions of non-jurisdiction and non-prosecution, the investigation could not proceed and this case became an event in which a counter power is enacted to the political power through precariousness of a particular community. Many pro-Kurdish politicians and other precarious communities named the event as ‘Roboski Massacre’. I consider this case’s importance at the intersection of apprehending some lives as ‘disposable’ and belonging to an ethnic minority.

Similarly, another violent attack is ‘Reyhanlı Bombings’ or ‘Reyhanlı Massacre’. In 11th of May, 2013, two car bombings exploded in the town of Reyhanlı, Hatay which is near the Syrian border, 52 people were murdered. It is second bloodiest attack after October 10 in Turkish Republican history. Reyhanlı bombings lead to the government’s criticism by the political dissident groups by the claim that these people were murdered because of the claim that government’s and army’s intelligence vulnerability.

The last event which I will place in this historical framework is ‘Suruç Bombing’ or ‘Suruç Massacre’. The activists of Federation of Socialist Youth Associations met at Suruç in 20th of July, 2015 - Suruç is a rural city of Şanlıurfa Province in Turkey, and it is near Syrian border – to go to Kobani and help the rebuilding of the town. The gathering was concluded with a terrorist attack. 32 young socialist activists lost their lives, and hundreds of them were injured. Kobani is a city in the northern part of Syria, and it was the battle place where the Islamic State militants and Kurdish fighters fight since September 2014. In the early days of 2015, Kurdish fighters regained the control of the town with the help of air strikes led by the US army. At that time, IS forced more than 100.000 civilians in Kobani to move to Turkey. Homes, schools, and hospitals were ruined during the battle, and there was no residential area for the people who will return to Kobani. The city needed rebuilding and it was the aim of the meeting. After this bombing, the government is criticized because of security

vulnerability and lack of investigation in the long run. I consider the importance of ‘Suruç Massacre’ in the fact that these people gathered to intervene the precarity of ‘the other’ and their political subjectivity became the reason of their apprehending as ‘ungrievable’.

At such a time, some left-wing parties, unions, confederations, foundations, associations, artists and journalists made a call of a rally. For the ‘Labor, Peace and Democracy’ assembly that is organized by KESK, DİSK, TMMOB, and TTB, and which some other political parties, NGO’s, and unions integrated with the slogan ‘urgent peace, urgent democracy’. The organization committee applied to the Governorship of Ankara and obtained the necessary permits and informed the governor how the meeting would be held. Accordingly, demonstrators from outside Ankara would gather in front of the Central Railway Station and form the corteges and would walk to Sıhhiye Square at 10:00 a.m. The rally would start when all of the demonstrators reached the Sıhhiye Square. So, thousands of people gathered in front of the Ankara Railway Station at the early morning of October 10. Before the rally began, at the most crowded point, 2 bombings occurred at 10:04 a.m. The first bomb was exploded at the cortege of HDP, and the second one exploded between the corteges of EMEP and SGDF. 102 people are murdered. It is the bloodiest terrorist attack in Turkish Republican history. The mourning process of October 10 has been held in public spaces and the aim of the gatherers of the assembly was repeated in mourning rituals, protests, and strikes.

These people lost their lives in a violent attack, and the mourning for the losses of October 10 was politicized. Therefore, in this thesis, I will interrogate the mourning process of October 10 within the framework of Butler’s discussions, particularly on ‘Violence, Mourning, Politics’, and generally precariousness, precarity, livability, grievability, unlivability, and ungrievability. In order to clarify what does these terms supposed to be mean throughout the thesis, I will reserve this part of the introduction chapter to briefly explain these terms. Precariousness is about the required conditions which need to be met in order to sustain the life as a life, and it points out to living socially. The precariousness of life indicates that the desire to sustain the life depends

not only on the postulated psychic drive to live but more crucially to social and political conditions. In Butler's terminology, precariousness refers to the corporeal vulnerability shared by all mortals, while precarity refers to the particular vulnerability imposed on certain communities (Butler, 2009). This discussion on the differential allocation of grief and precariousness does not focus on the value of any life or the competence to survive, rather it focuses on the social conditions in which the conditions that guarantee life are not met (Butler, 2009). As Butler states, precariousness refers to "living socially, the fact that one's life is always in some sense in the hands of the other. It implies exposure both to those we know and to those we do not know; a dependency on people we know, or barely know, or know not at all" (2009:14). In other words, Butler does not comprehend 'livability' by only a survival instinct, but she focuses on the social and political conditions which are necessary to sustain a life as a recognizable subject. When it comes to precarity, Butler states that precarity is "politically induced condition in which certain populations suffer from failing social and economic networks of support and become differentially exposed to injury, violence, and death" (2009:25). While she differentiates precarity and precariousness, Butler draws attention to the differential allocation of recognizability, and she claims that "when we ask what makes a life livable, we are asking about certain normative conditions that must be fulfilled for life to become life". (2004:39). In her conceptualization, grievability functions as marginalization and unlivability, it refers to those who will be eligible to demand rights, support, and recognition as 'grievable' and those who won't as 'ungrievable'. In this thesis, I focus on the political subjectivity of the precarious group and I elaborate 'livability' as the condition to demand social and political rights, and recognition as 'political subject'. As she claims, comprehension of grievability prioritizes and enables the comprehension of precariousness (Butler, 2009).

This thesis is a scholar based thesis and I use Judith Butler's conceptualizations and discussions to elaborate on October 10. The conceptualizations on subject formation, cultural intelligibility, interpellation and constitutive outside which took place in *Gender Trouble* (1990), *Bodies That Matter* (1993), *The Psychic Life of Power* (1997) is used to understand how the community of October 10 is marginalized and

constituted as precarious by the political power and how this constitution has become the source of community's political acts. I argue that this discussion which is based upon performativity theory is particular to understand what makes a life livable in Turkey. Moreover, I consider that to start to think about subject formation is a useful starting point for feminism and other social transformative politics.

Apart from these books, I use *Excitable Speech* (1997) to provide the basis for the discussions on linguistic vulnerability and linguistic survival. I use *Precarious Life* (2004) and *Frames of War* (2009) to provide the theoretical background for the discussions on loss, mourning, and grievability in the process of October 10. I elaborate the discussions in these two books by reserving them into the frameworks: affect, the politicization of mourning, body, relationality, and community. Thereby, I aim to interrogate grievability, precariousness, and precarity by focusing on loss and mourning itself, regarding October 10. For a better understanding, I append Jacques Derrida's discussions on loss, trauma, and temporalization; Talal Asad's discussion on moral responsiveness, Giorgio Agamben's discussions on the politicization of life and death, 'homo sacer', and state of exception.

Lastly, I use Butler's *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly* (2015) for the chapter which I elaborate October 10 as an assembly. I canalize these notes' discussions by focusing on the constitution of the precariousness of the community based on precarity. Apart from these books, in order to enhance these discussions, I benefit from Judith Butler's articles and interviews.

I reserve this part of the Introduction chapter to present the arguments on why I use Butler's theoretical background. Ultimately, the question of 'what makes a life grievable' refers to the problem of recognition, and there is a point which Butler has highlighted and it differentiated Butler's conceptualization from other theories which are dealing with the issue of recognition. This is the conceptualization of recognizability and I consider that it is significant to understand the precariousness on October 10.

It is worth to be mentioned that Butler's conceptualization of recognition is not limited to the reciprocal acts that need at least two subjects in Hegelian sense, the focus which interests this study is the concept of recognizability which is the normative condition where recognition can take place. According to Butler, recognizability frames recognition (2004). In other words, recognition can only actualize on the field of the norms of intelligibility established by recognizability. Following this argument, in this study, the issue is not the recognition of the precarious group of October 10 by 'the other', but it is how the normative framework of political recognizability operates for livability and grievability of them. On the other hand, as Butler argues, the iterability of the frames of recognition and the schemes of intelligibility provide the condition of resignification. To be clear, by subversive and resignificatory acts, the counter power may extend or break the limits of the frames. For this study, October 10 assembly itself and mourning for the loss of October 10 in the public sphere are elaborated as the acts of resignification on livability and grievability. In my view, the gatherers and the mourners of October 10 act against the normative framework of political utterance on the one hand, and against the normative framework for livability and grievability, on the other. For this study, I elaborate both acts as constitute acts of the counter power to recognizability frame which produced and reiterated by the political power.

The fact that Butler's discussions on vulnerability intersect with those of recognizability is a significant point for this study. So that, Butler's discussion on recognizability and vulnerability points to the interrogation of how the norms enact a differential organization of vulnerability rather than how these subjects are damaged by the terms of these norms. Regarding this study, I aim to search for the theoretical clues of how the violent operations of political power could be discussed within the context of grievability in Chapter 3, in Chapter 2, I am searching those of how this violence is not seen in the field of violence. To be clarified, I aim to indicate how political power decides, produces, and regulates the normative citizenship, in other words, who will be the subject of legal, political, and social rights by restricting political participation and freedom of assembly in the name of the war on terrorism. As Feola clarifies, "the guiding intuition behind this analytic of framing is not simply the existence of exclusionary dynamics within social space (as a brute social fact), but

rather how the shifting interests of power take hold of these dynamics and use them to disqualify certain subjects from full normative standing.” (2014:136). In this study, I claim that the political power in Turkey operates the normative framework of grievability in terms of political subjectivity, and try to limit the possibilities of resistance to its politics, especially on the war on terrorism and secure its hegemony. By deciding on what meaning they will have in the political space, hence addressing them in the social space, the political power regulates the sphere in which political claims will be registered as political claims. I argue that limits of the ‘we’ which refer to those who can utter its political claims and demands are drawn and closed by this frame.

The way of Butler conceptualizes the subject is worth to be mentioned to understand both recognizability and vulnerability, and the politicization of mourning. So, as Butler argues in *Undoing Gender*, the self is beyond itself from the start (2014:150). She often uses the terminologies ‘being dispossessed’, ‘being undone’, ‘being beside oneself’, ‘given over to the other’, ‘being outside myself’ (Schippers, 2014:20-21). This account of ek-static subjectivity, in my view, is the base of her inquiries on vulnerability, ethics, and also normativity. To be clarified, she interrogates what kind of norms, or what operation of power is at play in the constitution of the ek-static subject. While in the earlier writings, these questions try to find the answer for heteronormative frameworks, in the later writings, the issues are inquired in Western neoliberal democracies and the issue of US government’s war on terrorism.

In my view, Butler’s arguments on the constitutive power of norms and ‘what makes a life livable’, and the fact that the fundamental interdependence is the starting point of these discussions intersect at a point; it is an attempt of mapping of power and this point is important for this study. So, Butler’s discussions come to such a point; how this dependency is operated by the social and political networks of power. And this question leads us to the notions of precariousness and precarity. I consider the difference between precariousness, vulnerability, and precarity as significant for this study. Because, while this attack appears as a vulnerability by definition in the discourse of political power, the explanations of the precarious community which this

study is concerned with reference to a state of precarity. What I mean by the claim that this group is exposed to precarity is that they cannot merit the full benefits of political membership. In other words, their political demands were not registered as political demands and the frames that I want to elaborate is concerned with the regulated relation of political expression and the right to have rights. As Butler points in *Precarious Life*, “one way of “managing” a population is to constitute them as the less than human without entitlements to rights, as the humanly unrecognizable” (2004:98). For this thesis, I am concerned with how the operations of political power are done by deciding what certain agents are ‘seen’ to demand the protections related to a membership in a privileged category, namely citizenship which may utter the political demands. Moreover, I claim that the political power secures the privilege of some forms of citizenship by referring others with marginality. Therefore, my argument turns to a claim of the category of citizenship constitutively defined by foreclosures. As Butler states in *Precarious Life*, “..because politics – and power- work in part through regulating what can appear, what can be heard”, therefore ‘who counts as human’ or ‘citizen’ (2004:147). From this claim forth, I argue that because of the fact that the political power in Turkey regulates the field of livability, resistance actualizes through grievability as well. By way of this relationality, the power relations are constituted upon grievability.

Performativity theory contributes a way to conceptualize gendered subject and provides ways of resistant cultural politics, based on the strategy of the radical subversion of the reigning cultural and social norms. As Butler states in *Performativity, Precarity, and Sexual Politics*, “Performativity has everything to do with “who” can become produced as a recognizable subject, a subject who is living, whose life is worth sheltering and whose life, when lost, would be worthy of mourning.” (2009:xii). To clarify, while Butler claims that the subject always constituted through recognizability in the web of norms, she also argues that these norms constitute the framework which decides whose life will be considered as ‘life’. Therefore, she intersects performativity with precarity as follows: “Precarity is directly linked with gender norms, since we do know that those who do not live their genders in intelligible ways are at heightened risk for harassment and violence.” (2009:ii).

However, her way of conceptualizing precarity is not limited to gender. By discussing this issue within various frameworks in different writings, Butler does not confine the issue of livability to gender and does not concern with only gender and sexual minorities.

Another concept which can be included in this discussion is normative violence. Butler's account of normative violence deals with the effort to 'make life livable' and I consider it as a significant point for the resistance of precarious populations of October 10. Therefore, I intend to operationalize Butler's this politico-theoretical effort for the case of October 10. This thesis takes the research case October 10, and it may seem not linked with gender or women, however, I aim to use the theoretical framework which is presented by Judith Butler from *Gender Trouble* (1990) to the most recent writings and I am planning to operationalize a framework which is coming within gender studies, especially queer theory and focuses on the normative violence within heterosexual matrix for another normatively violent order, namely politically normative discursive order in Turkey. To clarify what it means to be normative violence, Samuel Chambers elaborates 'normative violence' as a useful contribution of Judith Butler to political theory and claims that the notion takes place from *Gender Trouble* (1990) to the writings which rethink the notion of violence with regard to grief and grievable lives (2007). As Chambers states, "Normative violence names not a type of violence that is somehow 'normative', but the violence of norms... Normative violence should be understood as a primary form of violence because it both facilitates typical, physical violence and simultaneously renders such violence invisible." (2007:43). If we rethink the arguments on *Gender Trouble* (1990) with regard to normative violence, Butler assumes that in the heteronormative order, gender norms themselves impose a certain violence to the bodies which cannot be fitted into the presupposed coherence of sex, body, and desire. Butler takes the unlivability of those who have non-normative sexualities as a problem of heteronormativity and shows how the norms can be powerful to allow some lives to live, and others to maintain a life that is less than a 'livable life'. Butler takes the life 'livable' or 'lived' with regard to the capacity to be recognized as a subject within the matrix of intelligibility and being received in this matrix of intelligibility makes one a subject, in other words, there is

no subject before the matrix. When we connect these two arguments to each other, as Chambers clarifies, “the concept of normative violence draws our attention not *to* the violence done to a pre-formed subject, but to the violence done *within* the formation of subjectivity” and it can be understood only through discourse (2007:47). In other words, we should give attention to the part that language takes place in violence. Not only through the formation of discourse, but also through the circulation of these discursive practices, normative violence makes the everyday forms of violence invisible and illegible (Chambers, 2007). As Butler states in the Preface of 1999 Edition of *Gender Trouble*, “it was difficult to bring this violence into view precisely because gender was so taken for granted at the same time that it was violently policed.” (1999: xix). *Gender Trouble* was an effort to denaturalize what is taken for granted since the naturalization of gender masks the normative violence of gender norms.

When we consider the normative violence which the precarious group in question is exposed to at October 10, we may assume that the marginalization of this kind of political subjectivity is almost taken for granted and as we may deduce from the references to the earlier sufferings, it is violently policed. Besides, it is violently formed. Therefore, we may argue that, to denaturalize the ungrievability of this particular precarious group and the politics of resistance, which is based on this attempt, not only move the normative violence which is exposed to the precarious group to the domain of visibility, but also has the potential to interrupt the relation of ungrievability and normative violence. As she states in *Precarious Life*, “normative schemes of intelligibility establish what will and will not be human, what will be a livable life, what will be a grievable death” (Butler, 2004:146).

At this point, following Chambers’s point which is “politics is the declaration of wrongs” (Chambers, 2009:11), I claim that the attempt to understand the power mechanism which regulates ‘what will be heard as a political claim’ is meaningful for all the social transformation politics who aim to articulate a wrong. Chambers refers to Ranciere’s concept of ‘democratic miscount’ (2008) and claims that the condition of the occurrence of democratic politics is a confrontation of domination by equality. Besides, if we consider this argument for the resistance through grievability, we come

to such a point: politics on livability occurs when the unintelligible make themselves intelligible. In this respect, when we think about political power's regulation on the conditions of speakability, sayability, and visibility, it cannot be limited to the precariousness of a particular group. I consider that this thesis's attempt to think about the politics upon precariousness, which is not irreducible to either identity politics or the call for inclusiveness, may be counted to rethink the ways of doing gender politics, especially dissident ones, in Turkey.

In this study, I use discourse analysis as the methodology. The reason why I use discourse analysis is that Butler conceptualize the subject formation in a discursive plain and she emphasizes linguistic vulnerability. I attained the texts which I use in the analysis chapters as linguistic material from web newspapers between 1st of October and 30th of October. I scanned 147 online news in total. While I convey the emphasis on the resistance through mourning for the experience of mourning parts, for the discourse of political power, I made a distinction according to the codes which appear in all of the declarations. Therefore, I separated them into cohabitation and sedimentation of marginalization. My aim in this separation is to suggest that ethics of cohabitation should be considered, even, based on precariousness rather than common future and shared citizenship.

From now on, I will mention trajectory of this study. This study is composed of eight chapters. In the second chapter "Subject Formation within the Matrix of Cultural Intelligibility", I discuss Butler's conceptualization of subject formation. This chapter is prepared with 3 books; *Gender Trouble* (1990), *Bodies That Matter* (1993), *The Psychic Life of Power* (1997). In this chapter, I focus on the following discussions of these 3 books; In *Gender Trouble*, Butler discusses the theory of performativity which is revealed within a critique of the subject of feminism. Theory of performativity focuses on the constitution of the gendered subject within the heteronormative framework. In *Bodies That Matter*, Butler enhances performativity theory with the notions of 'constitutive outside' and 'interpellation' and discuss how the subject is constituted within discursive power relations. In *Psychic Life of Power*, Butler focuses on how the subject is constituted by subjection. The conceptualization of the matrix of

cultural intelligibility is operationalized to turn to socio-political marginalization from sexual marginalization within the heteronormative order. By integrating this discussion, I aim to indicate how the subject is significant both for feminist theory and politics, and cannot be thought independently from gender. Since the 'livable life' is conceptualized within the discussion of the subject, I aimed to provide this chapter as a background for following discussions on livability and grievability.

In Chapter 3 "The Discussions on Loss, Mourning, and Grief", I discuss grievability, precariousness, and precarity within the discussions of *Precarious Life* (2004) and *Frames of War* (2009). I begin with the discussions of loss, grief, mourning to reach the differential allocation of grief. Butler bases this discussion on the lived experience of September 11. In the analysis chapters, I will draw these discussions from the global level to local level. The politicization of grief is discussed to form a base the analysis chapters which will focus on the marginalization of political subjectivity after October 10.

In Chapter 4 "Methodology", I discuss how discourse analysis is used to connect the theory and the data. I elaborate the methodological approaches in discourse analysis. I mention about the discussions on feminist methodology, and how I revised this perspective to reach queer methodologies. Then, I discuss why I use CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis) in this study and main discussions on CDA. Also, queer methodologies are used to interpret the data and integrate the theory. In this chapter, I also present the selection of the texts and methodological limitations of the study.

Chapter 5 "Resistance to Precarity" is focusing on October 10 Labor, Peace and Democracy rally before the attacks. How assembly can be a way to resistance to precariousness and precarity is discussed first, then, I analyze the call texts of 'Labor, Peace and Democracy Rally within the frameworks of precariousness, precarity, 'livable life' and constitution of 'we'.

In Chapter 6, "Counter Power on Grievability: From Unbearable Grief to Uncontrollable Rage", I take October 10 as a terrorist attack henceforth. I discuss the narratives of the explosion within the body, the public dimension of the body, and

bodily vulnerability. In the second sub-section, I focus on how mourning is experienced by families by analyzing the emphasis on the narratives within the framework of Judith Butler's discussion on the politicization of mourning, the transformative effect of loss, the constitution of the subject and 'livable life'. In the third sub-section, I analyze the emphasis in the discourse of organizational chief mourners which is revealed on October 10 with the discussions on precarity, political subjectivity, speaking subject, the constitution of 'us' and 'them', constitutive outside, non-violent resistance, and ethics of cohabitation. Also, I give place how the funerals, strikes, and protests which have been held after October 10 is experienced. This chapter ends with an attempt to rethink the experience of mourning and grievability.

In the last analysis chapter "Hegemonic Power on Grievability: Constitution of Speaking Subject", I focus on the discourse of political power which are circulated after October 10. In the first sub-section, I examine how the cohabitation is constituted in these discourse. In the second sub-section, I focus on the sedimentation of political marginalization and 'the other'. By dividing the emphasis in discourse in these two sides, I give attention to the breaking in discourse, and I interrogate how it can be seen as a breaking. I end this analysis chapter with an attempt to rethink on grievability and freedom of assembly which is the beginning point.

In the last chapter of the thesis, after a brief reminder of the discussions and analysis of the thesis, I present the theoretical and practical contributions of the study.

CHAPTER 2

SUBJECT FORMATION WITHIN THE MATRIX OF CULTURAL INTELLIGIBILITY

In this chapter, I will convey Judith Butler's conceptualization of subject formation. My aim in this chapter is to provide the theoretical base for the discussions on how the precarious group itself and the political power discursively form the 'life' and 'human' after the losses of October 10. Another aim of this chapter is to search for the clues of how Butler's conceptualization on the constitution of the gendered subject within the heteronormative framework could be signified in another normative framework. For this thesis, this normative framework is regarding the constitution of political subjectivity.

Although Butler clarifies the notion of 'grievable life' and 'ungrievable life' in the writing which focuses on normative violence after 9/11, she constructs the foundation in *Gender Trouble* (1990) by deconstructing the subject of feminism within the heterosexual matrix. In a sense, Butler relates the notion of 'grievable life' with the narration on how the gendered subject is performatively constituted itself as culturally intelligible within the heterosexual matrix. In the Preface of 1999 Edition of *Gender Trouble*, which can be read as a text that was written to clarify the theory of performativity, she asks the question; "What constitutes a viable life and what does not?" (Butler, 1999: xxii). When we think of this question in the context of gender, as if we could think otherwise, we can say that the normative assumptions on gender and sexuality are significant to predetermine the limits of what human and livable life is. In other words, normative gender presuppositions define the boundaries of the description of the 'human', in a sense (Butler, 1999). At the same time, gender norms determine what will and will not be 'human' in an intelligible way, and also determine what is to be considered 'real' by creating an ontological area where bodies can acquire the legitimate expressions (Butler, 1993). When we consider that some 'gender identities' appear as developmental faults or logical impossibilities in the matrix of

intelligibility, we see that it is stemming from their failure to comply with the norms of cultural intelligibility (Butler, 1993). As aforementioned in the introduction chapter, the hegemonic power in Turkey constitutes the speaking, especially politically speaking subject by way of grievability in a highly gendered manner. This manner is not only heteronormative, just because it constitutes those who do not cite the normative construction of 'womanhood' in the domain of unintelligibility.

I think that understanding of the matrix of intelligibility, at this point, is going to present remarkable ideas about the social norms that are constructed, and repeated in this respect and are possessed in order to sustain a 'livable life'. It is important to ask, at this point, which relations of power constitute the subject and the other, and the binary opposition between man and woman, and how these terms acquire their own internal stability. Butler asserts that what is to be included and not to be included in the boundaries of 'sex' is formed by means of a number of exclusions, that these exclusions will be based on the discursive possibilities of hegemonic conditions rather than a position (Butler, 1993). However, this conceptualization reveals how hegemony operates in the heteronormative framework; I argue that it also has the capacity to reveal how it operates in various normative frameworks apart from gender.

Butler mentions the 'fear of losing one's place in gender' and claims that a person in the dominant heterosexual system, in which normative sexuality reinforces normative gender, becomes a woman when she acts as a woman within this system (Butler, 1999: xi). The inquiry of this frame weakens the feeling of having a certain place in this frame and the person starts to fear losing the place in the frame. If a subject gains its status as subjected to gender norms, it will be useful at this point to open up the feminist subject 'woman' to debate (Butler, 1999). I argue that we can mention about the 'fear of losing one's place' for the case of this thesis and therefore, to open the livable life with regard to political subjectivity and the 'citizenship' to debate may present remarkable ideas how the power constitutes its hegemony by way of normativity. The discussion begins with the significance of subject for feminism, after evaluating the post-structural critique of the gendered subject and the subject of feminism, assessing the advantages and disadvantages of subjecting terminology to

criticism in the context of knowledge and politics, and briefly touches the limitations of identity politics which are assumed and worked at some forms of feminism. Within this frame, the critique of identity politics may be useful to differentiate how counter power on grievability with regard to October 10 differs from identity politics. In other words, this study may show up how a politics based on an identity may have disadvantages if the case is on grievability of 'the ungrievable'.

2.1 Gendered Subject

According to Butler's critics on the subject of feminism within a deconstructionist perspective, it is not easy to offer an alternative to the notion of 'women', which is an extension of the frame, although, in the feminist literature, universal patriarchy has lost its former value. When we look at the recent debate, we see that the 'women' itself is not understood as stable and decisive, but there are also approaches that question the 'subject' to be the ultimate candidate to be represented and emancipated. On the other hand, there is no consensus on the idea of what constitutes the category of 'woman' or what should constitute it (Butler, 1999). On the other hand, the question of whether feminist politics will work without the subject of 'women' gives the signals that the 'subject' should be considered both in the context of knowledge and the politics. The feminist 'we', as she argues, is a fantasy construct based on the rejection of internal complexity and indeterminacy, and the exclusion of a segment of its base, although it aims to represent it (Butler, 1999: 181). Certainly, there are some goals and things must be transformed, but the fact that the category is fundamentally unstable will open the debate in the very least as constraints on the basis of feminist political theory. In addition, this discussion has the capacity to "open up other configurations, not only of genders and bodies, but of politics itself" (Butler, 1999: 181). It can be said that this study aims to elaborate this discussion of Butler, in a sense. Besides, it aims to problematize to what extent the feminist politics hold the category of 'woman' and insist on identity politics while setting up alliances with other precarious groups.

The 'genealogical' examination, which is Foucault's critical approach to re-formulating Nietzsche, interrogates what kind of political accounts are operating in naming the categories of identities which are the consequences of various institutions,

practices, and discourses, and many other sources as origin and cause. According to Butler, revealing that categories such as sex, gender, and desire are the consequences of certain forms of power requires such a critical approach (1999). Some parts of Butler's writings on the genealogy of the gender ontology are based on the deconstruction of the category of 'woman' and bring to mind these questions: Does the category of 'woman' become dysfunctional with such a deconstruction, and does the post-structuralist critique make these terms politically useless by reducing material to linguistic? (Butler, 1993). Butler claims that questioning an assumption is not the same as abolishing it; on the contrary, it serves to save it from its metaphysical lodgings (1993: 30). Opening the categories to debate, on the other hand, can put the 'reality' of gender into a crisis; but this crisis, and the blurring of the distinction of the real and unreal that follows, helps us to understand that what we consider as 'real', the circulated knowledge which based and naturalized within essentialist conceptions of gender, could be transformed and played on (Butler, 1999: xxii). Indeed, although this understanding is not a revolution in itself, a political revolution without a radical change in the conception of what counts as real and possible is full of question marks. According to Butler, in terms of political practice, it seems possible to formulate alternative politics that will address feminism on other bases, but only to radically rethink the ontological construction of the identity (Butler, 1999). It is precisely the point how the aim of the thesis is intersecting with gender. For this reason, I think the ontological inquiry on 'the people' can lead us to a politics which is based on precariousness and precarity and which constitutes its ethics based on the relationality and moral responsiveness to 'the other'.

When we consider Foucault's argument that the legal systems of power produce the subjects they represent, and when we think that legal subjects are produced through certain exclusionary practices, we can see that the issue of the subject has a great significance for politics, especially for feminist politics. The law, which resorted to discursive formations in order to legitimize its regulatory hegemony in the political commitment of some progressing legitimate and exclusive goals, uses the subject as its naturalized premise (Butler, 1999). In other words, the purpose of legitimization is to first create a subject before the law and then hide it; the political and linguistic areas

of representation prescribe the criterion that constitutes and forms the subject, and the representations merely confer to the subjects and those who want to be represented need to meet the conditions of becoming a subject. At this point, Butler argues that the 'subject position' of women can never be fixed by the signifier of the 'women'. On the contrary, the 'subject position' of women is part of the organization and shaping of this very category, which is always discussed and expressed in relation to other signifiers within the political sphere (Butler, 1993: 195). Taking this into account, we can say that the feminist subject is discursively established by the political system itself.

When we address the compulsory boundaries of identity politics from the point of view of representation and origin, it can be argued that the reality of confrontation is unquestionable: it is a fragmentation within feminism (Butler, 1999: 7). The 'women' who are claimed to be represented are paradoxically opposing feminism. As Butler argues, on the other hand, one of the risks of the mobilization of identity categories to be politicized is that the power that one opposes makes this identity as a means, because there is no political position fully separated from the relations of power (Butler, 1999: xxvi). Butler relatedly asks the following questions: What kind of politics will these politics return when the identity as a common ground restricts the feminist discourse? And to what extent does the identity as the base of feminist politics restrict the radical interrogation on political formation and regulation of identity?

Butler is introducing the concept of 'gender performativity' by deconstructing the category of 'woman'. In the following sub-section, I will mention the conceptualization of gender performativity as first introduced in the *Gender Trouble* (1990), and then, I will mention the significance of the conceptualization of interpellation and constitutive outside for a better understanding of performativity as Butler focused on *Bodies That Matter* (1993). Following the conceptualization on self-constitution of 'woman' or 'man' in order to live an intelligible life in heteronormative framework, my aim with this discussion is to found the theoretical base to understand that how both the hegemonic and the counter power constitute the 'grievable subject' performatively in a politically normative framework, regarding the case of October 10.

2.2 Gender Performativity

In order to understand the theory of gender performativity, one should start with some critical questions which Butler suggests at *Preface* of 1999 Edition of *Gender Trouble*: “Does being female constitute a ‘natural fact’ or a cultural performance, or is ‘naturalness’ constituted through discursively constrained performative acts that produce the body through and within the categories of sex?” (Butler, 1999: xxviii).

According to the theories of speech act, the definition of performativity is a discursive practice that produces or legitimizes what it utters. As for Butler, performativity is not a singular and intentional act, but performativity is to be understood as a repetitive and citational practice, repetition, and ritual. Besides, performativity must be understood as a culturally temporal process that manifests and naturalizes itself in the context of the body (Butler, 1993). As she highlights, considering gender as a constructed concept does not mean that it is artificial and imaginary if the terms imaginary and artificial are conceived in a duality that is positioned as opposed to true and authentic (Butler, 1999: 43). Butler's claims on performativity reject a gender identity in a stable manner which is subjected to entity ontology behind gender expressions. She claims that gender is established performatively by ‘enunciations’ and ‘expressions’ which are said to be the results of gender identity (Butler, 1999). In other words, what we see as an ‘inner’ feature which is relevant to ourselves is something we actually produce through certain expectations and certain bodily actions (Butler, 1999: xv). According to Butler, gender is not a name, but it is a set of floating-qualities (1999: 33). Because the substantial effect of gender has been constructed performatively, and it has been forced by regulatory practices which make it coherent. Regarding the case of this thesis, I conceive that how the effort of political power to constitute the precarious group as ‘unlivable’ and the effort of the precarious group itself to constitute themselves as ‘livable’ are discursive and embodied, in the case of assembly, could be studied in this framework. When we rethink this particular point regarding the issue of political subjectivity related to the case of October 10, we may assume that the identity of political opposition has been establishing performatively by expressions at any time. To what extent, we may assume that these enunciations and expressions are made only to ensure the coherence of political subjectivity? If it is, however, how can we

elaborate this case if these expressions constitute this identity as ‘the other’ or precarious?

As Butler warns us - in order to prevent misunderstandings - the act of acquiring gender is definitely not a deliberate appropriation, expression, or never putting a mask on. It takes place in a matrix that allows the agency and cultural conditions (Butler, 1999). The argument that the subject itself is produced within the matrix of socially gendered relations does not aim to escape from the subject; on the contrary, it points out that the results of its emergence and its operation must be questioned (Butler, 1999: 7). In this respect, “performative acts are forms of authoritative speech: most performatives, for instance, are statements that, in the uttering, also perform a certain action and exercise a binding power” (Butler, 1993: 225). We can say that performativity is an area where power acts as a discourse when we consider the performative with the power of discourse to produce what it names. Regarding the case of October 10, I aim to unravel how ‘livable life’ or subject itself is produced within the matrix or the order of socially and politically normative relations. To be clarified, following the theory of performativity, this study aims to interrogate how the political subjectivity of the precarious group which I am discussing is emerging and forming itself by being implicated by the operations of political power within the frame of grief.

Repeatability of performativity points to the agency, but the theory based on recognizing this agency has to consider the fact that power is the condition that establishes the possibility of the agency. To be clear, if the agency in gender performativity is in question, we cannot account this agency with a conceptualization of a voluntary subject which is formed free from the regulatory norms which it opposes. From this point of view, it is always an act of making, but it does not belong to a subject that may have been said to exist before its enactment. Butler reminds us of Nietzsche's claim in *On the Genealogy of Morality*: “there is no ‘being’ behind doing, effecting, becoming; ‘the doer’ is merely a fiction added to the deed—the deed is everything” (Nietzsche, 1887, cited in Butler, 1999:33). The paradox of subjectivation arises at this point; the subject that resists norms is produced and is

enabled precisely by these norms. Although these constitutive restrictive acts do not foreclose the agency, they position it not as an opposition but as a relation to power which is immanent in it, repetitive, and a rearticulative practice (Butler, 1993: 15). For my study, this discussion on agency could be read through the attempt of October 10 assembly before the attacks and the resistance based on grief and mourning that has been done after the attacks, and these are the occurrence of the political agency of the precarious group and it is possible within the power relations. In other words, negotiating with power is possible with that agency and the relation of the counter power of the mourners and the gatherers with the hegemonic power both enables and is enabled by the political agency. The subjectivity of the precarious group which is constituted within the norms of political utterance and livability at the first glance, then the norms of grievability after the attacks are indeed produced and enabled by these norms. Therefore, the agency of the precarious group could be read as the performative way of bringing themselves into being within the power relations.

If we follow Butler, we should consider gender as a repetitive stylization of the body, and we should apprehend these repetitions as a series of acts that are, of course, realized in a strict regulatory framework. These repetitions, over time, merge to create the appearance of a substance, a natural entity (1999: 43). The power to create a social 'reality' is possible through the locutionary acts of the speaking subjects. For this study's case, I consider the strict regulatory framework as a frame that is not only based on gender but it contains the normativity of gender and exceeds it also. Here, my argument is that the regulatory framework based on the political subjectivity which I am discussing has been establishing in a binary frame just like gender. The political power constitutes the binary frame and demands the citation to the forms of livable and unlivable lives from the people and regulates the sphere of political utterance and the sphere of speaking subject based on this binary frame.

If we consider gender as something that someone does not but do, another argument, then, is that gender is itself a kind of activity or process of becoming (Butler, 1999: 143). According to Butler, we conceptualize gender as a sort of uninterrupted and repetitive act, rather than a substantial or stable cultural sign. The essence or identity

that is made as if it is expressing is actually productions that are created and sustained through bodily signs and discourses; this repetitive act comes from the performativeness of bodily movements and performances (Butler, 1999: 173). The fact that the gendered body is performative means there is no ontological status separate from the acts that constitute it. Within the compulsory systems that are produced and sustained discursively, gender performances as a survival strategy have obvious consequences; certain enactments of gender are one of the things that 'humanize' people in contemporary cultures, and those who do not exercise gender in an appropriate way are punished regularly since they are dehumanized (Butler, 1999: 178). At this particular point, what can we say about the gender expressions which cause the marginalization and dehumanization of the people who perform them and constitute them at the 'outside' while these people know the effects of these gender expressions or expect them at all? Or, regarding the case of this study, we may assume that both the states of the political dissident and the advocator are subjected to the process of becoming. In other words, these subject positions are filled by discursive and repetitive acts, and sometimes embodied, therefore they create and sustain themselves. Then, I raise the question again regarding the case of October 10. The precarious group sustains their constitution at the outside after the attacks, in other words, while they are grieving, they oppose the political power and maintains their lives at the domain of unlivability. Then, how can we elaborate and understand this situation? I argue that the answer may lay on the in-group recognition, to be clarified, their becoming is occurring within the discourse of political critic with relation to earlier sufferings and losses.

The fact that gender is not a phenomenon but various gendered acts create this idea has the following consequence: without these acts, there would be no gender. Therefore, gender appears as a construction that constantly and regularly hides its construction, the collective agreement on performing, production and maintenance of individual and binary genders makes these productions even more convincing, and thus maintains its secrecy (Butler, 1999: 178). Another important thing that comes to mind when we question the performativeness of gender and its consequences is that the performance has a strategic goal of limiting gender in a binary framework and this

goal cannot be attributed to a subject; because it has the task of formatting and reinforcing the subject in the first place (Butler, 1999: 179). With this debate, Butler tries to bring about the most egalitarian thought possible for humanity, for the widest possible variety, by starting from the basic vital rights of a sexually marginalized minority. In other words, the problem of vital violence of individuals who do not perform gender in an intelligible way resolves as a crisis symptom of a heteronormative social order (Özkazanç, 2015: 83). Along these lines, this study aims to indicate the politics upon livability and grievability in a political normative social order in Turkey, and I claim that the political subjectivity of the precarious group is produced by the opponent acts, and without these acts, there would be no political subjectivity. In that case, the obstruction of these expressions which are performed on assembly or the mourning protests restrains actually their claim of politically speaking subjectivity itself and the livable life.

Within Butler's conceptualization, gender must be conceived as an identity that is constituted externally off the subject through the stylized repetitions of acts, not as a stable and decisive identity or a center of the agency that lies within the source of actions. The place where the concept of gender identity decoupled from the foundation of private identity is to be based on an identity model that will require an established social timeliness according to Butler. Gender established as an act of internal discontinuity is a performative accomplishment that is both performed and watched by ordinary audiences in the society, and that is created by this belief (Butler, 1999: 179)

Butler repeatedly emphasizes the main concern of the theory of performativity which is often misunderstood in the *Preface* of 1999 edition of *Gender Trouble* and following writings; the performativity must be understood as repetitive actions of discourses that produce and limit the subject, not as an act the subject voluntarily designates and materializes. Because the subject or the speaking 'I' enters the process of becoming with the condition that one passes the process of acquiring gender, and the process of becoming continues. It is quite difficult to summarize, but in Butler's own words, "performativity is neither free play nor theatrical self presentation; nor can it be simply

equated with performance. Moreover, constraint is not necessarily that which sets a limit to performativity; constraint is, rather, that which impels and sustains performativity” (Butler, 1999:94).

In the following sub-section, I will try to convey how Butler associates performativity with the concepts of interpellation and constitutive outside and regarding the case of October 10, I will try to indicate how ‘livable’ life and politically dissident speaking subject is constituted with interpellation by both the political power and the counter power and how can we approach this case with the conceptualization of constitutive outside.

2.3 Interpellation & Constitutive Outside

First of all, the discussion begins with the acceptance that gender has been constructed, and with the premise that the process of acquiring gender actualizes if one is guaranteed by its gendered position within the binary frame, and ensuring this position can be guaranteed by an ongoing basis. This is not a singular act or event, but rather a repetitive practice. Thus, in this context, by the act of citing the gender, one interprets norms. This shows us that gendered positions are not localized; conversely, this area within a judicial field is filled with constitutive constraints and the repetitive practices that are found and thus established by this citation (Butler, 1993: 108).

In this case, the materialization of gender ought to be citing some kind of law, and we can say that there is neither gender nor law before the citation. Gender norm exists as long as it is cited as a norm, and it establishes itself through citations it has to compel (Butler, 1993: 13). Butler starts out by addressing the interpellation as a fiction created by the representations of this position rather than from a primitive position that legitimizes gendered positions and encourages action. Therefore, as Butler puts it, “The subordination of the citation to its (infinitely deferred) origin is thus a ruse, a dissimulation whereby the prior authority proves to be derived from the contemporary instance of its citation.” (Butler, 1993: 109). At this point, I argue that Butler’s idea of doing politics by subversive repetitions of norms may be clarified. Regarding my case, following this discussion, we may claim that there is no power of political power’s discourse on citizenship and political dissidence if it is not cited and circulated by the

people. Besides, there is no segregation and marginalization, therefore violence without the citation.

Butler refers to Althusser's notion of interpellation and sets up its relation with the theory of performativity, by which the power of judge comes into being by the law it cites and the law comes into existence through the presence of this citation. To be clear, the judge authorizes the law by naming a case and assigns its power of this attribution to the performative power of the law (Butler, 1993: 107). The power of the judge's words is neither derived from the power of his own will nor from an authority before him; the judge's 'will' is first produced by his attribution to the law, and the 'priority' of the textual authority is constituted on and through this citation (Butler, 1993: 225).

The citation arises from iterability aforementioned, and this iterability constitutes the authority of speech act and also establishes the non-singular character of speech acts. In other words, "every 'act' is an echo or citational chain, and it is its citationality that constitutes its performative force." (Butler, 1993: 282). On the other hand, this iterability should never be understood as a simple copy of the same copy. As Butler states in *Bodies That Matter*;

"If a performative provisionally succeeds (and I will suggest that "success" is always and only provisional), then it is not because an intention successfully governs the action of speech, but only because that action echoes prior actions, and accumulates the force of authority through the repetition or citation of a prior, authoritative set of practices." (1993:226).

Here we can come to the conclusion that a performative operates as it wears and keeps the constitutive conventions. Therefore, no term or utterance that can be performed can work performatively without the accumulative and secretive historicity of power (Butler, 1993). I consider the importance of the iterability discussion for my study as two-sided. Firstly, I argue that the attempt of political power to not to desolate the discourse on the political dissidence and grievability could be read as the absence of power to operate the marginalization on the discursive level and within a binary frame without circulating itself by iterability. Therefore, when it does not operate the frame, there would be no constitution of both livable and unlivable lives. Secondly, when we

think about the precarious group's attempt to gather on October 10, I argue that the claim and demand of 'livable' life is the reason of the assembly, as I mentioned before their resistance to precarity in public space could be considered as an attempt to change and transform the domains of intelligibility. Therefore, if we consider the freedom of assembly with the discussion of iterability, the inhibition on the utterance of politically opponent claims of the precarious lives on their own lives and on the operative social and political order cause the attenuation of citation, therefore lacking its performative force, in a sense. Hence, I consider the mourning rituals, and strikes and protests in the period of mourning after October 10 as the act of iterating the grievability, therefore livability of the precarious group. For this reason, I take these attempts as the most significant feature of precarious groups' non-violent resistance.

If we think about doing gender again, Butler argues that one has to cite the citation of 'her' gender in order to deserve and preserve the state of being a viable and consistent subject. Femininity, therefore, is not a product of choice; it is composed of compulsory citation acts whose history cannot be separated from discipline, order and penal relations. Undoubtedly, then, it is impossible to say that 'one' acquires gender norm. On the contrary, citation to gender norms is necessary to qualify as 'one' and to be able to live as 'one', in which the formation of the subject is based on the primary operation of legitimizing gender norms (Butler, 1993: 232). For my study, in Turkey, to have a 'livable' life, to live as 'one' certainly necessitates acquiring gender appropriately. But it also, and the argument of this study begins here, necessitates to reproduce and legitimize the norms on political subjectivity and 'citizenship'. In a sense, if 'one' does not cite them appropriately, 'one' will be exposed to various forms of precarity and be coerced to live at the borders of 'livability'.

Butler treats interpellation as formative and performative since it invites the transition of the individual to the subject status (Butler, 1993: 121). Let's picture the following scene: when one is hailed, the subject turns back; so a scene emerges where acceptance of the concepts are used when one is called. Sure, we have to consider that this act is undoubtedly punitive and restrictive. The person hailed has a series of critical questions about this scene; it turns before the possibility of directing these questions.

One cannot ask who calls, why one should return, why one should accept the concepts used when it is speaking, but it turns (Butler, 1997: 95). If we move from this point regarding the precarious group of October 10, every time when the political power calls the precarious group as ‘unlivable’ on the discourse on the war on terrorism, the precarious group turns that interpellation by appropriating that position. Since, I argue, they constitute themselves by speaking from particularly from there, but they try to break or transform the relation with livability and grievability and the political dissidence. At this particular point, how can we approach their acts of resistance from the position that the political power assigned to them, in a sense?

When we think that the use of language is made possible by first being called with a name, we can say that we carry a name so that the person identifies its place in the discourse, without much chance of choosing it. Butler maintains that such interpellations accumulate and converge to produce "I";

“This "I" which is produced through the accumulation and convergence of such "calls," cannot extract itself from the historicity of that chain or raise itself up and confront that chain as if it were an object opposed to me, which is not me, but only what others have made of me; for that estrangement or division produced by the mesh of interpellating calls and the "I" who is its site is not only violating, but enabling as well.. To be implicated in the relations of power, indeed, enabled by the relations of power that the "I" opposes is not, as a consequence, to be reducible to their existing forms.” (1993:122).

Interpellation works by imitating previous interpellations. Thus, the speakers are as if they have spoken throughout time as a kind of unity (Butler, 1993: 226). Interpellation is a state that both enables and activates, but at the same time, it does some sort of prohibition. There is a social order that constitutes subjects with a number of constitutive exclusions. The fact that this order is constituted on discourse through language indicates that it is a kind of symbolic order, and the name is also a sign of this symbolic plane (Butler, 1993: 152). So, in other words, the person ‘survives’ by locating itself in this plane, and finding its place in this plane is directly related to how it is interpellated. Following Butler, I consider interpellation and calling the people as ‘x’ or ‘y’ have an important role in politics, and I argue that it is certainly in operation for politics in Turkey, especially concerning the politics of marginalization. Therefore, for the case of October 10, I argue that the importance of interpellation appears on the

relation of hegemonic political power and the counter power of the precarious group. So that, the assembly was supposed to be against the way of political power's interpellating the precarious group up to that time, and the force of these interpellation's impulsion them to 'unlivable life'. After the attacks, on the other hand, the process of resistance through mourning, they maintain the resistance to that interpellation by naming their dead's, in other words, calling their dead as 'grievable'.

If we come to the notion of constitutive outside, first of all, it is worth repeating that in order to theorize gender performativity, it is necessary to consider regulatory sexual regimes, their compulsory and repetitive practices. The materialization of the norms requires some kind of identification-based processes, which are assumed and possessed by the person. These identifications prioritize and enable subject formation, but this situation should not be understood as being performed by a subject. What constitutes the subject as the subject is the performative repetitions based on this identification. The limits of the construction of these practices are revealed at the borders of life where bodies have been fouled and expelled from the area of legitimacy and become unable to be counted as 'bodies' (Butler, 1993: 15). In other words, the imperative to be or to be sexed requires a differentiated interpretation of the masculine and feminine, which is not entirely comprehensive (Butler, 1993: 187). And this necessity requires and constitutes a 'constitutive outside'. The exclusionary matrix which Butler conceptualizes is the field of the formation of the subject since the domain of the subject necessitates the abject beings to form the subject and form the domain of unintelligibility which is held by those who are not yet 'subjects' as constitutive outside of the domain of intelligibility. Besides, the production of the domain of abject beings takes part with the production of the domain of the subject concurrently. The abject in that zone, or the 'unlivable' in the social order defines the borders of the inhabitable and livable zones of social life by appropriating this sign. In Butler's own words;

"This zone of uninhab- itability will constitute the defining limit of the subject's domain; it will constitute that site of dreaded identification against which—and by virtue of which—the domain of the subject will circumscribe its own claim to autonomy and to life. In this sense, then, the subject is constituted through the force of exclusion and abjection, one which produces a constitutive outside

to the subject, an abjected outside, which is, after all, "inside" the subject as its own founding repudiation." (Butler, 1993:3).

Following the line of the power of interpellation to form the political subjects, we may assume that these interpellations are formed by excluding each other. Regarding my case, the political power forms the livable life while it forms the unlivable and ungrievable life concurrently, and establishes the zone of livability in the defined and regulated category of citizenship. To clarify the argument, I claim that the political power warns the people and gives the direction which triggers the performative formation of the livable subject while forming the unlivable life. Therefore, the domain of political subjectivity is constructed upon the grievability or vice versa.

The constitutive outside is unspeakable, unlivable, and nonnarrativizable, and fails to preserve the limits of this materiality. Therefore, the normative power of performativity, which sets forth what is to be described as 'real', needs not only to reiterate but also to exclude. When it comes to bodies, "those exclusions haunt signification as its abject borders or as that which is strictly foreclosed: the unlivable, the nonnarrativizable, the traumatic." (Butler, 1993: 187).

We can approach the constitutive outside as what must be excluded in an economy which ensures its internal coherence by this exclusion (Butler, 1993: 38). However, there is not a single outside, since forms require a number of exclusions, they exist through what they exclude and copy themselves, in a sense (Butler, 1993: 52). We can talk about the existence of an 'outside' as constituted by the discourse, but the points that should not be misunderstood are these: this 'outside' is not an 'absolute' external; there is no ontological presence to counter and exceed the boundaries. It can be thought only in relation to the discourse (Butler, 1993: 8). But with Butler's statement;

"Even if every discursive formation is produced through exclusion, that is not to claim that all exclusions are equivalent: what is needed is a way to assess politically how the production of cultural unintelligibility is mobilized variably to regulate the political field, i.e., who will count as a "subject," who will be required not to count." (1993:201).

In terms of this study, this discussion is the starting point to think about what kind of politics should be done which focuses on livability, grievability, and precariousness. The claim that the 'outside' is not absolute, that it is capable of comprising any one at

any time and including other ‘others’ to the zone of ungrievability is read as the clue of the alliance between precarious groups based on precarity and precariousness. Another point is that the instability of the ‘outside’ which implies the domain of unrecognizability, I claim that it refers to the limitations of a politics based on identity in such a case like October 10. Because the identity which expects to be represented may constitute itself at the stability which ensures ‘the outside’. To be more clear, with regard to the case of October 10, although the most of the losses belong to ethnic and denominational minorities, and they have the chance to maintain the politics of minority identity, I claim that they should and must to do politics with other precarious groups, namely, gender, sexual, ethnic, linguistic, political and religious minorities in this political and social normative order which the political power exposed them all to precarity.

2.4 The Matrix of Cultural Intelligibility

I want to start the sub-section where I will try to explain the matrix of cultural intelligibility from the constitutive outside with the following notation of Butler: the ‘unthinkable’ and ‘unsayable’ within existing cultural conditions is not excluded from the matrix of cultural intelligibility, but it is marginalized in this matrix, or it is the cultural possibility which is radically less sanctioned. In other words, the ‘unthinkable’ is actually entirely placed within the grid, but it is completely excluded from the dominant culture. The dominant culture keeps it out of place intentionally to keep the places of those who are inside, and it gains its power from the inside.

When gender itself is perceived in its own normative sense, the gendered body must form itself within the framework of the cultural intelligibility. In other words, the materiality of the body cannot be considered independent of the materiality of these regulatory norms (Butler, 1993). So ‘gender’ is neither a thing that someone has nor a definition of what someone is. On the contrary, ‘gender’ is one of the norms which make a life - and therefore a body – livable throughout the ‘life’ within the realm of cultural intelligibility (Butler, 1993: 2). In this study, I concern with another norm which makes a life livable within the matrix of cultural intelligibility, which is political subjectivity, and I plan to reach a conclusion about the relationship between political

subjectivity and livability in Turkey with reference to the case of October 10. And I claim that the constitution of political subjectivity becomes possible with the signification capability of hegemonic discourse just like gender.

As Butler claims, the language has the ability to fix such positions. However, this ability, in other words, the ability to enact its symbolic effect, depends on the continuity and consistency of the field of symbolic itself, to put it differently, the field of cultural intelligibility and signifiability. Following Butler, it is necessary to ask where and how it emerges the linguistic balancing function in fixing gender positions or ‘subject’ positions (Butler, 1993: 138). Within a given discourse, some kinds of mechanisms of denial work to produce something that cannot be symbolized; and these production mechanisms are already consisting of the historical functioning of certain manners of power (Butler, 1993: 205). Butler, with reference to Foucault, mentions the inadvertently productive dispositions of prohibition. According to Foucault, the foundations of the ‘subject’ are thrown out in and through prohibitions, and even produced; and this ‘subject’ is not in a position to reach a sexuality ‘outside’, ‘before’, or ‘after’ the power (Butler, 1999: 39). Although gender is the clearest feature to enforce, restrict and protect what is described as ‘human’ in Turkey, too, for sure, I claim that we may see another feature in political subjectivity. Furthermore, I argue that its normative feature is being used and operated to describe ‘human’ or ‘citizen’, to be clarified, whose life will be counted as worth to protection from various risks to the livability of that life, by the political power.

As aforementioned, a number of citations and interpellations help the operation of discourse and domination which enforces, restricts and protects what is described as ‘human’. We see the clearest example of this in abjected beings whose gender appears to be ‘not fully and appropriately acquired’. The question is exactly about their humanness. Gender, for sure, operates by exclusionary means. However, the human is not produced only through ‘non-human’ and against ‘non-human’. It is produced through a series of foreclosures and radical rejections. From here we can say the following: It is not enough to claim that human subjects are constructed; because the constitution of ‘human’ is a series of operations based on exclusions that produce

classifications such as ‘more human’, ‘less human’, ‘inhuman’, and ‘humanly unthinkable’. The excluded areas limit the ‘human’ as constitutive outside and they intervene constantly against their possibilities of rearticulation and destruction (Butler, 1993: 8).

In this respect, I argue that the interrogating question of dehumanization or what it means to be human within an ontological level cannot be considered without approaching gender critically. At this junction, the fact that this thesis takes political marginalization as the research focus does not deduct the scope of this research from gender, ultimately reserving the act of rethinking gender critically. Therefore, I argue that the final inference may provide a critique the way in which to find how contemporary gender politics is approaching the ‘life’ itself, precarious lives and how the precarious groups organize their lives.

2.5 Subject Formation & Subjection

In this sub-section, I will try to address the issue of subjection and subject formation with regard to political marginalization and political subjectivity which may be said to constitute the main problem of my thesis. I would argue that subjectivation cannot be considered apart from the process of gendering, therefore I will open up the discussions of constitutive outside and interpellation, again and again, acknowledging the risk of self-repetition, as interpellation and constitutive outside as narrated in the process of gender acquiring operate within the same way in the process of subject formation.

In social theory, it is sometimes expressed that the ‘subject’ can be used interchangeably with the concepts of ‘person’ or ‘individual’ (Butler, 1997:10). However, the genealogy of the subject which comes out of a critical evaluation cannot exactly identify the subject as individual or person. Here, the subject is understood rather as a linguistic category, a placeholder, a structure within the formation. Individuals come to the domain to fill the subject position, but their intelligibility depends on their establishment in the language, in the first place. This point of view claims that the subject must be understood as the linguistic condition of existence and agency of the individual. In other words, it is an opportunity for the individual to gain

intelligibility and to reproduce it repeatedly. We cannot say that an individual will be a subject without being subjected or the process of subjectivation. At this point, a contradiction emerges: if the individual gains its intelligibility through subjectivation, it becomes meaningless and incomplete to perceive the individual as an intelligible being. On the other hand, some stories that deal with subject formation become cyclical because they are “presupposing the very subject for which it seeks to give an account.” (Butler, 1997:11). In this study, the precarious group which I am discussing, are taken as the placeholders of ‘unlivable’ and ‘ungrievable’ of the present political conjuncture and I consider their constitution as ‘unlivable’ on discourse as the condition of these individual’s political agency. My claim that the precarious group constitutes their subjectivity by the political power’s constitution of them as ‘unintelligible’ in a sense, appears as one of the paradoxes of this study.

Butler recruits the things which a critical analysis of subjection has to involve in three main points in *The Psychic Life of Power*;

“(1) an account of the way regulatory power maintains subjects in subordination by producing and exploiting the demand for continuity, visibility, and place; (2) recognition that the subject produced as continuous, visible, and located is nevertheless haunted by an inassimilable remainder, a melancholia that marks the limits of subjectivation; (3) an account of the iterability of the subject that shows how agency may well consist in opposing and transforming the social terms by which it is spawned.” (Butler, 1997:29).

So, this study aims to elaborate (I) how aforementioned precarious group’s continuity and visibility in the political field and livability in the public space both for the assembly form before the attacks of October 10 and the mourning form after the attacks, their political expressions are discursively regulated by the political power through locating them on the differential allocation of grief and (II) how the precarious group resist the norms of the differential allocation of grief by constituting them ‘livable’ and ‘grievable’ again and again both before the assembly and after the attacks, although their constitution as ‘unlivable’ and ‘ungrievable’ is the condition of their agency to gather and mourn in the public space.

The ‘subjection’ mentioned here refers not only to the process of being subjected to power but also to the process of becoming a subject. Butler’s conceptualization of the

process of subject formation begins with being subjected to power in the context of an interpellation in Althusserian sense and a discursive productivity in Foucaultian sense which grounds itself on the former (Butler, 1997:2). In Althusserian interpellation, the subject is constituted with an interpellation, a citation, and naming. Althusser believes that these social demands can be understood as a symbolic command, and mentions a process that began with the hailing of the police on the street: 'Hey, you there!'. This call, according to him, constitutes the person whom it refers to. This interpellation, which always has a certain misrecognition risk, may only attempt to trigger this process to action. If a person misrecognizes this attempt which produces the subject, the production will be interrupted; he may not hear the call, may return to the other side or may return to another name. So he insists that he is not called. In this narrative, the name occupies an absence by taking the place of the nonextant. If this position is abandoned, it occupies the place again (Butler, 1997: 95)

This discussion can be continued as follows: There is no 'I' standing behind the discourse or operating its agency through discourse. On the contrary, 'I' comes to existence with the interpellation, and initiates the 'I' (Butler, 1993: 225). Recognition is what makes the subject subject, not something that is endowed to the subject. However, this recognition is never always settled there, which is an indication of inconsistency and incompleteness of subject formation. As Butler stated; "Power not only acts on a subject but, in a transitive sense, enacts the subject into being. As a condition, power precedes the subject." (Butler, 1997:13). From this point, I am trying to see how the precarious group start and maintain their own recognition as political dissident actualizes upon the discursive operation of the political power to marginalize their political subjectivity and to locate them on the 'outside' and form them as precarious subjects.

As we look at the issue from this perspective, Butler makes the conceptualization of power both external to the subject and as the very site of the subject. The contradiction here gives us another understanding: the subject cannot exist without power and this existence hides the power and, as Butler states;

“This apparent contradiction makes sense when we understand that no subject comes into being without power, but that its coming into being involves the dissimulation of power, a metaleptic reversal in which the subject produced by power becomes heralded as the subject who founds power.” (1997:15).

The fact that the formation of the subject is always subjected to reiteration makes it compulsory to understand the subject as the result of a specific rules-based discourse that leads to the emergence of identity in the matrix of cultural intelligibility. In this case, the subject still has the agency, because;

“the subject is not determined by the rules through which it is generated because signification is not a founding act, but rather a regulated process of repetition that both conceals itself and enforces its rules precisely through the production of substantializing effects.” (Butler, 1999: 185).

By drawing attention to the temporal contradiction of the subject, Butler argues that we cannot understand the existence of subject as something that has already occurred, and she explains this existence as follows: “That "becoming" is no simple or continuous affair, but an uneasy practice of repetition and its risks, compelled yet incomplete, wavering on the horizon of social being.” (1997:30). These repetitions can be understood not in the sense of being produced from scratch, but as being able to gain their presence repeatedly throughout the process. Besides the fact that these repetitions are due to the performative effect of interpellation, it does not fix it; it always opens the way for later productions (Butler, 1997: 93).

In sum, this narrative, on the one hand, assumes that subject cannot gain its existence without being subjected to power and returning the demands of interpellation, while on the other hand, it infers that the subject stays as subject only through the ways of its repetitive and rearticulative acts. This reveals the inconsistent and incomplete character of the subject. Thus, in fact, the possibility of agency can activate itself through resignification and subversive repetitions. In other words, it provides the opportunity to incorporate its own constitution into operation while negotiating with power. Therefore, the field which is occupied by marginalized groups entering discursive lives in injurious terms is occupied by another since the incompleteness gives these groups the opportunity to lose the meaning that is attributed by creative innovative repetitions of those injurious terms. The act of mourning for the ungrievable, the act of speech which utters ‘I am livable and grievable’, or the act of

enactment only by the bodily appearance undermines the existing possibilities of signification and triggers its reformation within and despite the power.

In this chapter, I tried to give the theoretical framework for the formation of the precarious group regarding October 10 within the political framework of that time. I tried to operationalize the conceptualization of the formation of the gendered subject in the heteronormative framework and reworked to conceptualize the formation of the politically marginalized subject in the political normative framework in Turkey. My aim is to indicate how hegemonic power discursively constitutes a community as ‘unlivable’ and ‘ungrievable’ and their precarization becomes the condition of their existence in the political sphere and their political agency.

CHAPTER 3

THE DISCUSSIONS ON LOSS, MOURNING, AND GRIEF

In this chapter, I will narrate the discussions on loss, grief, and mourning. My aim is to prepare the background to the things which the process of mourning itself could speak for grievability by elaborating the mourning for October 10 from different frames. In this thesis which presumes that the loss, grief, and mourning are significant to understand the political and the social, this chapter will serve to how this presumption is acquired. For that purpose, in the introduction of this chapter, I will briefly summarize a general outlook on the issue of mourning and grief from different disciplines and take a brief look on the evolvement of the discussions, my aim is to indicate why I do not use these discussions and operationalize Butler's discussion on mourning and grief which she discussed with politics and violence together. Throughout the study, I approach October 10 as a significant lived case which mourning, politics, and violence intersect in the last period of Turkey. For that purpose, I aim to approach the politics of mourning and grief with the scopes of affect, relationality and community, and body and finally I aim to reach grievability, precariousness, and precarity.

Kellehar claims that the reality of death itself is the root of the moral and political history of humankind, in the introduction chapter of *A Social History of Dying*. The main argument of this discussion is that death reveals our interdependency, its conditions, and its wider context. To clarify this argument, she considers death as an awareness beginning with the emergence of consciousness and argues that this awareness turns into an expectation, and this expectation is the source of continuity and discontinuity of the self and its relations with others at a cognitive level (2007).

Bereavement, mourning, and grief are three words to refer to the post-process of losing someone. While bereavement is used to refer to the objective situation of losing someone through death, grief is used to refer to the bereaved person's internal feelings

and emotional acts, and mourning is used to refer to socially appropriate behaviors charged to mourners in a given culture (Seale, 1998). Thus, such a segregationist practice between what is felt, called ‘internal experience’, and what is done, called ‘external behavior’, is open to a deep criticism, because interdependency between these two is, obviously, inevitable. However, I follow the claim that these are not only dimensions of grief; the people experience loss within both of these dimensions. The meaning that we attribute to our behaviors is already mediated by our internal psyche (Howarth, 2006).

Similarly, the segregationist usage of terminology points out to the disciplinary differentiation. Grief and mourning have been studied in different disciplines; initial studies have focused on the symptomatology of grief, and psychologists have criticized doctors for treating it as a disease¹ (Parkes, 2001). Psychiatrists, too, have criticized doctors for their ignorance of the psyche. Sociologists, on the other hand, have criticized psychologists for reaching universal conclusions over findings from a particular culture². Ethnographers have criticized all other disciplines for their anthropocentrism. Anthropological studies’ focus on death rituals and mourning practices in different cultures lead to the query of universal dimension of mourning. (Parkes, 2001). The purpose of narrating these approaches is to indicate how these conceptualizations may obstruct to understand the particularity of the case of October 10, I consider this case constitutes a particularity, because of their fundamental assumptions.

In this introduction, I will briefly mention the criticisms and insights of the dominant perspective of grief, namely the discipline of psychology. From the following section, I will focus on Judith Butler’s conceptualization of grief and mourning throughout the analysis, and figure out grievability.

¹ Small has come to the following conclusion in his research of the history of mourning and loss in the 20th century: the theories of mourning are linked to social changes and, in certain periods of history, dominant discourses have been produced in the context of these changes (2001).

² Many early psychiatrist studies were based on samples of white and Christian widows; thus the initial conceptualization of grief was highly biased. (Parkes, 2001).

Until recently, loss and mourning were predominantly seen as areas of psychiatrists and psychologists, and dominant theoretical perspectives were based on these disciplines. In the medical model, grief is treated as a disease that needs to be rescued through focusing on the individual who is atomized in a clinical setting; therefore, the mourning experience was considered separate from the social, cultural, and historical conditions (Howarth, 2006). Grief was measured by stress, depression, and other health-related indicators in these dominant discourses (Stroebe & Stroebe, 1987). These writings aim to provide a ‘healthy’ grief resolution which can be defined as the protection of the mental health of the mourner and they consider the social factors which develop in the context of the mourning as more conclusive instead of the cause of mourning. As Nesse argues (2005) the earlier conceptualization of resolution divided such a subjective experience into pieces and created methods to determine what it meant to be normal grief, abnormal grief, and traumatic grief. This expectation of recovery and necessity of the break from the bonds with the deceased is providing a normative framework for grief, thus describes an ideal path for the grief (Nesse, 2005). However, it seems impossible to discuss and understand my case with such a normative framework. Because the mourner community of October 10 constitute their subjectivity exactly from that point and such an ideal path like breaking bonds with the deceased appears as a threat to their political existence. In recent years, it has become accepted that the answers were given by the mourner’s social circle and the regulation of one’s own social roles after the loss affect the process of ‘resolution’. Because grief cannot be experienced in an isolated context, there need to be interactions with ‘the other’. In other words, grief is interdependent by definition (Stroebe et al., 2007). Then, it has been argued that although social relation allows the mourning practices, the culture provides the premise of mourning (Riches & Dowson, 1997). For this study, I elaborate this argument to indicate how the mourning of ‘the ungrievable’ is experienced at the level of the social and the cultural. Besides, how the resolution for this particular loss appeared on the public sphere and held through the politicization of mourning. In other words, how it cannot be experienced in an isolated from which it is lived.

Although the writings in the discipline absorb the social factors to the analysis, their focus on ‘resolution’ leads to approach grief as a progressive process and the aim of reintegrating the mourner to the ‘real world’ (Howarth, 2006). ‘The model of continuing bonds’ which was developed by Silverman and Klass (1996) and ‘The continued presence of the deceased’ which was developed by Bennett and Bennett (2000) change the direction of the discipline’s approach, and the claim of ‘resolution’ which is based on leaving behind the dead has become criticized. Silverman and Klass argue that the mourner creates an inner representation of the deceased in an imaginary level and by doing that the mourner achieve the continuity of the self (1996). In a similar vein, the symbolic interactionist perspective to grief, following Mead’s claim of the self is formed through interactions, considers grief as a painful process in which the self is reestablished. Within this perspective, Neimeyer provides a new framework for reconstruction of the meaning of the lost and argues that this process requires a reconstruction of pre-loss meanings; that is, previous constructions are reassessed and built to evolve into the meaning of survivors after the loss (2002). The importance of this argument for my study is that the mourner of the ‘ungrievable’ reconstructs the pre-loss meanings upon resistance and political dissidence in the process of reconstructing the self. Moreover, to ensure the consistency, being the mourner of ‘the ungrievable’ integrates to this resistance.

Within the discussion of ungrievability, it can be said that Doka’s ‘Disenfranchised Grief’, Fowlkes’ ‘demoralized loss’ and Kellehar’s ‘Shameful Death’ appear in the literature. Firstly, ‘disenfranchised grief’ refers to the grief which is not socially accepted and is experienced with the absence of social support as Doka argues; for instance, abortion, the death of a pet, the death of a homosexual partner, etc. Although ‘disenfranchised grief’ is argued within the conditions of death, namely the timing of death, the cultural context that the loss occurred, the prohibition of the relation of deceased and the survivor, or the ability of the mourners to mourn, Doka points to the intrapsychic level of disenfranchisement (2002). However, the term of ‘disenfranchised grief’ is criticized within the claims that both the word ‘disenfranchised’ has a bad connotation in Western democracies, and it evokes a binary opposition (Robson & Walter, 2013). In a similar vein, ‘Demoralized Loss’,

which was developed by Fowlkes, focuses on the regulation of affect and legitimacy of the relationship between the deceased and the survivor (1990). Kellehar, on the other hand, argues in the '*The Birth of Shameful Death*,' which is the last chapter of *A Social History of Dying*, in the Cosmopolitan age, since the claim that the identity transmits with the blood is disappeared, the social support feeds from the continuous manifestations of 'positive' social, economic, and bodily possessions. Kellehar grounds this conceptualization on the concept of 'stigmatised person' which was developed by Erving Goffman (1963), and the claim of this stigma is internalized as shame by 'the other', and 'the other' perceive the stigmatized person within the base of this stigma, instead of a more comprehensive approach. The reason why I use Butler's conceptualization of 'ungrievable lives' instead of all these discussions is that Butler figures out 'unlivability' from 'ungrievability', then by focusing on the living conditions she reaches the conceptualizations of precariousness and precarity. In other words, Butler aims to have a conclusion on organizing life for precarious populations upon the discussions on loss and grief.

Jakoby, from a symbolic interactionist perspective, considers grief as a social emotion and argues that grief itself is a vivid form of the social experience of humankind. She states that grief is immanent in life, therefore not a situation that needs to be treated. According to Jakoby, grief needs an understanding of self-concept and mental representations of the deceased, to be more clarified, its nature depends on them. Therefore, it is a social emotion and interpersonal process, since this emotion is shaped and reshaped by interpersonal, familial and social relations, discourse, memories and personal biographies, face-to-face interactions with 'the other' (2012). However, I claim that taking grief into consideration as a social emotion is not enough when the point is about 'the ungrievable' because the fact that our emotions come to existence in a discursive level constitutes a significant feature of the politicization of grief. In order to clarify this argument, in the following sub-section, I will try to narrate Butler's claim that affect always already actualizes as its contaminated form by the political. From the next sub-section, I will cultivate the discussion by following Butler.

3.1 Rethinking Grief as a Social Emotion: Affect

The arguments that emotions cannot be separated from the intellectual and critical tendencies are not new (Ahmed, 2004). As a matter of fact, emotions can be seen as not the base but the direct material of intellectual and cultural critiques. In such a way that affective moment always come to play within certain interpretative responsiveness (Butler, 2009). The notions of responsiveness and responsibility, which we mention within ethical discussions, are found at the primary sensory responses to the externalities of the world. When the potentials of affective responses are considered, it should also be considered that the mediation and regulation of such affections are inevitable. As Butler argues, affective and ethical tendencies are organized within a selective and discriminatory framework of violence at the cultural level. However, how exactly are they mediated and regulated and what this mediation and regulation are supposed to mean? (Butler, 2009)

Butler mentions the notion of moral responsiveness and points out to the anthropologist Talal Asad's query of the issue *On Suicide Bombing* (2007) in the article *Survivability, Vulnerability, Affect*; "Why do we feel horror and moral repulsion in the face of suicide bombing when we do not always feel the same way in the face of state sponsored violence?" (2009:41). There is a point here that should not be misunderstood; to ask this question is not to claim these two situations are the same, or we should give the same moral reaction to both. The query is that our moral responses, firstly arising as affected responses, are indirectly regulated by certain interpretative frameworks. Asad clinches the query with further questions; when someone dies in a battle, whether or not this war is supported by the state, the presence or the absence of the legitimacy we attributed to that state certainly changes something about the affection that appears in the first place (2007). While the loss in a legitimate state-sponsored war is considered as sad and unfortunate, the loss of the resistance groups that are attributed illegitimacy generally by the states is definitely considered within other affective engagements, namely indifference or righteousness (Butler, 2009).

To summarize briefly, Asad's moral responsiveness is trying to interrogate the affective responses that are seen as primal reactions that do not require explanation, and prior to comprehension and interpretation. However, this is the question of politics of moral responsiveness, namely "that what we feel is in part conditioned by how we interpret the world around us; that how we interpret what we feel actually can and does alter the feeling itself" (Butler, 2009:41-42). Then, how can we explain the regulatory power that generates our affective and moral reactions in such a discriminative scheme?

As Butler argues in *Survivability, Vulnerability, Affect*, affection never belongs only to us. From the very beginning, it is transferred to us from somewhere outside of us. The affections convince us that we can perceive what happened around us in a certain way. Through them, while we are accepting certain dimensions of the world, we resist others. In other words, affections depend on the social and political support that lead to emotions. These arguments are based on the claim that affection is conditioned by our way of interpreting the world, which partly frames us (2009). Furthermore, the way we interpret our emotions is actually changing the emotions themselves. In order to create and maintain an ethical discussion within the lives of others, we should ask;

"How do we re-approach this question of affective response and moral evaluation by considering those already operative frameworks within which certain lives are regarded worthy of protection while others are not, precisely because they are not quite "lives" according to prevailing norms of recognizability?" (2009:50).

In the afterword of the Turkish edition of *Precarious Life*, Butler points out to the governments' regulation of affection in the times of war, and asserts that states work on the sphere of recognizability and intelligibility to mediate and regulate affection, with the prediction of the ways to suppress the opposition and to revive and feed allegiances (2005). Legitimized violence, such as war, can sustain its practice by having an effect upon senses, shaping the affections in such a way as to apprehend the world selectively while freezing the emotions in response to certain images, and keeping the affective alive in reaction to others. This implicitly justifies the events of today's violence; War can be justified for the sake of some lives, and the destruction of other lives can be righteously defended (Butler, 2009). Ultimately, "war is precisely

an effort to minimize precariousness for some and to maximize it for others” (2009: 54).

Accounting for the frameworks that we apprehend lives as ‘lives’ and paradoxically, as ‘not-quite-lives’ within regulated addictions may deepen the query. In a similar vein, Derrida reminds that we do not consider the deaths in various regions of the globe as the same, and asserts that the shockwaves which are created related to these kinds of murderers are not pure and natural, indeed they depend on such a complex mechanism which includes history, politics, and media in *Philosophy in a Time of Terror* (2003)³. As Butler states, “The differential distribution of grievability across populations has implications for why and when we feel politically consequential affective dispositions such as horror, guilt, righteous sadism, loss, and indifference”, and this is the exact point that the Left politics should come up against with in order to realize precariousness and fight for it (2009:24). For my study, inquiring those interpretative frameworks which allow or do not allow the grief for the losses of October 10 is significant since I argue that we may see production and regulation of the discourse which the political power constitutes them as ‘ungrievable’ or on the ‘outside’ on these interpretative frameworks. On the other hand, I argue that the resistant acts of the mourners of October 10 which aims to manifest their loss as ‘grievable’ losses include the attempt of transforming the present frameworks which affect actualizes. In other words, the resistance of the mourners operates to resignify the hegemonic interpretation of affection.

3.2 Mourning, Trauma, Temporality and Naming Act

Derrida highlights a point in his dialogue with Borradori published as *Autoimmunity: Real and Symbolic Suicides* in *Philosophy in a Time of Terror* (2003), about 9/11 which has become the focal point of many of the post-2000 terrorism debates worldwide; the act of naming. The act of naming is, namely September 11 or 9/11, about just a date and nothing more. This shows that something has stamped a day, a date in history. The appearance of the event immediately feels like the case is unique

³ Derrida points out to the ethical responsibility to question this mechanism without reducing the grief and anger to the victims of 9/11.

and unprecedented in history. '*Fait date*', as Derrida states, something marks a date, points out to something that will be unforgettable, even though it is not known how it is described, determined, or resolved. That thing happened first and last time. And then Derrida warns us: It is necessary to be careful about the obligation of repetition, what this language, the naming, and dating phenomenon points out. Just because of this, we should understand the thing that enforces us to repetition without knowing what exactly it is (2003). When the naming acts that are circulated within 3-5 years in our country are considered, I argue that Derrida's warning should be marked.

According to Derrida, the presence of the mechanism which forms and shapes the first impression of the event and circulates it with an information machine should be critically rethought, and this machine is always already political and economical. In contrast, it is almost impossible to distinguish this naked phenomenon from the information-producing systems (language, communication, rhetoric, image, media, etc.) (2003). Regarding the case of October 10 with the discussion on the act of naming the event, Ankara Massacre, Gar Massacre, October 10, October 10 Ankara Attacks, October 10 Ankara Terrorist Attacks are used to cite the event. The first two naming acts are talking about being a massacre while citing the event. The place, a more specific place, and the date are cited in all of these usages. Beyond these, it is often called the 'bloodies terrorist attack of the history of republic' to cite the event. I used 'October 10' throughout the thesis. A date will interpellate its anniversary every year within the cycle of time. Besides, what you call signifies that event took place in history. Following Derrida (2003), calling October 10 with just a date indicates this is something mark a date in the history of Turkish Republic. It evokes immediately that that event is particular, and it leaves a trace in history. A date refers that it has to remain unforgettable from the point which it has happened, even though it is not how to identify, determine, or resolve that thing. It implies that it happened first and last. In order to mark a date in history, it has to be a significant event. I consider October 10 at that significance, and citing with a date and to remember the date every year is triggering remembrance.

Derrida adduces to the issue of trauma in this discussion. The traumatic event is conceptualized in relation to the traumatizing things that always open a wound in the ordinary repetition and anticipation of all experiences in the daily course of history. And provocatively, he opens up the chronology of the traumatic event into question, in other words, the temporalization and order which it seems to contain. According to him, the trauma destroys the temporality of the wound, in his words "For the wound remains open by our terror before the future and not only the past." (2003: 96). Similarly, the determinant of the inability to adopt such a traumatic event is not now in the past; it is the future. According to Derrida, the point in the temporality of the trauma is not a past, but a present which cannot be presented. After a trauma, the mourning could be shorter if it is said that the event was limited to minutes, that all was over, would be guaranteed that such a thing would never happen again (2003). Grief cannot be run into 'resolution' since trauma is not caused by an accident that is over and done, but by the threat of the future that may generate even the worse. In Derrida's own words; it is stated that; "There is traumatism with no possible work of mourning when the evil comes from the possibility to come of the worst, from the repetition to come-though worse." (2003:97). When we consider this discussion with regard to October 10, we may assume that the trauma of the precarious group opens again and again with the events of social violence after October 10. Moreover, the possibility of normative violence may target another community in the precarious groups causes the wound remains open.

Trauma causes the destruction of the distinction between the past, the future, and now, resulting in a continuity of a single moment. The past can not be brought back; on the other hand, it is not 'past' at the same time. "The past is the source of the future, the future is redemption of the past" (Butler, 2003:467). In this context, the loss should be marked, although not literally depicted. The loss causes cracking of the depiction itself, and the loss is exposed to participate only by its own way of expressions (Butler, 2003).

3.3 Transformative Effect of Loss: A condition for a new political agency

Another emphasis on Butler's discussion of mourning is the transformative effect of loss, and it is grounded on Freud's claim that loss begins to reside in body with the identification of the deceased. Since the subject of the loss is no longer representable, it becomes something else and cannot be understood by the classical methods of knowing. It can be claimed that Butler's arguments on the transformative effect of loss target to critique the dominant discourses' considering grief as a process which aims to leave the dead behind. Butler rejects the conceptualization that aims to evaluate the 'success' of grief process within the success of forgetting the deceased or someone else taking this place. However, she claims also that when mourning becomes something to be feared, we can instinctively solve it as soon as possible in *Violence, Mourning, Politics* (2004). These fears can give rise to "banish it the name of an action invested with the power to restore the loss or return the world to a former order, or to reinvigorate a fantasy that the world was formerly was ordered" (Butler, 2004: 29-30). Regarding the precarious group which mourns for the losses of October 10, we may argue that these people do not have an option like leaving the dead behind. Since these people constitute their subjectivity on the political field with particularly being the mourner of the 'ungrievable'. Because of the fact that they constitute their political subjectivity as resistant subjects and the resistance occurs with the act of grieving itself, the grief resolution of the mourners of October 10 cannot be understood and conceptualized with a dominant scientific discourse on grief.

Butler asserts in *Violence, Mourning, Politics*, mourning can be seen as a heavy-handed process in which we begin to identify with the suffering itself. This process amazes us at what is happening to human beings and pushes "I" into the unknown. She claims that one mourns for when one accepts that one will be changed because of the loss, maybe forever. In other words, the process of grief is something about resigning oneself to a change that can not be fully known or predicted. There is a loss, and there is a transformative effect of loss, but this effect cannot be planned or foreseen. Pain captures us, the transformative effect of pain and suffering wastes our efforts to choose how we will experience loss, and what will be the result. With the loss and continuing

suffering, grief can ruin us at any moment. When we experience a loss, we are faced with something that claims to be our own master (2004).

Butler mentions Freud's *The Ego and the Id* (1923) and argues that we do not always know what was lost in the loss in that person. There should be something that the loss is hiding, and the lack of knowledge of what is missing in loss is crucial to the continuity of this experience (2004). When you lost someone, you can feel something like absence. It can be like something is there for a long time, and it is not here now. Could it be anywhere else? All these questions cannot find answers in the first place, and may not in a near future. This wide range of unknowingness leads to a question about the thing that relates us each other.

In other words, mourning is sustained by the experience of unknowingness that provoked the unintelligibility of what is lost. And when we bear this pain, something comes in sight about who we are, "something that delineates the ties we have to others, that shows us that these ties constitute what we are, ties or bonds that compose us" (Butler, 2004:22). And so, what the mourners of October 10 lost? Did they lose only the people they love or move with the same political concerns? When we consider how October 10 happened, although we do not know what these people lost and what this unknowingness turned to, I argue that we cannot approach this experience of mourning without considering precariousness.

As aforementioned, mourning and following grief are the moments that one passed without self-controlling. In other words, that one lost oneself or discovered one is not alone. From this point of view, mourning and grief may include a different insight into core apprehension of who we are. This understanding gives us considerable ideas both about the autonomy of our bodies and the limits of that autonomy. It is so undeniable that we are autonomous. However, since we are bodily beings, the fundamental sociality of embodied life, being beyond ourselves, involvement in the lives of others from the start designate the limits of that autonomy. Butler explains the unknowingness about what is lost with referring to the unconscious dimension of sociality; "it may be that this sphere of dispossession is precisely the one that exposes my unknowingness, the unconscious imprint of my primary sociality." (2009:28). Loss

reveals the interdependency of the subject to the other to develop the sense of self and sustain it (Lloyd, 2009). The political suggestion of this study appears at that particular point. Throughout the study, I take both the assemblers, losses and the mourners of October 10 as precarious, following Butler's conceptualization of precariousness and precarity. If the point is about a precarious group, and this group lost someone, and there is a condition which we cannot consider this loss without regarding the precariousness of the group, I argue that the interdependence and ethical responsibility of the survivors always refer to the interdependence with other precarious groups. And, when we consider its relation with hegemonic power, it should refer to the alliance between precarious groups.

It is not something like, the 'I' exist independently from 'the other', then lost 'the other'. On the contrary, the attachment to 'the other' makes 'I' who I am. In a point, one discovers unexpectedly one lost the 'I' when one thinks one lost 'the other';⁴

“At another level, perhaps what I have lost “in” you, that for which I have no ready vocabulary, is a relationality that is composed neither exclusively of myself nor you, but is to be conceived as the tie by which those terms are differentiated and related.” (Butler, 2004:22).

Perhaps the most difficult form of the transformative effect of loss is the situation that loss is lost. Somewhere, at some point, something has disappeared; but nothing has been said on it. No memory has been returned. A fragmented horizon pushes the vagueness of someone's path into an imaginative agency. In this loss, there is something else that one cannot 'deal with', 'cannot work on'. This is a deliberate act of violence against people –community- who are made anonymous for violence. And their deaths reiterate this anonymity for collective memory. However, after such an internal break, the person continues in some way. This continuity is established and structured by this fracture itself, and this fracture is conveyed as a mark of its own history. For a person who is left behind in a situation which complete "recovery" is impossible, this irrecoverableness, on the other hand paradoxically, becomes a condition for someone to become a new political agency (Butler, 2003). However, for

⁴ For a similar discussion, See: Derrida, Jacques (2001) *The Work of Mourning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

the case of October 10, I claim that we should consider and inquiry ‘newness’ of the mentioned new political agency. So that, the attacks of October 10 occurred when a resistance over livability having paraded, and it reminded the unlivability of the precarious group again. In this case, to what extent we can expect a new political agency apart from the agency which the individuals in this particular community established upon precarity? Although these two cannot be separated, it may be claimed that the agency turns to a resistance on grievability from that on livability.

3.4 After Politicization of Life and Death: The Politicization of Mourning

There are debates about whether the concepts of life and death are medical and biological, or legal and political. Is a fetus a living thing, from which moment an organism is considered to be alive, is the fall to the mother's womb the beginning of it? On the other hand, it is argued what death is, which one should be regarded as the moment of death, the brain death or end of cardiac rhythm. Whether death is regarded and marked as death with a medical statement or a series of medical and legal certifications are brought in the force are in ongoing debates (Butler, 2004; Agamben, 1998).

As Butler argues in *Frames of War*, all these debates are discussions that indirectly open the query of the notion of ‘personhood’. At this point, the argument that life and death are tied directly to discourse may be mistaken. Rather, these claims indicate that there is no understanding of a life and death regardless of any framework. The mechanisms that enable the establishment of ontological fields are operating everywhere, but nevertheless, a life that opens up the questioning may arise. A living figure that is outside the norms of life; in other words, the lives which are ‘alive’ but not quiet apprehended as ‘life’ undermine the ontological position claims of being a person and the ‘life’ itself (Butler, 2009).

Agamben claims in *Homo Sacer* that what constitutes the core of the sovereign power even though it is hidden, is the embedding of bare life into the political arena; even the original act of sovereign power is to produce a biopolitical body. Then, what is done by the politicization of this bare life is nothing but a decision on the ‘personhood’ of

the living person⁵ (1998). As he stated in *Homo Sacer*, the human life, which can be killed and politicized by its ability to be killed, is the basic foundation of today's political life. The bare life of 'Homo Sacer' is particularly interesting for us in today's world, since the figure of life that the era has provided carries the capacity of not to be sacrificed, but being killed at an unprecedented dimension. The fact that we all are 'Homo Sacer' today, on the other hand, can be read as a reason for not being a distinct type of 'Homo Sacer' (Agamben, 1998).

Biopolitics can be read as "the growing inclusion of man's natural life in the mechanisms and calculations of power", following Agamben, and what makes it possible for today's politics to be totalitarian unprecedentedly is the transformation of the politics into biopolitics (1998:76). When life and death are political terms, not scientific and "which as such acquire a political meaning precisely only through a decision", re-determination of the borders of biopolitics becomes 'the' issue, the enforcement of power operates within these borders (Agamben, 1998:105).

The politicization of life, according to Agamben, always and inevitably requires the determination of the threshold where it is legitimate to destruct the political meaning of life. This threshold exists in every society, and even the most modern society determines who will be their 'Homo Sacer'. Bare life is no longer in a specific place or a certain category but in the biological body of every living thing⁶. The first political relationship, according to Agamben, is the relation of prohibition. The basic act of sovereign power is to produce the state of exception, as a zone of uncertainty between

⁵ Agamben's reference of bare life is the life of Homo Sacer, who emerged as a person who could not be sacrificed but could be murdered in the archaic Roman Law. The Homo Sacer is a vague person who is included in the legal order of time only by being exiled, that is, being able to be killed (1998).

⁶ Agamben analyzes deeply the habeas corpus (1679) and the articles that it contains, which is considered to be an important stage in the development of human rights by the legists, and claims that the original of this formula is a pure and simple body, not a citizen or people. With this law, the new subject of politics is no longer the free man and its status and privileges, but the body. Democracy arises from the submission and presentation of this 'body', as well. Agamben, claims that this is the bare life pointed out by this body, and considers the transformation of modern democracy is about without removing the 'homo sacer', but by dismantling it and distributing it to the bodies of all people, thus 'homo sacer's becoming the object of political conflicts. The roots of this biopolitical drive are that the body is formed as a two-sided entity, that is to say, as it is both the carrier of obedience to the sovereign power and the individual freedoms. The ability to kill this body is due not only to its biological dimension, but also to a political dimension (1998).

outside and inside, namely the bare life. Today, people, in Agamben's consideration, are not only the animals whose lives have entered their politics as living beings but also the citizens who enter their natural bodies in politics (1998).

After the politicization of death and life, I want to remind that Butler evolved her discussion of grievability within restraints of mourning and violence in the public sphere after 9/11, and asserts that the public mourning after 9/11 is used by the political power in order to shut the critical expressions. In this regard, Butler warns us, based on ethical grounds, we can sense a profound hatred for violence and a deep sorrow for loss, and we should, but we should not overlook the restrictive effect of this public mourning on public debates (Butler, 2004). Butler considers mourning as a certain dimension of political life; and propose to consider as;

“a dimension of political life that has to do with our exposure to violence and our complicity in it, with our vulnerability to loss and the task of mourning that follows, and with finding a basis for community in these conditions” (2004:19).

According to Butler, the source of our loss and our vulnerability lies in the fact that our bodies are socially constituted, that we have interdependence to others, that we have the danger of losing our ties with others, that we are exposed to others, and that we are exposed to the danger of violence by this exposure (2004).

It can be argued that Butler approaches the politicization of grief as two-sided in *Precarious Life* (2004) and *Frames of War* (2009). It appears on the one side that, the usage of public mourning as a reason for the politics under the name of war against terrorism. As Zehfuss clarifies, the mourning is being instrumentalized in order to legitimize military violence, and this is not only the case for states that want to rationalize the use of violence (2009). On the other hand, Butler reminds that mourning and the act of mourning itself may be a non-violent way to do politics, more clearly for political claims, but not to the point of inertia (2004). Another content of the mourning is rage; undoubtedly, the rage which is sparked off by an unbearable loss has a political potential that can not be underestimated (Butler, 2009). The point does not suggest that all losses are the same, but it is possible to talk about the common sense of loss. As Butler asserts in *After Loss, What Then?* belonging is probably something that takes place in and through this common sense of loss. I consider the

case of October 10 as a case which we can elaborate the politicization of grief completely. The fact that Labor, Peace and Democracy Rally took place for political reasons, and the fact that these people died and wounded because of their political expressions on the public sphere politicize the loss itself. Moreover, the process of mourning proceeded over grievability, more clearly, the experience of mourning for 'the ungrievable' in the public sphere cannot be thought separately from the present resistance of the precarious community and it could be read as a way of doing non-violent resistance to the political power. Besides, the fact that the losses are unbearable for the mourners may open the way to ally with other precarious communities which previously experienced unbearable grief for their loss because of political reasons.

When the community does not overcome the loss, and the community cannot overcome the loss without losing its own prior perception as a community, the loss itself becomes a condition and necessity for the community in a certain sense (Butler, 2003). As Franklin and Lyons clarify, the political and psychic energy released by the grief should not serve in the name of suffering and violence; on the contrary, should be in the service for the apprehension of shared human precariousness (2009).

The dead do not merely reside on the memories of individuals who know those people but at the same time in the collective memory, as Klass and Goss argue. They refer to Connerton and assert that the collective memory sustains its continuity through its ritual performances as well as abstract and mental, and bodily performances. The materiality of individual mourning, in this respect, is a very useful tool for the performance and transmission of collective memories. The political issue here, however, is this: how does collective - family, community, state - control the performance of the memory via which the lost is remembered and how does it operate? (2011). Since the differential allocation of public mourning has become an extremely important political issue, it should be rethought why administrations are so keen to keep and use their ability to regulate and surveillance who will be mourned publicly and who will not in the public space (Butler, 2009). When we consider this question for the context of Turkey, we may find the answer to my claim that a political power which built up its hegemony by exposing particular communities to precarity cannot

do regulation apart from the differential allocation of grievability. On the other hand, if we consider the emphasis of precarity both on grievability and livability at the same time, I claim that the discourse on grievability is operating for the people who will support the political power's hegemony and its normative politics and send them the message about how they will organize their 'livable' lives. In other words, the political power constitutes the inside and the outside at the same time by way of grievability.

It can be argued that Butler conceptualizes and considers the grief and mourning within the contexts of 'people', violence, precariousness and precarity, relationality (interdependence) and community, the public space and the public dimension of the body. In following sections, they will be discussed.

3.5 Precariousness and Precarity

The fact that a life can be lost, destroyed, and systematically neglected until death points out not to the inevitability and certainty of death and relatedly the finitude of that life, but it emphasizes the precariousness of that life, as Butler argues in the article *Precariousness and Grievability in Frames of War* (2009). Precariousness is about the required conditions which need to be met in order to sustain the life as a life, and it points out to living socially. Our fundamental interdependence to 'the other' is implied by the term precariousness, namely, that is one's life is always in the hands of the other in some sense. As Butler states; "It implies exposure both to those we know and to those we do not know; a dependency on people we know, or barely know, or know not at all" (2009:13-14). Our dependence on the anonymous other deeply affects our lives; it opens the doors of the exposure to violence, on the one hand, and the issue of ethical responsibility, on the other.

The precariousness of life indicates that the desire to sustain the life depends not only on the postulated psychic drive to live but more crucially to social and political conditions. The continuum of life that is precarious by definition is never guaranteed; therefore, it can be erased intentionally or accidentally. Following Butler, it can be said that the existing orders, including economic and social institutions, are designed in order to address the needs of this sustainment of life (2009). This may be the point to

begin to interrogate, which lives' continuation will be considered by the political order, and this discussion will lead us to the notion of precarity.

There are the highlights of precarity in Butler's previous books, *Gender Trouble* (1990) and *Bodies That Matter* (1993). This emphasizes focus on the precarity which exposed the bodily figures that cannot be fitted properly to the heteronormative frameworks and fixed up within the continuity and coherence of sex, body, and desire. In order to be recognized, for Butler, it needs to be intelligibly gendered; undoubtedly, this gendered status should mean something accordingly to the hegemonic gender norms of the given culture. Those who are not intelligible by the heteronormative framework are not recognized, which means not considered as political subjects who can declare their own claims and as legal subjects who can defend their own rights (Lloyd, 2015). In other words, they cannot find a place except 'the outside' in the social order. These lives are disposable, and not worth to be protected and maintained. As Butler states in *Frames of War*, precarity;

“designates that politically induced condition in which certain populations suffer from failing social and economic networks of support and become differentially exposed to injury, violence, and death” (2009:25-26).

In Butler's terminology, precariousness refers to the corporeal vulnerability shared by all mortals, while precarity refers to the particular vulnerability imposed on certain communities (Butler, 2009). In this study, the distinction between these two terms is highlighted in the analysis chapter, therefore I take the risk of repetition and continue to explain these intersecting concepts. It can be asserted that precariousness has a connotation in a sense existential, precarity, on the other hand, undermines certain social and political conditions which expose the risk of situations such as violence, death, hunger, imprisonment, and deprivation to the certain bodies. In a sense, the state of vulnerability is interpreted within the context of the historical conditions and maximizes the precariousness of bio-political bodies.

Butler argues that differential allocation of precarity should be considered both within its material and perceptual dimensions, since lack of meaning or value attributed to that life, or absence of them, appears on the maximization of the risk of pandemic,

poverty, hunger, forced displacement, deprivation of legal rights, and the exposure to violence without protection (2009). Another feature of precarity, as Butler states, is

“that politically induced condition of maximized precariousness for populations exposed to arbitrary state violence who often have no other option than to appeal to the very state from which they need protection.” (2009:26).

The effort to question the framework which generates the differential distribution of precarity is to question the framework which sustains wars, both global and local, displacements, leaving the communities dead with hunger or disease. Therefore, this query encourages us to rethink about ‘the life’ itself (Butler, 2009).

As she clearly states in the Preface of *Precarious Life* (2004), there are substantial connections between grief and precarity. The fact that we can be injured, the other also can be injured, and the permanent possibility of death by the hands of the other brings about both grief and fear (Butler, 2004). On the other hand, if there is something that we may acquire from the comprehension precariousness, according to Butler, it is the intuition of the presence of the people who I know or do not know, the other that my life depends on. In other words, being injured pushes the people to think about the vulnerability, to question the mechanisms which distribute it differentially, and who else is suffering from unexpected violence and fear; and even an opportunity for that (Butler, 2004). Could it be a way to return to the comprehension of our primary interdependence and collective responsibility to ‘the other’?

Butler argues that the precariousness of life returns to us with an ethical responsibility; to question the frameworks and conditions which make possible or impossible to apprehend some lives as precarious (2009)⁷. As Lloyd states, people cannot get somewhere by rejecting the shared human vulnerability, instead, they should mourn their loss in order to comprehend it (2009). When this mourning comprises the loss of

⁷ However, the ethical claim is always framed and limited by the notions such as culture, ethnicity, and religion. Butler’s understanding of ethics is always the issue of interdependence. Granted that the lives are messed with each other from the very start, in other words, the ‘I’ is always contaminated by ‘we’. When an ethical claim is demanded, the starting point of the answer is not personal tendency or morality, therefore the ethics is not an issue of the particular. On the contrary, it is clearly stated in the first place; ‘I am my relation to you’.

See: Lloyd, M (2015). The Ethics and politics of vulnerable bodies’. IN: Lloyd, M.S., (ed.) Butler and Ethics, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 167-192

‘the other’ that one may not ever know, the value of ‘life’ itself becomes apparent. In this sense, precarity may carry the task to gather the transsexuals, the queers, women, the poor, the stateless’. As Butler states in her Adorno lecture, the democratic struggle needs a political resistance which is plural and embodied and “entail the gathering of the ungrievable in public space to demand livable lives” (Butler, 2012:18). Moreover, it should be considered that the comprehension and recognition of vulnerability have the potential to change both the meaning and the structure of vulnerability itself (Butler, 2004). In this study, precariousness and precarity appear as fundamental discussions both for elaborating October 10 as an assembly before the attacks, and the process of mourning after the attacks. So that, my claim is that the precarious group gathered at October 10 to resist to precarity with reference to the call texts of the assembly. I read the resistance of this group to the war as resistance to the differential distribution of precariousness. With reference to Chapter 2 which is discussing the issue of subject formation, I conclude that this community is constituted as precarious at the hegemonic order by the political power and I consider this precariousness as a state which performatively sustained by the political power rather than existential. By trying to elaborate livability and grievability from precariousness and precarity, I consider the mourning process of October 10 as an attempt both for recognition and transformation of the precariousness of the community and I claim that this could be a way of resistance which may transform both the meaning and the structure of the vulnerability based on political subjectivity. Lastly, following Butler, I suggest that a politics on the basis of grievability should pay regard to an alliance with other precarious groups. In other words, I claim that a resistance which is carried out on precariousness make visible the interdependence and responsibility between precarious groups which are excluded from the field of political utterance in Turkey.

In Butler’s conceptualization, vulnerability is directly related to the body, in fact, the vulnerability is the exposure of the body to what is beyond and outside; that is to say, the body is vulnerable by definition. Butler’s reconceptualization corporeality as vulnerability brings with it other discussions. That is, the relationality that is conveyed by bodies always resides with the other bodies in the community becomes a historical element of the subject formation, and even this relationship is a continuing normative

dimension of our social and political life, in other words, what is possible and necessary for our interdependent formation. In the following section, the issue of body and its public dimension will be explained in relation to this discussion.

3.6 Body and Its Public Dimension

The body has always taken its place as a basic argument in all of Butler's work, from earliest to the most recent (Butler, 1990; Butler, 1993; Butler, 1997; Butler, 2015) and her conceptualization has always been far away from being statistic and clear. *Bodies That Matter* (1993) is providing answers to the critiques around the question of 'what about the materiality of the body?' which is raised after *Gender Trouble* (1990). In *Bodies That Matter*, Butler presents arguments about the question of 'can materiality of the bodies itself be constructed, just as gender?' and focus on how heterosexual matrix shapes the 'matter' of the body. Along with *Precarious Life* (2004), Butler changed the direction in the conceptualization of the body and turned to its precarious and vulnerable aspects (Lloyd, 2015). Butler's most recent arguments of the body, on the other hand, focus on bodies' alliance in the public space as a way of performative politics in *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly* (2015).

Firstly, Butler underlines the distinction between precariousness and precarity, then, relates it to the politics of precariousness and points out the conceptualization of the body within the context of this politics of precariousness. She argues that there is a need for a reconceptualization of the body, but, what is wrong with the existing conceptualizing? Butler answers this question in *Frames of War*;

“We have to consider whether the body is rightly defined as a bounded kind of entity. What makes a body discrete is not an established morphology, as if we could identify certain bodily shapes or forms as paradigmatically human... This view has implications for rethinking gender, disability, and racialization, to name a few of the social processes that depend upon the reproduction of bodily norms.” (2009:52).

Butler argues that the corporeal vulnerability of the body enables the relationality with the beyond of it, therefore provides the basis for the ethical and political debates on the body.

As Butler argues in *Precarious Life*, body implies mortality, vulnerability, and agency; but what does the relationship of these implications tell us? Our corporeal existence exposes us to the violence of the 'other', and our body endangers us to be the agency and means of all these violence (Butler, 2004:26). According to Butler, the idea of being 'interdependent' from the body may have two remarkable political connections: the first one is bodily autonomy; this claim is that we possess our bodies, that we are in control, and that we can claim rights on our bodies; on the other hand, the second is the ability to be in non-normative political assertions in the name of a group of class or community. After all, it is necessary for presenting ourselves as autonomous and recognizable, but interdependent to each other, as well (Lloyd, 2015). Butler already claims that we have to be the holders of our rights over our bodies, and we should fight for them since it is important to claim our bodily integrity against normative frameworks, but the bodies that we have, actually, are not only our own. The body has public dimension, as well (Butler, 2004). As Lloyd clearly states, bodily autonomy is a living paradox that we need to claim and reject, as well (2015).

Butler's re-conceptualization of the body and body politics in *Precarious Life*, is based on a new body ontology. The body has always been subjected to others, norms, and social and political organizations that have sought to allocate precariousness discriminatorily throughout the history. In other words, the body is vulnerable by definition. As she claims, the continuity of the body depends on the social conditions and institutions; it has to endure those outside of itself to resist for the sake of being. This is also what makes the body's ontology a social ontology; the body is mostly being processed by the society and exposed to social form. Therefore, it is not possible to first define a body ontology, then analyze the social meaning attributed to it. (Butler, 2009)

According to Butler, the social vulnerability of our bodies, which are the site of publicity, plays an important role in our political formation. The fact that being a human is a normative notion precedes a normative notion of what the human body should be. (Butler, 2004). To put it more precisely, Butler's claims on the interdependent disposition of the body will repeat in the discussion of the subject

formation. As she claims, the subject cannot be possible without doing and undoing these ties. In other words, these ties are the primary condition of subjectivity (Lloyd, 2015). In this study, following Butler, I take the ontology of the body into consideration as a social ontology. By combining Butler's claim on the discursive construction of the body with the conceptualization on the vulnerability of the body, I claim that we cannot elaborate the vulnerability of the bodies of the precarious group of October 10 without considering their exposure to precarity. To elaborate October 10 before the attacks, I take the appearance of the body in the public space and the attempt to form the public space as a space which the precarious bodies may gather and ally as a way of resistance through the publicity of the body itself. However, to elaborate October 10 after the attacks, by remarking the differential distribution of the vulnerability of the body, I evaluate the mourners' claims on security vulnerability regarding the assembly on this basis. By considering the increasing of the terrorist attacks in Turkey time and again, both the attacks targeted to certain communities, clearly the politically-driven assemblies, and the attacks catch the ordinary citizens by chance in the streets, I claim that disclosure of the vulnerability of the bodies certainly affected the appearance of the bodies in the public space of that time. Lastly, I argue that we cannot consider the conditions which boost the precariousness of the bodies of the communities which have political concerns and demands apart from the issue of the freedom of assembly.

3.7 Relationality and Community within the Context of Mourning

Butler rejects the idea that grief itself isolates people, makes them private, therefore it detracts the griever from politics. She argues that grief provides a complex political community in a sense, and this understanding of politics undermines the relational ties which include fundamental interdependence and ethical responsibility. The story of grief must be a kind of story which its query grounds on the relation of the 'I' with the 'other' at first glance. As she claims in *Violence, Mourning, Politics*,

“What grief displays, in contrast, is the thrall in which our relations with others hold us, in ways that we cannot always recount or explain, in ways that often interrupt the self-conscious account of ourselves we might try to provide, in ways that challenge the very notion of ourselves as autonomous and in control” (2004:23).

Butler clearly states that her intention is not to develop a theory on grief, but she considers grief as an experience in which human precariousness and vulnerability to the 'other' merely appear. In other words, it is the sign of our interdependent being (Lloyd, 2009). In this thesis, following Butler, I take the grief for October 10 into consideration as an experience which reveals the precariousness and the vulnerability of the politically marginalized group to the other, hegemony, and norms through politics and violence. In order to discuss the issue of interdependence separately from the context of grief and mourning, there is another connotation about this interdependence; if self loses itself ensures its existence, otherness is constitutive of the self.⁸ 'I', in this sense, cannot exist beyond or before its relation with the social context. So much so that, the act of speech is the discovery of 'I', at the same time. There cannot be a story about 'I', before its existing relationship with a set of norms (Zehfuss, 2007). Butler claims that a person is born into a world that is already structured by certain norms, a world that existed before and transcends the 'I' in *Undoing Gender* (2004). So, all self-perceptions are always already socially and historically conditioned self-perceptions. In other words, it is an ego that is governed by regulatory norms that allow a livable life and determines what is meant to be a culturally intelligible subject (Lloyd, 2009).

By drawing this relationship to an ethical discussion, Butler aims to show how a theory of subject formation that accepts the boundaries of its definition can serve both an ethical conception and even a sense of responsibility. According to Butler; the truth of 'I' is questioned in its relation to 'the other'. Therefore, ethics involves the violence

⁸ Butler discusses the argument of subjection in *Psychic Life of Power* in a psychoanalytic framework; and the frame consists of three main elements. First of all, Butler begins with fundamental dependence of human species. The argument is simple; during the infancy, all subjects develop a passionate attachment to the other on which the continuity of its life depends. If the child insists on the psychic and social senses, it has to be an attachment formation. Even though this primary dependence is not political in any sense, it is worth noting, because this situation becomes a tool of subjection by which condition the political formation and regulation of the subject. From now on, the subject will always be willing to be subjected except for the desire of the survival. Far from an autonomous subject, the psychic subject is a dependent subject which forms itself in subordination and its continuity depends on the continuity of subjection. The desire for the continuity of this subjection by the power is the result of the desire to possess a social existence. See: Lloyd, M. S. (2009). *Towards a Cultural Politics of Vulnerability: Precarious Lives and Ungrievable Deaths*. In: Carver, T. and Chambers, S. A. (eds.). *Judith Butler's Precarious Politics: Critical Encounters*. London: Routledge, pp. 92-105.

not only to 'the other' but also to us. Because of our radical dependence, it is never possible to distinguish it. The 'I' is already inextricably dependent to the 'other' (Zehfuss, 2007)

From taking this perspective, Butler intersects the discussion of relationality to the notion of the agency; and claims that if 'I' is shaped with constitutive social ties, and within the social norms are enacted, then every form of individuality is, in fact, a social determination (2009). Therefore, since the social conditions of existence never merely subjected to one's own will, there is no agency free from these conditions and their undesirable effects. The mandatory dependence constituted with people who I have not chosen to relate with and, even with whom I've never known forms the condition of any act I can claim for myself, as Butler argues in *Frames of War*. Butler warns and provokes us to think about another point related to relationality; there should be a way to think about how we are both constituted and deprived by our relations. This is the point to turn to loss and grief; despite the differences in our histories and places, the loss joins us in a loose 'we', at least a 'we' that contains the people who have an idea about what it means to lose someone (Butler, 2004).

While taking such an understanding of community into consideration, we have to consider that we are struggling for autonomy in many areas on one hand, on the other hand, we are physically dependent on each other, hence, we have to conceive the demands that are imposed on us by living as beings that are mutually vulnerable to each other, as well. The most important point of Butler's conceptualization of the community in such a way is that such an understanding of community compels us to think about our interdependence as not only a definitional or historical fact of our formation but also of our social and political lives (2004). Even so, this continuity becomes normative and affirms the relationality.

After these discussions on relationality, Butler turns her point to 9/11 and claims that after 9/11 the USA lost the political opportunity to describe itself as a part of the global community. This political opportunity, as Lloyd states, could be summarized as a perception of the fact that people are dependent on each other and a reaction to the relationship between shared human vulnerability and violence (2009). If it does not

seem as to thin customization, it can be claimed that this opportunity is lost in recent years in Turkey, too. If we take this claim into consideration, the following questions about the ‘we’ in this discussion could be asked: “What happens to this “we” during times of war? Whose lives are regarded as lives worth saving and defending, and whose are not?” (Butler, 2009:37). Via these questions, Butler aims to re-think the ‘we’ from a critical perspective and whose lives are worth to be considered as lives, and whose lives are deprived of this worth by ‘not us’. When we think that what could be said about these discussions on interdependence, relationality, and community regarding the case of October 10, I argue that the mourners of October 10 join themselves in a politically dissident ‘we’ and attach themselves to a narrower ‘we’ which has lost their members and suffered from similar political reasons before. While the ethical responsibility and following community formation which rises upon the fundamental interdependence lead the spreading of grief and mourning of October 10 in waves and extend the ‘we’ on the one hand, they reveal the interdependence of life to the other, how the precariousness of life always be in the hands of the norms and the political power which produce and regulate the norms, on the other hand. In other words, because of the fact that the ‘we’ which mourners of October 10 finds each other in, and the hegemonic ‘we’ which implies those lives who have worth to be protected, namely ‘livable’ lives are always been constituted through each other, fundamental interdependence has a significance both for the ‘inside’ and the ‘outside’. The precariousness of the lives of the community of October 10 is always subjected to recognizability through the constitutive interdependence.

3.8 Differential Allocation of Grief

3.8.1 Why state of exception?⁹

According to Agamben, if the general situation is to be understood, a real state of exception should first be sought and found. As a matter of fact, the state of exception explains the general situation, as well as itself. As an etymological origin, the exception is something that is not left out completely, but something that is kept out.

⁹ Before Butler’s discussion on ungrievable life, I want to reserve this part for the importance of state of exception with reference to Agamben’s ‘homo sacer’. I consider that this point of view could be read as a critique to the notion of universalism and objective knowledge.

Agamben claims that the exception as a kind of exclusion is a disjunctive situation that is excluded from general rules (1998).

Agamben warns us about the necessity to think carefully on exception since the exception is something that is excluded from the law, not something that does not really bear upon the existing laws. On the contrary, the exception keeps its relation to the rule by suspending the rule. He claims that the rule maintains its effectualness on the exception by withdrawing from it. From taking this perspective, the state of exception arises from the suspension of the order. The legal-political sphere, as Agamben claims, is a structure in which things held outside are held inside at the same time. When the system encounters extremism, it takes it in by banning it. To put it more clearly with his own words;

“The exception does not subtract itself from the rule; rather, the rule, suspending itself, gives rise to the exception and, maintaining itself in relation to the exception, first constitutes itself as a rule.” (Agamben, 1998:14).

Agamben clearly relates the exception to the politics in *State of Exception*, and states that;

“To show law in its nonrelation to life and life in its nonrelation to law means to open a space between them for human action, which once claimed for itself the name of ‘politics’. Politics has suffered a lasting eclipse because it has been contaminated by law, seeing itself, at best, as constituent power (that is, violence that makes law), when it is not reduced to merely the power to negotiate with the law.” (2005:88).

As he claims in *Homo Sacer*, this era is an age when the exception becomes the foundation of political structure day by day and, eventually becomes the rule (1998). The exception is the place where the placement and regulation are completely broken. In the cases where the belonging and commonalities of individuals is being attempted to be understood, the exception and the example are strictly related concepts that cannot be separated from each other.

The relationship between the exception and the example is quite complex, as well as the relation of outside and inside, and the relation of strangeness and closeness. This claim which Agamben points out to may be the core point of both Butler’s conceptualizations of ungrievable life, and relatedly the concept of constitutive

outside; the things that cannot be comprised at all is comprised by being excluded, so that the exception becomes a state in which things cannot be represented are represented. With reference to Schmitt who defines the sovereign as “he who decides on the state of exception”, Agamben claims that the relation of exception is a relation of the ban (Schmitt, 1922; cited in Agamben, 2005:1). In such a way that “He who has been banned is not, in fact, simply set outside the law and made indifferent to it but rather abandoned by it, that is, exposed and threatened on the threshold in which life and law, outside and inside, become indistinguishable.”, just like the differential allocation of precariousness, namely precarity imprints such lives as ungrievable (Agamben, 1998:21). At this state of uncertainty, the sovereign makes the decision about the exception. The threshold state of life, that is, this limited structure, holds life both inside and outside of the law, and the place of the sovereignty is this threshold (Agamben, 1998).

To understand the relationship of power with death and mourning requires a work that goes far beyond the scope of this thesis. However, it is relatively easy to fold this area by pointing to the edges of the border stones of the area covered by this hierarchy. For this purpose, to understand the hegemony which the political power in Turkey constitutes by way of death and life, therefore grief and mourning, I elaborate the case of October 10 as a state of exception. I draw upon the case of October 10 as an example which the rule suspends, and by looking at ‘the ungrievable’, I aim to figure out whose life is grievable, therefore livable at that time in Turkey. I hope that this discussion will provide clues about the rule which is suspended. Lastly, I aim to examine the relation between the resistance and the politics which those lives who are at the state of the exception perform and the hegemony of political power who decides on the state of exception.

3.8.2 Grievability and Livability

Who counts as human? Whose life counts as life? In order to make these questions stronger, Butler forms the question as follows: “What makes a life grievable?” (Butler, 2004; 2009). Butler starts the argument by accepting that there is no existing condition of ‘human’ which is universally shared and continues with the argument that

differential allocation of grief is important to understand who is considered to be a human and who is not. As she claims, obviously, to cite ‘human’ falls to a challenge these days. That is, today’s circulating citation does not include all people, the normative suppositions on civilization determine which people will deserve legal protection and which people will be left to space that is not protected by any law (Butler, 2004). In this study, I focus on the normative suppositions on political subjectivity in Turkey and I argue that it determines which citizens will deserve protection and to speak politically and which people will not. For that purpose, I take the case of October 10 since the assembly was carried out by politically dissident groups and aimed to demand livable lives for all, and it concluded with a terrible terrorist attack.

Butler’s interest in mourning and grief dates back to before *Precarious Life* and *Frames of War*. The first discussion which is first raised in *Gender Trouble*, then developed in *Bodies That Matter* and *Psychic Life of Power* focuses on the operation of heteronormative sexuality to limit people’s public mourning expressions. In the article *Violence, Mourning, Politics* in *Precarious Life*, Butler gives a new direction to her discussion of grief and mourning. Within this discussion, it is referred to not only how the traditions or norms of mourning are shaped by the relations of power, but also how the mourning experience will open another normative desire within the political arena (Lloyd, 2009).

I would like to remind that Butler grounds these arguments on the politics that the USA government followed after 9/11 in *Precarious Life* and *Frames of War*, she undermines the point within these politics: Can Arabs, or more broadly, the people who belong to Islam have a location in today’s process of humanism? In other words, to what extent do these operations take the ‘human’ which is shaped and naturalized by the pattern of ‘Western’ for granted and by which people’s exclusion this process is operating? Is the source of this sustainability of this operation the exclusion itself? What are the boundaries of the ‘human’ in this operation? Do the cultural frameworks we use to apprehend the human being work on the process of apprehending the loss itself? If someone has lost their life, the loss is actualized, but if the person who is lost

is not 'someone', what is lost, what is the effect and shape of the loss, or how do mourning and grief actualize in this case? (Butler, 2004; 2009)

Butler does not doubt that their grief is being held by close circles of Palestinian, Iraqi, and Afghan people being killed by the US army, but she is addressing the issue with a focus on the public discourse on the absence or presence of these lives in the United States or in the West generally. Butler's question at this point is not why US citizens do not mourn the people who died in Iraq and Afghanistan publicly, but rather why they cannot apprehend their lives as 'life' in the first place (Zehfuss, 2009). In a similar vein, Butler also points out to the witnessing of the entire world over the last 20 years to the US government's declaration about the prisoners in Guantanamo; their cases will never be entitled to regular trials, instead they will be indefinitely detained. At this point, this is the question which Butler asks: under what conditions do some human lives begin to be unworthy of fundamental and universal human rights? (Butler, 2004). Or, who is the subject of the human rights? (Rancière, 2004)

Butler does not aim to bare the genealogy of life or death. Instead, she includes the criticisms of the fact that precariousness is presupposed and regulated by the discourse, but there is not anything that is completely resolved in any discourse at the same time (Butler, 2009). Butler refers to a differential allocation of grief¹⁰. This allocation decides whose lives can be griveable and whose lives cannot, what kind of subjects should be grieved for and what kind of subject should not. This allocation leads us to production and sustainment of certain exclusionary insights on who is normatively human, what is apprehended as a livable life, and what is apprehended as a grievable death (Butler, 2004). In order to clarify, griveability functions in Butler's work as marginalization and unintelligibility, it refers to those who will be eligible to demand

¹⁰ The distinction between Butler's "high-protected western lives" and "disposable non-western lives" in these discussions has been found to be simplistic by some thinkers. Instead, they argued that there are many discriminatory allocations of grief at global and local levels and they tried to take out the debate from the war against terrorism between USA-Afghanistan and USA-Iraq. Within these discussions, a separation is pointed out that they are grades from a rough distinction, such as being vulnerable and untouchable. On the other hand, this distinction is not arranged in a single term. Depending on the circumstances, a different allocation may dominate the others. See: Lloyd, M. S. (2016). Naming the dead and the politics of the 'human'. *International Studies* (1:20) doi:10.1017/S0260210516000358

rights, support, and recognition as ‘grievable’ and those who won’t as ‘ungrievable’ (Lloyd, 2015).

In *Frames of War*, Butler takes grief into consideration as the intersecting point of life and death and argues that the value of life shows up with the loss; because grievability is a presupposition about a life which has importance. In daily language, grief requires a life that has already been lived and finished. An expression like ‘a life has been lived’ is possible if the language can express the ending in the future, and it presupposes that this life has merely begun to be lived. The expression ‘this will be a life that will have been lived’ is a presupposition of a grievable life, in the cases of the absence of grievability, this life cannot be regarded as a life, it is paradoxically something living but not a life and as Butler states, “Instead, "there is a life that will never have been lived," sustained by no regard, no testimony, and ungrieved when lost.” (2009:15). Therefore, comprehension of grievability prioritizes and enables the comprehension of precariousness (Butler, 2009). My aim in this study is to query ‘life’ by way of loss and grief. In order to clarify, to what extent the lives of the politically marginalized groups in Turkey, presupposing that this political marginalization may intersect with cultural, ethnic, and denominational marginalizations, counted as lives by the political power? When we consider that this politically marginalized group appear in the public space in order to utter against war, we may assume that the group is already dealing with a political desire on ‘life’ itself. In this respect, I regard it important to interrogate the case of October 10 with Butler’s discussion on grievability and I claim that this discussion can say something about the relation of precariousness, which is the point that life and death intersect, and political marginalization in Turkey.

Butler argues that the question of grievability is not purely ontological since both forms of subjects take and the lives that cannot conform to available subject categories occur within historical and geopolitical changes. The issue, however, as she claims, is an insurrection at the level of ontology, because it critically opens the door to such questions: What is real? Whose lives are real? Is their ungrievability the result of the fact that these people are always lost, or they have never existed? Where can the status

of their lives be settled? (Butler, 2004). These are the questions which Butler asks to interrogate differential allocation of grief, relatedly 'life' on an ontological level.

This ontological discussion which involves derealization of life brings with this question: Is this derealization just on the level of discourse? Can it be? As Butler argues, those who cannot be involved in any sovereign concept of 'human' and are even kept outside the cultural boundaries of this concept, those lives that cannot count as lives or be humanized and may be exposed to physical violence. On the other hand, this discourse itself may create conditions in which violence is found in the form of neglecting. In other words, the matter is not simply that an 'utterance' of dehumanization creates some consequences, but rather that the limitations in the discourse constitute the boundaries of cognition of 'human' (Butler, 2004).

This discussion of ontology is intersected with epistemology in *Frames of War*. What Butler argues is the epistemological capacity which is required for apprehending a 'life' has already been determined in accordance with the norms that characterize it as a 'life'. Therefore, while the ontological issue in question constitutes the epistemological question of being able to apprehend a life, on the other hand, it suggests an ethical problem through the precautions to be taken against the exposure of these lives to violence. The frameworks which allocate intelligibility differentially constitute specific ontologies on the subject; they organize visual controlling, as well. So, the constitution of the subjects is through the norms which produce and shift the conditions of recognizability in repetitive usages. The normative condition in this constitution creates a historically contingent ontology; then the capacity to distinguish and name the 'existence' of the subject in this ontological field becomes depending on the norms which make recognition possible (Butler, 2009).

The claim that ontology is normatively produced signifies a resolution which is historically and socially contingent. More explicitly, these ontological claims are not natural, pre-language, given things which do not exist free from social and political organizations. Rather they point out to naturalized effects of political configurations. In this sense, ontology is not an institution, but a normative warning which draws limits to cultural intelligibility and conditions what can be apprehended as real and

who will count as fully ‘human’. Ontology, in other words, is a regulatory and regulated field that operates through norms such as race, gender, ethnicity, bodily form, etc. in order to make certain people and communities privileged above others. Ontologies in this sense should be understood as historically defined and culturally constrained, temporary and spatially exceptional things that can be separated from the social and political contexts they are embedded in. Hence, ontologies are completely superimposed within power relations. (Lloyd, 2016).

Butler claims that what constitutes the greatest issue of contemporary political life is the fact that not everyone is considered as the subject. As she claims, multiculturalism assumes already established communities and established subjects; but the issue is precisely the communities which are not apprehended as communities, subjects who live but whose lives are not considered as ‘life’. When we accept that there are some lives that are worth protecting, living, mourning, and those who are not worth, we cannot take the issue within the framework of an identity problem. The issue in the questions can be explained by asking how power shapes the field where subjects are possible, but more importantly not possible. Identity politics already assumes that; the subjects are already there, they occupy a common public space, and we can reconcile the differences with the right instruments to keep them together. However, it is possible to explain the discriminatory allocation of grief and mobilize political implications by critically thinking against these assumptions. This issue requires an analysis that can interrogate the frame that intercepts the question of who is considered ‘someone’ (Butler, 2009).

Butler comes with another provocative argument in this discussion; the categories and norms which make it possible for an entity to be recognized are already predicting and enabling the act of recognition. Thus, recognizability precedes recognition. Within this argument, Butler suggests that to think of the human being as something which constituted and withdrawn, magnified, personified, degraded and unrecognized, raised and affirmed value and morphology in the afterword of Turkish edition of *Precarious Life* (Butler, 2005). Perhaps, this may be a way to recognize an impossible paradox, a non-human human. Butler argues that there is another level of normativity that works

through the norms that produce the idea of ‘human’ which is worth being recognized and represented. Therefore, unless we can clearly understand this discrimination of power, we cannot question the more general normative form of how these subjects are recognized and how they are represented (Butler, 2009).

The exclusion of ‘ungrievable’ lives from the legitimate and established political structures, namely not recognized as subjects are exclusion is not by itself (Lloyd, 2015). Just as the norms of recognition make it possible to be recognized; the schemes of intelligibility condition and produce the norms of recognizability. Therefore, in order to be recognized as life, it must first be apprehended as a life, more clearly it requires conforming to certain intelligibility schemes on what it meant to be a ‘life’. At this junction, it is clear that it is important to respond to the question of what can be done in order to change the direction of political conditions of recognizability, to produce a series of more egalitarian conditions, in order to obtain more radical democratic results (Butler, 2009). We may claim that Butler answers that question with the assembly in order to resignify ‘the human’ (2015). Following this line, I consider the assembly of October 10 as an answer of a precarious group in Turkey to that question, since this assembly was carried out for political utterance, especially those aiming to utter for political conditions of recognizability. Therefore, I claim that the assembly and the case of October 10 itself while answer the question that what can a precarious group in Turkey do for more egalitarian conditions of recognizability on the one hand, it blurs the answer of that question on the other.

These arguments are not merely to claim the existence of norms that define who is considered a human being, but another important aspect of the question is how this normative operation serves various political purposes (Lloyd, 2009). According to Butler, it is necessary for the hegemonic conception of politics to set the limits on what is to be regarded as a part of the public sphere and what is not to be done (2004). In order to produce what the public sphere includes and excludes, it is necessary to control what people see, how people see, what they hear and how they hear. However, these restrictions are not only handled in the content but also what can be known and what can be felt. By limiting the public sphere, the power to determine what is counted

as reality is also a way of determining whose lives count as life and whose deaths are considered as death. At this point, it is crucial to think about how our competence of apprehending and sensation are sensitive as such. When our competence to mourn is not present, in this sense, the risk of losing the sharp understanding of lives which is necessary to stand against violence arises (Butler, 2004). Regarding this discussion, it is important to ask which political purposes are served by the hinders on the appearance of precarious groups in the public space and the acts of political utterances in Turkey. In other words, what these operations which decide whose lives will be counted as lives who speak on behalf of their own 'lives' should be rethought if the question is about any form of inequality.

There is another concept that Butler focuses on in these discussions; 'to be framed' which means 'to be sacrificed to a frame'. According to Butler, the frames that determine which lives are recognizable as life and which are not must be circulated and stay in circulation to establish the hegemony. While the circulation itself brings forward the frame, it also constitutes its repeatable structure (Butler, 2009). It is not easy to recognize a life without the frames that are provided; these frameworks constitute the way we know and recognize life. On the other hand, they establish the conditions for the survival of that life. The sustainability of these conditions points out that they are not static, but are producible social institutions and relations. The necessity of a repetition of these conditions creates an obligation to preserve life conditions. Likewise, these frameworks are subjected to an alterable structure; there is a circulation, and this entrance to circulation requires and results from their reproducibility (Butler, 2009).

A critical approach to differential allocation of grief gives us the competence to oppose to the conditions that some lives are more vulnerable and open to violence than others, as Butler argues in *Precarious Life* (2004). The fact that human vulnerability is distributed in radically different forms in the world is also the source of supporting and sustaining lives differently. The fact that some lives are being protected extremely and sanctified politically leads to present as a sufficient reason to mobilize the powers of war. However, other lives are not supported and protected as wrathfully and fast,

and precisely for that it will justify ignoring the vulnerability of the others and legitimize violence (Butler, 2004). In a similar vein, Zehfuss also claims that the hierarchies of grief lay the groundwork for war. According to Zehfuss, mourning may seem very personal and confidential in the first place; however, when the violence comes into play, especially against the people who are members of a particular community, mourning becomes public and falls victim to various political justifications (2009). The first thing that left politics should do in this context is, according to Butler, the focus of political criticism on all forms of violence, including state violence which pushes certain communities to precarity within a discriminatory approach and restricts all access to reduce this vulnerability (2009). When we consider the normative violence and precarity which exposed to the precarious group who lost their lives and relatives, their hold on public mourning becomes meaningful. Because by mourning publicly, while they create discourse on their losses' grievability against the discourse of political power, on the one hand, they utter their own words against the political attempts which may legitimize this violence. I claim that, by mourning publicly, they demand the recognition and oppose the violence which they are exposed to from 'the other'.

According to Butler, the precarity of ungrievable lives is biopolitically regulated; in other words, this is a situation which is actively produced, maintained, and reified by repetition by the states, although the states are not the only ones. Hence, this is a situation which is internal to politics and relations of power (Lloyd, 2015). The differential allocation of grief operates on behalf of a distorted logic that rationalizes these deaths; the communities that are not protected from hunger, famine, and pandemics, or security vulnerability are exposed to life under these conditions pose a threat to human life. The functioning of this distorted logic is necessary to preserve the lives of the actual 'living' (Butler, 2009). For that purpose, in my study, by analyzing the discourse of political power with regard to October 10, I aim to indicate how the precarity which is exposed to the community of October 10 does operate in the discursive level and how this discussion is implicit in power relations.

This discussion on the differential allocation of grief and precariousness does not focus on the value of any life or the competence to survive, rather it focuses on the social conditions in which the conditions that guarantee life are not met (Butler, 2009). To put it more clearly, this grievability does not point out to the same thing as death or mourning, the question is about rethinking the livability (Lloyd, 2016). When questioning the ‘existence’ of life, it would be a failure to attribute it as an asset that is outside of the operations of power, since it is constituted within this discriminatory approach. This study aims to interrogate the specific power mechanism which constitutes ‘life’ and to draw the discussion to a local framework from a global framework, differently from Butler. More clearly, I aim to understand the relationship between political dissidence and acquiring and sustaining ‘livable’ lives in Turkey. By starting to think about call texts of October 10 Labour, Peace and Democracy Rally, I consider the political demands which were uttered to sustain ‘the life’ as a condition to sustain these lives. In other words, I claim that the hinders on the acts of political utterances push the politics of livability which precarious groups carries out into a vicious cycle.

3.8.3 Naming and Representing the Dead

Grievability is etymologically related to grief, and therefore to death; so another focus of research on grievability is how deaths are presented in obituaries, newspapers, news, and so on (Lloyd, 2016). At this point, following Judith Butler, it is important to ask the following questions; what is the relationship between the violence that leads to the loss of these lives and the prohibition on their mourning in public space? To what extent this prohibition is another form of the existing violence? Could we relate this prohibition on discourse with the dehumanization of the deaths, therefore lives? (Butler, 2004).

One of the most concrete examples how we can talk about a grief hierarchy is obituaries -death announcements-. Presence of obituary presupposes a life which has the qualities of prestige, the importance of protection, care, and the existence of worth. Butler undermines that we must rethink how the death announcements operate as a means of differential distributing of the mourning at the public level. Noting that

obituaries have become a means of considering a life publicly worthy, Butler is arguing with the provocative question of whether the obituaries of the people murdered by the US military forces in war could be located in the US media (2004).

The issue of representing death news of different populations in diverse ways on the public arena is not new. Since the 1990's, most academic works cite to the 'death hierarchy' of the media that Roy Greenslade has revealed¹¹. However, to claim or define the existence of a death hierarchy is not same as to explain how it was produced. At this junction, Moya Lloyd's claim is based on the necessity of an inquiry centered on 'human' as an indicator of an existing and continuing order of grievability and the norms that constitute it. As Lloyd argues in the article *Naming the dead and the politics of the 'human'*, the production of normative ontology within the context of grievability becomes visible by not considering some lives as qualified to take part in obituaries or other public recognition forms organized by the media (2016). This is because their lives do not make any sense; these lives are not recognizable, epistemologically it is about the power of ontology to limit what counts as real. Categorizing a particular community with a reduced humanity, therefore, points to a specific ontology in operation; they have failed to meet the norms that define what is included in this category. It means that the ending of those lives which are constituted as unreal or taken out from the reality by normative ontology is not equivalent to killing; it is something less than killing. This ontological distinction, on the other hand, does not include only the norms which condition public discourse, it also frames what will be heard, what will be seen, and what will be said (Lloyd, 2016).

According to Lloyd, 'human' has become a category which is expressed by subaltern groups in order to assert political claims and demands; in other words, the term 'human' is used to oppose to exclusion, dehumanization, and subordination in order to prompt equality (2016). According to Butler, the relationship between dehumanization and discourse is quite complex. So much so that to claim that violence transfers the discourse into practice is unsatisfying to comprehend this complex relation. Rather, dehumanization occurs at the limits of discursive lives which

¹¹ See: The Damien Walsh Memorial Lecture by Roy Greenslade, 4 August 1998

constitute the limits of intelligibility through prohibition and foreclosure (Butler, 2004). There is a critical issue in the delivery of losses to us, the delivery which is often expressed by the amounts of losses, and the continual repetition of this deliver; how do the circulating frameworks shape this delivery and how do these frameworks create affect through it? (Butler, 2009). In other words, could the form of this deliver say anything about the relationship between affect and ethical and political claims?

Butler claims that the discussion of face and recognizability which is argued by Levinas in *Peace and Proximity* (1996) provides a way to think about the complex relationship between representation and humanization in *Precarious Life* (2004). So that there is an assumption in the debate about humanization and dehumanization; those who have the right to represent themselves are more likely to be humanized. On the other hand, those who cannot find the chance to represent themselves face the danger of being treated with a low level of humanization or dehumanization. The media is constituting the intelligibility schemes through the image, therefore it is emptying what is 'human', or constituting a set of ideals which leads us to consider some images are less than human. As Butler puts it more clearly, these normative regulations operate in two different ways; it symbolically identifies a face to non-human, therefore it works by preventing us to apprehend the person on stage. Secondly, it works through radical erasure or anonymization; this life is never lived, this loss or murder never happened. The first way requires a scheme of intelligibility that will doubt the humanity of what has already appeared, the second, on the other hand, is based on the exclusion of that image from the public appearance field (Butler, 2004).

According to Butler, the removal of loss from reality through some forms of exclusion, erasure, and anonymization is a mechanism that prioritizes indifference to human suffering and death, thus ensuring the successful completion of dehumanization. The subtraction from the reality is not outside or inside of the image but occurs in the framing of the image itself (Butler, 2004). At this junction, there is a point which needs to be emphasized: the media does not produce hierarchies of death from the outset;

media is only one of the mechanisms by which the norms of grievability is circulated and reiterated (Lloyd, 2016).

Following Butler's conceptualization of 'grievability', Lloyd includes the ways of presenting dead by statistics or name to the discussions of differential allocation of grief. She questions why naming is preferred rather than a statistical census in order to record deaths and places, the idea of 'human' at the center of her argument. As she argues, when a particular community is constituted as ungrievable, if the members of this community cannot be apprehended as 'human' within a specific hierarchy of grief, naming the dead –unnamed- itself becomes an act of political opposition (Lloyd, 2016). What happens if those who are considered as ungrievables themselves assert this claim of humanity? Does such a claim have the potential to reconfigure the differential allocation of grief?

Lloyd gives reference to Ranciere (2007) and argues that our indifference towards the fate of the lives which have not yet influenced us results from the fact that their names do not mean anything to us. What will reconfigure our way of counting them, taking out of this indifference, and sensitizing their stories is visibility of their names and stories. Therefore, naming the dead publicly is a meaningful political step to overcome the problems of anonymity and invisibility. The utterance of a name, especially for those who are unnamed and anonymous is the most extraordinary form of recognition (Lloyd, 2016). In this study, I elaborate October 10 mourners' acts of naming their deads in mourning rituals, strikes, and protests as a way of doing politics for recognizability. Despite the fact that most of the mainstream media organs publish the news of October 10 with the numbers of dead, two independent news portals publish the names of the deceased with their photographs and short life stories and titles were 'not a number, but human'¹². I assume that we may evaluate it with Lloyd's mentioned arguments.

Lloyd points out to the importance of naming by the subaltern community itself, and argues that although this could be a way of naming by someone else, ultimately it

¹² 'Sayı değil, insan'

misleads to a situation that they passively wait for accepting to the category of ‘human’ and that they do not resisting political actors who stand for their humanity on their own behalf. Besides, if the act of naming is carried out by the privileged communities, there would be another lacking point; they do not question the privilege attached to their own lives, they do not problematize the specific mechanism that the norm of ‘human’ is associated with naming, or they do not question which particular institutions or organizations are authorized by such a hierarchy. If those who are ungrievable themselves undertake the act of naming, that is, if they claim their own griveability, these acts become performative acts which call for their own humanity. In other words, they appropriate the category of ‘human’ which they are excluded from to themselves (Lloyd, 2016).

This political act does not show that they are trying to adapt themselves to the normative category of ‘human’ or they are trying to incorporate themselves into an existing allocation of grief. On the contrary, politically, their effort is to disrupt and reconfigure the dominant allocation of grief by counting themselves (Lloyd, 2016). In other words, it is a subversive repetition to overthrow what is meant to be ‘human’ and resignify the term itself. A critical politics of ‘human’ should do it by this way, as Lloyd argues, and such a critical politics, ultimately, may have transformative effects (2016). Following Butler, it could be considered as “an insurrection at the level of ontology” (2004:33). A critical politics of ‘human’ is a politics which query the sphere of the appearance of the ‘human’; therefore, interrogate our perception of ‘real’ and ‘normal’. Such a politics which aims for the disintegration of normative ontology does not permit humans to be on an ontological status as ‘ungrievable’ (Lloyd, 2016).

The act of such deaths is expressed only with numbers on the media as it reproduces their lives as an anonymous mass without any difference, personal history, or individuality. On the other hand, those who are grievable treated as subjects who are unique, irreplaceable, have their own familial, social, and friendship relations, unique hopes, dreams, and wishes (Lloyd, 2016). Naming the dead in obituaries indicates that they are not numbers but each of them is ones who loved by their family members and friends, by pointing out to their specialty. Obituaries also tell us that this life has been

lived and has been lost, that is, the number has a story, indeed (Zehfuss, 2009). Another important feature of obituaries is that they are creating lives retrospectively. Just like mourning, obituaries are not for dead people. To be more precise, although the effort is seen as a duty to the dead, they are no longer live and not in a position which can be affected by the practices of remembrance –or the issue of whether or not they will be affected will lead us to a metaphysical debate and this is not its place-. The question is that; the act of naming the dead and mourning practice itself is for those who are left behind, in a complicated way (Zehfuss, 2009). The narratives of the familial mourners of October 10 about their losses which I will take place in this study are indeed the things which are uttered for the grievability of those lives. So that, their utterance which declares ‘this life has lived, and it has witnesses’, I claim that, is a performative attempt to resignify the differential allocation of grief in Turkey. On the other hand, it is an attempt to constitute their own livability on the basis of their losses’ grievability. It could be considered as a reiteration of the resistance to precarity, just as the assembly before the attacks.

As Butler suggests in the afterword of Turkish edition of *Precarious Life*, we should approach critically towards the performative power of states on regulating and affirming to the range and scope of the ontological field, to be more precisely what counts as reality through media and journalism. Because we are experiencing not the field of representation but the field of representability as a field by structured by the permission of the state. Therefore, it is problematic to aim to understand the field of representability which is constituted by the outside of the framework that the representation emerges by only examining the content. Thus, we need to consider this framework as something that is active, that constitutes the inside and the outside at the same moment quietly, that operates without a visible sign of operation (Butler, 2005). In this study, I use media to reach the discourse of political power and the mourners, instead of investigating media organs’ approach to the case of October 10. There were differences on considering the case in terms of different newspapers, but these differences are ignored since my research problem is not on this issue.

In this chapter, I take place the arguments on loss, grief and mourning, mostly those of Butler, and how I will operationalize these arguments for the case of October 10. Although the focus of this study is on grievability, therefore precariousness and precarity, I did not limit this chapter with only these conceptualizations, since I argue that other discussions on mourning and grief may include political clues regarding precariousness and precarity in Turkey. In the following chapter, I will narrate the methodology of the study.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I will elaborate the methodology of my study. Firstly, I will try to narrate why I choose the methodology of my study as discourse analysis, my aim is to indicate the connection of the theoretical background of my study to its methodology. Secondly, I mention about how I operationalize feminist research to my study and why I benefit from queer methodologies. Then, I will convey theoretical and methodological explanations about discourse analysis. After general discussions on discourse analysis, I will convey both the theoretical explanation of Critical Discourse Analysis and the reason why I use CDA in this study in the following part. After this narration, I narrate how I operationalize these methodological arguments and how I selected the data for my study. In the last sub-section of this chapter, I will mention about the methodological limitations of the study.

Butler asks a provocative question in the introduction chapter of *Excitable Speech 'On Linguistic Vulnerability'*; "Could language injure us if we were not, in some sense, linguistic beings, beings who require language in order to be?" (1997:1-2). Following Butler's theory of performativity and conceptualizations of the subject formation, I aim to unravel the 'linguistic survival' which refers to a specific kind of surviving that takes place in language regarding the case of October 10 (1997:2). In order to clarify what it meant to be 'linguistic survival', to be addressed in language, according to Butler, is not only about the being recognized for what one already is, but rather "to have the very term conferred by which the recognition of existence becomes possible." (1997:5). Taking discourse as something that sustains the 'life' itself and also threatens its existence open the road of discourse analysis as the main methodology of my study, attendantly.

I design my study with the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) for the analysis part, and I operationalize queer methodologies' insight of questioning normativity for the interpretation and integration to theory.

4.1 My Methodological Perspective: Reconsideration of Feminist Methodology and Embracement of Queer Methodologies

Although there is no agreement on what feminist research is, since the main arguments, common concerns and assumptions of feminist research and feminist methodologies are a central concern with gender, and I do not consider gender difference as problematic; I do not think that feminist methodology can fit my study's theoretical approach. However, I reconsider some key points of feminist research and they are the points that I paid attention throughout the study. The first argument is about that feminist research's concern of the exclusion of women's voices and experiences in the production of knowledge (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002). This is the point that I embrace as the exclusion of the voices and experiences of marginalized lives, both within normative framework of gender and other socio-political stances. Along with this point, the second point that I paid attention to is that the feminist research's critique of the concepts of knowledge, objectivity, and reasons of social worlds was produced by men and became the dominant view about the social (Husseini & Asad, 2012). This is the point that I tried to understand and explain with access to discourse within the notion of hegemony. The last point that I revised from the feminist research is that considering objectivity and neutrality as a masculine perspective to exercise power and control (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002). Following poststructuralist theory's notion of power/knowledge, I consider language as always already ideological and knowledge is always produced at a specific historical specific point, from a specific place, from certain subject positions, and by taking a specific recipient into the account. Because my study is not conducted data with participants, but texts and talks, feminist methodology's rejecting hierarchy claim between the researcher and the researcher are not interesting me for this study.

As Browne and Nash (2010) argue; since particular methodologies may not fit the conceptualization of queer theory, the methodologies which poststructuralist and

postmodernist theories provide such as some forms of feminist, anti-racist, or post-colonial studies can be selected as good companies in the research and the research process. If we consider the queer thinking claims that subjects and subjectivities are fluid, unstable, and perpetually becoming; gathering data from the 'field' may be problematic, and more important point is that we should design the trajectory of the research within anti-normative frameworks. Their suggestion, on the other hand; 'queer research', if there is, can position its methodology within conceptual frameworks that emphasize the instability of taken for granted meanings and resulting power relations (Browne & Nash, 2010). This inflection of perspectives approaches, and conceptualizations may dispute, rework, and reflect the tradition of knowledge production in these disciplines, as well. Queer theory is already in conversation with many scholarships, especially the ones which challenge the conceptualization of the modern Enlightenment subjects as rational, unified, and stable. Furthermore, these disciplines challenge so-called 'objective researcher' which rooted in 'the' objective truth (Browne & Nash, 2010).

Since I approach the subject as contingent, multiple, unstable, and constituted within historically, geographically, and socially specific relations; not as unified, coherent, and self-knowledgeable; I reject a representational theory of truth and the methodologies which grounds on this particular thinking. Within this frame, it is plausible to use various forms of discourse and textual analysis to consider how power relations are constituted and sustained in the constitution of the meanings of various marginal lives. Within the commentary of *the grid of cultural intelligibility*; I aim to unravel how is the ability to experience the variability of a self is embedded in power relations that limit and/or open up certain possibilities and not others. From this point of view, within an anti-normative queer framework, I take CDA as both a form of discourse analysis and cultural critique; and I aim to challenge and critique a host of taken for granted 'stabilities' in the social.

4.2 Discourse Analysis: Theoretical and Methodological Explanations

Although it is hard to trace the historical emergence of discourse analysis in the first place, we can say that from the beginning of public speech itself, its origins have been

settled. Since the language is not a neutral and transparent vehicle which some kind of knowledge is transmitted from one person to another, but is a ground in which meaning is created and changed; language is inseparable from the social phenomenon, therefore it can be used as an evidence of social phenomena (Taylor, 2013). Within this perspective, we can take discourse as ‘language as a form of social practice’, and the ground of integrating words, acts, values, attitudes, beliefs and social identities (Taylor, 2013). Another and maybe the most important point of discourse for my study is the constitutive relation of subject and discourse. As Butler states;

“If the subject who speaks is also constituted by the language that she or he speaks, then language is the condition of possibility for the speaking subject, and not merely its instrument of expression. This means that the subject has its own “existence” implicated in a language that precedes and exceeds the subject, a language whose historicity includes a past and future that exceeds that of the subject who speaks. And yet, this “excess” is what makes possible the speech of the subject.” (1997:28).

Discourse analysis does not refer to a single approach or method, but roots on a theory of how we use language to say things, do things and be things (Gee, 2011). In other words, this analysis takes the language utterances as a tool of analysis and through the analysis of language material, talk or written texts, the researcher tries to reach phenomena of society and how it functions. In this study, I take the language material of the political power and the mourners of October 10 as the data of the study and aim to reach how the relationship of political subjectivity and precarity has been operating in power relations regarding the case of October 10.

There are various approaches to take the language-in-use as a tool; some of them focus on the structure of the language, namely grammar-in-use and how it functions to make meaning, while others focus on the ‘content’ of the language, or the themes or the issues (Gee, 2011). In this point, it should be considered that different approaches fit the issue or the question better or worse than others, therefore, the researcher’s decision on what kind of analysis might contribute to the issue, what specific approach to use, and what data are appropriate to this analysis is needed. In other words, the framework depends on the researcher and the issue, since discourse analysis is always partial. To sum, while building a chain of argument, the researcher links a theory of how social worlds works, with a second theory, usually referred as methodology, how

material is collected and treated as the evidence of working that world, and the selection of these evidence to support an argument or to claim a new one (Taylor, 2013: 68).

From evidence to claims, the researcher should trace and develop an account of what is really happening in the talk or the text as functional and constitutive. When we consider that we are unable to detach language from its contexts, the investigation of language, meanings, resources, and practices, then, includes the details of how language varies across contexts and mark social difference (Taylor, 2013). Therefore, to trace the function of the talk or the text and exertion to examine the assumptions which underlie what is intended to say, is far from presenting an objective knowledge. To be more explicit, it is important to highlight that while we use language as evidence and reach a social reality within its meaning, we cannot get away from the fact that the meaning is always already cultural, and made itself familiar through the many experiences within the obligatory scheme of being part of a society. Hence, since its theoretical foundation challenges to the notion of simple and objective truth, discourse analysis is interpretative and depends on certain subjective premises; language is constitutive, and meanings are socially derived and situated, also negotiated and co-constituted, and language use is a functional social practice. From a Foucauldian perspective, in other words, 'discursive formation' is a form of knowledge which is inseparably linked to the workings of society (Taylor, 2013). It can be read as what we know does not necessarily is rooted from what we observe, rather, it is largely determined by already existing, and socially circulated knowledge. Therefore, the possibility of objective knowledge, namely the status of what 'is' or 'was', has been obliged to shift to what is generally known and accepted. Also, this is the point that we can reach what is taken for granted, and trace the priorities and values shared by members of the community.

The system of formation of meanings and the connections of those meanings to society indicate the power relations within society and normativity. That is to say, the rules and conventions that meaning cultivate do not determine directly the winners and losers within that power relations but constituted who has acted appropriately and

normally or not, therefore, being a ‘player’ in this playground itself depends on and seeds from the appropriate repetitions of these rules. Briefly, in using language, social goods are always at stake (Gee, 2011:7). When we consider that the politics is about how to distribute social goods in a society, language is always already ‘political’ in a critical sense.

J. P. Gee (2011) claims that the people who are talking and interacting with each other as the ‘carriers’ of the Discourse which one represent and enact. Following this argument, as it is stated that;

“The Discourses we enact existed before each of us came on the scene and most of them will exist long after we have left the scene. Discourses, through our words and deeds, have talked to each other through history, and, in doing so, form human history.” (Gee, 2011:35).

Yet, if we see the resignification as the only possibility of the agency of the speaking subject, then, I believe that we may resist or interrupt the existence of particular discourses before we will leave the scene. It may be the most important point of discourse for my political arguments is, in other words, the meanings and associations are not fixed. That means the meaning depends on and changes within context, more importantly, the meanings are constituted through what is ‘done’ (Taylor, 2013). That is to say, through repetitive and circulated practices and processes. In other words, language has to mean only in and through social practices (Gee, 2012:12). The mentioned practices always gain sense in a social group, culture, or an institution. Therefore, the enactment of these practices, also points out to the sustainment of these belongings. The message that I will draw from this argument is, undoubtedly, the politics of resignification through language utterances, namely the discourse. In order to clarify, in this study, I will pay attention to ‘bottom-up’ relations of resistance and compliance as well as ‘top-down’ relations of dominance.

4.3 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

As aforementioned, there is no single approach to discourse analysis, but many, Gee divides them into two general forms; descriptive and critical (2011). Critical Discourse

Analysis (CDA)¹³ does not aim to just to describe how language works or offer deep explanations about the structural functioning of language but aims to be concerned with and intervene in the linguistic characteristics of social and political problems. In other words, the researcher who will apply CDA takes an explicit position, and aim to understand, expose, and lastly resist social inequality from this explicit position (van Dijk, 2008). This aim, namely goes beyond observational, explanatory, descriptive stance of descriptive discourse analysis and rather take a socio-political one, is criticized by other discourse analysis approaches as ‘unscientific’. On the other hand, CDA analysts come with an argument that theory formation, description, and explanation are already socio-politically situated by nature. Following van Dijk, descriptively, to take CDA as a specific direction, school or specialization, or unitary theoretical framework next to the other approaches in discourse studies would be a mistake, since CDA aims to present a different ‘mode’ or ‘perspective’ of theorizing, analyzing, and application throughout the whole field (2008).

According to van Dijk, CDA

“is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context.” (2008:352).

The fact that CDA’s focus primarily on social problems and political issues, rather than on current paradigms or fashions, it shifts the concern of the analysis from the language’s semiotic and symbolic structures, to the linguistic characteristics of social and political problems. Then, the mode of analysis itself reveal the discursive strategies that legitimate, control and naturalize the social order, namely taken for granted inequality, and mention to need for change. Another feature of this point, an important one for me, is that empirically adequate critical analysis of social inequality problems needs a multidisciplinary perspective, rather than solely describe discourse structures (van Dijk, 2008). This study, i.e., tried to reach the unequal distribution of ‘life’ with the help of disciplines, such as gender studies, philosophy, politics, sociology, and discourse studies. Without these stances, the study may claim its

¹³ Hereafter, CDA will be used to refer Critical Discourse Analysis.

‘scientific’ objectivity respectively, but its compass may be narrower and may not reach the discursive management of public mind of ‘what makes a life grievable?’ Thus, it may not construe the ways particular discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge the relations of power and dominance that decides who can count as human. In this point, I want to highlight that, the question that I want to answer, and the theoretical foundation which I follow throughout the thesis, do not concern with the ‘objective’ contextualization of ‘human’, ‘life’, hence ‘the subject’, and not interested in to come up with a ‘scientific’ resolution from ‘nowhere’. Such a stance may be seen as ‘political’ (biased) and ‘unscientific’ (subjective), however, again, this study does not aim to reproduce objective and nonbiased knowledge about the social reality but criticize the knowledge production which undertakes the way that serves to sustain status quo.

Another important conceptual framework of CDA is that discourse as macro vs. micro level of social order. Van Dijk states that micro-level of the social order includes language use, discourse, verbal interaction, and communication, while the macro-level includes power, dominance, and inequality between social groups (2008). In this point, CDA has to constitute a theoretical bridge between macro and micro approaches. For example, a misogynist or homophobic speech at the parliament is a discourse at the micro level of social interaction in the specific situation of a debate, on the other hand, it is the enactment, constitution, or reproduction of sexism at the macro level. Many studies which apply CDA, according to van Dijk, deal with

“the discursively enacted or legitimated structures and strategies of dominance and resistance in social relationships of class, gender, ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, language, religion, age, nationality, and world-region.” (1995:18).

Following Butler’s terminology, I take them all as ‘the cultural intelligibility’ which is the matrix of, as I considered, some kind of transsectionality of all these possessions or relations.

Another point that van Dijk highlight within the aims of CDA, is the revealing, uncovering, and disclosing what is implicit, hidden, or not straightly obvious in relations of discursively enacted hegemony and their underlying ideologies (1995). Thus,

“CDA specifically focus on the strategies of *manipulation*, *legitimation*, the *manufacture of consent* and other discursive ways to influence the minds (and directly the actions) of people in the interest of the powerful.” (1995:18).

In other words, when focusing socio-political problems, we should meet the need of the details about how such forms of inequality are expressed, enacted, legitimated, and reproduced by the particular discourse. Following this argument, I focus on the differential allocation of grievability, and I aim to unravel how the discourse of political power that has been uttered at the process of grief express, enact or reproduce this inequality and how can we find the clues of precarity which is exposed to the particular community of October 10 at this discourse.

The last point that I want to emphasize about the concerns of CDA is that the access to discourse. Access or control over public discourse needs to be seen as an important ‘symbolic’ resource in the case of circulating knowledge and information (van Dijk, 1996). On the other hand, we can come to a point from here is that lack of active or controlled access to discourse is a ‘symbol’ of lack of power, and it cannot be thought without the immediate enactment of dominance in course of limiting the ‘discourse rights’ of ‘the other’. Therefore, the discourse structure itself “is a segregated structure” (van Dijk, 1993:260). Furthermore, the people who have access to create and circulate discourse in a particular point, such as political propagandists, advertisers, or journalists have practical experiences to foresee what kinds of messages will have what kind of effects (van Dijk, 1995). According to van Dijk, the access is an interesting but also a vague analytical notion, because of a surprising parallelism between social power and discourse access (1993). Since, the discursive reproduction of hegemony has two major dimensions, namely that of production and reception, what kind of social action will result from such a mind control, again, points out to the meanings that are constituted through what is ‘done’. Furthermore, the access to discourse, within the help of practical experiences, some strategies are attained to postulate structures within more general and abstract knowledge, beliefs, opinions, ideologies or attitudes. As he considers the crucial implication of the correlation between power and access and control over discourse not merely as “social action control, but also and primarily that it implies the conditions of control over the minds

of other people, that is, the management of social representations”, the echo of the cultural intelligibility is constituted within these managements (van Dijk, 1993:257). For instance, strategic generalizations in discourse (this always happens like that, they are all the same) have a power to shift the provisional situations to more abstract group attitudes and prejudices (van Dijk, 1995). Thus, to constitute some kind of specific local coherence between past and present, thereby future makes it easier to attribute negative properties to ‘the other’ and positive ones to ‘us’. It will be the point that I draw ‘the constitutive outside’ in political discourse. Following Judith Butler, I focused on the ‘linguistic conditions of survivable subjects’ which refers to being recognizable in a prior sense and enacts itself in a discursive ritual often through exclusion (1997:5).

Van Dijk sees the mind control as another fundamental way to reproduce dominance and hegemony within the CDA framework and focuses on contextual and discursive conditions of mind control. In other words, in a specific situation, “who is allowed to say/write/hear/read what to/from whom, where, when and how” must be stressed in the analysis (1993:257). He claims that in a specific context, certain meanings and forms of discourse work much better to influence people’s minds (van Dijk, 2008). As van Dijk defines context as “the mentally represented structure of those properties of the social situation that are relevant for the production or comprehension of discourse”, it includes overall definition of the specific situation, setting, ongoing actions, as well as some mental representation; i.e., goals, knowledge, opinions, attitudes, and ideologies, the ‘reflection’ of context is crucial in the enactment of power (2008:356).

Consequently, I choose CDA as a special approach in discourse analysis that primarily focuses on the discursive conditions, components, and consequences of power abuse by dominant groups and institutions. I will try to reach a special form of inequality, namely the grievability and livability is expressed, represented, legitimated, circulated, and reproduced in text and talk. While focusing discursive dimension of power abuse and inequality, I do not aim to contribute to discourse theory; but interested in primarily a better understanding of livable and grievable life through discourse analysis. Following CDA, I also aim to reach a point within the relation of discourse

and power. Tracing upon discursive strategies of power, in my sight, is a way of denaturalizing the social order, not merely seeing ‘natural’ and ‘subtle’ forms of hegemony and regarding them as ‘it has been always like that’. In other words, I aimed to isolate ideology in discourse.

4.4 Selection of the Texts and Operationalization of CDA

In this study, I select the online newspapers to reach the discourses of October 10 Terrorist Attack, Ankara. 147 web pages related to the case that is published on the internet between 1st of October and 31st of October are scanned. I intended to reach first reflections of the case, therefore I limit the date range within a month. To reach the judicial process, I scanned the newspapers apart from this process. The cause of selecting documents from the 1st of October is to reach calling texts of Peace and Democracy Rally. I use official web pages of newspapers to reach the political discourses and mourning narratives. I scanned and selected the related pages within official web pages of national newspapers; Evrensel, Birgün, Radikal, Cumhuriyet, Sabah, Akşam, Vatan, Hürriyet, Milliyet; official web pages of news channels; CNN Turk and NTV; independent news portals; Diken, Mynet, Haberler, Çağdaşlar; and official Turkish web pages of international newspapers; BBC, Aljazeera.

In my study, I operationalized CDA both to analyze the context in which text is produced and the text in itself. Therefore, I use Contextual Model of CDA to do access analysis, intertextual analysis, and genre analysis. However, I focus on Textual Model of CDA to analyze texts. While analyzing, I consider *local meanings* (presuppositions, allusions, vagueness, certainty, implicitness), *main categories of local meanings* (criminalization, discrimination, exclusion), *level of specificity and degree of completeness* (descriptions in terms of complete, detailed, less complete, abstract level), *rhetoric and style* (argumentation, alliteration, metaphors, hyperbole, rhetorical questions, parallelism, comparisons, ironies, us/them comparisons, structural emphasis), and *anaphora* (the use of pronouns).

4.5 Limitations of The Study

Firstly, I used the translated data; this may be one of the most crucial limitations of my study. Since the meaning can be lost in translation, I gave the place the original texts in the footnotes to hinder this limitation.

Secondly, since the data is very extensive both for the political discourses and the mourning narratives and to limit the length, I gave the place some of these texts. To overcome the problem, links of full texts will be available in the references part.

Thirdly, since my perspective is not objective while analyzing the texts, I used openly the pronoun of 'I' and I do not want to passivate myself. In other words, my subjective view, which is rooted in the theory and method, can be classified as another limitation of the thesis.

CHAPTER 5

RESISTANCE TO PRECARITY

In this chapter, I elaborate October 10 Labor, Peace and Democracy Rally as a resistant act of the precarious group to the precarity which they are exposed to. My aim is to operationalize Butler's most recent writings on the performative theory of assembly for the October 10 Rally and provide the background of how the precarious group which I am dealing with speaks politically from 'the outside', how these utterances signal to precarity, and how they perform the counter power on the warfare, in other words, differential distribution of precarity. In accordance with this purpose, firstly, I mention about Butler's notes on the performative theory of assembly and how October 10 Labor, Peace and Democracy Rally could be read by the help of this theory. Within this scope, I will analyze the call texts of the rally and focus on the precariousness and the political subjectivity of the gatherers.

In *Frames of War*, Butler asks two questions in order to query the question of social transformation related to differential distribution of recognizability and of apprehending life: "What might be done to produce a more egalitarian set of conditions for recognizability?", and "What might be done, in other words, to shift the very terms of recognizability in order to produce more radically democratic results?" (2009:6). This is the first point where I connect Butler's discussions on livability and precariousness and the case of October 10, because I argue that Butler herself provides one of the possible answers to these questions with appearance of precarious groups in the public space and form the public space as such, therefore to interfere in the grid of cultural intelligibility.

Butler's most recent work *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly* which is published in 2015 consists of different articles which links the issues of the body, the right to appear, and political meaning of 'we' in the performative theory of assembly. She openly states the thesis of the book as "none of us acts without the conditions to

act, even though sometimes we must act to install and preserve those very conditions.” (2015: 16). Butler starts with a basic question to her argument ‘Who really are ‘the people’?’ and she queries for the performative framing and formation of the term. Since ‘the people’ always in the process of becoming, she queries how the alliance between precarious groups change and reform its meaning to a more inclusive direction. The inclusion of one group to the ‘we’ is not the aim of radical democratic politics, Butler focuses on the performative formation of the ‘we’ and suggests that to keep it open to debate. Butler takes the “the process of naming and renaming of renewing what we mean by ‘the people’ and what various people mean when they invoke that term” and the openness of the term itself resist the act of delimitation of the power on that term (2015:6). What differentiates Butler’s conceptualization of the assembly from the others is linking it with the theory of performativity. To clarify, she takes assembly both “the activity of self-constitution in the public sphere and the constitution of the public sphere as a condition of appearance” (2015:19). Regarding October 10 Labor, Peace and Democracy Rally, I argue that the people which have gathered in front of the Central Railway Station could form the Sıhhiye Square as a place which one of the precarious groups in Turkey gathers and utters political inferences and demands. Similarly, the appearance in the public sphere regarding the mourning rituals, strikes, and protests, which will be discussed in the following chapter, the precarious group sustains the performative formation of ‘we’ and the public sphere as a place where ‘the people’ mourns for ‘the ungrievable’.

While in earlier writings, Butler’s conceptualization of the body is based on its formation in discourse, its vulnerability, and its publicity; this book takes it the compulsory tool for the enactment of assembly and its potential to ally to each other and signify the appearance in the public space in neither discursive nor prediscursive ways. When the unintelligible body appears on the public, it subversively repeats its hegemonic constitution in incapability to appear, gather, and resist, and the body does the enactment with its disposition as vulnerable. In my opinion, when the bodies ally, the interdependency of each other turns out from vulnerability into something else, which we might call apprehension of the vulnerability, and enacts the primary interdependence to ethical responsibility. Moreover, when bodies become a part of the

plural embodiment, not only claim the equality but enact the notion of equality by equally stand with each other (Butler, 2015). In this chapter, I will elaborate this discussion and claim that the bodies which have gathered in the public sphere on October 10 were already exposed to precarity, therefore they gathered. On the other hand, they intended to transform their precarity to the alliance, since the appearance of thousands of bodies in the public sphere with their vulnerability is significant if we consider that exposure to precarity is actualizing through the body. In other words, their bodily resistance was for changing the normative terms which determine 'what is livable'.

Those people who act from and against precarity bring a preestablished collectivity into being and a new 'we' come into existence, a 'we' based on a shared precarity within different forms. Even though women, queers, children, elder people, disabled people, poor, immigrants, ethnic, racial, sexual and religious minorities are subjected to different forms of marginalization and all of them deal with their own way, an alliance of the groups question the marginalization itself and point out its possibility to other precarious groups. Then, the alliance becomes taking the plural responsibility and have the power to call a livable life for all. Therefore, it leads to an ethics of cohabitation based on precariousness and those people always have the answer of 'why we care the life of the other'. But it is not a single or unified will, this demand means the possibility of different futures for every one of them, in other words, the right to have rights. Because the sense of freedom comes from not the one or the other but happens within a relationship between them, a different form of the sense of freedom may be enacted, also in the alliance. In the following sub-section, I will give the place the call texts of October 10 Labor, Peace and Democracy Rally. As it could be understood from the calling texts, this assembly was organized by different fractions of the Left-wing parties and organizations and the representatives of the organizations who expressed the callings speak on behalf of different minorities. Besides, they invite both organized and disorganized people to the assembly, from my perspective, they invite those whose lives are exposed to precarity by the political power of Turkey. Therefore, I consider that this assembly was supposed to form a new 'we' with the

gathering itself, but a new ‘we’ came to existence within the process of mourning and it will be discussed in the following chapter.

In my interpretation, Butler takes the grid of cultural intelligibility as the site of who counts as ‘human’ and the appearance on the public space as the subversive repetition of that very term. Then, to demand a livable life, all those who are apprehended as ‘unlivable’ gathers and form the plural existence in public space, the indispensability of those people becomes the key to change the grid of cultural intelligibility. This change, however, not a change as always, but have the potential to reveal its instability and open its normativity and its very power to normalize particular versions of the human over the others into question. In other words, when the unintelligible ones form a group, they triggered to the space of appearance to one another. Therefore, they become intelligible to one another, the bodily alliance between precarious groups will undermine the hegemonic norms of intelligibility. Eventually, they enacted the resignification of ‘the people’. For this study, I consider this argument as the point which intersects the precarity which is exposed to the precarious group who has gathered on October 10, the political normativity which forms them at the ‘outside’ of the hegemonic political intelligibility, and their act of resistance to change the direction or transform the normative presuppositions of intelligibility. In other words, I elaborate this assembly as the precarious group’s act of counter-power on precarity.

As aforementioned in the introduction chapter, in 2015, the people in Turkey witnessed a conflictual and painful process. After the parliamentary election of 7 June 2015 that has been held in an environment of various challenges, AKP failed to win the parliamentary majority and the results restrained AKP’s single-party rule for the first time in 13 years. The outcome of the elections was followed by the debates on different possibilities of coalitional formation and the possibility of an early election. The opposition parties failed to form a coalition, and a snap election was sighted on the horizon. In an environment of growing polarization in society, conflictual external affairs with Syria, and massive tension of the Eastern and Southeastern parts of the country, Turkey was going for another election.

5.1 Calling of Labor, Peace, and Democracy

As mentioned earlier, mass demonstrations and public assemblies could be considered as one of the most effective ways of collective bargaining with the existing political trajectory. In order to pose a challenge to a certain regime, a particular political decision, or just to enact freedom and to engage in political self-determination, bodies gather in the public space and make the public space ‘public’, in other words, they evoke that it is ‘for the people’. However, who really are the ‘people’? Who is considered as ‘speaking subject’ in the political arena, and who can be the part of ‘what is happening’? In this study, October 10 Labor, Peace and Democracy Rally is elaborated as a point which we can search for the answers to these questions, regarding Turkey’s political atmosphere in 2015.

I want to start this subsection by reminding the political and social atmosphere before 1st of November Parliamentary Elections, aforementioned. This period might be construed as a state where a war cry was uttered, in other words, it was an effort to differentially distribute precariousness and convert it to precarity for particular communities. After Gezi Park Protests, not only sudden assemblies but also the significant demonstrations that have been held on certain days, such as 1st of May, 8th of March, and Pride were banned by the justification of insecurity. Just to clarify, there was an effort and it was succeeded so much that the public appearance of precarious and opposition groups was intimidating. The act of democratic resistance to precariousness was tried to enact, but it did not succeed because of the fact that the act of voting had the risk of untransferrability, as aforementioned. Approximately 3 months before October 10, the meeting of Federation of Socialist Youth Associations at Suruç was held to assist the reconstruction of Kobani which was attacked by suicide bombers and where 31 young activists lost their lives and 104 of them were injured¹⁴.

¹⁴ Kobani is a city in the northern part of Syria, and it was the battle place where the Islamic State militants and Kurdish fighter fight since September 2014. In the early days of 2015, Kurdish fighters regained the control of the town with the help of air strikes led by the US army. In that time, IS forced more than 100.00 civilians in Kobani to move to Turkey. Homes, schools, and hospitals was ruined during the battle, and there was no residential area for the people who will return to Kobani. The activists of Federation of Socialist Youth Associations meet at Suruç in 20th of July, 2015 - Suruç is a rural city of Şanlıurfa Province in Turkey, and it is near to Syrian border – to go to Kobani and help the rebuilding of the town.

At such a time, some left-wing parties, unions, confederations, foundations, associations, artists and journalists made a call of a rally. From my point of view, it was a rally where not only the members of such organizations but also everyone who aims for social transformation was invited. Even if it had not ended up with such an unfortunate close, it was an assembly that would resound at Turkey in such a period of time. In that, it was a meeting that was held to demand the other's right to live, in other words, not just to resist their own vulnerability, but at the same time, to aim to reinvigorate the shared beliefs of different groups. Above all, it had the capacity to portray what kind of an alliance might be formed within all these precarious ensembles. In a sense, the organizations undertook the duty of reminding the fact that no minority suffering from discrimination can sense freedom until all other discriminated minorities are free. To sum, this rally actualized when the public appearance of precarious communities had been dying away, the vulnerability and mortality of the bodies in the street had been clearly seen, the government had been in a serious trouble to provide security and protection of the bodies in the assemblies, and some groups had been pushed to precarity insistently by the political power. In this part, the call texts and talks of October 10 Labor, Peace and Democracy Rally is analyzed within the determined contexts of the power of people against dictatorship; demanding of peace and resistance to politics of war; basic ethical and political claims, such as equality, freedom, democracy; emphasis on precarity and living humanely. Also, the connotation of precious pains is articulated to the emphasis on precarity. Lastly, the constitution of the 'we' is analyzed within the frame of radical democracy.¹⁵¹⁶ Following CDA, a textual model analysis is made with the focus of *rhetoric and style, anaphora, and local meanings*.

5.1.1 Power of Peoples Against Dictatorship

It might be discussed that, contrary to the dominant political discourse of AKP, the absence of the power of people is seen as one of the basic aims of the assembly. As

¹⁵ Since different points are emphasized in the same quotations, the quotations are cited repeatedly.

¹⁶ Because the call texts were placed only in some newspapers, the diversity of resource could not have ensured in this part of the analysis. However, I hope that it might be a reminder of the role of the media as a mechanism that operates for differential distribution of what can be seen.

aforementioned, the assembly itself is an enactment of direct political participation before it utters any demand. As it can be seen in the following quotations, the representatives of the organizations express that ‘being in public space’ is first with the purpose of the enactment of the collective resistance. Another emphasis here is ‘var gücümüzle’ which can be translated as ‘again’, and I take this emphasis into consideration as a connotation of being in the public space by taking the risks of the vulnerability of the bodies. What is more, it makes sense that these political subjects reveal their ultimate agency in order to sustain their lives. Another note is that the utterance of “adına” which can be translated as “on behalf of” might be interpreted as a connotation of representation, which is a problematic issue, on the other hand, it might be embraced as the aggregation of different groups at the root of precariousness:

“Against the dictatorship that AKP government tries to carry out, we will be on the streets with all our strength for the power of people.” (Representatives of Organizations / Evrensel, 1st of October 2015)¹⁷

“We call for everyone to come to Ankara on October 10 on behalf of those saying ‘Sultanate’ order to be destroyed/ People will win!” (Oya Ersoy, Chairwoman of Halkevleri / Evrensel, 10th of October, 2015)¹⁸

5.1.2 The Demand of Peace against the Politics of War

The point which has been emphasized most both in the call texts and the discourses that have been circulated by the chief mourners after the attack is the demand of peace and resistance to the politics of war. At this junction, following Butler, I consider war precisely as “an effort to minimize precariousness for some and to maximize it for others” (2009:54). Following Butler (2004, 2009), we might say that today’s wars are started both to activate differential distribution of precariousness and to protect the right to live of the privileged groups from those who are unlivable. From this perspective, when we consider the wars as the very act of separating the lives into two domains, grievable and ungrievable, we might take the resisters into consideration as the embodied critiques of this differential distribution of grief, hence ‘life’. On the

¹⁷ “AKP iktidarının yürütmeye çalıştığı diktatörlük iktidarına karşı, halkların iktidarı için var gücümüzle alanda olacağız.”

¹⁸ “Saray düzeni yıkılacak ve halklar kazanacak diyenler adına 10 Ekim’de herkesi Ankara’ya çağırıyoruz.”

other hand, the act of interpreting peace movements as anachronistic and nostalgic is becoming a part of the effort of their marginalization, in other words, a part of the maintenance of this differential allocation.

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation)

As the word, ‘peace’ is located in the name of the rally itself, and since it is emphasized with its urgency, it might be deduced that there are a deep suspicion and worry for the continuance of the act of transforming precariousness to precarity for certain populations. The clarity of the need of peace is reflected as something which is incontrovertible, besides, the issue of whether or not it will be registered as a claim appears as another suspicion:

“Calls for the ‘Against War Peace Right Now! Labor, Peace and Democracy Rally’ which will take place in Ankara on 10th of October continues.” (Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)¹⁹

“We will be in the rally together with the institutions demanding the war to be ended.” (Mehmet Soğancı – Chairman of TMMOB / Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)²⁰

“When we even look at the agenda of Turkey in the last few weeks, it is obvious how much we need peace, freedom, and democracy.” (Selma Gürkan – Chairwoman of EMEP / Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)²¹

“I hope that this conflicting period will end in a short time, and we may turn the need of peace into a demand..” (Öztürk Türkoğlu – Chairman of İHD/ Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)²²

This assembly is appraised as one step of a wider resistance, in other words, there is a manifested fight. However, this fight is not between equals. The fact that fight is not between equals leads us to a paradoxical point; the fight which does not run on between equals, is performed against inequality by the ones who demand equality:

¹⁹ “10 Ekim’de Ankara’da düzenlenecek olan ‘Savaşa İnat Barış Hemen Şimdi! Emek, Barış, Demokrasi Mitingi’ öncesi çağrılar sürüyor.”

²⁰ “..savaşın durmasını.. isteyen kurumlarla birlikte 10 Ekim’deki mitingde olacağız.”

²¹ “Son birkaç haftalık gündeme bile baktığımızda Türkiye’de barışa, özgürlüğe, demokrasiye ne kadar ihtiyacımız olduğu açık.”

²² “Bu çatışmalı süreç umarım kısa zamanda sona erer ve barış ihtiyacını bir talep haline getiririz.”

“We fight for something. It is the fight of those who want peace, serenity, and equality against the ones carrying out the war politics. (Prof. Dr. Özden Şener – Secretary General of TTB / Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)²³

Another emphasis within the utterances of demanding peace is on life and death. The state which is exposed to certain lives by the political power is directed against it by using the metaphor of ‘cehennem’ which means ‘hell’, and it might be considered as a reference to the consideration of these lives not quite as a ‘life’. The first connotation of this quotation for me is a very important question that is uttered by Judith Butler with reference to Adorno: “Can one lead a good life in a bad life?” (2015:193). The state of unsustainability of a good life by oneself leads us to a very critical ethical point; the effort to sustain a life in a world which is structured within inequality, injustice, exploitation, and trivialization of life itself;

“We are struggling altogether for the resistance against a life transformed into hell by the government. (Erkan Baş – Member of HTKP Central Committee / Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)²⁴

At this junction, the emphasis on death could be interpreted as an effort of organizing life in a limbo between precariousness and precarity. The metaphor of ‘ok’, which means ‘arrow’, is used to point to the government’s power to kill and abandonment to death, in other words leaving them to precarity. At this particular point, the necessity of sustainment of life within a series of power actions which is subjected to the differential valuation of life itself, is trying to transform to a demand with the public appearance, and this community is doing it with the awareness of their own precariousness:

“... We are standing just across an arrow, actually across the death. (Sibel Uzun – Chairwoman of EHP / Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)²⁵

Local Meanings

²³ “Biz bir kavga veriyoruz. Savaş politikası yürütenlere barış, huzur, eşitlik isteyenlerin kavgası”

²⁴ “İktidar tarafından cehenneme çevrilen bir hayata karşı direnişin mücadelesini hep birlikte veriyoruz.”

²⁵ “... Biz okun sivri ucunun tam karşısında, ölümün karşısında duruyoruz.”

When we look at the usage of the words ‘barış’ (peace) and ‘savaş’ (war), in the statements of invitations and specification of the goals of the rally, with which words and with what emphasis, we can apprehend the mental map and ideological structure of the discourse. In the call texts, the word ‘war’ is uttered remarking the urgency of its being stopped. Besides, it is expressed most with the metaphors of ‘kirli’ which means ‘dirty’, ‘kan’ which means blood, ‘silah’ which means gun, and ‘saray’ which means ‘palace’ which were used by opposition groups in order to point to AKP in general, R. T. Erdoğan in particular;

“Urgently stop the deaths – To stop this war – To say no to war and assimilation – A dirty war plan – To say no to the dirty and bloody war of the Palace– Sultanate and war policies of the Palace – Bloody plans of the war lobby – to end shedding the blood - the one who wants to stop bloodshed as soon as possible – after the guns were silenced.”²⁶

The word ‘peace’, on the other hand, is used for the constitution of the political subjectivity of the attendees and invitees of the assembly. Moreover, it is used with connotations of interpellation; ‘ses’ (voice), ‘çağrı’ (call), ‘çığlık’ (scream). Lastly, it is attracted the attention that ‘peace’ is uttered toward something which should be established and sustained;

“those who advocate peace against war – everyone demanding peace – those whose heart beating for peace – we are here for peace – Peace right now – Speak up for peace – Amplify the peace call – Amplify the scream for peace – Never give up peace – Providing peace in Turkey – our establishment of peace – providing constant peace – long live peace”²⁷

When we sum up these utterances integrally, it is understood what message was tried to be transferred to the invitees and made public, and also how the discourse was built; the people who called for the rally constituted themselves as people who had the knowledge of who started this war, they situated themselves as against that war, who

²⁶ “Ölümleri bir an önce durdurmamız - Bu savaşı durdurabilmek - Savaşa hayır ve asimilasyona hayır demek için - Kirli bir savaş planı - sarayın kirli ve kanlı savaşına hayır demek için - Sarayın saltanatı ve savaş politikaları - savaş lobisinin kanlı planları - akıtılan kardeş kanının son bulması - kan dökülmesinin bir an evvel durmasını isteyen - Silahlar sustuktan sonra”

²⁷ “savaşa karşı barışı savunanlar - barış isteyen herkes- Yüreği barıştan yana atanlar - Barış için varız- Barış hemen şimdi - Barışa ses - barış çağrısını yükseltmek - barış çığlığını yükseltmek - barıştan asla vazgeçmemek - Türkiye’de barışın tesis edilmesi - barışı tesisi etmemiz - kalıcı barış sağlanması - Yaşasın Barış”

called for peace urgently, and who aimed for the establishment and sustainment of the peace.

5.1.3 Key Ethical Demands

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation)

When we look at the press release of the president of the left-wing Labor Party, which is one of the calling parties, we can see that other basic ethical demands except peace demand are emphasized as the fundamental necessities for making life a ‘livable’ life. Before these basic ethical demands are raised, the ‘unlivable’ life is constituted with all those who do not uphold the politics of AKP; taking this perspective into consideration, we can deduce that these lives became ‘the object of violence’, and it constituted with the word ‘hedef’ which means ‘target’. The argumentation takes ‘peace’ as the initial point, and it is sustained by stressing the basic ethical claims that could not happen without the other. In order to clarify, it becomes obvious that we can not cite the existence of life without reference to the existence of the basic concepts that will guarantee the right to live and the operations of power;

“Anyone who does not think like AKP became a target now..We know that without peace and without an order in which equal rights of people and believes are provided democracy is not possible. And without democracy we know that any right and freedom, particularly of labor, will not be guaranteed. There is an urgent need for democracy, peace, freedom, equality of believes and securing the rights. (Selma Gürkan – Chairwoman of EMEP / Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)²⁸

Local Meanings

At the level of selection of the vocabulary, basic ethical claims are constituted as feeders for the struggle and also for each other. It is emphasized that the country lacks these basic issues at present, and these issues are expressed as things to be developed;

“The one who gives importance to the justice – struggle for democracy and freedom – Missing a country where there is a rule of truth – advancing

²⁸ “AKP gibi düşünmeyen herkes hedef haline gelmiş durumda...Barış olmadan halkların ve inançların eşit haklarının tesis edilmediği bir düzen olmadan demokrasi olmayacağını biliyoruz. Demokrasi olmadan da emeğin hak ve özgürlükleri başta olmak üzere bütün hak ve özgürlüklerin güvence altına alınamayacağını biliyoruz. Acil demokrasiye, barışa, özgürlüğe, inanç eşitliğine, hakların güvence altına alınmasına ihtiyaç var.”

democracy which advocates the values of labor – advancing the rights and freedoms – advancing the democracy – free media ”²⁹

5.1.4 Precarity and The Conditions of ‘Livable’ Life

As mentioned before, we can apprehend a life apart from the frames in which that life is given. This recognition does not only mean cognition, but it also points out to the necessary conditions for the survival of those lives. In political formation, on the other hand, the precarious groups resist to those conditions in which their life is constituted as ‘unlivable’ by the knowledge of these conditions which are not static entities, but producible and reproducible social conditions and relations.

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation)

The texts which indicate that these groups are in a state of deprivation of social and economic support also establish their lives as framed within the risk of injury and exposure to violence, as well as the object of arbitrary state violence. In doing so, an intense community emphasis is expressed; the texts point out to a political community as those are subjected to the conditions that push them to precarity, the possibility of political and social transformation and resistance are expected exactly from this particular political agency;

“There is an urgent need to secure the rights. (Selma Gürkan - Chairwoman of EMEP / Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)³⁰

“We are experiencing the most severe conditions of a palace coup. (Erkan Baş – Member of HTKP Central Committee / Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)³¹

“All sections of society are wanted to be captured. (Erkan Baş - Member of HTKP Central Committee / Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)³²

²⁹ “adalete önem veren - demokrasi ve özgürlük mücadelesi - Doğrunun egemen olacağı bir ülke özlemi - emeğin değerlerini savunan demokrasinin gelişmesi - hak ve özgürlüklerin geliştirilmesi - demokrasinin geliştirilmesi - özgür medya”

³⁰ “Acil, hakların güvence altına alınmasına ihtiyaç var.”

³¹ “Bir saray darbesinin en ağır koşullarını yaşıyoruz.”

³² “Toplumun bütün kesimleri esir alınmak isteniyor.”

“If the system is attacking all of us, we are going through a period which we will have a total struggle. (Fadime Türkyılmaz – Secretary General of Alevi Bektaşî Federation / Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)³³

Local Meanings

It has already been mentioned before that the ‘human’ has become a category that is often used in political and ethical claims and demands, and which is uttered by subaltern groups. In the call texts of the rally, the word ‘insan’ which means human is uttered with reference to the conditions of livability in order to evoke equality and to oppose the specific procedures of exclusion, subordination, and dehumanization. The binary opposition of death and life is also used together with the opposition of ‘defiance and defense. Another emphasis on this use is the blessing of death. This, undoubtedly, awakens in minds the strategy of reconstructing the value of particular lives by blessing their deaths, which is used by political powers;

“Providing a life within humanitarian conditions – advocating life while refusing to bless the death – in favor of humanity”³⁴

5.1.5 Reference to Previous Pains

Another highlight that emerged in the calls texts is the reference to previous pains. I would like to point out the fact that the particular subject positions which have the potential to possess political agencies cannot be considered independent from the suffering that is previously experienced. The precarity of individuals in their personal and collective histories has led them to raise their awareness of the precariousness of life to a significant degree and to provide the agency to act for other precarious groups which have become the object of political violence.

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation)

As mentioned in the first quotation, peoples in Turkey have witnessed series of acts that distribute precariousness differentially in recent years. Despite the fact that the mentioned events are in different contexts - ethnic, social change demand, worker

³³ “Sistem hepimize topyekûn saldırıyorsa topyekûn mücadele edeceğimiz günlerden geçiyoruz.”

³⁴ “insanca koşullarda yaşamın tesis edilmesi - ölümü kutsamayı reddedip yaşamı savunmak - insandan yana olan”

insecurity - the experience of suffering is expressed as ‘our’ by the organizing groups. This, in fact, opens the door for us to extract the interpretation that the unequal distribution of precariousness of life is not static, but reproducible, and it can direct towards other groups at any moment. In the second quotation, we see that a certain religious minority group, namely ‘Alevis’, describe their history as the history of suffering. With reference to these pains, the discourse unites the act of being in public with that of standing against the violence towards the other groups which demand basic ethical issues by using the metaphor ‘çocuk’ which means ‘child’ and has generally been accepted as the connotation of the state of innocence and vulnerability in cultural rhetoric in order to point the groups, and the metaphor of ‘kurşun’ which means ‘bullet’ to refer to political violence, especially militarism. For the last quotation, we can say that the pain of war is expressed with the utterance of ‘akıtılan kardeş kanı’ which can be translated as ‘shedding blood of siblings’ and it emphasized the rising polarization of the peoples;

“Turkey has gone through many sorrows: Roboski, deaths in Gezi Resistance, Soma Massacre and so on. October 10 is a milestone against the policies carried out by the political power. (Sibel Uzun – Chairwoman of EHP / Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)³⁵

“History of Alevis is the history of sorrows. While as Alevis our hearts beat for the independence of peace, democracy, and labor, we will be on the streets against the guns directed to children. (Fadime Türkyılmaz - Secretary General of Alevi Bektaşî Federation / Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)³⁶

“We are ready to take responsibility today like how we did previously in order to stop this war in the society and to prevent the occurrence of greater sorrows. (Memiş Sarı - DİSK Aegean District Representative / Evrensel, 1st of October, 2015)³⁷

5.1.6 Constitution of the ‘We’

Finally, in this subsection, the focus is on how the callers describe themselves apparently by using the pronoun ‘we’, who are invited and how that is, how the ‘we’

³⁵ “Türkiye çok büyük acılar yaşadı. Roboskî, Gezi şehitleri, Soma ve diğerleri bizim için büyük acılar oldu. Siyasal iktidarın yürüttüğü politikalara karşı 10 Ekim bir milattır.”

³⁶ “Alevilerin tarihi acıların tarihidir. Biz Alevilerin yüreği barış, demokrasi, emeğin egemenliği için atarken çocuklara dönen kurşunlara karşı alanlarda olacağız.”

³⁷ “Bizler; akıtılan kardeş kanının son bulması, daha büyük acılar yaşanmasının önüne geçilmesi için dün olduğu gibi bugün de görev ve sorumluluk almaya hazırız”

is constituted. Butler states that in the article *Bodies in Alliance and The Politics of the Street* which is placed in *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly*, the rights which bodies gather on the streets in favor of, are plural rights, but that plurality cannot be framed only by identity. It is further argued that the embodied act of gathering in the public space itself is an act which expands what is meant by the 'we' (2015:66). It is worth remembering at this point, life is actualized with our interdependence on other people, and the subject is formed by this mutual recognition. However, there is a situation in which a new ethical understanding that emerged from and imposed by neoliberalism. The emergence of neo-liberal ethic imposes upon people as reconstitution of the concept of responsibility; that is taking responsibility only for themselves, notably to become economically self-sufficient. Taking this perspective also leads to a situation where the understanding of the interdependence, namely the alliance between precarious groups is trivialized. When the appearance of precarious groups in the public space is at stake, this form of resistance itself, in fact, becomes a resistance against this new ethical conception which is imposed on the majority of people all around the world. The call texts of 'Labor, Peace, Democracy' rally explicitly state their focus on the impossibility of salvation by oneself and emphasize the interdependent tendency of resistance.

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation)

The emphasis on precariousness, which is clearly expressed in the texts of the call of the rally, emerges in the warfare that the political power has started on them according to the precarious group's claim, namely the exposure of precarity. It is stated that it is no longer impossible to make a sound at the political atmosphere created and that resistance is considered as a right against these politics. In other words, anyone who finds the solution to the problem of political participation in a series of nonviolent resistance acts is invited to this assembly. The formation of 'we', which is based on the critique of state violence, does not consider one form of freedom above the other or does not claim that one can really experience without the other, no matter what kind of freedom is being fought for. The maxim for the formation of a strong union on the left confronts with the affirmation of the unity within differences. I read it as an

attempt, seeking and performative enactment of radical democracy. In an atmosphere where political subjectivity is constituted in a normative framework, these political subjects who call this assembly are exactly constituting themselves outside of the hegemonic norm and state that ‘We’ are still demanding a livable life, ‘we’ are here, and ‘we’ are not disposable:

“10th of October Rally is a demonstration of everyone advocating humanity, law, and justice. In order to increase our voice and enlarge our struggle, we invite all those, who are a member of an organization or not, on behalf of the people, labor, law, justice, and brotherhood to the rally to be held in Ankara on 10th of October. (Mehmet Soğancı – Chairman of TMMOB / BirGün, 10th of October, 2015)³⁸

“We invite everybody saying ‘Peace right now’... In order to make those plans failed, those whose hearts beating for peace will say ‘Raise voice to Peace’ in Ankara with the motto day is the day of clasping our brothers’ arms more’ This call is for everybody. For a Turkey where we can live democratic, free and in peace with all of our colors, voices, and languages; we are saying ‘Let’s go to Ankara!’. We cannot stay silent! There is a total war against us, so we have a right to a total answer and rejection... As KESK we highlight the motto ‘*day is the day of clasping our brothers’ arms more*’ against the separation tried to be made. Anyone whose hearts beating for peace is invited to Ankara on 10th of October to raise this rejection. (Şaziye Köse – Co-Chair of KESK / BirGün, 10th of October, 2015)³⁹

Local Meanings

When we look at the selection of the words in calls made by other organizations, people describe themselves as subjects who aim and target basic ethical and political demands such as justice, peace, equality, welfare, unity, democracy, and freedom. We can say that they create their self-constitution as hopeful political subjects who want to organize plural and embodied resistance on the basis of these concepts, and who are trying to maintain this resistance, despite everything;

³⁸ “10 Ekim mitingi insandan, haktan, hukuktan yana olan herkesin mitingidir... Sözümüzü hep birlikte söylemek ve mücadelemizi büyütmek için 10 Ekim’de Ankara’da yapılacak olan mitingine insandan, emekten, haktan, hukuktan, adaletten, kardeşlikten, yana olan örgütlü örgütsüz herkesi davet ediyoruz.”

³⁹ “‘Barış hemen şimdi’ diyen herkesi davet ediyoruz... Yüreği barıştan yana atanlar bu planları boş çıkarmak için, ‘gün daha fazla kardeşleşme günü’ sloganı ile Ankara’da ‘Barışa ses’ diyecekler. Bu çağrı herkesedir. Çok renkli, çok sesli, çok dilli demokratik, özgür ve barış içinde yaşayacağımız bir Türkiye için haydi Ankara’ya, diyoruz... Biz sessiz kalamayız! Bize karşı topyekûn bir savaş sürdürülüyor. Öyleyse topyekûn cevap verme, itiraz etme hakkımız var. ..Biz KESK olarak yaratılmak istenen bu yarılmaya karşı ‘gün daha fazla kardeşleşme günüdür’ şiarını öne çıkarıyoruz... . 10 Ekim’de yüreği barıştan yana atan herkes Ankara’da bu itirazı yükseltmeye davetlidir.”

“the one giving importance to justice – the one demanding the war to be ended and a life within humanitarian conditions to be provided – those demanding peace, serenity and equality against those carrying out war politics – right defenders – just across the arrow, across the death – the one saying continue struggle, the ones getting their strength from people – the one saying that Order of the Palace will be overthrown and people will win – the one whose heart beating for peace, democracy and independence of labor – victims of 13-year-AKP policies – the one on behalf of humanity, peace, labor, law, justice, and brotherhood - the one saying ‘Peace right now’ – the one whose heart beating for peace – we are here for peace”⁴⁰

To sum up, in this chapter, it is targeted to narrate the act of naming non-violent resistance within democratic struggles which aim to produce more egalitarian series of conditions for recognizability. The focus is on the constitution of the political subjectivity and the constitution of ‘we’ since it is important to query what happens to this ‘we’ in times of war. From now on, I consider October 10 as a terrorist attack and the focus becomes the political experience of mourning.

⁴⁰ “adalete önem veren - savaşın durmasını, insanca koşullarda yaşamın tesis edilmesini isteyen - Savaş politikası üretenlere barış, huzur, eşitlik isteyenler - hak savunucuları - okun sivri ucunun tam karşısında, ölümün karşısında - mücadeleye devam diyen gücünü halktan alan - Saray düzeni yıkılacak ve halklar kazanacak diyen - yüreği barış, demokrasi, emeğin egemenliği için atan - 13 yıllık AKP politikalarından mağdur olan - insandan, emekten, haktan, hukuktan, adaletten, kardeşlikten, barıştan yana olan -emek, barış, demokrasi, hak ve özgürlükten yana olan – ‘Barış hemen şimdi’ diyen - Yüreği barıştan yana atanlar -Barış için varız”

CHAPTER 6

COUNTER POWER ON GRIEVABILITY: FROM UNBEARABLE GRIEF TO UNCONTROLLABLE RAGE

In this chapter, I will elaborate familial and organizational chief mourners' mourning acts as a counter-power on grievability, regarding the case of October 10. By looking at mourning narratives and acts of October 10, my aim is to indicate how the utterances on loss serve to political resistance against hegemonic discourse on grievability. For that purpose, after a brief explanation about what happened on October 10, I will take a closer look at the time of the incident with the narratives of the eyewitnesses. In this brief sub-section, I will focus on bodily vulnerability. In the following sub-section, I will focus on the transforming effect of loss as a condition of the emergence of a new political agency. In this discussion, I will analyze the reference to the earlier pains, and the narratives of the familial, and related chief mourners after they are uttered their loss. The discussion of how the funerals become political protests and difficulty of distinguishing the funerals from the demonstrations are the points which I tried to read them within the framework of politicization of grief and interdependence and community within the context of the grief. In the following sub-section, I will turn my point to organizational chief mourners, and their use of 'us-them' discourse. In the final sub-section, after a brief focus on how the incident is transferred within affect, I will focus on the acts of naming the dead, their stories, and personal narratives.

For the 'Labor, Peace and Democracy' assembly that is organized by KESK, DİSK, TMMOB, and TTB, and which some other political parties, NGO's, and unions integrated with the slogan 'urgent peace, urgent democracy'. The organization committee applied to the Governorship of Ankara and obtained the necessary permits and informed the governor how the meeting will be held. Accordingly, demonstrators from outside Ankara will gather in front of the Central Railway Station and form the corteges and would walk to Sıhhiye Square at 10:00 a.m. The rally would start all of

the demonstrators reached the Sıhhiye Square. So, thousands of people gathered in front of the Ankara Railway Station at the early morning of October 10. Before the rally begins, at the most crowded point, 2 bombings occurred at 10:04 a.m. The first bomb was exploded at the cortege of HDP, and the second one exploded between the corteges of EMEP and SGDF. 102 people are murdered.⁴¹

After the explosions, riot police came to the crime scene before the ambulances. After the tension between police riots and attendees, the masses were attacked with tear gas and water cannons in the place where the injured and killed people are laid. It prevented health personnel to render first-aid. The injured ones were moved to a hospital with private vehicles since the policemen left their vehicles to the entry points of the area. After the problem is solved by the MPs of HDP and CHP, the wounded people were carried to the ambulances on the banners, but the numbers of the ambulances, not even enough. This is a brief explanation what happened on that morning.⁴²

6.1 The body of the ‘ungrievable’: Mortal vulnerability and mortal precariousness

We are all entered into public space as embodied subjects. The people who are gathered and murdered or wounded at October 10 entered the public space to claim a ‘livable life’ and to enact to right to appear, as mentioned in the previous chapter. But, they have entered the space of appearance with their body as its vulnerability. This vulnerability does not refer to powerlessness and lack of agency, however (Butler, 2014). Embodied action may be distinguished from other acts of speech within this framework, perhaps as a consequence, the body is used for the purposes of resistance at these performative actions. When the body appears on the stage of the public, its existence itself becomes a way of non-violent resistance, even though it does not utter any word or demand something (Butler, 2015). In my opinion, the body says something with its appearance “I’m here, I’m vulnerable but livable, hurt me if you

⁴¹ The number of dead reached 102 when Mustafa Budak lost his life in 25th of June, 2017.

⁴² It is written with reference to İHD Massacre memorandum.

can”. Sometimes, not all times, but sometimes, the vulnerability turns to mortality, and October 10 was one of these unfortunate events.

In the narratives of eye-witnesses about the occurrence of the attack, the destruction of the bodily integrity as a dimension of bodily autonomy is emphasized with horrifying statements. The newspapers also give place the destruction of the bodily integrity in the parts of transferring the knowledge about the occurrence of the attack as follows;

“The street was wiped with blood. The chopped parts of human bodies were everywhere.” (Evrensel, 10 October 2015)⁴³

When we look at the narratives that are uttered by the survivor meeting attendees, we are faced with the fact that how precariousness and precarity are strongly related to bodily vulnerability. The ‘real’ interrupted act, namely, halay is used to refer solidarity, resistance, and disobedience. We can deduce that with these bombings, not only the halay is interrupted, but solidarity, resistance, and disobedience also interrupted. Trauma may cause the dividing of the self into two pieces, the ‘self’ before and ‘self’ after the trauma. The person reconstitutes the before of the trauma with a phantasm is highly concentrated on the fully ‘ordered’ of the world. The witness states about the falling of the pieces of the ‘humans’. He does not use body or corpus, but use the word ‘human’. What I read from this statement is that the difficulty of pointing the ‘human’. What does that use refer to, if it does not point out to bare life? Does pointing the ‘human’ needs a bodily integrity or an intelligible body? Another emphasis is that his statement of his sorry for he is not dead. From my view, the bodily alliance may have such a power to interrupt the survival instinct. In the following sentences, his grief turns to rage and potential for resistance. Such a trauma is followed with a future which can not be provided, therefore he states “We died”, and the following sentence, he states about the loss of the chains, which can be read as the ‘ties’ which constitute what he is;

“We started to sing the anthem named ‘Ellerinde Bayraklar’. Dancing halay meant solidarity, resistance, putting a brave face for us. We were dancing halay

⁴³ “Caddenin her tarafı kan gölüne dönerken, insanların uzuvları, vücudundan kopan parçalar etrafa saçıldı.”

with our political comrades coming from tens of cities and we were happy. Right at the moment, we said 'This square has seen blood' a bomb exploded, and right after that another one did. When I heard that, I did not consider it as a bomb sound; but when I turned around, I saw the fireball and the human body parts falling over us. The sky was ensanguined. A corpse without a lower body fell on the spot we were dancing halay; I recall that. There were two police cars which were not damaged by the explosion but there were no cops. People wrecked the cars out of rage. Nobody knew what to do. Everybody was crying. We were having a nervous breakdown. We were crying both for the dead ones, and for staying alive. The government should be scared of the hundreds of survivors of this event, like myself; since we died in Ankara. We have nothing to lose including our chains, even our life does not matter.” (Mert Aslanyürek, SYKP Member / 16 October 2015, Çağdaşses)⁴⁴

The first sentence of the following narratives is like an evident of the aim of an assembly; the bodies from different places come together in order to make a claim in and form the public space. It is forming the space, because public space is not given, and the gathering makes it public and started its recognition as public (Butler, 2015). The same is in use for the 'bloody square' which is mentioned in the following sentences of the narratives; “This square is bloody square” is a line of the Requiem which is dedicated to the dead of Bloody May 1. October 10 attacks occurred when the people say this part of the Requiem, ironically. These narratives also emphasize the vulnerability of the bodily integrity, and the difficulty of the identifying a 'person' without bodily integrity by experienced by the relatives. Lastly, they point out to the pain of remembering the day while referring the state as the subject of the attack, but when it is to remember becomes a way of resistance, to forget and to cause to forget becomes betrayal to the dead and the resistance itself. As its integrity of the whole statement; the transitive effect of the grief and politics reveals, we cannot detach where the grief begins or ends, and for its resistance effect, as well;

⁴⁴ “‘Ellerinde pankartlar’ marşını söylemeye başladık. Halay bizim için dayanışmaydı, direnişti, boyun eğmemekti. Onlarca şehirden gelen yoldaşlarla halaydaydık ve çok mutluyduk. Tam da 'Bu meydan kanlı meydan' dediğimiz anda bomba patladı ve hiç geçmeden bir bomba daha. O sesi duyduğumda bomba olduğu aklımdan bile geçmedi arkamı döndüğümde çıkan alev topunu ve üstümüze yağın insan parçalarını gördüm, gökyüzü kana bulanmıştı. Tam halay çektiğimiz yere göğsünden aşağısı olmayan bir ceset düştü net olarak onu hatırlıyorum. Patlamadan etkilenmeyen 2 tane polis aracı vardı alanda ama polis yoktu insanlar o sinirle o araçları parçaladı. Kimse ne yapacağını bilmiyordu herkes ağlıyordu. Sinir krizi geçirmiştik. Hem ölenlere hem ölmediğimize ağlıyorduk. Devlet benim gibi oradan sağ kurtulan yüzlerce insandan korksun çünkü biz Ankara’da öldük. Artık zincirlerimiz dahil kaybedecek hiçbir şeyimiz yok, canımız bile.”

“When we arrived the station, we started to wait for the protest to begin with our political comrades from other local areas. When we were singing ‘This square has seen blood’ we heard a loud noise and we were shaken. Right at that moment, I started to see ripped bodies on the floor. Much more were falling over us when we were running... All of us had instant nervous breakdowns. We tried to find our acquaintances and comrades. Lots of people tried to carry away their injured fellows since the ambulances were late. When I went there, there were many people who lost their kids, fathers, mothers, lovers, and comrades. Since they could not identify the bodies, they came to the hospital hoping that the people they were looking for were only injured. May had a bloody history, because of the state, now October also has one. No matter how badly we want to forget about that, we will always remember it, we will not let anyone forget about it. We will continue to call for peace.” (Roza Kahya, İstanbul, Member of Eğitim-Sen / 16 October 2015, Çağdaşes)⁴⁵

“(...) We were greeting our comrades coming from other cities, having small talks. Everybody was smiling. We were happy, we were hopeful. When we were singing ‘This square has seen blood’ the bomb exploded. There were blood and body parts. The air was filled with an intense blood smell. What I saw and felt there became the things I will and can never forget during my whole life. This attack was against the revolutionary power which was trying to bring peace. We will not forget, we will never let anyone to forget. I offer everyone my condolences.”(Şeyda Yazıcı, Meeting Participant / 16 October 2015, Çağdaşes)⁴⁶

If the physical proximity is a core factor for sharing the pain, the statements about ‘falling of pieces of corpus’ may be considered the zero point of this proximity. Not with only eye-witnessing, these witnesses feel the effect of the attack on their all bodily senses. In a sense, the zero point of the sympathy with the dead body leads the thinking of the death, for sure. What exactly is lost is a site of fully unknowingness, and transferring the experience becomes more difficult within this unknowingness;

⁴⁵“Vardığımızda diğer yerellerden gelen yoldaşlarımızla selamlaşıp eylemin başlamasını bekliyorduk. "bu meydan kanlı meydan" diye söylediğimiz bölümde büyük bir ses duyduk ve sarsıldık...Tam o sırada yerde insan etleri görmeye başladım. Koşarken önümüze her tarafları paramparça olmuş cesetler düşüyordu... Hepimiz anlık sinir krizleri geçiriyorduk. Yakınlarımızı, yoldaşlarımızı bulmaya çalışıyorduk.. Çoğu insan ambulansların gelemeyişinden yaralılarını kucaklayıp götürmeye çalışıyordu.. Oraya geçtiğimde çocuklarını, babalarını, annelerini, sevgililerini ve yoldaşlarını kaybetmiş insanlar vardı. Cesetlerini teşhis edememiş olmaları ki belki bir ihtimal yaralılarıdır diye hastaneye gelmişlerdi. Devletin yapmış olduğu mayısın kanlı tarihine birde ekim eklendi. O günü zihnimizden her ne kadar silmekte istesek, unutmakta istesek, unutmayacağız, unutturmayacağız. İnadına barış demeye devam edeceğiz.”

⁴⁶ “..şehir dışından gelen yoldaşlarla sarılıyor hal hatır soruyor muhabbet ediyorduk. Hepimizin yüzü gülüyordu. Mutlu ve umutluyduk... tam 'bu meydan kanlı meydan' kısmında bomba patlatıldı... Etrafta kan ve et parçaları vardı. Etrafı bir anda çok yoğun kan kokusu sardı.. Orada gördüklerim, hissettiklerim hayatımda unutamayacağım ve bile isteye unutmayacağım şeylerdir. Bu saldırı barışa barışı getirmeye çalışan devrimci güçlere yapılmıştır. Unutmayacağız, unutturmayacağız. Başımız sağolsun.”

“After that, my friends started to dance halay... When I looked up, I saw the flames and body parts. I started to run. When I was running, pieces of human flesh were falling near me. I started to scream, the air smelt like burned meat. The only thing I thought about was dying. I said none of us would survive this place. It is really hard to describe what I went through that day; because it swims before my eyes. It was horrible.” (Zeynep Kalaç, Meeting Participant / 16 October 2015, Çağdaşses)⁴⁷

In the following narrative that I want to give place in this sub-section, the witness explains the horrifying details of the moment, and defines the place as ‘last day’. In my opinion, the experience that is lived with all senses could not be considered as belonging to the world. It is a place between life and death, and who experienced the death is fully uncertain. To what extent, could we say these people stay alive after the attack? My argument is not about the material effects of the death, but it is about the distance between death and life. In the following sentence, we may see how the flesh bounded us and makes a resist to death of the each other. In my opinion, the tricky point of the bodily alliance lays in here; sharing the same vulnerability, for this square, it refers to mortal vulnerability;

“(...) We were dancing halay. Nearly 3-4 seconds later the same sound was heard and we understood that a bomb had exploded 8-10 meters behind us. Human flesh was falling over us and we were covered with blood. We experienced Armageddon over there. Our comrades from HDP became a wall of flesh for us. If it had not been for them, we would be dead.” (Anıl Günay, SYKP Member / 16 October 2015, Çağdaşses)⁴⁸

These were the statements about the very moment of the attacks. However, this scene does not end with this, for sure. The people who survived carry the wounded between the dead bodies. They use to banners and posters, which are probably include slogans about peace or democracy, to cover the bodies. To be brief, there is another compulsion with the dead bodies, namely funerals. According to the reports, the three of the

⁴⁷ “Ardından arkadaşlarım halay çekmeye başladılar.. havaya baktığımda alevleri ve insan parçalarını gördüm. Koşmaya başladım koşarken yanıma et parçaları düşüyordu.. Çığlık atmaya başladım burnuma yanık et kokusu geliyordu. O an tek düşündüğüm ölmektir. Buradan hiçbirimiz sağ çıkamayacağımız diyordum.. O gün tam olarak neler yaşadığımı tarif etmek çok zor çünkü devamlı gözümün önüne geliyor. Çok korkunçtu.”

⁴⁸ “.. halay çekiyorduk..yaklaşık 3 4 saniye sonra tekrar aynı ses duyuldu ve bizler anladık ki 8 -10 metre arkamızda bomba patlamıştı üzerimize et parçaları yağmış üstümüz başımız kanlar içinde kalmıştı. Orada gerçekten mahşeri yaşadık. Bomba patladığı esnada HDP kortejinin içindeki yoldaşlarımız bizlere etten siper olmuşlardı. Onlar olmasaydı belki de bizler şu an hayatta olmayacaktık.”

funerals are just comprised of the legs, and so many others had missing parts. This is the first part which I want to narrate how the grief was unbearable.

For this case, the body in the field of politics is surely a bio-political body. Besides, following Butler, the consideration of the body as a bounded kind of entity becomes an obligatory perspective for this case (2009). I argue that there is two point for which we understand those bodies as bounded other bodies; the first one is about resistance, and the second one is about vulnerability. Within the previous narratives, we come to the point of how the bodies are vulnerable to the attacks and how they become the site of solidarity. The body implies mortality and vulnerability, but the agency, as well (Butler, 2004). From the call of the assembly to the funerals, the agency of the bodies appears as the capacity to resist. However, the maintenance of the body requires historically specific conditions of the embodiment, in other words, it requires the agency of those people who is not known at all. For instance, the police riot. As the site of the publicity, the bodies that gather on the square are vulnerable to suffering, death, and arbitrary state violence, as well. According to the court reports of October 10, the majority of the eyewitnesses indicates that police riot use tear gas and water cannons after the attacks. This report states that because of the health services did not come to the crime scene on time, those who wounded cannot be intervened due to the tear gas, some of them have lost their lives due to the tear gas, and the emergency services could not enter to the place, the death toll is increased and it was decided to send the reports to office of chief public prosecutor to investigate⁴⁹. Along with this line, according to the TTB's October 10 report, this attack of the police delayed the intervention of the wounded and caused many people to die. Besides, at the onset of the crime scene investigation, police fire into the air in order to remove the demonstrators at Arena Sports Hall and caused them to scare, not surprisingly. This is the second point that indicates how the grief was unbearable and how it will unrestrainable turn to rage and resistance. We see that one of the attendees promise to the dead fellows that they will be always resisted, after the details of the attacks on the police;

⁴⁹ See: Ankara Massacre Court Decision, 10 February 2017, Evrensel.

“Fog and gas bomb were parts of the attack. The ministers of the state said ‘There is no security gap’ like nothing happened. When they were asked if they were going to resign, they smirked as if they were mocking the people over there, mocking the dead. They also came to the hospitals to visit the survivors, this was the most flagrant behavior one could ever see. We will never let go of this attack, this massacre. We will continue our comrades political case until the very end.” (Emek Party Antalya Provincial Lead Hasan Alkan, *Sondakika*, 14 October 2015)⁵⁰

The body is always at the hands of the other by its disposition of vulnerability (Butler, 2004). Moreover, as we cannot apprehend a life or a death without its political frames, those bodies could not have apprehended, as well, without the very political frames. Once for all, we all are the animals whose lives have entered the politics as living beings (Agamben, 1998). Taking this perspective, from my point of view, the trivialization of the dead bodies does not target the dead bodies, but alive memories. The survivors those who have shared belongings with the dead are faced with a message and we have to think critically about what kind of message that be sending?

In this sub-section, I gave place to the narratives of eye-witnesses on the moments of the explosion. The first reason why I gave place to these narratives instead of the newspapers’ extrinsic narratives’ on the moments of the explosion is to rethink on the experience of bodily vulnerability by means of other bodies in the alliance by listening to these moments from the attendees of the assembly. The second reason is to indicate how the first moments of the explosion may intersect with the resistance of the precarious group through remembering and mourning themselves. In other words, I tried to show how the unbearableness of losses becomes the source of rage and resistance. This is the point which I will focus on the following sub-sections. As mentioned in Chapter 5, Labor, Peace and Democracy Rally was organized to demand ‘livable life’. The gatherers enacted bodily resistance to change or transform the terms which decide on ‘what makes a life livable’. However, the assembly did not actualize how it was supposed to be. Despite all, the precarious group resisted to maintain the

⁵⁰ "Sisle, gaz bombasıyla saldırıldı. Aynı şekilde devletin bakanları da hiçbir şey olmamış gibi çıkıp 'güvenlik zafiyeti yoktur', 'istifa edecek misiniz' dediği zaman oradaki insanlarla, adeta ölülerimizle alay edercesine sırtması, hiç yüzü olmadan hastaneye de gelip ziyaret etmesi kadar, tırnak içinde alçakça bir davranış yoktur. Bu saldırının, katliamın her zaman takipçisi olacağız, yoldaşlarımızın mücadelesini sonuna kadar götüreceğiz.”

resistance and the claim of ‘livable life’ while remembering the aim of the assembly and the what is done to this assembly and mourning for their losses. In the following sub-section, I will focus on what the family members and relatives of the deceased of October 10 uttered in the process of mourning, and how these utterances serve to resistance through mourning itself.

6.2 The Experience of Familial Mourning

6.2.1 The Mourning for The Will to Peace

The people who gather for ‘Labor, Democracy and Peace’ rally declare their aim to say something about the continuing state of warfare in the country and to stop it urgently. The awareness of the existence of those people who are suffered from the war and the fact that the state has declared its willingness to continue the state of war open up the ethically necessary point; a sense of responsibility, in a sense. The truth of the ‘I’ for those people who constituted their subjectivity with their passionate attachment to key ethical demands and a dependent future, the ‘I’ is questioned in the state of war. Therefore, the sustainment of the ‘I’ with its constitutive social ties leads their agency to act in an embodied and plural form. Those people who do not want to smell ‘the burned flesh’ anymore, and to stop terrible satisfactions of the war, performatively acted in the political sphere. When we consider the will to peace as standing against the differential distribution of precarity, the performative attempt becomes a claim of ‘livable life’ not only for own, but for the others, maybe they will never know. Besides, when we consider how ‘peace’ means for their own political insight, for those people who gathered, the precarity also refer to the inequality and the barriers on freedom of speech. Taking from this line, I argue that their livability also contains to becoming a ‘speaking subject’. Assembly was the way of non-violence resistance since it has the potential to break the cycle of revenge based on a violence.

After a brief reminder about what was the assembly settled for, I want to interrogate how these people mourn their loss and also their will to peace. In this section, I emplace the narratives of familial and relational chief mourners about the will to peace of their loss. I read them not as the actions of mourning, but also the resistance acts in which

actualized in a complex way; not foreclosing the grief, but the integration of resistance to the very grief.

When we look at the narratives which are uttered in the funerals, public statements, and protests; it obviously appears that the familial and relative chief mourners repeat their aims and point how a state of war could be so cruel and unconscionable. Because the attacks cause the spring of the existence of an illogical understanding; the fact that these people want to stop the death of those who are disposable and losable shows how their losable and disposable are. As they stated, living for peace, going to assemble for peace, and dying for peace are not distinguishable at this point. How can we differentiate the chronology? Another highlight is that the chief mourners clearly state that their loss' demand of peace not for a particular community, rather an extensive state of peace. At this junction, I want to point out how they conceive the 'emancipation', and I claim that their political position is nourished basely from a collective and cooperative socialist understanding; their imagination of 'revolution' requires a sense of togetherness;

“Şebnem wanted peace for all of us.” (Şafak Yıldırım, Mother of Şebnem Yurtman (23), T24, 20 October 2015)⁵¹

“The only thing we demanded was peace; nothing else. My sisters and brothers died for peace.” (Aycan Çiçek, Sister of Leyla Çiçek (23) / Radikal, 12 October 2015)⁵²

“My spouse was there for peace. She was there to say stop to deaths. However, she died there for peace.” (Cuma Ercan, Husband of Emine Ercan (55) / T24, 20 October 2015)⁵³

“My nephew wanted peace and freedom. The people who died there died for their demands for humanity.” (Yılmaz Uzatmaz, Uncle of Ali Deniz Uzatmaz (19) / Evrensel, 16 October 2015)⁵⁴

⁵¹ Şebnem hepimiz için barış istiyordu”

⁵² “Tek isteğimiz barıştı. Başka hiçbir şey değildi. Kardeşim barış uğruna öldü”

⁵³ “Eşim barış için oraya gitmişti. Ölümle dursun diye Ankara’ya gitmişti. Ama eşim barış için orada öldü”

⁵⁴ “Benim yeğenim barış ve özgürlük istedi. Orada ölenler tüm insanlık için istedikleri bu talepler uğrunda öldüler”

“We condemn violence and wildness. I am proud of my sister. My sister went to that meeting in the name of peace.” (Ayten Çiçek, Sister of Leyla Çiçek (23) / Radikal, 12 October 2015)⁵⁵

For this case, we may draw certain traces upon how grief and political resistance based on the claim of livable life, hence livability, are intersected reciprocally. The first sight is on that; these people attempt to stop the warfare and their apprehension the ‘lives’ which are lost lives in this war as ‘livable’ leads to the fact that they grieve for them. Then, it provides a complex political community in a sense, so that, they found each other in the same ‘we’. So, the relation in this ‘we, the people’ necessitates an interdependence, hence an ethical responsibility to prompt to preserve the ties and bonds that constitute what ‘we are’. On the second sight, the grief of the lost ‘lives’ on October 10 became the point of departure to prompt another resistance to the subject of violence which is considered as the same for the chief mourners. Their emphasis on their deceased’s demand for peace is interpreted as an attempt to constitute them as ‘grievable’, because such a non-violent act, to be more clear, such a peaceful act is not a political act which could be punished. In the following statements, we might see how the mourners narrate how the deceased’s acts are non-violent. Also, the fact that they are murdered in such a non-violent event that is settled for the enactment of peacetime disclosed their rage and the irrecoverableness of the loss becomes a condition which opens up the sedimentation of the existent political subjectivity and resistance to the political power which is the subject of this violence, according to them. It is like they deliberately run after peace, justice, and togetherness because the ‘enemy’ does not use them but exactly the contrasts, and it became a way to constitute themselves on ‘the other side’. Because, if they lose the persistence to not to use the language of ‘the enemy’, they will lose their ‘non-violent resistant position’, as well;

“Our mother died for peace. She died for soldiers, police, and guerillas. Our mother died for each and every human being. She lived for that, she died for that.” (Adnan Bulut, Son of Meryem Bulut (70) / T24, 20 October 2015)⁵⁶

⁵⁵ “Vahşeti kınıyoruz. Kardeşimle gurur duyuyorum. Kardeşim barış için gitmişti o mitinge”

⁵⁶ “Annemiz barış için öldü, annemiz asker, polis ve gerilla için öldü. Annemiz bütün insanlar için öldü..İnadına barış, inadına kardeşlik için mücadele edeceğiz. Annemiz bunun için yaşadı bunun için öldü.”

“We are against the war, we say peace out of spite. Against Tayyip’s war, peace, out-of-spite. My Güney became a martyr. I support my son’s political case.”
(Father of Güney Doğan / T24, 20 October 2015)⁵⁷

“Gökmen went there only to cry for peace and he was killed. Our duty is to empower their political struggle and cry ‘We will never give up on peace’.”
(Firdevs Dalmaç, Wife of Gökmen Dalmaç / Evrensel, 17 October 2015)⁵⁸

If the mourners change the way their understanding of resistance and move quickly to violent action, it might lead to the foreclosing of the grief or refuse the reality and necessity of the grief. However, with the help of the statements, we see that their resistance still emphasizes the decisiveness on peace and solidarity with the people who suffered from October 10 and different forms of trivialization of the ‘life’ itself in elsewhere. This shows us a complex form of disobedience, so that, these mourners abide their vulnerability and losses, but still resist to differential distribution of the vulnerability and precarity. The subjectivity which based on such a complex position cause their togetherness in the loss, and the mourner subjectivity is constituted on the same moral demand. Therefore, it should have the coherence with the deceased’s way of understanding on the politics, since the loss is no longer representable, it requires to reside in themselves with the identification of the deceased. In this case, because of the way and the context of they murdered, the identification appears in this manner. It also, for sure, opens up the constitution of positioning themselves on a ‘we’ and take a stand against ‘them’. The ‘them’ is, for sure, the subject of violence, and also ‘the object of the assembly’. Therefore, it is represented within its eager and capacity to murder anyone else, even the most innocent ones;

“At the time when she, as a literate and free individual, would contribute to the struggle, she was murdered by the fascist murderers. I want to declare that we support our daughter’s messages, her worldview and her ambition for struggle. We are proud of her. This shame is not on the dead. This shame is on the murderers. Their bloodthirst does not go away. They do not want peace to have a place in this country. The ones for peace are here. The ones against it do not even have mercy for children. They kill the little children. Today, we are suffering. Tomorrow it will be someone else. We want nobody to experience these feelings. My daughter went there in the name of peace. She went there so

⁵⁷ “Savaşa karşı, inadına barış. Tayyip’in savaşına karşı inadına barış. Güney’im şehit oldu. Ben oğlumun mücadelesinin arkasındayım.”

⁵⁸ “Gökmen oraya sadece barışı haykırmak için gitti ve katledildi. Bize düşen onların mücadelesini yükselterek, İnadına barış, İnadına barış demek”

that nobody would die again. My daughter was a Laz person. Circassian people died with my daughter. Kurdish people died, Turkish people died. The people who wanted peace died. Enough is enough! Somebody hear our voice! There is a lot to say. Many words to utter, but this is all I can say with this pain.” (Ümit Kanlıoğlu, Father of Elif Kanlıoğlu (20) / Hürriyet, 12 October 2015)⁵⁹

“We entered the area. We trusted someone. We were calling for peace; nothing else. Only peace. They did that to us in the middle of Ankara. Our pain is unbearable. Now I only want to bury our dead ones. It is not fair to be on the newspapers with our pain.” (İzzettin Çevik, Father of Başak Sidar Çevik (21) / BBC Türkçe, 12 October 2015)⁶⁰

Another emphasis on the previous statements could be the possibility of the recognition based on suffering and grief. In the first one, he says and begs for their voice to be heard. In the second one, on the other hand, he says ‘we will be headlines with our sorrow?’. İzzettin Çevik is the father of Başak Sidar Çevik and the photograph of him and his wife after a limited time of the attack became the symbol of the attack and almost all the national newspapers and some of the international newspapers made this photograph the headline. In my opinion, becoming headline is about visibility, hence it could be about the recognition or intelligibility. Taken the perspective of Levinas (1996), the face could be the way of humanization and recognizability. Their face appeared, but how it appeared? How does this very moment feel them like?⁶¹ How is the vulnerability of the other body intersected with the vulnerability of one’s own existence? To what extent, the face worked against dehumanization? To what extent, this photograph stops the state of indifference? To

⁵⁹ “Aydın ve özgür bir birey olarak mücadeleye katkı sağlayacağı dönemde faşist katillerce katledildi...Kızımızın verdiği mesajlar, dünya görüşü ve mücadele azminin arkasında olduğumuzu, onunla onur ve gurur duyduğumuzu belirtmek istiyorum...Ölenlerin değildir bu ayıp. Bu ayıp öldürenlerindir. Kana doymuyorlar. Bu ülkede barış olmasını istemiyorlar. Barış isteyenler burada. Barış istemeyenler çocuklara bile acımıyorlar. Ufak çocukları öldürüyorlar. Bugün bizim canımız yandı. Yarın kimin canı yanacak belli değil. Biz istiyoruz ki kimsenin canı yanmasın. Kızım barış olsun diye oradaydı. Kimse ölmesin diye oradaydı. Benim kızım Laz’dı. Benim kızımın yanında Çerkezler öldü, Kürtler öldü, Türkler öldü. Çocuklar öldürüldü. Barış isteyen insanlar öldü. Yeter artık diyoruz. Bu sesimiz duyulsun artık istiyoruz. Çok söyleyecek şey var. Çok söz var ama bu acı ile bu kadar söyleyebiliyorum”

⁶⁰“Sonra alana girdik. Birilerine güveniyorduk. Barış diyorduk, başka bir şey demiyorduk. Sadece barış... Onlar da Ankara’nın göbeğinde bizlere bunları yaptılar. Acımız çok büyük. Tek istediğim şey şimdi canlarımızı toprağa vermek.. Acılarımızla mı manşet olacaktık?”

⁶¹ See: <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/o-fotografa-hala-bakamiyorum-40244168>

what extent, the frames of moral responsiveness allow the visual, as some sense of it 'is' not.

The breaking the cycle of indifference is appearing on the letter and speech which is uttered by the teacher of Veysel Atılğan. He was just nine years old and had gone to the assembly with his father who is a union member of BTS. Maybe it is the point we must critically think about the interpretative frameworks which an affect is actualized. Following Butler (2009), I argue that these affects are not pure and natural and come to us from nowhere, but how these frameworks acquired such a power to determine whose death is worth to worry for, and whose death is not. How the murder of a nine years old kid with 101 other people creates the affect of indifference or fair for some people? Within this discussion, I argue that, if the affect is subjected to some interpretative frameworks, circulating narratives to evoke the affect as it felt by the mourners could be a performative way to resistance. It has the potential to prompt to be apprehended as this life means something very precious and this life has a witness. If the casualty numbers could not create the tenderness, the act of emphasizing on the unique personal histories itself may problematize these frameworks and the very norm of 'human'. The letter and speech which is uttered by Veysel's teacher not only problematize the existent schemes of moral responsiveness, but also the object of the murderers as follows;

"I've lost my student at the traitorous attack in Ankara. My dear student Muhammed Veysel Atılğan, you became the target of the murderers just because you yelled for peace with your huge heart in your little body, with your hand in your father's hand. You fell into a fascist attack in the center of the capital city. I cannot forget about your vivid eyes when you were playing with your friends. Tell me, my beautiful child, how can I teach the meaning of peace to your friends. How can I teach the lesson without referring to you? If I teach peace without saying your name, it would be scarce; but when I say your name, your friends will ask, 'Does peace come with death?'" (Sabahat Yıldırım, Teacher of Veysel Atılğan (9) / BBC Türkçe, 12 October 2015)⁶²

⁶² "Ankara'daki hain saldırıda öğrencimi kaybettim... Sevgili öğrencim Muhammed Veysel Atılğan, küçücük bedeninde taşıdığın kocaman yüreğinle barış dediğin için babanla el ele katillerin hedefi oldun. Başkentin göbeğinde faşist saldırıya maruz kaldın.. Arkadaşlarınla daha dün mendil kapmaca oynarkenki coşkun gözlerimin önünden gitmiyor. Şimdi söyle güzel gözlü güzel yürekli çocuğum nasıl anlatayım arkadaşlarına barış sözcüğünün anlamını? Ben bu dersi seni anmadan nasıl veririm? Seni, barış sözünü kullanmadan anlatırsam eksik olur, barış dersem peki arkadaşların sormaz mı 'barış ölüme eş mi öğretmenim?' diye."

6.2.2 The Maintenance of ‘Speaking Subject’: The Emphasis on ‘We know the murderers’

As mentioned in Chapter 5, the gatherers of October 10 rally constitute a ‘we’ which demands livable life and it might be claimed that this ‘we’ grounds on politically speaking subjectivity. In the mourners’ narratives of October 10, there is an apparent emphasis on ‘we know the murderers’ and I will elaborate this emphasis as a resistance act to sustain politically speaking subjectivity. Although this emphasis could not have included to the resistance through grievability directly, the fact that this emphasis is explicit the narratives of both the familial and the organizational mourners indicates that the process of mourning actualized with this claim/knowledge.

This precarious community has uttered their exposure to precarity by referring to the political power in the assembly before the explosions, after the explosions, they uttered the mortal precarity by referring to the political power, too. In other words, the precarious group occupies the position of knowing and speaking subject by being politically dissident, to be clarified, with political utterances about the political atmosphere and appearance of the public space. Besides, they do them all with reference to their precariousness. For the maintenance of this subjectivity, after the explosions, they occupied the same position by acting politically dissident, again. They speak on the political atmosphere by means of their precariousness and refer to the political power again. However, the violence which is resisted brings them losses (according to their claims), the political power is accused of being the subject of mortal violence.

If we presuppose that constraints are brought about what can be known and what can be felt, to say something about what is known might be a way of making a politics based on ethics of precarity and precariousness. This knowledge might aim to lead an awareness of the ‘precarious life’ and how it depends on the social and political conditions for the communities who are not injured yet. If we assume that the apprehending of injurability refers to a collective responsibility following Butler (2009), and if we assume that the injured community have the knowledge that this need will not be met by the state, the target can now return to expressing this

knowledge based on lived experience to the other precarious communities and groups. Besides, this knowledge can be spoken to evoke the affect of empathy, to evoke the feeling of ‘I could/might be’, and break the state of indifference. On the other hand, it might include a message to those precarious groups about who might be their murderers, by narrating that the knowledge on the subject of violence. It might integrate a sign of this state of vulnerability is constituted, structured, framed, and in which frame this is regulated. In such a case, uncertainty about who to go to for justice might be reflected. It may aim to remind that the war does not help anyone, both to precarious groups and perhaps the subject of violence as follows;

“He was not only my father but also my political comrade. I cried saying ‘father’, someone near me cried saying ‘son’. We are small pieces of a big picture. However, we should see the big picture. We know the killers. We know who they are. We will not forget. Do not forget.” (Çağlayan Bozacı, Son of Osman Tuan Bozacı (58) / Radikal, 12 October 2015)⁶³

“This is not fate. Who will be called to account?” (Mehtap Coşkun, Wife of Uğur Coşkun (33) / T24, 20 October 2015)⁶⁴

“We are crying, yelling for peace. How can I say, we beg for it! They are still messing with us. What can we do? We want peace, not war. War is not good for anybody. No one can get benefits from it. What is better than peace, sisterhood, brotherhood? We want peace. We want peace even if we lose 10 people. We want peace, even if we lose 20, 100 people. God damn the traitors. They will be away from us someday if Allah lets. I hope they will suffer from the same pain. God is powerful. If Selahattin Demirtaş had said ‘we will make you president’, then we would not see these days. He (Erdogan) wants to be the president. He wants 400 deputies. I dare him to make himself lovable in the eyes of the people, only then can he have 400 deputies.” (Cafer Yanar, Father of Resul Yanar / T24, 20 October 2015)⁶⁵

⁶³ “Benim sadece babam değil yoldaşımdı. Ben ‘baba’ diye ağlıyordum, yanımda biri ‘oğlum’ diye ağlıyordu. Bizler, kocaman bir fotoğrafı tamamlayan birer küçük parçayız. Ama büyük resme bakmak lazım. Katillerimizi tanıyoruz. Kim olduklarını çok iyi biliyoruz. Biz unutmuyoruz, siz de unutmayın.”

⁶⁴ “Bu kader değil. Bunun hesabını kim verecek?”

⁶⁵ “Biz barış için bağırıyoruz, çağırıyoruz. Ne diyeyim, yalvarıyoruz. Peşimizi yine bırakmıyorlar yine bırakmıyorlar. Ne yapacağız. Biz barış istiyoruz, savaş istemiyoruz. Savaşta kimse bir şey anlamaz ki. Kimsenin karı yoktur. Barışta, kardeşlikten güzel ne var. Biz barış istiyoruz. 10 tane gitse, 20 tane gitse 100 tane de gitse biz yine barış istiyoruz. Hainlerin Allah belasını versin. Allah’ın izniyle yine bir gün uzağa giderler. İnşallah onlar da aynı acıyı çekerler. Allah büyüktür. Eğer, Selahattin Demirtaş deseydi, ‘Biz seni başkan yapacağız’, biz bugünleri görmezdik. Başkanlık istiyor adam, 400 milletvekili istiyor. Sevdirdin kendini millete 400 milletvekili versin.”

The familial chief mourners of October 10 points out to the more general problems which are operating within the social and political order, not just the subject of violence. It is the issue of security vulnerability. Hence, the power and the potential of the discourse itself for creating the conditions for the violence by the dehumanization of the lives (Butler, 2004). In other words, when the political power uses its power to extract some ‘lives’ from the reality itself, it became a knowledge which must be revealed. By reflecting the knowledge of how the ‘life’ itself could be worthless, in other words, how the extent of dehumanization is so wide, the prediction and the hope are sent to the precarious groups; the salvation will be together or not at all. By this prediction, the call of alliance with other precarious groups is sent with the warning of it can be never known who will be the next target of violence, and for whom the precariousness become mortal precariousness;

“While you cannot go to a game with pennies in your pocket, they can bring a bomb which has the capacity to kill hundreds of people into the protest area. There is not an authorized staff over there. While the wounded people needed emergency action, police were attacking the ones who tried to help with gas bomb. This tells a lot about the fact that it takes an abdication of reason not to understand what happened. It is all obvious. There cannot be anything more valuable than human lives; but in this country, human lives do not even matter.” (Ogün Uzatmaz, Father of Ali Deniz Uzatmaz (19) / Evrensel, 16 October 2015)⁶⁶

“God damn the attackers! I cannot find anything more to say. The ones who sent the suicide bomb here, the ones behind this attack must be found and punished. We are all sisters and brothers, as Turkish, Kurdish, Alevi, Sunni people. They want to pit brother against brother with terror attacks.” (İsmail Kıvrak, Brother of Hacı Kıvrak (45) / T24, 20 October 2015)⁶⁷

When we consider that the constitution of speaking subject depends on the performative acts in this process of becoming and always constituting itself in a

⁶⁶ “Siz bir spor müsabakasına bile cebinizde metal parayla giremezken orada yüzlerce insanı katletmek için yeterli bombayı alana sokabiliyorlar. Olay anında hiçbir yetkili yok. Olay sonrası orada yerde yatanlara acil yardım gerekirken, bunu yapmaya çalışanlara da polis gaz sıkıyorsa, itfaiye ve ambulansı engelliyorsa olanları anlamamak için akıl tutulmasına girmek lazım. Her şey ortada! İnsan canından kıymetli hiçbir şey olmaması gerekirken, bu ülkede en ucuz şey insan!”

⁶⁷ “Allah bu saldırıyı yapanların belasını versin. Söyleyecek başka bir söz bulamıyorum. Canlı bombayı buraya gönderenler, asıl bu saldırının ardında olanlar bulunsun ve cezası verilsin. Türk’ü, Kürt’ü, Alevi’si, Sünni’si hepimiz kardeşiz. Terör saldırılarıyla kardeşi kardeşe düşürmek istiyorlar”

repetition, we might say that everything we can say about the recognizability is both the consequence and the cause. In such a paradoxical and complex plain, by presupposing Butler's claim that recognizability precedes recognition, we might argue that this 'speaking subjectivity' is constituted in the discourse of marginalization (2004). However, how it takes a stand against it, while the discourse itself activates this subjectivity? To what extent, doing politics based on knowledge could be an act of sedimentation of this kind of subjection and marginalization, at the same resistance to the way which it is interpellated, in other words, not turn the call of 'ungrievable'?

6.2.3 The Transformative Effect of the Loss: A condition for the sedimentation of the political agency

Butler argues that mourning and grief reveal our fundamental interdependence, and she discusses the politicization of mourning based on this argument. Another focus of Butler's this discussion is the claim of the transformative effect of the loss. Although I will not elaborate the transformative effect of the loss as it is discussed in *Precarious Life* (2004), I still consider this point as significant to understand the politicization of mourning of October 10 and October 10 mourners' resistance by mourning itself. Within the process of grief, the rage that is revealed may become a condition for someone to become a new political agency (Butler, 2003). For the case of this thesis, I argue that the transformative effect of the loss serves for not the appearance of a new political agency, but the sedimentation of the existing one. Since the process of mourning and grief of the familial mourners of October 10 have the potential to sediment into core apprehension of who 'we' are. The process of grief provides a chance for the apprehending of the vulnerability in such an unfortunate way for the mourners. I argue that the political subjectivity of the deceased's, in this particular point, become a ground to direct and reside the political potential which is actualized from the rage based on grief.

It seems that the grief itself of the familial mourners of October 10 become a resource for doing politics and becomes the condition of receiving their political legacy. The political and psychic energy which is released by the grief is directed to sustain the politics within the way which the deceased did, and interrupted by their murder. It is

apparently stated the mourners take the risk of the death but still, resist on resistance. By reflecting this determination, they narrate the collective memory of the communities who they lost their members within a political struggle, in a sense;

“We will not give in to the massacres like this. If we need to we can give up on our own lives and be martyrs.” (Ömer Seyhan, Brother of Ümit Seyhan (19) / T24, 20 October 2015)⁶⁸

“He took my heart with him when he died. But I will always keep his memories alive. I will walk this path of peace, which he walked once.” (Kerem Özgan, Son of Vahdettin Özgan (52) / T24, 20 October 2015)⁶⁹

Another emphasis which is released on the sustainment of the political struggle is belief and hope on the potential of death to change the trajectory. In the first statement, we see that the father of Ali Deniz hope for his son didn't die for anything. We may have interpreted this quotation as calling the meaning of the death, and following grief within this political subjectivity and hope for peace. When we critically think about the belief and hope of the potential of death to change something particular in particular ways, it must be registered or apprehended as ‘death’ within its reality. In other words, in the condition of the ‘life’ not apprehended as ‘life’, could ‘death’ be recognized?

“None of them deserved this. All of them are the martyrs of democracy. I heartily hope that Deniz did not die in vain. I will do everything to keep his memories alive. I’m sure his comrades will never leave him. These brave men will never forget him. I hope his light will enlighten each and every one of us.” (Ogün Uzatmaz, Father of Ali Deniz Uzatmaz (19) / Evrensel, 16 October 2015)⁷⁰

“May my daughter’s blood be a means of peace, be sacrificed for peace. Killing us will not retain us from our peace, democracy and freedom demand. They should know that. No matter how many of us they kill, we will continue to make

⁶⁸ “Bu tür katliamlara baş eğmeyeceğiz. Gerekirse biz de bu yolda canımızı feda ederek şehit düşeriz.”

⁶⁹ “Bir parçam yarım kaldı ama daima onu yaşatacağım. Gittiği bu yolda barış için can verdiği bu yolda yürüyeceğim”

⁷⁰ “Hiçbiri bunu hak etmiyordu. Onların her biri demokrasi şehididir. Umarım Deniz, boşuna ölmemiştir. Çocuğumu yaşatmak için her şeyi yapacağım. Zaten yoldaşları bırakmaz onu. Bu civanlar asla unutmazlar. Umarım onun ışığı hepimizi aydınlatacak”

the same demands.” (Faik Deli, Father of Dicle Deli (17) / Hürriyet, 12 October 2015)⁷¹

I understand that sustainment of the existing resistance could not be prevented with an attack when we consider how many people lost their lives in a political struggle and the movement move on. I understand, perhaps the dead could be seen as the means and the sacrifice for the will to peace, but how we will organize ‘life’ itself within this sustainment? When we consider, the attack prevented the formation of the public space for recognizability, and they should work on the very grid of political and cultural intelligibility, where will they go now to appear? If the public place is not an option that it was before, what could be the initial point of launching the political action from the shadows, in other words, semi-public and semi-private sphere? As Emel Kitapçı stated, the solidarity and political action may be formed on the inner conscience and morality;

“We wanted peace to come into this country. We wanted peace for the poor, laborer, Kurdish, Turkish, Laz, Circassian, women, men of this country. We said ‘peace’, they said ‘death’. We know their murderer. We have not collapsed yet. We stand with our conscience, with our moral values; our struggle will go on. When they kill us once, they actually will give birth to a thousand of us. We will bring peace to this country, the traitors who stabbed us in the back will not hinder that.” (Emel Kitapçı, Wife of Ali Kıtacı (57) / T24, 20 October 2015)⁷²

On the other hand, when we look at the narrative which is uttered by Resul Baykara, he considers their death within the frame of cohabitation. In this thesis, the ethics of cohabitation is an important ground, and I interpret this narrative within this ground. Following Butler, I argue that the ethics of cohabitation must consider precariousness and precarity of certain lives, if we discuss the issue in such an occasion (2015). According to Resul Baykara, the people who gather at October 10 show how impossible to direct another way of resistance with the consciousness of the previous

⁷¹ "Benim kızımın kanı bundan sonraki süreçte barışa vesile olsun, barışa kurban olsun. Bizi öldürerek barış, demokrasi ve özgürlük söylemimizden bizi alıkoyamayacaklar. Bu böyle bilinmeli. Bizlerden ne kadar öldürülürse öldürsünler yine biz söylemlerimize devam edeceğiz"

⁷² "Biz dedik ki bu ülkeye barış gelsin, bu ülkenin yoksulu, emekçisi, Kürt'ü, Türk'ü, Laz'ı, Çerkez'i, kadını, erkeği için barış gelsin dedik. Biz 'barış' dedik, onlar 'ölüm' dedi. Biz katilin kim olduğunu biliyoruz. Ama biz dimdik ayaktayız. Biz vicdanımızla, ahlakımızla ayaktayız, mücadelemiz devam edecek. Bizi bir kez öldürürler ama bin kez doğururlar. Arkadan vuran bu kahpe sürüye karşı bu ülkeye barış, özgürlük gelecek.

experience probably, and they lost their lives for the sake of it. I argue that this statement points out that ethics of cohabitation should base on precarity, differential distribution of precarity, namely the state of war, and the appearance and formation of the public space could be ‘the’ way of forthcoming resistance;

“They gave up on their lives to show us that there was no other way to live in this country. The murderers stabbed peace in the heart, not only us. We have lost our sisters, brothers, comrades, friends; but we will win the peace.” (Resul Baykara, Brother of Hasan Baykara / Haberler, 23 October 2015)⁷³

In other respects, Erdoğan Tetik both point to the elections and the state of being organized as ‘the’ way of future resistance. He clearly states that the ‘we’ see that they are not desperate, even though the elections may not be transferrable as the June 7 elections. Moreover, he also promises the sustainment of the state of being organized, since he considers togetherness as ‘the remedy’;

“We are not desperate. We saw that on 7 June. We united and exceeded. We will tear down these cruel people with organized struggle. We will defeat those traitors with our organization.” (Erdoğan Tetik, Father of Korkmaz Tetik / T24, 20 October 2015)⁷⁴

The trajectory of the thesis based on the possibilities of non-violent resistance through mourning acts. However, when we consider how this grief is unbearable and how the attack was violent, the mourners may despair of the non-violent resistance for democratic participation and to say something against the trajectory. Onur Kartal narrates the details of how hard it is to find the dead body of his friend, Şebnem, and clearly states his guilty. After he did mortuary, he saw that the body is someone else’s body, and he had hope. He queried how he could felt something like hope and feel guilty. After a little time, he learned that Şebnem died on the square. After these details, he does not believe that neither God nor Law was there on October 10. If

⁷³ “Bu ülkede birlikte yaşamının başka bir yolu olmadığını canlarını ortaya koyarak gösterdiler. Barışın kalbinden vurdular sadece bizlerin değil. Kardeşlerimizi, yoldaşlarımızı, arkadaşlarımızı kaybettik ama barışı kazanacağız.”

⁷⁴ “Biz çaresiz değiliz, 7 Haziran’da gördük çaresiz olmadığımızı. Birleşe birleşe aştık. Örgütlü mücadeleyle bir araya gelerek bu zalimleri yine al aşağı edeceğiz.. Örgütlülüğümüzle, birleşerek bu hainleri yeneceğiz”

neither God nor Law is present, as he claims, every way is permissible and I argue that he points out to violent or self-defensive resistance;

“There is no God where Şebnem died! There is no law where Şebnem died! Everything is licid where God and law do not exist! Both for the oppressors and the oppressed! Everybody should prepare themselves for the worst! This is the most terrifying nightmare of all!” (Onur Kartal, Friend of Şebnem Yurtman (23) / T24, 20 October 2015)⁷⁵

If the non-violent resistance is not registered as it was when the political power, how the act of self-defense could be registered as?

6.2.4 Cherishing the Deceased as They were: The Constitution of the Political Subjectivity

Following the debates on living with the deceased, we may assume that the survivor resides the loss in its ‘self’ with the identification of the deceased. The mental representations could be drawn from the memories and some kind of biography is reconstituted and the grief could be ‘worked’ in this way. This mental or psychic representations have the potential to pull out the survivor, the ‘I’ from the state of unknowingness. I argue that, from the narratives of these representations, we may draw the clues on the way one lived and the way one died. Besides, if the life and the death is intersected at particular point, namely political subjectivity, we may reach how the dead is constituted by the mourner, hence, their constitution of subjectivity as the mourner.

For this case, the mourners of October 10 realize themselves as a community who lost someone close for the sake of a political struggle by giving reference to previous sufferings. Some of them use the word ‘şehit’ which means ‘martyr’ for their deceased in particular ways. Some of them gave reference to their previous martyrs. The using of this word could be interpreted as both grieving in a deeper dimension and the glorifying the dead. I interpret their attempt to use this word as resignification of that very term and change the hegemonic meanings that attributed to the word by the political power and previous political powers. I want to open a bracket for a brief

⁷⁵ “..Şebnem’in öldüğü yerde Tanrı yoktur! Şebnem’in öldüğü yerde hukuk da yoktur! Tanrının ve hukukun olmadığı yerde her şey mübahtır! Ezilenlere de ezenlere de! Herkes kendisini en kötüsüne hazırlasın! Bundan daha korkunç bir kabus yok!”

discussion, here. Until recent years, the word is used only for the dead of Turkish Armed Force, but we witnessed the signifier of this term is performatively changing. What kind of resignification is that word subjected to? Do we hear this word for the dead of October 10? Should we hear, or more accurately, do the mourners demand such a recognition? To what extent, this particular naming act makes the ‘life’ more precious? I do not argue that the vulnerability of the armed people and the vulnerability of unarmed people could be considered together, but, to what extent, in the state of war, the political power apprehends the ‘lives’ of the armed forces as indispensable? In Turkey, within 3 years after October 10, when we consider the usage of this word in different attacks towards different peoples, and other cases within social and public violence, we may assume that the people witnessed the process of resignification of it. Therefore, it has not a stable meaning and chain of signification.

The community of the mourners of October 10, we could say it is a community which is not apprehended as a community, constitute their martyrs as the martyrs of all the people who have the will to peace. I interpreted this particular use as the attempt the constitution of a loose ‘we’ which based on precariousness and precarity. I argue that the people who do not approve the politics of war of the political power are referred. Hence, the ‘we’ is constituted within the ground of grief;

“I want to say goodbye to my comrade with the first slogan I have ever taught her: Death to fascism, freedom for people. My comrade; say hi to our comrades.” (İzzet Sarıkaya, Father of Dilan Sarıkaya (22) / T24, 20 October 2015)⁷⁶

“My son is the martyr of our people, he is the martyr of everyone who asks for peace. This path has cost a lot, this is how we feel.” (Orhan Erkan, Father of Vedat Erkan (19) / T24, 20 October 2015)⁷⁷

⁷⁶ “Benim yoldaşımı ona öğrettiğim ilk sloganla göndermek istiyorum. Faşizme ölüm, halka hürriyet. Yoldaşım yoldaşlarımıza selam söyle”

⁷⁷ “Oğlum tüm halkımızın, barış isteyen herkesin şehididir. Bu yolda çok bedeller ödendi, biz işte böyle bir durumdayız”

“International Day of Peace, 1 May, memorial day of Denizs... He would run to those events before any of us. This kind of things would boost his desire to live.” (Burcu Karakuş, Friend of Sevgi Öztekin / T24, 15 December 2015)⁷⁸

Another emphasis within the discussion of political subjectivity is the focus the moment and the way of the death. The mourners uttered such a way of death as the proof of what kind of life lived before and they provide their close experiences and memories with the deceased. I interpret these narratives as an attempt to say ‘this life has lived, hence, should be grieved’. To utter and remind that in what kind of a struggle for life, these lives lost and they proud of how it was lived and died;

“I’m proud of my son. He is remembered as a token of the struggle of millions of people with his 19 years of life and struggle.” (Ogün Uzatmaz, Father of Ali Deniz Uzatmaz (19) / Evrensel, 16 October 2015)⁷⁹

“This is the only way of death which suits you. You died the way which would suit you, this is your fight against the traitors.” (Emel Kitapçı, Wife of Ali Kitapçı (57) / T24, 20 October 2015)⁸⁰

“My father was a revolutionist, and he always lived as a revolutionist. He died when he was chanting. It hurts a lot, but this death is good for him.” (Deniz Benol, Son of Kemal Tayfun Benol (54) / T24, 20 October 2015)⁸¹

In the previous chapter, the issue of political participation is discussed within the conceptualizations of appearance on public space, precarity and ‘liveable life’. In this chapter, how the mourning and the grief are experienced by the familial chief mourners and how the grief is experienced within in a frame of resistance to precarity, unliveability, and the community. The politicization of the very experience is discussed within political subjectivities of both the deceased and the mourners. How their grief leads them to deepen their political subjectivity and their commitments to basic demands is discussed within the issue of continuing bonds with the dead. The

⁷⁸ “Dünya Barış Günü, 1 Mayıs, Denizler’in anması... Hepimizden önce en önde koşarak o giderdi. Yaşama sevincini artırıyordu bu tür şeyler.”

⁷⁹ “Oğlumla gurur duyuyorum.. 19 yıla sığdırdığı yaşamı ve mücadelesiyle bugün sadece benim çocuğum olarak değil, milyonlarca kişinin mücadelesinde bir simge olarak anılıyor”

⁸⁰ “Sana yakışan bir tek bu ölüm, sen yakıştığı gibi öldün, o kahpelere inat.”

⁸¹ “Babam bir devrimciydi ve hep devrimci olarak yaşadı. Bir devrimcinin ölmesi gerektiği gibi eylem sırasında slogan atarken öldü. Çok acı çekiyoruz ama yine de onun için iyi oldu.”

issue of affect and moral responsiveness, hence the ethical responsibility and interdependence are tried to be integrated into most of the sub-sections.

In the following sub-chapter, how the organizational mourning is experienced will be discussed. At this junction, I want to remind a point. This sub-chapter is about the familial mourning, but when we consider how the community and their way of political participation, namely being active members of the left-wing unions, parties, and different organization, it is not possible to narrate in a familial plane as can be expected. Their way of utterance on their grief could not be separated from their political subjectivity, and regarded free from their organizations, I suppose. Their capability of political analysis was formed before the discourses of their community.

6.3 The Experience of Organizational Mourning

In this sub-chapter, I approach the political experience of mourning by organizational chief mourners. What it means by organizational chief mourners is that the parties, unions, and various organizations who call the ‘Labor, Democracy and Peace’ Rally and who lost their members in the attacks, and the people who attend the assembly. The active members of political parties, HDP, CHP, EMEP and the members of unions and organizations, Yaşam Hakkı Meclisleri, Halkevleri, BTS, Eğitim-Sen, İnşaat İşçileri Sendikası lost their lives on October 10. HDP, Malatya youth section of CHP, EMEP, and BTS could be considered as they have lost at the ‘maximum number’. Since the attack happened before the starting of the rally, most of the lost ‘lives’ are the out comers from different cities all around the country.

After a brief reminder, I analyze the discourses that are circulated by the mourners of organizations and parties after the attacks. But firstly, since the mourning on the familial plane cannot be separated from their ‘lived’ lives within these organizations, and we see similar emphasizes in the narratives and discourse, although the way of utterance is slightly different; I did not give place similar focuses in this section. In the following sub-section, I approach the strikes and protests which are performed in different cities. This sub-section focus on how the strikes and protests are experienced within grief, how they exactly performed, and how they are tried to be controlled with

violence. I also briefly analyze the slogans which are uttered in these protests and strikes.

6.3.1 Emphasis on Security Vulnerability within ‘We know the murderers’: Constitution of “Us-Them”

Just like the familial chief mourners, organizational chief mourners also give an obvious focus on the security vulnerability and police violence on the crime scene and I elaborate these claims in the context of precariousness and precarity. I consider that their precariousness as community figures in their self-constitution and through their constitution of ‘we’, they also refer to the political power and its supporters as the constitutive outside of this ‘we’.

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation, Anaphora, Certainty)

They pointed out to the political power and its police force, AKP in general, and Erdoğan in particular as the responsible of the attacks. For instance, in the first quotation, we see that a cross-reference to the ‘hit’ discourse of Erdoğan that was circulated before June 7 elections. The ‘we’ is constituted both related to the grief and this particular knowledge on the subject of violence. Melih Yalçın defines the attack as ‘civil massacre’ and points out the problem of democratic participation. At this point, when we consider TMMOB is one of the first callers of the assembly, it is understandable that how his grief or the grief of TMMOB turns to rage. What exactly the grief undermines the relational ties of who ‘we’ are is appeared in the discourse if we consider how the case is unique in its paradox stuck within the marginalization and democratic participation. I argue that this particular discourse is based on a style ‘this is what you do, and this is what you are’. Taking this perspective, we argue that the repetitive violent actions of the political power make them what ‘they’ are, namely ‘the murder’;

“We know the killers. The killers are the ones who try to have the autarchy with the thread that ‘Give 400 deputies, this will be solved peacefully’, they are the ones who support this threat...(.) The killers are the ones who refused to help the citizens when the floor was filled with body parts and injured people. They are the ones, who used tear gas against the people trying to help the others. The killers are the ones who say ‘There is not a security gap’, the ministers who laugh when asked ‘Are you going to resign?’ We know the killers, we will not

forget or forgive. We will call them to account.” (Melih Yalçın, TMMOB İzmir Spokesman / Radikal, 12 October 2015)⁸²

While the ‘we’ is becoming in mortal precarity, on the other hand, ‘they’ is constituted in the subject of violence and ‘their’ violent political decisions on various peoples. However, when we consider the claim that ‘they’ restrained the enactment of the assembly violently, with my argument which is the discourse of this political power activates them to assemble to stand against ‘them’, in a sense, how can we approach the relational ties? I argue that what grief reveals not only an interdependence within the community for dealing with the loss, on the other hand, how the interdependence become the source of bodily vulnerability.

Selahattin Demirtaş, the co-chair of HDP, declared a statement a short time after the attacks. In his statement, he targeted the political power of AKP with its all capacity to act and this statement will be referenced by almost all of the statements of AKP-wing. Demirtaş could be seen as one of the organizational chief mourners since HDP is the most injured political party with EMEP. In the statement, the mortal precarity could be seen as the focus;

“We experienced an enormous massacre. We are face to face with a lunatic, unreasonable, undignified worldview. They can do any type of craziness in this country. What we live indicates that. Even one of the offenders of the attacks in Diyarbakır and Suruç has not been identified yet. Of course, it is not our duty to conduct the investigations. It is the government’s duty. AKP government has used its credit of distraction. (...) It is revealed that you are the biggest supporter of terror. The government implies that the ones who are opposed to them, the ones who are their nightmares have no chances of life. This is the only explanation of what is happening. Security incidents of this country are under the responsibility of the government.” (Selahattin Demirtaş, HDP Co-Chair / Hürriyet, 10 October 2015)⁸³

⁸² “Katilleri tanıyoruz... Katiller, sandıkta mutlak hakimiyetini ‘400 milletvekili verin, bu iş huzur içinde çözülsün’ tehdidiyle sağlamaya çalışan ve bu tehdide destek verenlerdir.. (...) Katiller, yüzlerce insan yerlerde paramparça yataken, vatandaşlarımıza yardım etmeyen, aksine onlara yardım etmeye çalışanlara copla biber gazıyla saldıran emniyet görevlileridir. Katiller ‘güvenlik zafiyeti yok’ diyenler, ‘istifa edecek misiniz?’ sorusuna gülen Bakanlardır. Katili tanıyoruz, unutmayacak, affetmeyecek, hesap soracağız.”

⁸³ “Çok büyük bir katliamla karşılaştık.. Çılgınlaşmış, aklını yitirmiş, haysiyetini yitirmiş bir anlayışla karşı karşıyayız. Ülkede yapamayacakları hiçbir çılgınlık yok. Bütün bu olanlar bunu gösteriyor.. Diyarbakır ve Suruç’taki saldırıların arkasındaki faillerle ilgili tek bir kişi dahi ortaya çıkarılmış değil. Herhalde bu soruşturmaları yürütmekle sorumlu olan biz değiliz. İktidarda olanlar sorumlu. (...) Halka

Besides the constitution of the political power as the only responsible for both the security vulnerability and the preclusion of the very formation of the recognition of the particular groups through the assembly. He reminds the duty of the state to secure the public assemblies and give reference to the earlier attacks, one of them is happened in Diyarbakır meeting of HDP that is settled just a little time before the June 7 elections, and the other is Suruç meeting of SGDF. The security vulnerability is not formed with only the secure the “Labor, Democracy, and Peace” rally, but also not to pursue the earlier attacks. The last sentence of this quotation, however, concluded the precarity and livable life; he utters my main argument, the livability is formed within the allegiance to the political power.

6.3.2 Reference to Previous Vulnerabilities and Sufferings: Constitution of Resistance to Precarity as Organizational History

Throughout the analysis chapters, I mentioned some kind of political subjectivity. It referred to both the ‘individual’ and the collective subjectivity. In this brief subsection, I tried to analyze how the collective political subjectivity as the mourner within a slightly historical perspective. I argue that the state of precarity and precariousness is not natural, for sure. However, I believe that a critical study on livability should trace its historical trajectory. How the earlier experiences of precarity sediments in the collective subjectivity, and became a source of a future act of resistances and potential of new experiences of precarity.

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation, Anaphora, Certainty)

We might see that some of the organizational mourners openly narrates their previous experiences of resistance over such an unfortunate obstacle to peace. Through this, they constitute themselves in one side; that is a loose ‘we’ who have the will to peace and exposed to various forms of violence. They consider themselves as allies with senior fellows, and draw their belief and are integrated into their own way of resistance. Therefore, the resistance expands like a snowball for the community. The knowledge which is based on the previous experiences provides them with the capacity

şu mesaj veriliyor. Şu anda devleti ele geçirenlere kabus çökmüşlere biat etmeyenlere yaşam şansı yok deniyor. Bunun başka tanımı yoktur. Ülkede her türlü güvenlikten mevcut iktidar sorumludur.”

to recognize the subject of violence with its own ways. So, the answer to the question ‘where will we go now?’ is already there. It can be understood from the following statements that they know the subject of violence is not deathless; I assume that this knowledge itself is the ground of both the assembly and the following resistance acts. The answer is persistence on peace and solidarity;

“Peace will not come easily, we know that. History has witnessed the tyranny to which the peace supporters are subjected. Therefore, we will achieve our goal if we do not feel desperate if we hold on to each other especially in those days.” (Hüda Kaya, HDP İstanbul Deputy / Agos, 12 October 2015)⁸⁴

“We know the killers from their methods. When we raise peace, they take their weapons out. People will come together and bring the offenders to book. People of ethnicities will be siblings to each other and we will be free, we will live in peace despite all of the pain they put us through. We promise.” (Beyza Üstün, HDP İstanbul Deputy / Çağdaşses, 10 October 2015)⁸⁵

However, I want to propound a question here. I do not intend to trivialize any of them, but I want to argue that when the political power use its power to impose how the ‘peace’ meant to be and resignify the very meaning of the ‘peace’, what you do in the name of the peace may be obtained as something else. Moreover, if the political power constitutes a rocky ‘they’ the acts may fall into the space of meaningless, it will enter the perceptual field in a framework of ‘they will do what they do as they do’. In this point, if I do not over-read the case, October 10 prove how this particular trajectory was happening. Then, ‘where will we go now?’. Should the collective knowledge based on lived experiences sustain the existing forms of resistance, or should they use for creating the new ones?

6.3.3 Sustainment of Believing in Emancipation: Solidarity and Ethics of Cohabitation

The organizational mourners openly declare their belief on emancipation even though they see the current obstacles in such an unfortunate atmosphere for them. The

⁸⁴ “Barış kolay gelmeyecek bunu biliyoruz. Tarihte barış taraftarları hep zulme maruz kalmıştır. İşte tam da böyle bir zamanda yılgınlığa düşmeden, birbirimize sahip çıkarak o kadar başarılı olacağız”

⁸⁵ “Biz bu katilleri tanıyoruz, yöntemleriyle tanıyoruz. Biz barışı büyüttükçe onlar savaş silahlarını çıkarıyorlar.. Halklar kol kola girip bunun hesabını soracak. İnadına halklar kardeş olacak inadına özgür olacağız inadına barış içinde olacağız. Halklara sözümüz olsun.”

limitation on freedom of assembly could be seen as one of these struggles when we consider that the act of voting may not meet their demands and ensure their political participation as a community. While declaring their belief, they use the pronoun ‘we’, and try to trigger the solidarity between the mourners and supporters, so this attack will not cause a historical gap within the political subjectivity of the community.

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation, Anaphora, Certainty)

We see an obvious rage in the statements, and they consider different ways to integrate their rage to the grief, resistance, and the possibilities of emancipation. If the first statement, for instance, Arzu Çerkezoğlu from DİSK see how this emancipation will be at demanding resignation from the government. Moreover, she hopes and believes that all the government officers will be on trial. The argument was constituted with a ‘we’, and this ‘we’ is used with ‘them’ in several places. In the last sentence, she changed the ‘we’ with ‘people’ while uttering her belief on their trial will be held by ‘the people’;

“This government should immediately resign. Prime Minister, Interior Minister, Chair of National Security Organization should resign. Even it is not enough, they should be on trial. They should get out of their palaces with handcuffs. The smile of our friends, comrades, and children was frozen on their faces because of the offenders. I swear to god we will bury that dictator in the history. I swear to god we will take them from their palaces with handcuffs. We will judge them. We will overthrow this government. Furthermore, we will not do that confidentially; they will be judged in front of everyone’s eyes. Peoples of Turkey will judge them.” (Arzu Çerkezoğlu, DİSK General Secretary / Radikal, 12 October 2015)⁸⁶

In this statement, belief in emancipation is operating within a legal system. Besides, it is presupposed that the justice exists in the judiciary system, and the political power can be judged in this system. I argue that this statement does not foresee a resistance within power relations, and an emancipation negotiating with power. On the other

⁸⁶ "Bugünden tezi yok bu hükümet istifa edecek. Başbakan, İçişleri Bakanı, MİT Başkanı istifa edecek. İstifa etmeleri yetmez, yargılanacaklar. O saraydan kollarında kelepçelerle çıkacaklar. Onlar ki bizim arkadaşlarımızın, yoldaşlarımızın, çocuklarımızın gülüşlerini yüzlerinde dondurdular. Ant olsun ki o diktatörü tarihe gömeceğiz. Ant olsun ki saraylarında oturdukları yerden ellerinde kelepçelerle çıkartacağız. Onları da yargılayacağız. Bu iktidarı yerle bir edeceğiz. Hem de onların yaptığı gibi gizli de yargılamayacağız. Stadyumlara dolduracağız. Açık yargılayacağız. Halk yargılayacak"

hand, some statements found the way of resistance in daily capacities of the people; such as not forget what is done. I argue that it is an important point in the current political atmosphere. Since the various forms of violence against particular groups is insisted by the power, and the frequency is increased, such a violence based on intimidation have the capacity to break the resistance through the very capacity of a human being to forget. When the power is operating its power to forget what is done; not to forget will become the way of resistance;

“We are summoning the ones who try to frighten, browbeat, suppress us. We will not be frightened, we will not give up on our case, we will not forget or forgive. You will be drowned in the blood you spilled. ” (Esra Tetik, Aviation Union, Aviation Branch, Woman Secretary / Radikal, 12 October 2015)⁸⁷

“Let alone 7 days, even if 7 thousand years have passed, we will not forget the ones we have lost. We will not forgive, we owe calling the offenders to account for the lost ones. We will never give up, but struggle.” (Bahri Akkan, KESK Spokesman / Evrensel, 17 October 2015)⁸⁸

“We will not forget this massacre. If we forget it, it means we also forget about our humanities.” (Sırrı Sakık, HDP Ağrı Co-Mayor / T24, 20 October 2015)⁸⁹

As Sırrı Sakık states, to forget what is done is constituted in losing one’s own very human feeling, in other words, to forget causes dehumanization of this particular group. At this particular point, my inquiry cannot exceed my main problem in this thesis. What exactly means to be human? And I argue that humanness or ‘living a life’ requires resistance for those who are exposed to precarity.

The organizational mourners of October 10 think of a resistance through remembrance. However, the act of remembering is not only limited to the community's own resistance practice, but it also invites people outside the group to not to forget about the what is done by keeping it on the agenda. On the other hand, there is also a resistance within the judicial system in order to prevent October 10 to become an unidentified murder. It is not just mourned and the process of grief is done, it is actually

⁸⁷ “Bizi korkutmaya, bizi yıldırmaya, bizi sindirmeye çalışanlara sesleniyoruz. Korkmayacağız, yılmayacağız, unutmayacağız ve affetmeyeceğiz. Döktüğünüz kanda boğulacaksınız.”

⁸⁸ “7 gün değil 7 bin gün geçse de yitirdiklerini unutmayacağız. Affetmeyeceğiz, hesap sormadığımız sürece onlara borçlu kalacağız. Yılmayacağız, mücadele edeceğiz”

⁸⁹ “Bu katliamı unutmayacağız. Unutursak insanlığımızı unutacağız.”

a matter of that should be kept on the agenda, therefore grievability of the lives aimed as a resistance in the long run. The claim of ‘we know the murderer’ which has been already been emphasized, is repeated as ‘we know you’. In a sense, the perpetrator is being revealed. However, this system is not only limited to political power, but it is also emphasized with other knowledge-production mechanisms which the power can reach. In other words, it is implied they are aware of the fact that the constitution of ‘what counts as real’ is actualized in a very complex framework. In this case, the mourners assume that the political power will cause to forget, and claims that they know in which fields the resistance through not to forget will be held;

“We will not let them cover the 10 October massacre. We will not let them prison this story into the dirty, dark tunnels of Ankara.” (Selma Setan, Eğitim-Sen, Woman Secretary / Evrensel, 17 October 2015)⁹⁰

“Despite all of your wildness, violence, massacres, we will never give up on standing for life and peace all together as a whole country.” (Ethem Kartal, KESK Spokesman / Evrensel, 17 October 2015)⁹¹

“We know the offenders of this massacre. We know you, the managers of the government party, we know you, the bureaucrats and mayors of it, we also know that you did not sympathize with us. We also very well know the ones who prevented the media to convey the news to the people. We will call for the account of our lost ones.” (Rıdvan Turan, HDP Adana Deputy / Evrensel, 17 October 2015)⁹²

“We will have either peace or peace.” (Özlem Tolu, KESK Spokeswoman / Evrensel, 10 October 2015)⁹³

Demirtaş, for instance, accepts that the attack will be the cause of unbearable sufferings but do not consider the attack as a barrier to the resistance. On the contrary, his statement has an implicit meaning as the belief in resistance is strengthened. He

⁹⁰ “10 Ekim katliamının üzerinin örtülmesine, Ankara’nın kirli, karanlık dehlizlerine hapsedilmesine izin vermeyeceğiz”

⁹¹ “Bütün vahşetinize, bütün şiddetinize, bütün katliamlarınıza rağmen, eşit, özgür, demokratik bir ülkede bir arada yaşamı ve barışı savunmaktan asla vazgeçmeyeceğiz”

⁹² “Katliamı yapanları biliyoruz, bizimle duygudaşlık yapmayan adeta oh oldu diyen iktidar partisinin yöneticileri de bürokratları da belediye başkanları hepinizi biliyor ve tanıyoruz. Gerçeklerin halklardan saklanması için basının bunu haberleştirmesini engelleyenleri de iyi tanıyoruz. Kayıplarımızın hesabını mutlaka soracağız”

⁹³ “Ya barış gelecek ya barış”

points out to a tradition of non-violence and believes that the politics of frightening could not be operated in such a tradition. I claim that, like it is mentioned in the previous sub-section, the political subjectivity within this tradition obtain the power to resist from sufferings;

“We guarantee for our peoples that, we will never bend our knees before those traitors; although it is true that it hurts a lot and we will be face to face with other horrible attacks. Know that, even if you rip apart our bodies, even if we are left with only one eyelash, one eyebrow, that eyelash of ours will never surrender. You are against the people who come from an honorable tradition of resistance, you are against people who are not afraid of you. If you think that we will surrender, you are wrong. You were wrong in the past, you are wrong now. We will bind up our wounds. We will continue to live in peace. We need all of the peoples of Turkey to interlocked around the struggle of peace and freedom. The ones with a conscience should interlock against this dishonor. We do not have the desire to live together with traitors. We are already in solidarity with the ones who have always been ignored, subordinated in this country. We cannot expect life to come out of the ones who have lost their dignity. Coexistence will happen with subordinated ones. We will defend that.” (Selahattin Demirtaş, HDP Co-Chair / Hürriyet, 10 October 2015)⁹⁴

Another emphasis that Demirtaş points is cohabitation. He openly states that their understanding of cohabitation is not aiming to include the people who have not lost their ‘self-respect’ yet. The cohabitation is framed within a ‘we’, and this ‘we’ refers to those who are subjected to violence, exposed to precarity, and who have ‘self-respect’.

6.3.4 The Spreading of the Rage: Funerals, Strikes, and Protests

After the attacks, beginning from the same day, the protests are performed in different cities all around Turkey. In the mourning of October 11, at 10:04 a.m., the remembrance activism is settled by different organizations and parties. The unions

⁹⁴ “Halklarımız şundan emin olmalıdır evet acı büyük yaşadığımız süreç itibariyle vahim saldırılarla karşı karşıyayız. Ama bu alçakların önünde asla diz çökmeyeceğiz. Şunu bilmeleri gerekir. bedenimizi lime lime etseniz tek bir kirpiğimiz, kaşımız sağlam kalsa bile o kirpiğimiz sizin karşınızda asla kapanmayacak. Sizin gibi alçaklardan korkmayacak onurlu direniş geleneğinden gelen halklar var karşınızda. Bu şekilde toplumu teslim almaya düşünüyorlarsa yanılıyorlar. Geçmişte de yanılıyorlardı şimdi de yanılıyorlar. Acılarımız saracağız. Barış içinde yaşamak için bizler devam edeceğiz. Bütün Türkiye toplumunun kenetlenmesi lazım. barış ve özgürlük mücadelesi etrafında kenetlenmesi lazım. Bu alçaklık karşısında vicdanı olanların kenetlenmesi gerekiyor. Bizim alçaklarla bir arada yaşama dayanışma gibi isteğimiz yoktur. Bu ülkede zaten ezilmiş olan yok sayılmış olan her türlü zulüm gören ezilmişlerle dayanışma içindeyiz... Haysiyetini yitirmiş olanlarla birlikte yaşam falan da olmaz. Birlikte yaşam mazlumlarla olacak. Bunu savunacağız..”

both the callers of the assembly and the supporters declared 3 days strike for the enactment of grief. The protests are performed by the organizations of other minority and precarious groups, also by the people who have not relation with any of collective groups. The mourning was spreading within people. The funerals of the deceased's also turned to protests and so many people gathered for the funerals. It was almost impossible to distinguish where the funeral ends and where the rage begins.

The attendees of these protests planted olive trees as a symbol of peace. They stand in silence. They sit-in. They read the names of those who lost their lives, and the crowd replied as 'alive' or 'here'. They read the stories of their dead. In some cities, black balloons were left to the air, while in other cities white balloons were left. It was the state of paradox between the will to peace and grief. The black flags were strung up for the symbol of grief. There was nothing written on them. They wrote 'Barış' means 'peace' with candles. The 'Saturday Mothers' shed tears for those who lost their lives. In the funerals, the women who lost their lives are carried on the shoulders of the women. There were remembrances and protests which are restrained by the police force, and the number is not few. The police force used tear gas, water cannons, and plastic bullets. In some particular districts, protests detained by the police.

What I construed from these happenings, there was rage, but it was non-violent. When the police force attacked, it could be turned to self-defense. But, firstly, could or should the state of grief may have an effect on how the act of non-violence is approached and registered by 'the other'?

When we look at the slogans which are uttered in these protests, strikes, and funerals, there are different but relational statements. The appearance on streets, the will to peace, ethical demands, resistance within various non-violent forms, resistance within alliance, the knowledge on the subject of violence, relatedly, the knowledge about the will of the subject of the violence, political demand, naming the dead, warning to the precarious groups, the emancipation about other precarious groups. I argue that we might classify the banners which are appeared in the public space through the protests, funerals, and strikes.

Local Meanings (Selection of Words)

I consider the utterance of “Police, get lost, the streets are ours”⁹⁵, for instance, as the performative enactment or formation of the public space. It both calls for the belonging and the possession of the public space to the precarious and resistant subjects, both resisting the police, and tried to form the space without its violence. Within the public space, meanwhile, right to appear and right to resist is formed in alliances as we might deduce from the utterances of “We will win when we are together”⁹⁶ or we might say the protesters point out to a bodily alliance with the utterance of “Shoulder to shoulder against fascism”⁹⁷. The meaning of ‘shoulder to shoulder’ is formed within solidarity, for sure, but I argue that the bodily enactment of this alliance is a very significant point. Just as the calls of the ‘Labor, Democracy and Peace’ Rally, the protests were settled for the lost lives of this rally, point out to the emergence of the state of peace with the slogans like “No to war, we want peace now”⁹⁸ or “Raise your voice, no to war”⁹⁹. From my perspective, we might interpret the latter as the performative enactment of speaking subject, it is performative, as long as the speaking subject actualize the act of speech itself and the answers to the call ‘don’t be quiet’, the speaking subject who resists to the differential allocation of precarity is started to becoming. The will to peace and resistance to the state of war has intersected the knowledge on the asserted subject of violence and its will to war. The utterance of “The palace wants war, we want peace”¹⁰⁰, I argue that the constitution of both the subject of violence and the object of violence, through that, the object of violence becomes and constituted within the subjectivity who struggles, speaks, and act for peace. The subject of violence or the power which pushed them precarity is defined as ‘murderer’, they both point to

⁹⁵ “Polis defol, bu sokaklar bizim”

⁹⁶ “Birleşe birleşe kazanacağız”

⁹⁷ “Faşizme karşı omuz omuza”

⁹⁸ “Savaşa hayır barış hemen şimdi”

⁹⁹ “Susma Haykır, Savaşa Hayır”

¹⁰⁰ “Saray savaş halklar barış istiyor”

ISIS and AKP in these utterances as “Murderer, thief AKP”¹⁰¹ or “Murderer ISIS, collaborator AKP”¹⁰². I argue that, with this line, the livability and unlivability are constituted through the notions with the utterance of “Death to fascism, freedom to peoples”¹⁰³.

The protests utter the immortality of their deceased’s and constitutes them with the martyr of peace and revolution; “Peace martyrs are immortal”¹⁰⁴ and “Revolution martyrs are immortal”¹⁰⁵ or they named the lost life and proud of the way that life is lived; “Leyla Çiçek is our honour”¹⁰⁶ and “Hi to the fighters and victims in Ankara”¹⁰⁷, or they intersected the livability of the dead with their resistance; like the utterances of “Martyrs live, laborers resist”¹⁰⁸ and “We stop life for our peace martyrs”¹⁰⁹.

The resistance and the resistance on it non-violence forms are another focus of the slogans in the funerals, strikes, and protests. For instance, the utterance of “Peace, out-of-spice, brotherhood, out-of-spice”¹¹⁰ both refer to solidarity and cohabitation in a sense, to resist is possible just with ‘being’ or just sustaining the ‘living’ under these conditions for them, if we look at the slogan; “We existed, we exist, we will exist”¹¹¹

¹⁰¹ “Katil, hırsız AKP”

¹⁰² “Katil Işid, İşbirlikçi AKP”

¹⁰³ “Faşizme ölüm, Halka Hürriyet”

¹⁰⁴ “Barış şehitleri ölümsüzdür”

¹⁰⁵ “Devrim şehitleri ölümsüzdür”

¹⁰⁶ “Leyla Çiçek Onurumuzdur”

¹⁰⁷ “Ankara’da doğuşene düşene bin selam”

¹⁰⁸ “Şehitler yaşıyor, emekçiler direniyor”

¹⁰⁹ “Barış şehitlerimiz için yaşamı durduruyoruz”

¹¹⁰ “İnadına barış inadına kardeşlik”

¹¹¹ “Vardık, varız, varolacağız”

and “Pressures cannot stop us”¹¹² or it is possible with to resist to some kind of intrinsic demands of the self; “Never forget, never forgive”¹¹³.

At the funerals of the women who lost their lives on October 10, it was uttered that “Jin jiyan Azadi” which means “Woman, Life, Freedom” in Kurdish, and it is the motto of Kurdish Feminist Movement in the region. Another emphasis on woman is about the motherhood and the capacity of their rage to stop the violence; they uttered “Mothers’ rage will drown the killers”¹¹⁴.

The solidarity which is the key term both for the assembly and the mourning is a key emphasis of the protests; they uttered their belief on the emancipation and their prediction on it will happen altogether, or will not happen. They gloried the solidarity within different antagonisms; “Long live the brotherhood of peoples”¹¹⁵. The famous slogan “Raise your voice, or you will be next”¹¹⁶ is, from my perspective, the call for the communities who are subjected to precarity to the precarious groups. The enactment of speaking subjectivity is expressed with a warning; if they do not ‘speak’, their precariousness will turn to precarity. Then they point out to how the salvation will be like with another famous slogan which is got its fame in Gezi Park Protests, namely “Salvation requires everybody, either all of us or none of us”¹¹⁷.

They uttered their political demands like resign of the government, with “Government to resign!”¹¹⁸ and the demand of justice, with “Murderer government will answer”¹¹⁹. In this particular point, who is justice is want from is not clear. Who will the state

¹¹² “Baskılar bizi durduramaz”

¹¹³ “Unutmak yok, affetmek yok”

¹¹⁴ “Anaların öfkesi katilleri boğacak”

¹¹⁵ “Yaşasın Halkların Kardeşliği”

¹¹⁶ “Susma sustukça sıra sana gelecek”

¹¹⁷ “Kurtuluş yok tek başına, ya hep beraber ya hiçbirimiz”

¹¹⁸ “Hükümet İstifa”

¹¹⁹ “Katil devlet hesap verecek”

account to? To what extent, the people who are subjected to state violence may appeal to very state if we consider there are limited options.

The last focus that I want to narrate here is that the use of future sense. “Laborers will call the murderers to account”¹²⁰, “The day will come, the murderers will answer to people”¹²¹ and “Katilleri tanıyoruz unutmayacağız unutturmayacağız hesap soracağız” are the examples. I interpret these utterances as both the act of promise to the deceased and like a mixture of their prediction from themselves in the future and its enactment in the future.

6.4 Rethinking Mourning and Grievability

In this entire process of grief, some other things have actually happened. Since these things cannot be located in either familial mourning, or organizational mourning, and I do not want to these things in a different frame, I will try to narrate these things in this sub-section. My aim is to indicate that how and in what kind of temporality the process of grief has taken place in a political sphere.

Firstly, when October 10 occurs, there were some things other than the issues of security vulnerability, police’s usage of tear gas, and the problem of ambulances’ entrance to the area. These are happened except where the explosion has taken place and the public space in which the gathering is to be formed and never been formed.

I argue that we can read all these as a sign that how grievability has been operated in a quite complex order. The RTUK imposed a broadcast ban on the attacks. It was stated that the reason of ban is related to the provisions that under the cases where the national security clearly required it, and cases where the public order was seriously deteriorated. Creating obstacles in the way of access to knowledge can be considered as an effort to continue the rhetoric of the stability of the country, which will be mentioned in the political discourses on October 10. While the fact that the explosion took place at the center of the capital of the country, and the fact that 102 people were murdered, in other words, slaughtered is materialized through security vulnerability,

¹²⁰ “Katillerden hesabı emekçiler soracak”

¹²¹ “Gün Gelecek Devran Dönecek Katiller Halka hesap verecek”

the broadcasting was also banned due to security discourse. I argue that the fact that this event did not take place on television in the first place, has directly affected how much it will be remembered not only for that time but also afterward. While what counts as real or which life is apprehended is life is actualized such a frame, I claim that we must rethink what kind of resistance should be being pursued in the terms of precariousness and precarity. It is already mentioned in the previous sections that how the affect is actualized in some interpretative frameworks and how it affects the ability to stand against violence of ‘the other’. Besides, at the first place, talking about and citing the event is hindered for particular people, when we consider how many people access to knowledge only by television in Turkey, I claim that it also limits the frame of how the event will take place in collective memory.

The fact that sharing and receiving information publicly had been subjected to specific boundaries, thus communication has been improved within their own networks. Rather, tried to develop. When the information about who was killed, who was wounded, and which hospitals where the wounded were circulating through Twitter and Facebook, the internet slowed down. Access difficulties to Twitter and Facebook are experienced. People were able to access these sites via VPN. While the sharing information of the event with the ‘outside’ was already blocked, the fact that sharing the information within ‘the community’ is limited through such technical limitations made it difficult to transfer and circulate information. At this junction, I argue that it shows us how knowledge, politics, and resistance could not be separated and thought free from each other. I claim that we should rethink about what counts as real, whose life counts as life, who ‘the people’ really are, and what kind of frameworks they are constituted.

After October 10, some platforms such as, T24, Ötekilerin Postası, Evrensel and Bianet shared about the lives who had lost and specified that they are not numbers, but lives. These were shared with photographs of those lives, often with photographs of their political subjectivities appeared. Sharing include how old they were, what they were doing, marital status and child-bearing status, and in which organization they are members of. In addition, the statements made by the familial chief mourners are placed

for some of them. I consider this effort as a very significant method of resistance since the lives of these people not to be heard on television or in the mainstream media organs. Because this narrative actually tells us that life was lived, it has a witness, and therefore it is grievable. However, beyond that, the 'Peace Portraits' platform was created within the resistance of remembrance¹²². A group of writers talked about these lives with people who know the deceased and shared the stories of lives at #101015Ankara. At this point, I consider the use of 'portrait', and I argue that it signifies the recognition of that life when we consider the face has a fundamental importance in terms of recognizability. From my perspective, it is an attempt to resignify 'the people'.

I do not think that it will fit in any way how the mourning of 10 October is experienced, to the conceptualization of mourning is something which happened in the private sphere of life. Mourning includes a complex aspect of political life which our fundamental interdependence and ethical responsibilities within a 'we' is revealed. It presents us something important for both the relations within 'we', and the relation to 'other'. In a sense, even though the discussion is about mourning and grief, it is actually an attempt to think about, life, lives, and how the lives intersect with each other. When we think the interdependence of these lives with ethics of cohabitation, a significant question arises. While precariousness and precarity constrain the lives to become 'speaking subject' or 'subject', how should we organize 'life' itself?

¹²² <http://101015ankara.org/>

CHAPTER 7

HEGEMONIC POWER ON GRIEVABILITY: CONSTITUTION OF SPEAKING SUBJECT

Butler argues that a critical analysis of subjection needs to address an explanation on “an account of the way regulatory power maintains subjects in subordination by producing and exploiting the demand for continuity, visibility, and place” in *Psychic Life of Power* (1997:29). In this part of the thesis, I try to examine the political discourses that have been circulating after October 10 terrorist attacks by using Butler’s framework. Political parties such as the CHP, HDP, TKP, and EP, which are part of these political discourses, were treated as political chief mourners and took part in Chapter 6. Here in this part, I include discourses by AKP wing, especially the president, the prime minister, ministers. These discourses have been analyzed within the framework of the constitutive outside, the formation of political opposition subjectivity, interpellation, and the grid of cultural intelligibility.

To be reminded, Butler's conceptualization of subject formation that is established and articulated in *Gender Trouble* (1990), *Bodies That Matter* (1993) and *Psychic Life of Power* (1997) conceptualizes interpellation as formative and performative. That is to say, in analyzing the discourse that has been circulated by political power here, the precariousness and grievability that I left out in the previous chapter are transferred through the matrix of cultural intelligibility, which is the site of formation and regulation of precariousness, and it forms the basis in this section. Taking this line, as discussed in the critical analysis of subjection, in this chapter discourses are treated as both violating and enabling. Therefore, those power relations enable the becoming of the political opponent subject, even if it opposes them. Because, as mentioned in the previous sections of the analysis, the interpellation is prohibiting, while at the same time these people are enabled to realize this assembly and activate them in this direction.

Following Butler, we can say that the social order which forms the subject within abjection borders is established by discourse. At this point, the establishment of this formation through a kind of symbolic, and the formation of this signifier through a social category rather than a name may reveal to us how and through which formative discourse this social category is able to find its place. The subject discussed here has not a state of there-ness which enables exceeding and countering political discourse. In other words, the otherness of the community which called for the assembly in the present political discourse is not through the exclusion from the matrix of intelligibility. On the contrary, it is formed as something that is marginalized within the matrix. So, it is becoming a cultural and political possibility which is denied to have sanctions. At this junction, the point that should not be misunderstood is that they are still in the political culture, but they are excluded from the dominant political culture. There is not a political subject behind the act of opposition, and doing performative identification of this opposition and otherness. It enables this subjectivity to become as itself, the repetition of the performative acts at any moment. At this point, it is almost impossible to not include how the funeral rituals evolved into resistance actions, strikes and protests, as mentioned in the previous chapter, how these actions took place in the dominant political discourse, and to think about them apart from each other. I claim that the political allegiance in Turkey is becoming a state of the norm that enables one to speak in the sphere of political intelligibility. However, this norm enables not only the act of speaking, but also the act of living itself, and perhaps this point constitutes the extreme part of this claim. The main argument of the thesis begins exactly at this point. How is it that the citizen, the placeholder of the right to live in the country, and the state of non-opposition intersect at the same point? At this point, it becomes compulsory to recognize the opposition as a placeholder and a category in the hegemonic discourse. It is because the categories of opposition or otherness arise as a consequence of repetitive practices at this hegemonic order. To be clear, in my opinion, it is trying to ensure coherence between citizenship, political identity, and political practice by repeating, citing, and abjection. The contingency of these practices comes from their repeatability and it points to being a placeholder, rather

than a 'natural' state of being there. The political power here, then, becomes both external to the subject and emerges as the very site of the subject.

To sum up, the concept of subjection discussed in this chapter is used both in terms of being subjected to power and in the process of becoming a subject. In this sense, the subject is the consequence of particular rule-based discourses that lead to the emergence of opposition identity in the matrix of political-cultural intelligibility. I want to repeat that the subject mentioned is not in a constant state of always there, or in the preliminary cause of these actions, but a process of repetition. Such is the case that the political discourse uses its power to form and orchestrate the subject in the matrix that it has created and sustained by compelling its concepts. At this point, the performative effect of interpellation goes beyond forming a simple agency, because the formed subject is not fixed in this way, but at the same time it becomes the instrument of later acts, and hence later formations. The inhabitable field, which reappears on October 10, sets the boundaries of the domain of the speaking subject and reshapes the 'citizenship', namely the opposition to the visibility of the political dissent, how it looks and is excluded from it. In order to expose the limits of this formation of subjectivity, in other words, to provide a perspective of who is the subject of rights based on democratic participation in Turkey, the discussion in this chapter will begin with the focus on reconstitution of cohabitation in Turkey. The debate will continue in the attempt to reconstitute the claim of 'security weakness', which is often expressed by the mourning groups, by using the terms 'duty' and 'state' in discourses. Later on, it will be analyzed the reconstitution attempt of political power on purpose of the attack, or object of violence. Within this discussion, the unstable dimension of the discourse will be referred to, as the unity in Turkey, which is manifested in the discourse, and the way in which this unity and integrity are formed. The discourses on elections will be integrated with their emphasis on 'who is targeted' and 'who did it'. The section of 'reconstitution of cohabitation' will end here, and the following section 'reconstitution of the constitutive outside' begins with the discourse which targets the callers of the meeting in relation to 'who did it' discussion and its possible effects on elections. After that, the second focus will be on how dominant political discourse misrepresents and reconstitutes the 'knowing subject' debate which is mentioned in

Chapter 6. The chapter will be concluded with a rethinking of grievability and freedom of assembly.

7.1 Constitution of Cohabitation

7.1.1 Reconstitution of Security Vulnerability or Precarity

As mentioned in the previous analysis chapter, one of the most shared arguments of familial and organizational chief mourners is the security vulnerability. I consider this debate on security vulnerability with the claim that precariousness of life emphasizes social and political conditions. So, apprehension of the vulnerability requires the barriers to be drawn in front, and this refers to a collective responsibility. At this point, we can claim that the gathering security must be provided by the units of the state since the gathering is a right of citizenship. Let us put the possibility of arbitrary state violence on one side, the state which is mentioned has the power to expose some lives to violence within discourse, and this particular community adjusts to insecurity through discourse. Even more than that, the discourse itself creates the conditions of violence through negligence and reiterates it. If there is such an effect of this violence that cannot be reversed, a situation such as the death of 102 people, it will be valid for the state to talk about what is to be done after that, for the survivors and mourners, it will not be a possibility.

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation)

When we look at the statements made by the state about the security vulnerability, contrary to the insistence of familial and organizational chief mourners, who are exposed to precarity, the event is constituted as something dark and to be illuminated. The state is tasked with illuminating this darkness with 'all its units':

“After the attacks carried out in front of Ankara Train Station at 10.04 am on 10th of October, all units of our state are now on duty to shed light on the incident as soon as possible and to relieve the grief.” (Prime Ministry Coordination Center, T24 / 11th of October, 2015)¹²³

¹²³“10 Ekim saat 10:04’te Ankara Tren Garı önünde meydana gelen bombalı saldırılar sonrasında devletimizin tüm birimleri olayın bir an önce aydınlatılması ve yaraların sarılması için görev başındadır.”

When we look at the statement made by the President, we see another issue: ‘despite everything’. This point can be read as a reference to the episodically griveability, hence livability. An obligation is expressed in discourse; although it is evident from the very beginning that it is an act carried out by suicide bombers, the delivery of the perpetrators to the justice is uttered. If we follow the perspective of Erdoğan, this ‘agency’ may not be referring to the person who actually performs the action, and this is a reasonable point to be accepted. But if this agency goes to the issue of ‘cause’, this point will again lead us to the role of the state:

“Regardless of the source, discourse, purpose, and name, we are opposed to any kind of terrorist acts and terrorist organization, and altogether we are obliged to be opposed to them. Our state is working to shed light on this incident with all its units, and I believe that the perpetrators will be identified as soon as possible and will be brought to justice. ” (R. T. Erdoğan, the President / Cumhuriyet, 10th of October, 2015)¹²⁴

If we look at the statement made by the Prime Minister, we see that the argument is established with a reference to hesitation. There was a doubt that was often expressed by a segment of society, particularly by those who are suffering and those who shared this suffering, but the social conditions in which lives there were not secured were tried to be reconstituted in a sense of rejection. However, I claim that it is not just the precarious group that is trying to reconcile this hesitation. This emphasis on security weakness, which is used to point to the problems of the state's functioning, is reinforced for the group that is not currently looking at the role of the government critically and one step closer to reification. Another emphasis which is uttered by Deputy Chairman of AKP in a similar vein is what can be done for the future in the case of security vulnerability. What are the ‘necessary’ steps to be taken in this case? Can punish criminals - suicide bombers as active agents, a terrorist organization as supporters of the active agents - return the effects of mortal precarity of these lives? Let us suppose that the political power is attempting to include these particular groups into the ‘inside’; is this vulnerability operating for other groups? Would the use of ‘not

¹²⁴ “Kaynağı, söylemi, amacı, adı ne olursa olsun, her türlü terör eyleminin ve terör örgütünün karşısındayız, hep birlikte de karşısında olmak mecburiyetindeyiz.. Devletimiz, tüm birimleriyle bu olayı aydınlatmak için çalışmaktadır; faillerin en kısa zamanda belirleneceğine ve adalete teslim edileceğine inanıyorum.”

be noticed' increase or diminish the suffering of the mourners? I think we should think about these questions.

“No one should have any doubt that our government and all of our related units are always dedicated to fighting on the most efficient way against terrorist attacks like how we did in the past and how we will do in the future.” (Ahmet Davutoğlu, Prime Minister / NTV, 10th of October, 2015)¹²⁵

“For sure, our security forces and national intelligence try to be careful as much as they can. However, sometimes there is an unnoticed terrorist attack which escapes from attention. All those results in that as a state our security forces have to be more careful. Preventing such an attacks before they occur through intelligence is the main duty of our police and security forces.” (Mehmet Ali Şahin, Vice Chairman of AKP / T24, 10th of October, 2015)¹²⁶

Moreover, these statements which are uttered by the government are based on the fact that these events are not due to the precarity of these lives, but rather because of their precariousness. In other words, a group of people was gathered on the street, the bodies of these people were injurable by definition, and these people were killed by this 'causeless and sourceless' neglect. Just at this point, I claim that there is something else we need to ask: is it possible to distinguish arbitrary state violence from arbitrary state negligence?

Another point emphasized in the reconstitution of the security weakness is the July 20 Suruç Massacre. It is more logical to remember these two events together when we consider the fact that the two events happened at dates not far apart, they were carried out by the same terrorist organization and were events aimed at reorganizing life against precariousness. However, this parallelism by the Prime Minister is established by reconstitution of safety:

“In the past, the perpetrators of the attacks in Diyarbakır, Suruç, and Reyhanlı were caught and brought to justice. Please be sure that we will identify who carried out this attack, which organizations supported it and which secret

¹²⁵ “Hükümetimizin ve ilgili bütün birimlerimizin bugün de dün de yarın da her zaman terör saldırıları karşısında en etkin şekilde mücadele etme kararlılığı olduğu konusunda hiç kimsenin tereddüdü olmamalıdır.”

¹²⁶ “Bunun için güvenlik güçlerimiz, istihbaratımız elinden geldiği kadar tabi ki dikkatli olmaya çalışıyor. Bazen gözden kaçan, dikkatten kaçan bir terör eylemi de oluyor. Bütün bunlar bizim devlet olarak, güvenlik güçlerimizin daha dikkatli olmaları sonucunu doğurur. Bu tür eylemler olmadan önce istihbaratı yaparak önlemek, emniyetimizin, güvenlik güçlerimizin en başta gelen görevidir.”

powers helped them, and they will bring to justice by being punished as they deserved.” (Ahmet Davutoğlu, Prime Minister / NTV, 10th of October, 2015)¹²⁷

7.1.2 Reconstitution of the Object of Violence

In cases where political violence is the question, the object of violence seen as one of the greatest factors in the politicization of mourning in the previous chapter, it is functioning in a sense in order to develop resistance through it. In the frame of mourning as a certain dimension of political life, I argue that communities that are not accepted as a community have provided a complex representation of the situation of becoming an object of violence because this point is fundamental for the claims that can be developed against this violence. In a sense, the violence towards a particular segment of the society makes it possible to recognize the vulnerability and precarity that people are exposed to. The existing state of indifference to that community is to be transformed through suffering. Reminding that this affect is developed through some interpretive frameworks, therefore, resignification of those interpretative frameworks may be used by the political power to break, misrecognize, or trivialize the resistance that might be against it.

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation) – Local Meanings (Level of Specificity)

When we look at the rhetoric that has been circulated by the government after the October 10 attack, we see a deeply shared point: implications for the purpose of the attack. It is also a fact that these deductions contain an intense certainty. Peace, trust, stability, unity, solidarity, fraternity, functioning and the future of a presupposed order are constituted as the aims of this attack by the political power. At the same time, another dimension of this constitution is the transfer of their existence as if it were something at hand. At this point, it is pointing to a denial of political polarization, a break, and instability in the discourse. However, the success or coherence of this change, namely the aim of the constitution of cohabitation, will be discussed again in the second sub-chapter, sedimentation of the constitutive outside. This is where I come

¹²⁷ “Geçmişte Diyarbakır’da, Suruç’ta, Reyhanlı’da yapılan saldırıların sorumluları yakalanmış, adalete teslim edilmiştir. Şundan emin olunuz ki bu saldırı kimin tarafından yapılmışsa, hangi örgüt bunlara destek vermişse, arkalarında hangi gizli odaklar bu desteği sağlamışsa, hepsi ortaya çıkarılacak ve hak ettikleri şekilde cezalandırılıp adalete teslim edilecek.”

up with the question of how we can approach the theory of constitutive outside and the cultural intelligibility in such situations.

As I have already mentioned at the beginning of the analysis chapter, the last periods of AKP government are considered by many communities to be a process of increasing polarization in the society. I claim that it is not only expressed by opposition groups, when we consider that polarization requires two sides, it is accepted at the level of actions, even if not explicitly stated by them. The fact that what is being targeted is constituted on these notions, in fact, means that these things are always already there, and must be preserved:

“In this attack aiming to create social unrest and to disorder our country’s safety and stability... Like the other terror attacks, this attack in Ankara Train Station targeted our unity and solidarity, our brotherhood and our future. The purpose of the perpetrators of the attack in Ankara is to set at odds within different social segments. (R. T. Erdoğan, the President / Cumhuriyet, 10th of October, 2015)¹²⁸

“They want to create a perception as if this country has deficiencies.” (Ahmet Davutoğlu, Prime Minister / T24, 15 October, 2015)¹²⁹

“As AKP, the ruling party, we know all of them are the issues directed to Turkey’s future and stability. No matter which thoughts or opinions...” (Taner Yıldız, Former Minister of Energy and Natural Resources / T24, 10th of October, 2015)¹³⁰

“The purpose is to create an unrest in the society. That’s provocation.” (Veysel Eroğlu, Minister of Forestry and Water / Cumhuriyet, 10th of October, 2015)¹³¹

I argue that in the reconstitution of the object of violence, we face with a rhetoric about the claim that there are enemies inside and outside of the country which targets the developing and stable Turkey. Here I want to remind this to hinder misunderstandings; my argument is not to deny that the interests of states collide in the global arena and that they have developed strategies against it. Indeed, states are certain sites of power,

¹²⁸ “Milletimizin huzurunu, ülkemizin güven ve istikrar ortamını bozmayı amaçlayan bu saldırıda.. Diğer terör eylemleri gibi Ankara Tren Garı'ndaki saldırı da, birliğimizi, beraberliğimizi, kardeşliğimizi, geleceğimizi hedef almaktadır..Ankara'daki saldırıyı gerçekleştirenlerin amacı, farklı toplum kesimlerini birbirine düşürebilmektir.”

¹²⁹ “Zaten bir ülkeyi zaaf içindeymiş algısı yaratmak istiyor.”

¹³⁰ “İktidar partisi ve AKP olarak, bunların her birisinin, Türkiye’nin geleceğine, istikrarına ve istikbaline matuf konular olduğunu biliyoruz. Hangi düşünce, hangi fikir olursa olsun.”

¹³¹ “Maksat milletimizin huzurunu bozmaya yöneliktir. Provokasyondur.”

and among these powers, for sure, will be relations involving conflicts. My argument is aimed at the fact that although Turkey is involved in certain international conflicts due to some kind of geography requirement, the reality of this situation is being tried to be reconstituted through these discourses, through the attack against a certain community. Just at this point, I want to point to how the public mourning is used to reconstitute perception of the trajectory of the country;

“Because Turkey serves as a model country which achieved to maintain its stability even in this ‘circle of fire’ and to integrate its stability with democracy.” (Ahmet Davutoğlu, Prime Minister / NTV, 10th of October, 2015)¹³²

“They wish to damage the unity and solidarity of this country. They wish to disrupt the operation of the civilization of this country. I wish from Allah that this country would go on its way as long as these people will be in unity. The country will be hope of not only this geography but all other oppressed people.” (İsmet Yılmaz, Speaker of the Grand National Assembly / T24, 10th of October, 2015)¹³³

What we have seen in the discourse over who is targeted, which has been circulated by the political power, is to remove the event from its particularity and thus to vague what kind of conjuncture it took place in. The fact that the lives and deaths of these people are not recognized as an object of violence can, in fact, be read as a clear indication of the precariousness of this community. Precariousness for the dead people of the community cannot be of concern except for their bodies’ trivialization, but for the rest of the community, the unrecognition of these deaths can contain a clear message. The call of the assembly, the funerals, the strikes and the protests that accompany the process of mourning, obviously declare that this community is exposed to precarity, and when we consider the attacks afterward, these all materialize precisely in the area which they occupied in present political field. If we have added the

¹³² “Çünkü, Türkiye ateş çemberi içinde, istikrarını korumayı başaran, demokrasiyle istikrarını bütünleştiren örnek ülkedir. Ülkemiz itibarına, huzuruna, istikrarına doğrudan bir saldırı gerçekleştirilmiştir.”

¹³³ “İstiyorlar ki bu milletin birliğine, beraberliğine zarar versinler. İstiyorlar ki bu milletin medeniyet yürüyüşünü aksatabilsinler. İnşallah bu millet bir ve beraber oldukça kardeş oldukça. Bu kervan yoluna devam edecek. Sadece bu coğrafyanın değil bütün mazlum milletlerinde umudu olmaya devam edecektir”

discourse's access to circulation into account, by using this power, it is uttered with great certainty which will not allow a doubt:

“There is no difference between this attack targeting our civilians in Ankara Train Station today and the other terrorist attacks carried out in different places previously against our soldiers, police, village guards, public officials and our innocent citizens.” (R. T. Erdoğan, the President / Cumhuriyet, 10th of October, 2015)¹³⁴

“This attack is an attack directed to all of us. The attack targeting a citizen can never ever be attributed to any segment of the society.” (Ahmet Davutoğlu, Prime Minister / T24, 15 October, 2015)¹³⁵

“This attack is not just targeting a group, our citizens joining that rally or any political community. I am clearly expressing that this attack targeted the unity of our country, our people, all segments of the society as a whole. To sum up, this attack is an attack on our democracy and our country.” (Ahmet Davutoğlu, Prime Minister / NTV, 10th of October, 2015)¹³⁶

“This is a cursed attack to the unity and solidarity, and the peace of Turkey. It is a malicious and conscious attack. It is obvious where it referred to, where it attempted to break and what it was trying to do. I think that it was carried out in order to prevent economic and political stability in Turkey and to prevent such a result of forthcoming 1st of November elections.” (Nihat Zeybekçi, Minister of Economy / T24, 10th of October, 2015)¹³⁷

When we consider the emphasis of peace and precarity which can be related to ethics of cohabitation is often expressed in the call texts of the assembly, the narratives that are uttered when the mourning is experienced, especially by chief mourners, a question arises; In fact, what exactly is trying to be constituted, and to whom the message is being sent? So that, when the discourse on the target of the attacks –with its certainty-

¹³⁴ “Daha önce değişik yerlerde askerimize, polisimize, korucularımıza, kamu görevlilerimize ve masum vatandaşlarımıza karşı yapılan terör eylemleri ile bugün Ankara Tren Garı'nda sivil vatandaşlarımızı hedef alan terör saldırısı arasında hiçbir fark yoktur”

¹³⁵ “Bu saldırılar hepimize yapılan saldırılardır. Hiçbir şekilde bir vatandaşa yapılan saldırı bir kesime mal edilemez.”

¹³⁶ “Bu saldırı herhangi bir şekilde, tek bir gruba, o mitinge katılan vatandaşlarımıza ya da herhangi bir siyasi topluma karşı değildir. Çok açık şekilde ifade ediyorum, bu saldırı ülkemizin bütününe karşı yapılmış bir saldırdır, bu saldırı halkımıza, bir bütün olarak her kesime yapılan saldırdır ve nihayet bu saldırı demokrasimize yapılan saldırdır, ülkemize yapılan saldırdır.”

¹³⁷ “Bu Türkiye'nin birliğine beraberliğine, Türkiye'nin huzuruna yapılmış olan melun bir saldırdır. Hain bir saldırdır, bilinçli bir saldırdır. Ne şekilde, nereyi kastettiği, nereyi kırmak istediği, ne yapmaya çalıştığı çok malum olan bir saldırdır. Türkiye'de ekonomik ve siyasi istikrar olmasın, 1 Kasım seçimlerinde böyle bir sonuç ortaya çıkmasın diye yapılan bir saldırı olarak düşünüyorum”

is reached to the people who grieve directly and indirectly, what affect exactly shows up? Let us leave the political and organizational chief mourners aside, when we consider that familial and relative chief mourners also expressed their knowledge on the subject of violence, how successful can it be to reach and succeed in establishing this cohabitation? To what extent, cohabitation is sabotaged from a much deeper place and serves exactly the opposite of its 'purpose'? By using a somewhat reductionist argument and knowing the risk it carries, I will try to convey the argument as well; A says: 'You murdered me (my relation)', B answers as 'We are all murdered'. To sum, my query is that; Although they seem like the opposite, where and to what extent we can separate the discourses on cohabitation and marginalization?

7.1.3 Reconstitution of Object of Violence: Emphasis on Forthcoming Elections

At the beginning of the analysis chapters, in what kind of political atmosphere the Labor, Peace and Democracy meeting took place is briefly mentioned. The fact that this attack is happened between two elections which are considered as significant for the trajectory of the country, shows that discourse about the attack cannot be free from the elections. So that, HDP, which is considered a representative of Kurdish politics in Turkey for a long time and was openly declared and voiced the radical democratic understanding with the slogan 'Biz'ler Meclis'e' which can be translated as "All of 'Us' into parliament" and various election propaganda, entered parliament. This prevented AKP to come to power alone after 13 years and soon after as the coalition was not formed among opposition parties, early elections were held. It is also useful to remember that; the warning that democratic participation may be only and solely through elections, a rhetoric often spoken by Erdoğan and AKP in general.

Local Meanings (Presupposition, Degree of Completeness)

The results of the Ankara Public Prosecutor's Office's investigation on October 10 were shared with the public on 28 October. In this statement, not only the existence of a political stability in the country assumed previously, but also expressed this stability could be disrupted through the elections;

“The Chief Prosecutor listed the purpose of the attack as follows: By sabotaging the forthcoming elections to disorder the political stability, and to make the

process of forming government difficult after the political scene coming after the elections...To postpone the November 1st General Elections by spreading the terrorist attacks.” (Ankara Supreme Court / Birgün, 28 October, 2015)¹³⁸

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation, Anaphora, Alliteration)

We see a similarity in the assumption of the Chief Public Prosecutor's Office in the statements of the prime minister and the minister of the economy; namely, the stable progress of the country far from uncertainty, political and economic stability. In addition, by using repetition, certainty, and certain pronouns, the argument strengthens. In the heart of the argument, the act of reconstituting the target of the attack draws the attention. So that, the elections are regarded as a meeting with ‘the people’ and the idea that democratic participation will be through elections is reinforced once again.

“This is an action to effect the election results. To prevent us from meeting our people, to make the country go in emergency conditions... One of the main reasons of the attackers is to effect the results of November 1st Elections, and another reason is to obscure the atmosphere in the country.” (Ahmet Davutoğlu, Prime Minister / T24, 15 October, 2015)¹³⁹

“When the signs of economic and political stability showed up at the election on 1st of November, it's a request that doesn't want this as it is, and I think it's an assault, so there shall be no economic and political stability in Turkey, there shall be no such signs.” (Nihat Zeybekçi, Minister of Economy / T24, 10th of October, 2015)¹⁴⁰

In the statement of the Deputy Chairman of AKP, preventing the elections passing peacefully stands out as the aim of the attack. The point that distinguishes this quote from the others and what I want to focus on is the effort to constitute a social reality that the elections are always carried out far away from the disturbance and blemish in

¹³⁸ “Başsavcılık, saldırının amaçlarını şöyle sıraladı: Yaklaşan seçimleri sabotaj ederek siyasi istikrarı bozmak ve seçim sonucunda çıkacak siyasi tablodan herhangi bir şekilde hükümet kurulmasını zorlaştırmak.. Terör eylemlerini yaygınlaştırıp 1 Kasım genel seçimlerini erteletmek.”

¹³⁹ “Seçim sonuçlarını etkilemek için yapılan bir eylem. Halkla buluşmamamız için, olağanüstü şartlarda gidilmesi için... Gerçekten bu terörü yapanların ana hedeflerinden biri 1 Kasım sonuçlarını etkilemek, bir diğer hedefi de ülkenin ortamını belirsizliğe boğmak.”

¹⁴⁰ “Yani seçimlerde 1 Kasım seçimlerinde bu ülkenin istikrarı, bu ülkenin siyasi ekonomik istikrarı ile ilgili güçlü görüntüler emareleri ortaya çıkmaya başladığında, bunun böyle olmasını istemeyen bir istek, böyle bir talep. Türkiye'de ekonomik ve siyasi istikrar olmasını, 1 Kasım seçimlerinde böyle bir sonuç ortaya çıkmasını' diye yapılan bir saldırı olarak düşünüyorum.”

Turkey. Let us put aside the fact that elections are considered as the only way of democratic participation, that the demands of the people are transferred with very limited and specific representations of the elections, that certain demands cannot be transferred in elections; on the other hand, whether or not the votes are not transferred to the election results without any intervention, is always expressed by the opposition parties after every election in Turkey;

“We want to get through the Elections on 1st of November in a peaceful atmosphere, but the terrorist organization is trying to prevent this. However, we believe the common sense of our citizens. Like the previous elections, I wish from Allah that we would get through the elections on 1st of November without any blemish or doubt, actually, we have to get through like that.” (Mehmet Ali Şahin, Vice Chairman of AKP/ T24, 10th of October, 2015)¹⁴¹

I find it useful to explain this; My argument is not such a major event which the waves of the effects spread, would not have an effect on the elections. My argument here is; It is assumed that the possible results of attack will be against AKP. This assumption was accepted not only by the AKP and its followers but by many segments of the society. The claim that an assembly at the center of the capital city of the country is not ensured, and it is the failure of AKP government, is often expressed by non-left opposition parties, as well. At this point, I argue that the issue of the ways in which the effects of a discourse will take place, in reality, should be left open to debate. To clarify, the people have the ability to participate in the elections, and use their vote to continue the present order in any way –the political power calls it as stability- or they use it to transform the existing order. Therefore, we should consider other discourses on the significance of the elections. For instance, before the June 7 elections, Erdoğan stated in a rally “Let us have 400 MPs in the parliament, and we will get through this in peace”¹⁴², it can be considered as a ‘threatening’ demand. Another discourse is that, after the June 7 elections, AKP deputy Burhan Kuzu circulated a discourse via his official Twitter account; “Yes the election is over, the nation has decided. I said

¹⁴¹ “Biz 1 Kasım seçimlerini huzur ve barış içinde geçirmek istiyoruz. Ama terör örgütü buna engel olmaya çalışıyor. Ancak biz vatandaşımızın sağduyusuna inanıyoruz. 1 Kasım seçimlerini daha önceki seçimler gibi her türlü şaibeden uzak inşallah geçireceğiz, geçirmek zorundayız.”

¹⁴² “400 milletvekilini verin ve bu iş huzur içinde çözülsün”

stability or chaos; People chose chaos”¹⁴³. I argue that it is almost impossible to consider how these discourse and the discourse on the significance of October 10 attacks for the trajectory of the country evaluated by the people who will vote.

7.1.4 Constitution of subject of violence

In this subsection, the last part of the Constitution of Cohabitation section, I will discuss the discrepancy of the discourses of the chief mourners and the political power about the subject of violence.

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation, Alliteration, Vagueness)

To be briefly reminded of the point of the second analysis chapter, we can say that the discourse established by chief mourners’ claims that even though the attack is carried out by ISIS, it is carried out by negligence, cooperation, or condonation of AKP. Even if ISIS does not undertake the attack, after a couple of days, it has been determined that both of the suicide bombers were the members of ISIS¹⁴⁴. However, in the discourse circulated by political power, we see that this action is not solely committed to ISIS. It is also pointed out to the organizations which are often mentioned with HDP;

“This is completely a collective terror attack. There is IS, there is also PKK, and El Muhaberat and there is also PYD terrorist group located in the northern Syria. They jointly planned this attack, I would like you to know this particularly. No need to lie to each other.” (R. T. Erdoğan, the President / AlJazeera, 22 October, 2015)¹⁴⁵

“Here you see what they did. Right there, in front of the Train station... Look, this incident shows how terror is carried out collectively. Then they say ‘IS did this, and so-and-so did that’...” (R. T. Erdoğan, the President / AlJazeera, 22 October, 2015)¹⁴⁶

¹⁴³ “Evet seçim bitti Millet kararını verdi.Ya istikrar ya kaos dedim;Millet kaosu seçti hayırlı olsun.”

¹⁴⁴ See: http://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler/2015/10/151016_isid_turkiye_saldiri_ustlenme

¹⁴⁵ “Bu tamamen bir kolektif terör eylemidir. Burada DAESH de var, burada PKK da var, burada El Muhaberat da var, burada Suriye'nin kuzeyindeki PYD terör örgütü de var. Hepsi beraber ortak olarak bu eylemi planlamışlardır. Bunu özellikle bilmenizi istiyorum. Kimse kimseyi aldatmasın.”

¹⁴⁶ “İşte neler yaptıklarını görüyorsunuz. Şurada, garın önünde... Bakın bu yaşanan olay terörün nasıl kolektif uygulandığını gösteren bir olaydır. Şimdi kalkıyorlar 'efendim burayı DAESH yaptı, bunu bilmem kim yaptı.’”

“They are not only a group with only one dimension or axis. The stability of Turkey and democracy of our country are attempted to be threatened by terrorist attacks of different groups.” (Ahmet Davutoğlu, Prime Minister / NTV, 10th of October, 2015)¹⁴⁷

As it can be seen from the statements, the political power refers to other terrorist organizations than ISIS and claim that this attack was held by their cooperation. These statements indicate that the political power is not eager to declare the subject of violence as ISIS. How could we read these statements within the context of cohabitation? However, my debate here is not about revealing who did the attack. My argument on the subject of violence is based on these three questions. Firstly, to what extent we could distinguish the organizations that carry out the attack from the neglect in the context of this attack is carried out? Beyond that, to what extent, we could consider the actualizing the attack free from the constitution of this community with precarity? When we assume that the political power do politics clearly on the distinction of ‘us-them’ and the fact that the political power equalize the mentioned organizations, HDP, and other callers of the assembly in the same ‘them’, could this discourse open the path to the acceptance of the claims about ‘they’ did the attack, which will be discussed in the following sub-section?

I finish this part which has been focused on the issue of constitution of cohabitation within a discourse that was circulated by the political power on October 10. In the next section, I will focus on the parts where the discourse about the constitution of ‘the other’ is further deepened. I will begin by focusing on the discourse that both refer to the elections and subject of violence. However, there are some points that I would like to mention before I finish this section.

We can see that the reconstitution of cohabitation is based on the issues such as citizenship, common future through the citizenship identity and perpetuity of state and its stability. However, when we consider that these commonalities will always be constituted by the exclusion of others. Besides, the result of such a way of constituting relation with others through commonalities, with the people we already know, the

¹⁴⁷ “Tek boyutlu, tek eksenli, bir gruptan sadece kaynaklanan değil, değişik grupların terör saldırılarıyla Türkiye'deki istikrar, ülkemizin demokrasisi tehdit edilmek isteniyor”

people who are similar to us, people who we may find commonalities somehow, could be the normative frame of the cohabitation. Beyond that, what kind of contribution can an ethic that is based on the state of indifference against the people who are within a certain proximity, to the opposition of violence they are facing? In a place where cohabitation is possible through such an ethic, knowing that people will not stand against the possible violence will be subjected to each other, will not it increase the probability of being the object of violence for everyone? Let us put aside the reality that when people enter the public space, they will be always vulnerable to each other since their bodies are vulnerable by definition. We may see the public space as the very field where bodies meet with each other, also their vulnerabilities meet and intersect. In this case, while our vulnerabilities are connected to each other at any moment, it is ambiguiting that what a cohabitation which is not based on precariousness and precarity is serving to. What is the message that such a cohabitation would give to 'citizens' when we consider that the instability and break in the discourse of political power cannot be read exactly like as a break, that this instability in the discourse is not aimed at getting 'the outside' to the inside?

7.2 Sedimentation of Constitutive Outside

I will consider the intersecting point of the issues of elections and subject of violence as the beginning of this part where the marginalization continues deeply.

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation)

It is mentioned before that in the previous elections, HDP passed the election threshold and closed the way for the AKP to become the ruling party alone. In the statement of the Minister of Economy, the passing of the election threshold is pointed out without explicitly mentioning the HDP name. However, the emphasis, the representation of HDP is used with 'claiming', may the risk to devalue it with the connotation of that it is merely a claim. So that, if what is referred to certain opinion is Kurdish politics, the democratic participation through elections is already what AKP has always said with the emphasis on national will. If this particular view is referred to the understanding of radical democracy that HDP stated before the June 7 elections, it is not a specific

view, on the contrary, this attempt itself can be described as different antagonisms force the representation mechanism without unifying in a particular place.

In both cases, political power does not ‘befit’ the use of the right of this kind of representation to this particular group, and it is implied that they give up the path of democratic participation with the command of the terrorist organization, which is often mentioned with HDP;

“After the ones who claim to represent a specific ideology entered in the assembly 80 deputies with 7 June elections, the same group of people got the order to take up guns again. They used their same old methods to disturb the peace and break the union of people. The methods, the conscience and the resources that they used to do that, come from the same place, in our opinion. ”
(Nihat Zeybekçi, Ekonomi Bakanı / T24, 10 Ekim 2015)¹⁴⁸

The second quote in this section belongs to another minister and it is referring to the terrorist attack happened on the Diyarbakır meeting of HDP before June 7 elections, and it is implied that this victimization was made by them themselves, foreseeing it would be used to pass the electoral threshold. The fact that the statement begins with ‘you know’ implies that as if it is already revealed and accepted and operating for constituting this claim. I argue that, beyond precarity and precariousness, it is a further dimension of the marginalization of a community to circulate a discourse has the implicit meaning of that community has the capacity to kill its own members in order to obtain certain gains. This capacity, which we are talking about, is dehumanizing, beyond that, and it reveals that where the attempt to change the subject of violence reach up;

“As you may know previously they organized such a provocative attack before the elections in order to pass the threshold and to reflect themselves as victims. We saw the same scene in Diyarbakır and somewhere else.” (Veysel Eroğlu, Minister of Forestry and Water / Cumhuriyet, 10th of October, 2015)¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁸ “7 Haziran seçimlerinden sonra meclise belirli bir görüşü temsil ettiğini iddia edenlerin 80 milletvekiliyle girdikten sonra tekrar silaha sarılma talimatı emrini almasıyla Türkiye’de huzuru bozmak, birlik ve beraberliğine kastetmekle hemen hemen aynı yöntemle, aynı bilinçle ve aynı kaynaktan verilen saldırı talimatı olduğunu düşünüyoruz”

¹⁴⁹ “Biliyorsunuz daha önce Diyarbakır’da seçimlerden önce sırf barajı aşsın diye, mağdur görünsünler diye böyle bir provokatif eylem yapıldı. Aynı filmi biz Diyarbakır’da gördük, başka yerde gördük”

At this particular point, although it does not belong to politicians, I would like to give the place a discourse which is uttered by the general broadcasting coordinator of a media organization which we can say that it belongs to the same wing.

So that, a discourse that is circulated by the political power with its maximized access to speech, is spreading in waves, in every haunt, it consolidating itself by integrating different interpretations to itself. The fact that HDP is a very important place in the Kurdish politics in Turkey and the fact that the other caller organizations apart from HDP supports this movement, even if it is not clearly and organizationally, and above all what is mentioned most in the call texts is the will to peace is considered, the use of ‘bayram sevinci’ analogy can be translated as ‘rejoicing’ refers to a very troubled point. So that, when precariousness is turned to precarity, and precarity turned to loss, the fact that none of them are comprehended opens the door of trivialization of and disrespect to pain;

“Ankara massacre landed a hand to PKK and HDP. For this reason, the massacre made the unseen face of Kurdish politics gratified.” (Yeni Akit Executive Editor, Hasan Karakaya / T24, 24 October, 2015)¹⁵⁰

7.2.1 From Marginalization to Constitutive Outside

The period of AKP government is seen as a period in which polarization in the society is greatly increased. When we think of the constitutive role of discourse, I claim that we can not consider it independently from the use of 'us-them', or more precisely 'us-these', which is often expressed. I acknowledge that politics itself is capable of presenting itself with emphasis on certain differences, but I argue that the effort of exclusion of certain groups from the field of politics in order to unrecognize the political demands of them may include very basic vital problems. So that, one aspect of mechanisms of exclusion is to describe the site and procedure under which conditions a request will be heard. Thus, transforming it into a norm, and it may lead that to remove resistance from its aim, through the norms that must be completed or enacted for the recognition of political demand. At this point, the marginalization of a political demand tends to strengthen the legitimacy of the demands of political power.

¹⁵⁰ "Ankara katliamı, PKK ve HDP'nin imdadına yetişti... Ankara katliamı bu nedenle Kürt siyasetinin mestur yüzünde bayram sevinci yaşattı."

Another dimension of this precisely shows up in the constitution of this political subjectivity. With the exclusion of the outside, the inside is being formed and strengthened.

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation, Rhetorical Questions, Anaphora)

Speaking of Turkey, this categorization expressed by political power is not new. We can say that this categorization performatively determines the way of perceiving the future through prejudices and misunderstanding. This marginalization constitutes a subaltern and similarizes all the members of the group, make them a unified subject that is nurtured always from the same root political root, and utter the same wishes. The constitution of ‘us-them’ is operating here with presuppositions and marking. When the democratic participation through elections is in question, marginalization is functionalized by the treatment of equality under unequal conditions, and the way of democratic participation is restricted. In the case of a demand other than election and representation, these demands are not recognized as demand or even removed from reality. In the following quote, which begins with a rhetorical question, we are witnessing the removal from the reality, the peace demand of the gathering is unified with HDP. It is referencing that the unlivable life has no right even to ‘talk about peace’. The argument established within the opposition of peace and terror is subtracting the demand from the field of recognition by the claim that the unified ‘these’ cannot talk about peace and terror at the same time;

“Can you imagine they talk about peace in this country. Do you have a right to talk about peace? As treated like this, do they have right to mention peace? When they came to the West they say ‘Peace’, but in the East, Southeast it is completely a ‘Race’. This is what they do.” (R. T. Erdoğan, the President / Sabah, 30 October, 2015)¹⁵¹

We have also encountered the assertion that the attack, which was mentioned in the previous section, was actually carried out by groups gathered for victimization purposes in the President's statement. However, this claim is not left there, perhaps to

¹⁵¹ “Düşünebiliyor musunuz yani bunlar bu ülkede barıştan bahsediyorlar. Sizin barıştan bahsetmeye bir defa hakkınız var mı? Bu şekilde davrananların barış kavramını ağzına almaya hakları var mı? Bunlar Batı'ya geliyorlar barış, Doğu, Güneydoğu'ya gittikleri zaman orada da ne yazık ki tam manasıyla terörle yarış. Yaptıkları iş bu”

enact the interpretative frames which the affect arises within, 'these' are charged with 'not appreciating the value of human life'. The emphasis of 'we know the murderer' which is uttered not only by the partisans and organizations but also by the familial chief mourners is being tried to be rebuilt in a place where it is excluded from the dimension of affect in the frame of 'perception operation' and always invites dark powers in the eyes of the people. Thus, in fact, 'we' is constituted over them, while the crimes are attributed to 'them' in this contrast, 'we' is also purified from these crimes, in a sense. Not surprisingly, the deprivation of the main claims of the nation-state is brought back to the scene to constitute 'them', hence 'we';

“For them, there is no value of human being. They do not give importance to that. After every terrorist attack, they start a perception operation in both the country and abroad. However, we have never said ‘I or me’, we have always said ‘we and us’. God forbids! Even the country would experience a chaos, they would enjoy it causes they are very separated from their country and their nation.” (R. T. Erdoğan, the President / AlJazeera, 22 October, 2015)¹⁵²

“They do not have any values like country, nation, belief or religion.” (R. T. Erdoğan, the President / Sabah, 30 October, 2015)¹⁵³

At this point, I want to go back to the debate on which forms of violence is exposed to 'unlivable life'. Even though there are no obstacles in sheltering, health support, nutrition or other things that evoke the survival in the first sense, we can say that obstructing the hearings of some kind of demands which may contain the 'basic' survival demands in 'a democratic way', opens the door of a different form of violence in a sense. I argue that all of these, in fact, point to the fact that recognizability precedes recognition, recognition itself is not recognized without a struggle over recognizability and intelligibility mechanisms.

¹⁵² “..bunlar için insan canının değeri yoktur. Asla ona kıymet vermezler. Her terör eyleminin ardından yurtiçinde, yurtdışında algı operasyonuna başlıyorlar... Fakat biz hiçbir zaman 'ben' demedik, her zaman 'biz' dedik. Allah korusun, memleket yangın yerine dönse uzaktan bunu keyifle seyredecek kadar ülkelerinden ve milletlerinden, milletinden kopmuş durumdalar.”

¹⁵³ “Bunlar zaten vatan, millet, inanç, din, böyle bir şey de bunlarda yok..”

7.2.2 Misrepresentation and Misrecognition of the emphasis on “We know the murderers”

In the second analysis chapter, I conveyed the emphasis of 'we know the murderer' which is frequently expressed in the funerals, strikes, and the protests, by referring to the sustainment of knowing and speaking subject. In this section, I will refer to how this emphasis is misrepresented and reconstituted by the political power.

Rhetoric and Style (Argumentation, Anaphora)

The misrepresentation and devaluation of the 'we know the murderer' that is expressed by the almost all of the chief mourners is made by reflecting it as if it were a party speech, although it is not only expressed by the HDP, by the President and the Prime Minister. This misrepresentation is laced as ‘part of a great terrorist scenario’, and the 'us-them' distinction is strengthened. This is strengthened, by attributing the positive attitudes to ‘us’, and attributing the negative attitudes to ‘them’, with emphasizing who is focusing what on the first moment of the event. For sure, I accept that these declarations made by Demirtaş are political because when the mourning is about social violence, especially when there is a marginalized group exposed to precarity, there is no possibility that the discourses on circulation due to loss will not be political. This can be used as a nonviolent resistance method by circulating knowledge obtained through lived experience. However, the fact that it is not apprehended by the political power brings with the accusation of rent, calling of civil war, and unscrupulousness;

“Understand how is the logic of those who said ‘the Palace is the responsible of this attack’ right after the moment the attack carried out. They said that because they are working collectively with the terrorists. The planned scenario is that terrorist organization shed blood, then they came out to protect those terrorists with their TV channels, headlines, and politicians.” (R. T. Erdoğan, the President / AlJazeera, 22 October, 2015)¹⁵⁴

“9 minutes after the incident, the only thing in my mind was to find blood or hospital to the wounded ones. This is what we thought at that moment. Even for a minute, we have not thought about any interest or gaining of AKP from this incident, but the only thing Demirtaş thought was his interests. If thousands of people had really gone to the streets after he had said ‘murderer state’, he would

¹⁵⁴ "Daha eylemin olduğu anda kalkıp da 'bunu Saray yaptı' diyenlerin ne mantığının olduğunu artık anlayın. Çünkü ortak çalışıyorlar. Terör örgütü kan akıtacak; bunlar da çıkacaklar manşetleriyle, ekranlarıyla, siyasetçileriyle; o terörü, o terör örgütlerini, o teröristleri himaye edecekler. Senaryo bu.”

continue his discourse. However, our people did not fall for this provocation.” (Ahmet Davutoğlu, Prime Minister / T24, 15 October, 2015)¹⁵⁵

“Mr. Demirtaş is completely heartless. If he called for a civil war built upon the sorrows of our losses, and if he provoked people by saying ‘this is the crime of the state against its people’, these are the actual attitudes which will be questioned by people’s conscience, put on trial and adjudged. Nowhere in the world, in any modern or political state, no politician (I am talking within the context of his parliamentary membership) can blame its own state after such a terrorist attack, but normally they blame terrorists. While I said ‘This is an attack on our country, people, and our democracy’, he said ‘This is not an attack to the unity and solidarity of our country, but this is an attack of state to his people’. What kind of state of mind it is?” (Ahmet Davutoğlu, Prime Minister / NTV, 10th of October, 2015)¹⁵⁶

While this attack proves clearly and unfortunately the claims on precarity which placed on the call texts of the assembly, and it is almost impossible to claim that such an experience does not transform the existing knowledge on precarity, the discussion on the knowing subject plane is reconstituted by the political power through notions like unity and integrity just like the constitution of cohabitation. In such a case, the attitude of 'citizens' is restrained by the discourse, and this brings the possibility of normalizing the interpretive frameworks of empathy that can be established with the subaltern groups to existence;

“We need to highlight democracy, and while we are getting close to 1st of November, we need to stand shoulder to shoulder. One came out and named us a murderer, the other does not want to negotiate. If we cannot share our sorrows,

¹⁵⁵ “Olay olmuş, 9 dakika sonra benim tek düşündüğüm hangi hastanede kan var, hangi hasta nereye gidecek. Bizim düşündüğümüz buydu. Bir an bile AK Parti bundan ne kazanır ne kaybeder diye düşünmedik. Ama aynı anda Demirtaş'ın tek düşündüğü ranttı... Katil devlet dedikten sonra on binlerce kişi sokağa dökülseydi eski söylemini devam ettirirdi. Ama halkımız bu provakasyona gelmedi.”

¹⁵⁶ “Sayın Demirtaş'ın vicdanı kelepçelenmiştir, Sayın Demirtaş'ın ızanı kelepçelenmiştir.. Bugünkü terör saldırısında hayatını kaybeden vatandaşlarımızın acıları üzerinde bir iç savaş çağrısında bulunuyorsa, 'devletin, halkına yönelik suçudur' diyorsa ve halkı, devlete isyana teşvik ediyorsa, esas bunlar hukuken de millet vicdanında da sorgulanacak, yargılanacak, hükmü verilecek bir tutumdur. Dünyanın hiçbir yerinde hiçbir siyasi, modern, çağdaş bir devlette hiçbir siyasi böyle bir terör saldırısı karşısında dönüp de devletini, ait olduğu siyasal yapıyı, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi üyesi olması bağlamında söylüyorum onu, suçlamaz, teröristleri suçlar... Ben diyorum ki 'Bu ülkemize, halkımıza demokrasimize yapılan saldırıdır.' O ise 'Bu ülkenin birliğine, beraberliğine yapılan bir saldırı değil, devletin halka karşı yaptığı bir saldırıdır' diyor. Bu nasıl bir anlayıştır?”

and if we cannot meet in a joint democracy platform, so how can we come together?” (Ahmet Davutoğlu, Prime Minister / T24, 15 October, 2015)¹⁵⁷

“The time is not the time to blame each other, but it’s time to act together and come together. Common sense is inevitable against those dirty plans, as a nation, we will handle these attacks in an imperturbable and determined way. In such a day, talking about the elections, votes and political interests and politicizing the situation is just being irresponsible. The fact that those who cannot say anything to terrorist organizations blame government fighting against terrorism is also an irresponsibility.” (Yalçın Akdoğan, Deputy Prime Minister / MyNet Haber, 10th of October, 2015)¹⁵⁸

Local Meanings (Selection of Vocabulary)

In the reconstitution of the point which I called as ‘knowing and speaking subject’, the President, Prime Minister, and ministers point to a general responsibility and what should the ‘citizens’ do is uttered by using the words of ‘remedying, circumventing, getting rid of, and disposing of the disease’. Thus, in the arguments arising out of a partnership, common purpose and unity over a common destiny are pointed out on it, and this common step is often associated with the elections. It is emphasized that the fate of the country is already spreading peace all over the world by pointing out that not only the country but also the region and the world will be changed by meeting these expectancies. The vocabulary choices about the expectations from the citizens are as follows;

“Solidarity – dedication/ determination – meaningful answer – strengthening our unity and solidarity – a divine fate – unity and solidarity – shoulder to shoulder – keep calm – day is the day of solidarity – our land is indivisible- everyone saying nation and state will always be there – an absolute solidarity like how it was in the past – more tolerant – citizens of a common country – comrades who share the same fate of the country... - common responsibility – to avoid provocations – spreading our common fate belief – coming shoulder to

¹⁵⁷ “Demokrasiyi öne çıkarmamız ve 1 Kasım’a giderken omuz omuza vermemiz gerek. Birisi çıkıyor katil ilan ediyor, ötekisi görüşmem diyor. Acıları paylaşamazsak, ortak bir demokrasi platformunda bulaşamazsak ne zaman buluşacağız.”

¹⁵⁸ “Zaman birbirini suçlama değil, ortak hareket etme, yek vücut olma zamanıdır... Kirli oyunlara karşı sağduyu şart, millet olarak vakur ve kararlı şekilde bu saldırıları göğüsleyeceğiz.. Toplumu tahrik eden, terörün amacına hizmet eder. Böyle bir günde seçimden, oydan, siyasi hesaptan bahsetmek, olayı siyasallaştırmak sorumsuzluktur. Terör örgütlerine söz söyleyemeyenlerin, terörle mücadele eden hükümeti suçlaması başka bir sorumsuzluktur.”

shoulder – A Turkey free from terror – A Middle East free from terror – a world free from terror”¹⁵⁹

At this point, as I mentioned in the previous section, I claim that the ethics of cohabitation is not possible without recognition of precariousness and precarity. In addition, the reconstitution of precarious group’s effort to sustain their political utterance, through a common mind involves two risks; firstly, even though I consider low probability but it still poses a risk; the alienation of the subaltern groups from their own experience by this reconstitution attempt. Secondly, the message of trivialization of the experience by trivialization of the knowledge can be sent to the ‘inside’.

7.3 Towards Conclusion: Rethinking on Grievability and Freedom of Assembly

In this chapter, the political discourse which are circulated by the political power after October 10 is covered. After the attack, the President, the Prime Minister, the ministers, the spokesman and the MPs of AKP uttered their grief and mourning ‘in any case’. However, Public sphere could be a site of the people who are unrecognized as ‘the people’ to start the process of recognition. However, as Butler argues, recognizability precedes recognition, and when the people could not change the signifier of ‘the people’, the site of recognition becomes even narrower, since the hegemonic discourse have not a chance to stop to marginalize them (2004). Throughout the chapter, I use ‘circulating discourse’ intentionally, because I argue that when the hegemonic discourse enters a space and the implicit meaning transferred to the ‘real’ people, we cannot ever imagine how its effects could be.¹⁶⁰¹⁶¹

I want to end this chapter where I started, namely the freedom of assembly. For the people who lost their lives, who are injured, who lost their families, relatives, friends,

¹⁵⁹ “Dayanışma - kararlılık - anlamlı cevap - birliğimizi ve beraberliğimizi pekiştirmek - ilahi bir kader - birlik beraberlik - omuz omuza – Sakin olmamız - gün dayanışma günü - bu vatan bölünmez, millet ve devlet ilelebet var olacak diyen herkes - kol kola girelim - omuz omuza - geçmişte olduğu gibi tam bir dayanışma - daha fazla hoşgörülü - ortak bir vatanın vatandaşları - ortak bir ülkenin kaderini paylaşan eşit kaderdaşları - ortak sorumluluk - tahriklerden uzak durmak -ortak kader inancımızın yaygınlaşması - omuz omuza vermemiz - terörden azade bir Türkiye - terörden azade bir Ortadoğu - terörden azade bir dünya”

¹⁶⁰See: <http://www.diken.com.tr/konyada-saygi-durusu-ankarada-hayatini-kaybedenler-isliklandi/>

¹⁶¹ See: <http://t24.com.tr/haber/trt-spikeri-ankara-katliaminda-olenleri-ayni-kefeye-koyamazsiniz-oradan-gecen-masum-insanlar-da-vardi,312989>

or political fellows, the ‘life’ cannot be as it was before, for sure. But for the people apart from them, I argue it will not be the same. I consider that October 10 terrorist attacks not only as ‘the bloodiest attack in the history of the republic’, but also as the biggest barrier to assemble in the public sphere to oppose to the political power.

For those of us, perhaps all of us, whose political lives have entered our bodies, this attack will always remain in our minds as a reminder of how vulnerable we are, how mortal we are, and how is difficult and complex to be apprehended as ‘livable life’. Because, following Butler, we cannot take the street or the square as the ground for certain kinds of recognizability struggles as for granted (2015). The space of appearance is subjected to the process of becoming, as everything else, and requires the performative actions to establish the very ground and to get the space of appearance into the being. Can we say that it didn’t change the potential of ‘the people’ who are unrecognized as ‘the people’ to assemble or to appear in the public space, after October 10? Therefore, can we say that the potential of those people to become ‘speaking subjects’ on the political sphere didn’t change? If we assume that the unbearable grief turned to uncontrollable rage for the people who survived the attack and the people who lost their irreplaceable ties with the dead, can we say that those people will give up to become ‘speaking subjects’? If these people acquire their ‘lives’ within the political subjectivity based on that kind of an ‘unrecognized’ grief, can we say that the discourse did only form their becoming of ‘speaking subject’ and not their very ‘subject’ as ‘livable life’? Can we say that it didn’t serve the crystallization of ‘the outside’, hence ‘the inside’ within their epistemological frames? Can we say that it didn’t serve for ‘resignification’ of ‘the people’ who need protection from various kinds of threats to sustain that very ‘life’? Within these questions, I want to end the chapter with a quotation of the President;

“I hope such a chaos will not be allowed, and democracy will not be sought through such pursuits anymore.” (R. T. Erdoğan, the President / Sabah, 30 October, 2015)¹⁶²

¹⁶² "Temennim odur ki böyle bir kaosa fırsat verilmez. Bundan sonra bu tür arayışlarla demokrasi mücadelesi verilmez"

The fact that the political power determines the political field as such limit the political participation of the precarious groups in Turkey. This statement accords with the political power's emphasis on the act of voting when the issue is about democratic participation. I claim that restricting the field of political expressions for politically dissident groups leads them to be excluded from the political field. So that, it pushes their social, political, and economic demands in order to sustain their lives' to some kind of an invisible field. Therefore, it becomes a tool of operating normative violence. In other words, when these precarious groups cannot meet the social and economic conditions to sustain their lives, this restriction itself leads their exposure to precarity.

While October 10 community, the gatherers, and the mourners, which I elaborated as an intersection of the political dissidence and precariousness, resist to the political power through assembly at the first place, then they resist by mourning. Therefore, the act of mourning itself becomes a significant element of the political struggle. While the participation of many apart from the community to the funerals and the protest points to an association through precariousness, the public space is now occupied by precarious groups and formed by them as a place where one can mourn for 'the ungrievable' though politicization of mourning.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I have aimed to interrogate how political subjectivity of the community of October 10, of both the gatherers and the mourners, is marginalized discursively by the political power in Turkey, and how this political marginalization becomes the source of both the resistance and precarity of this community. Apart from that, I also wanted to indicate how the hegemonic power of the political power in Turkey and the counter power of the precarious community operate in the process of mourning of October 10, based on grievability. To sum, this study has aimed to reveal power relations on grievability, hence livability, regarding the case of October 10.

Following Judith Butler's conceptualizations and discussions, firstly, I have shown that how a precarious community in Turkey perform bodily alliance in the public space to resist the precarity, and also I have focused on the conditions of freedom of assembly. By studying on October 10 within the framework of political marginalization in a time when the violence has increased across the country and elaborating the case through normative violence, I have aimed to show how the operations of hegemonic power may render other forms of violence invisible through political marginalization.

I have analyzed that the familial mourners of October 10 narrated how unbearable their loss is by saying that their loss gathered for 'peace'. However, by defining the will to peace as a struggle, I have considered this point as resistance to the differential distribution of precariousness, they uttered that this struggle will be continued by them. In other words, their losses' aim to gather in the public space and their murder in that space generated non-violent resistance. Besides, I have focused another point in the process of mourning of which is the self-constitution of the precarious group. I have indicated that this community formed their subjectivity as 'politically speaking subject' both before and after the attacks of October 10. Therefore, the transformative

effect of the loss actualized through concentration of political dissidence for them. By emphasizing that their losses have gathered to make the need for ‘peace’ a political demand, and they lost their lives as a consequence of this attempt and other political dissident utterances, they constituted their political subjectivity as a mourner of October 10 upon their losses’ political subjectivity. I have claimed that we may distinguish how their political agency will target to through the emphasize on ‘We know the murderers’.

In a similar vein, organizational mourners of October 10 also establish a resistance to the political power through grievability and mourning itself by emphasizing the issue of security vulnerability, by referencing earlier sufferings and marginalization. I have aimed to show that a politics may occur by resisting to forget their losses, the case, by insisting on peace, and by calling the political power to account.

Furthermore, I have aimed to show that how the politicization of grief extends the resistance to precarity by attending of so many people apart from the familial and organizational mourners to the funerals, strikes, and protests. The hegemonic power is confronted by an alliance between precarious groups based upon grief and mourning, in other words, the people who have attended to these protests enacted a counter power by apprehending these deaths ‘grievability’ in the public space.

Lastly, I have aimed to show that, on the one hand, the political power uttered their responsibility to investigate the issue of security vulnerability through discourse on the shared future, citizenship, the claim that these attacks target to the unity and stability of the country. Differently from the familial and organizational mourners’ narratives on the constitution of the object of violence, which was their precarity and political marginalization, the political power emphasizes the unity of the country and forthcoming elections. I have elaborated these discourse of unrecognizability of the sufferings of the precarious group and I have considered that recognizability of sorrow and grief is subjected to a normative frame and I have claimed that we cannot elaborate this frame separately from the frame which decides which political claims would be counted as a political claim. In other words, the marginalization from the political field and unrecognizability of death, grief, and life are operating in the same framework.

On the other hand, I have analyzed other discourse apart from those who are related to cohabitation, and these discourse reproduce their marginalization. I have elaborated these discourse as an attempt to misrecognize and misrepresent and circulate the precarious groups' emphasis as it was a discourse of a political party. In other words, by reducing a resistance through grievability and precariousness to the leader of a political dissident party, I have claimed that political power marginalizes the intersection point of their political subjectivity and their grief.

In short, this thesis has aimed to claim that the marginalization of a resistance which articulates a wrong through grievability leads to the reproduction of the precarity because the recognizability of their political demands is pushed to the borders of politics. And, in such a case, I have claimed that those who are excluded from the normative framework of livability may perform counter-power to the hegemonic power by resisting through precariousness and building alliances with other precarious groups. That is to say, politics occurs when the excluded ones mourn for 'the ungrievable'.

REFERENCES

- ‘Savaşa inat, barış hemen şimdi’ (2015, October 10), *BirGün*, Retrieved from <https://www.birgun.net>
- 10 Ekim Ankara Katliamı Davası (2017, February 2), *Evrensel*. Retrieved from <https://www.evrensel.net>
- 10 Ekim Katliamı: 102 kişi hayatını kaybetti (2015, October 10), *Evrensel*. Retrieved from <https://www.evrensel.net>
- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer. Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford, California :Stanford University Press.
- Agamben, G. (2005). *State of exception*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Akit: Ankara katliamının hedefi CHP'ydi, Aleviler CHP'den koparılmalı ki, HDP büyüyebilsin! (2015, October 24), *t24*. Retrieved from <https://t24.com.tr>
- AKP'li Eroğlu'ndan Ankara'daki patlama için skandal açıklama (2015, October 10), *Cumhuriyet*, Retrieved from <http://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/>
- Ali Deniz'in babası ve amcası: Oğlumuzla gurur duyuyoruz (2015, October 16), *Evrensel*. Retrieved from <https://www.evrensel.net>
- Ankara katliamı grev ve eylemlerle lanetleniyor (2015, October 12), *Radikal*, Retrieved from <http://www.radikal.com.tr/>

Ankara Katliamı'na ilişkin Savcılık'tan açıklama (2015, October 28), *BirGün*, Retrieved from <https://www.birgun.net>

Ankara katliamında kaybettiklerimiz, katliamın yaşandığı saatte anıldı (2015, October 17), *Evrensel*. Retrieved from <https://www.evrensel.net>

Ankara saldırısında hayatını kaybedenlerin hikayeleri (2015, October 12), *BBC Türkçe*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/>

Ankara saldırısının kurbanları son yolculuklarına uğurlanıyor (2015, October 12), *Hürriyet*, Retrieved from <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/>

Ankara'da Ölen Baykara'nın Ailesi: Oğlumuzu Kaybettik Ama Barışı Kazanacağız (2015, October 23), *Haberler*, Retrieved from <https://www.haberler.com>

Ankara'daki katliamı İstiklal'de protesto eden kitleye saldırı (2015, October 10), *Çağdaşses*, Retrieved from <http://www.cagdasses.com/>

Ankara'daki saldırıya siyasiler ne dedi? (2015, October 10), *t24*. Retrieved from <https://t24.com.tr>

Asad, A., & Hussain, B. (2012). A Critique on Feminist Research Methodology. *Journal of Politics and Law* (5), 202-207.

Asad, T. (2007). *On suicide bombing*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Başbakan Davutoğlu'dan Ankara'daki patlamaya ilişkin açıklama (2015, October 10), *NTV*, Retrieved from <http://www.ntv.com.tr/>

Başbakanlık, Ankara'daki saldırıda hayatını kaybeden 77 kişinin ismini açıkladı (2015, October 11), *t24*. Retrieved from <https://t24.com.tr>

Bennett, G. & Bennett, K. M. (2000). The presence of the dead: an empirical study. *Mortality*, 5(2). 139-157.

Bomba patlamadan önce halay çeken gençler, katliam anını anlattı (2015, October 16), *Çağdaşses*, Retrieved from <http://www.cagdasses.com/>

Bomba Patlatıldığını, Hastanede Gazeteden Öğrendi (2015, October 14), *SonDakika*, Retrieved from <https://www.sondakika.com>

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1999). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2000). *Antigone's claim: Kinship between life and death*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Butler, J. (2003). After Loss, What Then? David Eng & David Kazanjian (eds.). In: *Loss: The Politics of Mourning*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Butler, J. (2004). *Precarious life: the powers of mourning and violence*. London: Verso.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2005). *Kırılğan Hayat*. İstanbul: Metis.

Butler, J. (2009). *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?*. London: Verso.

- Butler, J. (2009). Performativity, Precarity and Sexual Politics. AIBR. Revista De Antropología Iberoamericana, 4(3), 309.
- Butler, J. (2010). *Queer Yoldaşlığı ve Savaş Karşıtı Siyaset*. in Uluslararası Homofobi Karşıtı Buluşma –Anti-Homofobi Kitabı / 2 – pp. 19-28.
- Butler, J. (2014) Rethinking vulnerability and resistance. Madrid, June 2014. Available at: <http://www.institutofranklin.net/sites/default/files/files/Rethinking%20Vulnerability%20and%20Resistance%20Judith%20Butler.pdf> (accessed 10 July 2017).
- Butler, J. (2015). *Notes toward a performative theory of Assembly*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Chambers, S. (2007). Normative Violence after 9/11: Rereading the Politics of Gender Trouble. *New Political Science*. (29:1), 43-60.
- Chambers, S. (2009). A Queer Politics of the Democratic Miscount, *borderlands*, 8(2). 1-22.
- Cumhurbaşkanı Erdoğan'dan A Haber - Atv ortak yayınında flaş açıklamalar (2015, October 30), *Sabah*, Retrieved from <http://www.sabah.com.tr/>
- Davutoğlu: Ankara eylemi AKP'nin tek başına iktidarını engellemek için yapıldı! (2015, October 15), *t24*. Retrieved from <https://t24.com.tr>
- Derrida, J. & Borradori, G. (2003). Autoimmunity: Real and Symbolic Suicides - a dialogue with Jacques Derrida. In *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 85-136.
- Doka, K. J. (1998). *Disenfranchised grief: recognizing and treating hidden sorrow*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Doka, K. J. (Ed.) (2002). *Disenfranchised Grief*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Emek, Barış, Demokrasi Mitingi için çağrı: 10 Ekim’de barış için Ankara’da buluşalım (2015, October 1), *Evrensel*. Retrieved from <https://www.evrensel.net>

Erdoğan: DAEŞ de var, PKK da, El Muhaberat da... (2015, October 22), *AlJazeera Turk*, Retrieved from <http://www.aljazeera.com.tr/>

Erdoğan'dan Ankara'daki saldırı için ilk açıklama (2015, October 10), *Cumhuriyet*, Retrieved from <http://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/>

Feola, M. (2014). Norms, vision and violence: Judith Butler on the politics of legibility. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 13(2), 130-148.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality Volume I*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Fowlkes, M. R. (1990). The Social Regulation of Grief. *Sociological Forum*, 5 (4), 635-652.

Franklin, C. G. & Lyons, L. E. (2009). From Grief to Grievance: Ethics and Politics in the Testimony of Anti-War Mothers. *Life Writing* (5:2). doi: 10.1080/14484520802386733

Freud, S., & Strachey, J. (1962). *The ego and the id*. New York: Norton.

Gee, J. (2011). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall.

Howarth, G. (2006). *Death and Dying: A Sociological Introduction*. Polity Press: Cambridge.

- Jagose, A. (1996). *Queer Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Jakoby, N. R. (2012). Grief as a Social Emotion: Theoretical Perspectives, *Death Studies*, 36(8). 679-711.
- Kellehar, A. (2007). *A Social History of Dying*. Port Melbourne, Vic. : Cambridge University Press.
- Klass, D. & Goss, R. (2003). The politics of grief and continuing bonds with the dead: the cases of Maoist China and Wahhabi Islam. *Death Studies*, 27(9), Pp. 787-811.
- Klass, D., Silverman, P.R., & Nickman, S. (Eds.) (1996). *Continuing bonds: New understandings of grief*. Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.
- Lévinas, E., Peperzak, A. T., Critchley, S., & Bernasconi, R. (1996). *Emmanuel Levinas: Basic philosophical writings*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Lloyd, M. S. (2009). Towards a Cultural Politics of Vulnerability: Precarious Lives and Ungrievable Deaths. In: Carver, T. and Chambers, S. A. (eds.). *Judith Butler's Precarious Politics: Critical Encounters*. London: Routledge, pp. 92-105.
- Lloyd, M. S. (2015). The Ethics and politics of vulnerable bodies'. IN: Lloyd, M.S., (ed.) *Butler and Ethics*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 167-192.
- Lloyd, M. S. (2016). Naming the dead and the politics of the 'human'. *International Studies* (1:20) doi:10.1017/S0260210516000358

- Nash, C., & Browne, K. (2012). *Queer Methods and Methodologies: Intersecting Queer Theories and Social Science Research*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing.
- Neimeyer, R. A. (2001). *Meaning Construction and the experience of loss*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Nesse, R. M. (2005). *An Evolutionary Framework for Understanding Grief*. in Spousal Bereavement in Late Life Edited by Carr, D., Nesse, R. M., Wortman, C. B. Springer Publishing: New York.
- Nietzsche, F. W., Kaufmann, W., Hollingdale, R. J., & Nietzsche, F. W. (1989). *On the genealogy of morals*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Özkazanç, A. (2015). *Feminizm ve Queer Kuram*. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.
- Parkes, C. M. (2001). A historical overview of the scientific study of bereavement. in Stroebe, Margaret S. (Ed); Hansson, Robert O. (Ed); Stroebe, Wolfgang (Ed); Schut, Henk (Ed). (2001). *Handbook of bereavement research: Consequences, coping, and care*, (pp. 25-45). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Ramazanoglu, C., & Holland, J. (2002). *Feminist Methodology*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Reyhanlı saldırıları: 7 soruda olup bitenler (2013, May 13), *BBC*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/>
- Riches, G. & Dawson, P. (1997). Shoring up the walls of heartache: Parental responses to the death of a child, in D. Field, J. Hockey, and N. Small (eds) *Death, Gender and Ethnicity*. London: Routledge.
- Robson, P. & Walter, T. (2013). Hierarchies of loss: a critique of disenfranchised grief. *Omega (Westport)* 66(2): 97-119.
- Salih, S. (2004). *On Judith Butler and Performativity* in The Judith Butler reader. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Sayı deęil insan: İřte Ankara'da katledilen 100 insanın hikâyesi (2015, October 20), *t24*. Retrieved from <https://t24.com.tr>

Schippers, B (2014). *The political philosophy of Judith Butler*. Routledge: New York.

Seale, C. (1998). *Constructing Death: The Sociology of Dying and Bereavement*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Selahattin Demirtař'tan sert açıklamalar (2015, October 10), *Hürriyet*, Retrieved from <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/>

Stroebe, M. S., Hansson, R. O., Stroebe, W., & Schut, H. (2007). Introduction: Concepts and issues in contemporary research and bereavement. In M. S. Stroebe, R. O. Hansson, W Stroebe & H. Schut (Eds.), *Handbook of bereavement research: Consequences, coping, and care* (pp. 3-22). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Stroebe, W., & Stroebe, M. S. (1987). *Bereavement and health: The psychological and physical consequences of partner loss*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Suruc massacre: At least 30 killed in Turkey border blast (2015, July 20), *BBC*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/>

Taylor, S. (2013). *What is Discourse Analysis?* London: Bloomsbury.

Turkey clears military over Uludere bombing deaths (2014, January 7), *BBC*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/>

Türkiye cenazelerini uğurluyor (2015, October 12), *Agos*. Retrieved from <http://www.agos.com.tr/>

Van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse&Society* (4:2), 249-283.

Van Dijk, T. (1995). Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Japanese Discourse* (1), s. 17-27.

Van Dijk, T. (1996). Discourse, power and Access In Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and Practices. Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. Pp. 84-104. London: Routledge.

Van Dijk, T. (2008). 18 Critical Discourse Analysis. D. Chifffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (s. 352-371). Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Zehfuss, M. (2007). Subjectivity and Vulnerability: On the War with Iraq. *International Politics* (44: 58). doi:10.1057/palgrave.ip.8800158

Zehfuss, M. (2009). Hierarchies of Grief and the Possibility of War: Remembering UK Fatalities in Iraq. *Millennium* (38:2). doi: 10.1177/0305829809347540

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY / TRKE ZET

KIRILGANLIK POLİTİKALARINA DOĞRU: TOPLANMA, YAS VE YAŞANABİLİR HAYAT

Yaşam ve ölüm kavramlarının tıbbi ve biyolojik mi, yoksa hukuki ve siyasal kavramlar mı olduğuna dair tartışmalar var. Bir fetüs canlı mıdır, bir organizma hangi andan itibaren canlı sayılır, ana rahmine düşüş bunun başlangıcı mıdır? Öte yandan, ölümün ne olduğuna, beyin ölümünün mü kalp ölümünün mü ölüm anı sayılması gerektiği tartışılıyor. Ölümün tıbbi bir beyanla mı ölüm sayıldığı, yoksa bir dizi tıbbi ve hukuki sertifikalar yürürlüğe konulduğunda mı ölüm sayıldığı da süregelen tartışmalardan (Butler, 2004; Agamben, 1998). Bütün bu tartışmalar, ‘kişi olma durumu’na dair mefhumları zımnen sorguya açan tartışmalar. Bu noktada, yaşam ve ölümün doğrudan söyleme bağlı olduğu argümanı hatalı olacaktır. Daha ziyade, bu iddialar herhangi bir çerçeve ile bağıntılı olmayan bir hayat ve ölüm kavrayışının olmadığı ve olamayacağına işaret eder. Ontolojik alanların tesisini sağlayan mekanizmalar işin her daim içindedir, ancak buna rağmen bunu sorguya açan bir hayat vuku bulabilir. Hayatın normları dışında kalan bir canlı figür; bir başka deyişle canlı ama hayatta olmayan ‘hayat’lar, ‘hayat’ın ve kişi olmanın ontolojik konum iddialarını sarsar (Butler, 2009). Bu çalışma da Judith Butler’ın bu tartışmalarından hareketle hayatı ve hayatın bir hayat olarak yaşanabilmesi için karşılanması gereken sosyal ve politik koşulları sorunsallaştırmak amacıyla, 10 Ekim 2015’de meydana gelen terör saldırısını ele alarak yası tutulabilirlik üzerine işleyen iktidar ilişkilerine odaklanmaktadır. Bu amaçla, öncelikle öznenin performatif inşasına odaklanan bu çalışma Butler’ın sunduğu kavramlar yardımıyla özne formasyonunu çağırma, kültürel idrak edilebilirlik ve kurucu dış üzerinden inceleyerek, heteronormatif bir düzende

toplumsal cinsiyetli öznenin kurulumuna dair anlatıyı politik öznelliğe odaklanarak şiddet ve siyaset temelinde incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bir başka deyişle, 10 Ekim sonrası yas sürecinde kayıplar üzerine kırılğan grubun ve siyasal iktidarın ‘hayat’ı ve ‘insan’ı söylemsel olarak nasıl kurduklarına dair kuramsal zemini hazırlamak. Ben ise bu metinde önce performatiflik kuramı ve özne inşasına odaklanacağım, ardından yas ve yası tutulabilirlik üzerine yaptığım tartışmalara yer vereceğim.

İdrak edilebilir bir hayatı teşkil eden ve etmeyen şey nedir? Bu soruyu toplumsal cinsiyet çerçevesinde düşündüğümüzde, normatif bir toplumsal cinsiyet ve cinselliğe dair sanıların neyin insani ve yaşanabilir sayılacağını önceden belirleme konusunda önemli olduğunu söyleyebiliriz. Bir diğer deyişle, normatif toplumsal cinsiyet sanıları, bir şekilde, insani olana ilişkin betimleme sahasının sınırlarını belirliyor. Toplumsal cinsiyet normları, neyin idrak edilebilir bir biçimde insan olup neyin olmayacağını belirlerken aynı zamanda, bedenlerin meşru ifade kazanabilecekleri ontolojik alanı oluşturarak neyin ‘gerçek’ addedilip neyin edilmeyeceğini belirliyor. Bazı ‘toplumsal cinsiyet kimliklerinin’ idrak edilebilirlik matrisi içerisinde bakıldığında gelişimsel hatalar yada mantıksal imkansızlıklar gibi görünmesi, onların kültürel idrak edilebilirliğin normlarına uymamalarından ileri gelir.

İdrak edilebilirliğin matrisini anlayanın, bu noktada toplumsal cinsiyete dair, bu konuda inşa edilen ve ‘yaşanabilir bir hayat’ sürdürebilmek adına sahiplenilen, ve tekrar tekrar performe edilen normlara dair dikkate değer fikirler sunacağını düşünüyorum. Nitekim, toplumsal cinsiyete dair normatif bir değerlendirme, hangi toplumsal cinsiyet ifadelerinin kabul edilebilir olup olmadığı ile ilgilenirken, eleştirel bir çalışma öte yandan, Butler’ın da iddia ettiği gibi toplumsal cinsiyeti neyin idrak edilebilir kıldığına dair düşünmeyi zorunlu kılar ve toplumsal cinsiyetin kendisini mümkün kılan koşulları cevaplamaya çalışır. Hangi iktidar düzenlenişinin özne ile öteki’yi, kadın ile erkek arasındaki ikircikli ilişkiyi ve bu terimlerin kendi iç istikrarlarını inşa ettiğini sormak bu noktada önemlidir. Performatiflik kavramını anlamak adına Butler’ın ortaya attığı birkaç soruyla başlamak istiyorum. Kadın olmak doğal bir olgu mudur, yoksa bir çeşit kültürel performans mıdır? Bu ‘doğallık’ eğer oluşmuş bir şeyse hangi söylemsel kısıtlamalarla oluşturulmuştur? Bu ‘doğallık’

bedeni ikili cinsiyet kategorisi üzerinden ve içinde üreten tekrara dayalı kısıtlanmalarla oluşmuş olabilir mi? Bu ‘doğallık’ bir inşa ise farklı şekillerde inşa edilebilir mi, yoksa bu inşa faillik ve dönüşüme fırsat vermeyen bir nevi toplumsal determinizme mi çıkar?

Söz edimleri teorisinin performativite tanımını, adlandırdığını üreten ya da meşrulaştıran söylemsel bir pratiktir. Butler’a göre, performatiflik tekil ve kasti bir edim değildir, performatiflik yineleyici ve atıfsal bir pratik, tekerrür ve ritüel olarak anlaşılmalıdır. Performatiflik, kendisini beden bağlamında doğallaştırılmasıyla gösteren, kültürel olarak sürdürülen zamansal bir süreç olarak kavranmalıdır. Butler, *Cinsiyet Belası*’nda toplumsal cinsiyeti, ontolojik inşasının siyasi parametrelerini sorguya açacak soy kütük araştırmasının nesnesi olarak alıyor, ve toplumsal cinsiyetin “varlığının” bir sonuç olduğunu iddia ediyor. Butler’ın performatiflik ile ilgili iddiaları, toplumsal cinsiyet ifadelerinin ardında yatan varlık ontolojisine tabi bir sabitlikte bir toplumsal cinsiyet kimliğini reddeder; O, kimliğin toplumsal cinsiyet kimliğinin sonucu olduğu söylenen ‘dışavurumlar’ ve ‘ifadeler’ tarafından bizzat performatif olarak kurulduğunu iddia eder. Bir başka deyişle, kendimizle alakalı bir ‘iç’ özellik olarak gördüğümüz şey, aslında belli beklentiler ve belli bedensel eylemler üzerinden ürettiğimiz bir şeydir. Ben ise bu çalışmada, politik öznelliğin dışavurumlar ve edimler dolayısıyla daima elde edilen bir şey olduğunu iddia ediyorum ve 10 Ekim üzerine tutulan yas ile yas tutanların kendi politik öznelliklerinin devamlılığını sürdürdüğünü savunuyorum. Bir başka deyişle, yaşanabilir hayatın nasıl iktidar ilişkileri dahilinde kurulduğuna işaret ederek politik öznelliğin nasıl ortaya çıktığını sorguluyorum.

Butler’ın kavramsallaştırması dahilinde, toplumsal cinsiyet, eylemlerin kaynağında yatan stabil ve kararlı bir kimlik yada failliğin merkezi değil, edimlerin stilize tekrarları üzerinden öznenin dış mekanında tesis edilen bir kimlik olarak tasavvur edilmelidir. Tözel kimlik modeli temelinden kopmuş toplumsal cinsiyet anlayışının temelleneceği yer ise Butler’a göre kurulu bir toplumsal zamansallığı gerektirecek bir kimlik modelidir. İç süreksizliğe sahip edimlerce tesis edilen toplumsal cinsiyet, toplumdaki sıradan seyircilerce hem icra edilen hem de seyredilen ve bu inanç ile kendisini var eden performatif bir başarıdır. Ben ise bu çalışmada 10 Ekim toplanmasını gerçekleştirme çabasını da, 10 Ekim patlamaları sonrası yası

tutulabilirlik üzerinden yapılan politikayı da bizzat politik failliğin çıkışı olarak ele alıyorum. İlk etapta, politik söz söyleme ve yaşanabilirlik normları, sonraki etapta ise yası tutulabilirlik normları üzerinden kurulan öznellik aslında tam manasıyla bu normlar tarafından mümkün kılınıyor ve üretiliyor. Dolayısıyla, tüm bu faillikler, tam da için kuruldukları iktidar ilişkilerinde kendini performatif olarak var etme yolu haline geliyor.

İkili cinsiyet matrisi içerisinde, bedensel bir normun var sayılma, sahiplenilme, ve üste alınma sürecini, özne tarafından tecrübe edilen bir süreç olarak kavramak bu noktada hatalı bir hale geliyor. Çünkü, özne yada konuşan ‘ben’ bir cinsiyeti sahiplenme sürecinden geçmiş olması koşuluyla vücut bulma sürecine giriyor, ve bu süreç sürekli devam ediyor. Dolayısıyla performatiflik, tek bir ‘eylem’den ziyade birtakım normlar dizisinin yinelenmesi olarak anlaşılmalıdır ve bu yinleme kendisini, yinleme olduğu gerçeğini gizleyerek devam ettirir. Özetlemek oldukça zor, ama Butler’ın kendi sözleriyle aktarmak gerekirse; “Performatiflik ne serbest bir oyun, ne tiyatral bir öz sunumudur; ne de basitçe performans ile denk tutulabilir. Dahası, kısıtlama performatife sınır koyan bir şey olmak zorunda değildir. Aksine, kısıtlama performatifliği harekete geçiren ve sürdüren şeydir.” (Butler, 1999:138). Performatifliği iradi ve rasgele seçimler olarak okumak ise, öte yandan; genel olarak söylemin, özel olarak ise normların tarihselliğinin isimlendirdiği şeyi yasallaştırmak adına söylemin gücünü kurduğu noktasını kaçırmak olur.

Butler, çağırma nosyonu ile performatifliğin ilişkisini Althusser’e referans vererek bir yargıcın mütemadiyen atıfta bulunduğu yasayla ve bu atıfta bulunma ile varlığa gelen yasanın gücü ile kuruyor. Daha açıklayıcı olmak gerekirse, yargıç bir durumu isimlendirerek yasayı yetkilendiriyor, uyguladığı kanuna atıfta bulunarak bu atfın gücünü kanunun performatif gücüne aktarıyor. Yargıcın sözlerinin gücü ne kendi iradesinden ne de ondan önceki bir otoriteden türüyor, yargıcın ‘iradesi’ ilkin yasaya olan atfıyla üretiliyor ve metinsel otoritenin ‘önceliği’ bu atıf üzerinden ve içinde kuruluyor. Bahsettiğimiz atıfsallık, daha önce de bahsettiğimiz yinelenebilirlikten geliyor ve bu yinelenebilirlik hem söz ediminin otoritesini kuruyor ve hem de söz edimlerinin tekil olmayan karakterini tesis ediyor. Bir başka deyişle, edimin

performatif gücünü tesis eden bu atıfsallığı, ve her edim bir yankı yada atıfsal bir zincir. Öte yandan, bu yinelenebilirlik asla basit bir şekilde aynı kopyaların oluşması olarak anlaşılmamalıdır. Butler'ın *Bela Bedenler*'de iddia ettiği üzere; "Eğer bir performatif geçici olarak muvaffak olursa bu, niyetin başarılı bir biçimde söz söyleme faaliyetine hakim olduğundan ötürü değildir; sadece bu faaliyet önceki faaliyetleri tekrarladığı ve önceki otoriter pratikler dizisinin tekrarlanması veya onlara atıfta bulunulması üzerinden otoritenin gücünü biriktirerek çoğalttığı içindir." (1993:318). Buradan şöyle bir sonuca çıkabiliyoruz; bir performatif kendisini harekete geçiren kurucu uzlaşımları üstüne giydiği ve de muhafaza ettiği ölçüde çalışıyordur. Buradan da, iktidarın toplayıcı ve gizleyici tarihselliği olmadan hiç bir terim yada sözcenin performatif olarak işleyemeyeceği sonucuna çıkıyoruz. Butler, çağırmanın bireyin boyun eğdirilmiş özne statüsüne geçişini başlattığı için çağırıcıyı şekillendirici hatta icra edici olarak ele alıyor. Dilin kullanılmasının ilkin adlandırmayla, bir isimle çağrılmayla mümkün kılındığını düşündüğümüzde, bir ismi taşımak, böylece kişiye pek de bir seçim şansı tanımadan onun söylem içindekini yerini belirler. Bu tarz 'çağrılar'ın birikmesi ve yakınsamasıyla 'ben' üretilir, ki bu ben "kendisini bu zincirin tarihselliğinden ayıramaz veya doğrulup bu zincirin karşısına, bana karşı duran, ben olmayan, sadece başkalarının oluşturdukları bir nesneymiş gibi çıkamaz; çünkü sorgulayıcı çağrılar örgüsü ve onun yeri olan "ben" tarafından üretilen bu yabancılaşma ve bölünme sadece tecavüzcü, ihlal edici değil, aynı zamanda muktedir hale getirendir de" (Butler, 1993:175). Öte yandan, 'Ben'i muktedir hale getirenin bu güç ilişkileri olması, karşı koysa da bu güç ilişkilerine dahil olması ve bulaşması, 'ben'in bu güç ilişkilerinin mevcut biçimlerine indirgenebilir olması demek değildir. Ben ise bu çalışmada, siyasal iktidarın politik muhaliflik üzerine dolaşıma soktuğu söylemleri aslında atıf alması bir gücü olmayacağını ileri sürerek ele alıyorum ve buradan hareketle kırılan grubun siyasal iktidarın çağrılarına dönmesinin sebebini bizzat o noktadan söz söyleyerek kendi öznelliklerini kurmalarında buluyorum. Toplanma, kırılan topluluğun o zamana kadarki çağrılarına ve bu çağrıların onları 'yaşanamayan' bir hayata itmesine karşı gerçekleşiyor. Yas sürecinde ise onları isimlendirerek aslında 'yaşanabilir' olarak kayıplarını adlandırarak direnişi bizzat bu çağrılara karşı iktidar geliştirerek kuruyorlar.

Kurucu dış mevzusuna gelecek olursak, öncelikle şunu tekrarlamakta fayda var. Toplumsal cinsiyet performatifliğini kuramsallaştırmak için düzenleyici cinsel rejimleri, onların zoraki ve yineleyici pratiklerini göz önüne almak gerekiyor. Normların maddeleşmesi, onların kişi tarafından varsayıp sahiplenildiği bir çeşit özdeşime dayalı süreçleri gerekli kılar. Bu özdeşimler özne oluşumu önceler ve muktedir kılar, ama bu durum bir özne tarafından icra ediliyormuş gibi anlaşılmamalıdır. Özneyi, özne yapan zaten bu özdeşime dayalı performatifliğin her an olan tekrarlarıdır. Bu pratiklerin inşasının limitleri ise, dışkılanmış ve meşruiyet alanından kovulmuş bedenlerin ‘beden’ olarak sayılmayı başaramadığı hayatın sınırlarında ifşa edilir. Başka bir deyişle, cinsiyetli olma zorunluluğu tamamen kapsamlı olmayan eril ve dişilin farklılaştırılmış bir yorumunu ve düzenlenmesini gerektirir. Ve bu zorunluluk, ‘kurucu bir dış’ı gerekli kılar ve kurar.

Sosyal teori içerisinde, kimi zaman ‘özne’nin ‘kişi’ ya da ‘birey’ kavramları ile yer değiştirebilir olduğu ifade ediliyor. Ancak eleştirel bir değerlendirmeden çıkan öznenin soykütüğü tam olarak özneyi birey yada kişi ile özdeşleştiremiyor. Burada özne daha ziyade dilsel bir kategori, bir yer tutucu, oluşum içindeki bir yapı olarak anlaşılıyor. Bireyler, özne pozisyonunu doldurmak adına gelirler, ancak anlaşılabilir olmaları onların ilkin dilde kurulmalarına bağlıdır. Bu bakış açısı özneyi bireyin varlığının ve failliğinin dilsel koşulu olarak anlamamız gerektiğini iddia ediyor. Bir başka deyişle bireyin anlaşılabilirlik kazanması ve bunu yeniden ve yeniden üretebilmesi için bir fırsat. Bir bireyin tabi olmadan ya da özneleşme sürecinden geçmeden özne olacağını söyleyemeyiz. Bu noktada, bir çelişki karşımıza çıkıyor: eğer birey anlaşılabilirliğini özne olma yoluyla kazanıyorsa, bireyi anlaşılabilir bir anlam gibi algılamak anlamsız ve eksik bir hale geliyor. Öte yandan, özneleşmeyi ele alan bazı anlatılar, tam da açıklamak üzere araştırdıkları özneyi önceden varsaydıkları için döngüsel bir hal alıyorlar. Özetle, bu anlatı bir yandan öznenin iktidara tabi olmadan ve çağırma taleplerine dönmeden varlığını kazanamayacağını varsayarken, öte yandan öznenin yalnızca kendisinin yineleme ve yeniden ekleme yoluyla özne kaldığına işaret eder. Bu da öznenin tutarsız ve tamamlanmamış karakterini açığa çıkarır. Böylece aslında faillik imkanı yeniden anlamlandırma ve altüstü edici tekrarlar yoluyla kendisini aktifleştirebilir. Bir başka deyişle, onun asla tamamlanmamış olması

iktidarla pazarlık ederken kendi kurulumunu işin içine katma imkanını ona verir. Böylece incitici terimlerle söylemsel yaşama giren marjinal grupların işgal ettiği alan, o incitici terimlerin yaratıcı yenileyici tekrarlarıyla anlamlarını yitirmelerinin olanağını bu gruplara verir. Yası tutulamaz olanın, yasını tutmak, onun kamusal alanda ben yaşanabilirim ve yası tutulabilirim demesi, ya da sadece görünürlüğüyle bunu çağırması, mevcut anlamlandırma ihtimallerini sarsacak, onun yeniden oluşumunu iktidara rağmen ve iktidarın içinde başlatacaktır. Bu noktadan itibaren, Butler'ın yas, kırılğanlık, ve yası tutulabilirlik tartışmalarını nasıl işlevselleştirdiğime dair noktaları aktaracağım.

Butler, yası siyasi yaşamın belli bir boyutu olarak görür; bu boyut ona göre şiddete açık olmamız ve şiddetteki payımızla, kayıplar ve şiddet karşısında yaralanabilirliğimiz ve ardından gelen yas göreviyle ve cemaat oluşturma şartlarını bu şartlarda bulmakla ilgilidir. Ona göre, kayıp vermemizin ve yaralanabilir olmamızın kaynağı, bedenlerimizin toplumsal olarak kurulmuş olması, başkalarıyla bağlarımızın bulunması, bağlarımızı kaybetme tehlikesinin bulunması, başkalarına maruz kalmamız, ve bu maruz kalma nedeniyle şiddet tehlikesiyle karşı karşıya olmamızda yatar (Butler, 2004).

Bir hayatın, kaybedilebilir, sakatlanabilir, tahrip edilebilir, ölünceye dek sistematik bir şekilde ihmal edilebilir olması; bu hayatın sonluluğunu yani ölümün kaçınılmaz olduğunu değil, o hayatın kırılğanlığını vurgular. Kırılğanlık, hayatın bir hayat olarak devam ettirilebilmesi için çeşitli sosyal ve ekonomik koşulların karşılanması gerektiğiyle alakalıdır. Bu demektir ki; bir kişinin hayatının daima bir anlamda başkalarının elindedir; kırılğanlık, daima toplumsal bir hayata işaret eder. Tanıdıklarımıza ve tanımadıklarımıza maruz kalırız; az tanıdığımız yada hiç tanımadığımız insanlar ile bile bir bağımlılığımız vardır. Büyük oranda anonim ötekilere bağımlılığımız yaşamımızı derinden etkiler. Hayatın kırılğanlığı, hayatı uzatma arzusunun sadece varsayılan yaşama dürtüsüne değil, toplumsal ve siyasal koşullara bağlı olmasına işaret eder. Tanımı gereği kırılğan olan hayatın sürekliliği hiç bir zaman güvence altında değildir, bu hayat bilinçli olarak yada kazara silinebilir.

Ekonomik ve toplumsal kurumlar da dahil bütün siyasi düzenler, bu sürdürülebilirliğin gereksinimlerine hitap etmek üzere tasarlanmışlardır (Butler, 2009).

Butler'ın yas anlayışında yaralanabilirlik ile yas ve keder arasında kuvvetli bağlar var. Kırılğan Hayat'ın Önsöz'ünde bahsettiği gibi; yaralanabilecek olmamız, başkalarının yaralanabilecek olması, bir başkası yüzünden ölüme maruz kalabilecek olmamız hem korkuya hem de kedere sebep olur (Butler, 2004). İnsan yaralanabilirliğini reddetmek yerine, onu tanımak adına, kayıplar üzerine yas tutmak zorundadır (Lloyd, 2009). Öte yandan, yaralanabilirliğin bize kazandırdığı bir şey varsa o da Butler'a göre, hayatımın bağımlı olduğu ötekilerin, tanıyıp tanıyamayacağım insanların bulunduğu sezgisidir. Bir başka deyişle, yaralanmış olmak, insanı yara üzerine düşünmeye, yaralanmanın hangi mekanizmalar aracılığıyla eşitsiz olarak paylaştırıldığını öğrenmeye, başka kimlerin hangi şekillerde beklenmedik şiddetten, korkudan mustarip olduğunu anlamaya iter; ve dahi bunun için bir fırsattır. Kırılğanlık, bu bağlamda; kadınları, queerleri, transları, yoksulları ve devletsizleri bir araya getirebilecek bir şemsiye görevi görebilir. Öte yandan, hayatın kırılğanlığı bize etik bir yükümlülükle geri döner: bazı hayatları kırılğan olarak kavramamızı mümkün kılan, az mümkün kılan yada imkansızlaştıran koşulları sorgulamak (Butler, 2009). Bu çalışma da bu tartışmadan hareketle, kırılğanlık ve yası tutulabilirlik üzerinden bir politik ittifak ihtimalini sorgulayarak, yasin kırılğan toplulukları birleştirdiği bir 'biz'in, iktidara direniş için nasıl yapılandırılabilceğinin izlerini sürmektedir.

Butler'ın kırılğanlık ve güvencesizlik tartışmalarına dahil ettiği bir başka argüman ise bedene dair. Butler'a göre, kamusal aleniliğin mevkii olan bedenlerimizin toplumsal yaralanabilirliği, bizlerin siyasi kuruluşunda önemli bir rol oynuyor. İnsan olmanın normatif bir mefhum olması, insan bedeninin ne olması gerektiğine dair normatif bir mefhumu önceliyor (Butler, 2004). Ontolojik tartışmaların atıfta bulunduğu bedenin 'varlığı' aynı zamanda şunlara işaret eder; beden her zaman başkalarına, normlara, tarih boyunca kırılğanlığı ayrımcı bir şekilde tahsis etme amacını gütmüş toplumsal ve siyasi örgütlenmelere maruz kalmıştır, ve dolayısıyla önce ontolojik olarak bir beden tanımlayıp sonra bedene yüklenen toplumsal anlamları irdelemek mümkün değildir. Bedenin ontolojisini toplumsal bir ontoloji yapan da budur; beden olmak daha çok

toplum tarafından işlenmeye ve toplumsal biçimlere maruz kalmaktır. Öte yandan, beden sadece toplumsal ve siyasal güçlere maruz kalmaz, aynı zamanda devamlılığını ve gelişimini mümkün kılan toplumsallık iddialarına da maruz kalır; dil, emek, ve arzu da buna dahildir (Butler, 2009). Ben ise bu çalışmada bazı toplulukların bedenlerinin kırılğanlığının söylemsel düzlemde kurularak, bu kırılğanlığın boyutlarının ölümcül boyutlara ulaştığını iddia ediyorum.

Butler, yasın özelleştirici, yalıtıcı, ve bu anlamda siyasetten uzaklaştırdığı düşüncesini reddeder. Ona göre, yas girift türden bir siyasi cemaat anlayışı temin eder. Ve bu siyasi anlayış, ilkin temel bağımlılığı ve etik sorumluluğu da içerecek ilişkisel bağları öne çıkarır. Kederin anlatıldığı hikaye, ‘ben’in ta kendisinin Öteki’yle ilişkisi üzerinden sorgulandığı bir hikaye olmak zorundadır. Butler’ın yas ile ilgilenmesindeki amacı, yasa dair yeni bir kuram inşa etmek değil. Ancak O’na göre, yas insan hayatının kırılğanlığının ve bizim ‘diğer’ine olan yaralanabilirliğimizin oldukça açığa çıktığı, insan varoluşunun bağımlı doğasının bulgusu niteliğinde bir deneyim. Bu çalışma da 10 Ekim üzerine tutulan yasın meydana geldiği koşullar gereği özelleştirici, yalıtıcı ve bu anlamda siyasetten uzaklaştıran bir yas çerçevesinde incelenemeyeceğini iddia ediyor, aksine yasın kırılğan grubun mevcut direnişini mümkün kılan ve devamını sağlayan bir koşul olduğunu ileri sürüyorum.

Butler ‘Kim insan sayılır?’ ya da ‘Kimin hayatı hayat sayılır?’ gibi aslında tamamen siyaset alanında olan, ancak birtakım ön kabullerle gündem haline gelmeyen soruları daha güçlü bir hale getirmek adına soruları şu şekilde formüle eder: ‘Bir hayatı yası tutulabilir kılan şey nedir?’ (Zehfuss, 2007). Butler, evrensel olarak paylaşılan bir ‘insan’lık durumunun mevcut olmamasını halihazırda kabul ederek başladığı argümanını kimin insan sayılıp kimin sayılmadığına dair kavrayışın, ayrımcı yas tahsisini anlamak açısından önemli olduğu argümanı ile devam ettiriyor. İnsan olana atıfta bulunma, şimdilerde bir zorluğa denk düşüyor. Öyle ki, günümüzde dolaşımda olan atıf tüm insanları içermiyor, medeniyete dair sürmekte olan normatif ön varsayımlar hangi insanların yasal korumaya layık sayılıp hangi insanların da hiç bir yasa tarafından korunmayan bir alana terk edileceğini belirliyor (Butler, 2004).

Butler'ın yas ve mateme dair ilgisi, *Kırılğan Hayat* ve *Savaş Tertipleri*'nden öncesine dayanıyor. *Cinsiyet Belası*'nda ilk olarak ortaya atılıp, *Bela Bedenler* ve *İktidarı*'ın *Psişik Yaşamı*'nda geliştirilen ilk tartışma şuna odaklanıyor; heteronormatif cinselliğin insanların kamusaldeki yas dışavurumlarını sınırlamak adına işlemesi. *Kırılğan Hayat*'taki *Şiddet, Yas, Siyaset* makalesinde ise Butler, yas analizine yeni bir yön veriyor. Bu tartışma dahilinde, sadece yas normlarının yada geleneklerinin nasıl iktidar ilişkileri tarafından şekillendirildiği değil, aynı zamanda yas deneyiminin nasıl politik saha içerisinde bir başka normatif arzuya kapı aralayacağına da değiniyor (Lloyd, 2009). Bu çalışma da Türkiye'deki toplumsal şiddet bağlamında bu normatif arzunun ne gibi iktidar ilişkilerine bulaşarak meydana geldiğinin izlerini arıyor.

Butler ayrımcı yas tahsisinden bahseder. Bu tahsis, kimi yaşamların yası tutulabilir, ötekilerin yası tutulamaz olduğuna; hangi tür öznelerin yasının tutulması gerektiğine, hangi tür öznelerin de yasının tutulmaması gerektiğine karar verir. Bu bizi kimin normatif olarak insan olduğuna, yaşanabilir bir yaşam ve yası tutulabilir bir ölüm sayılanın ne olduğuna dair üretilmekte ve sürdürülmekte olan belli dışlayıcı kavrayışlara götürür (Butler, 2004). Bir başka deyişle, yası tutulabilirlik, Butler'ın çalışmalarında, dışlama ve idrak edilemezlik işlevi görür; yani hak talebi, destek ve tanınmaya muvafık olanları 'yası tutulabilir', olmayanları 'yası tutulamaz' olarak ayırır (Lloyd, 2015). Butler'a göre, hayatın değeri, kayıpla birlikte ortaya çıkar; yası tutulabilirlik önemi olan hayata dair bir varsayımdır. Gündelik dilde yas, halihazırda yaşanmış bir hayatın bitmiş olmasını öngerektirir. Butler bu tartışmada, provokatif sayılabilecek bir argüman daha ortaya atıyor; bir özneyi tanıma için hazır hale getiren yada tesis eden kategoriler ve normlar halihazırda tanıma edimini önceler ve onu mümkün kılar. Böylece, tanınabilirlik tanımadan önce gelir. Bu argüman dahilinde, Butler şunu öneriyor; insan olanı tahsis edilen ve geri çekilen, büyütülen, kişileştirilen, alçaltılan ve tanınmayan, yükseltilen ve olumlanan bir değer ve morfoloji olarak düşünmek. Bu, belki insan olmayan insan gibi imkansız bir paradoksu anlamak için bir yol olabilir (Butler, 2004). Ayrımcı yas tahsisi, yada 'hayat' tahsisi, tanınmaya uygun olan öznelerle tanınmaya uygun olmayan özneler arasındaki normlara dayalı ayrıma dayanır. Bir başka deyişle, tanınmaya ve temsil edilmeye değer insan fikrini üreten normlar sayesinde işleyen başka bir normatiflik seviyesi vardır. Dolayısıyla,

iktidarın bu ayrımcılığını açıkça anlayamadığımız sürece, bu öznelerin nasıl temsil edileceğine, ya da nasıl tanınacağına ilişkin daha genel bir normatifliği sorguya açamayız (Butler, 2009). Ayrımcı yas ve kırılğanlık tahsisine dair bu tartışma, herhangi bir hayatın değerine veya hayatta kalabilme yetisine odaklanmıyor; aksine hayatı güvence altına alan bu koşulların karşılanmadığı toplumsal koşullara odaklanıyor (Butler, 2009). Bir başka deyişle, buradaki yası tutulabilirlik, yas yada ölüm ile aynı şeyi işaret etmez; burada işaret edilen yaşanabilirlik hakkında tekrar düşünmedir. (Lloyd, 2016). Hayatın ‘varlığı’nı sorgularken, bu seçici yaklaşımla tesis edilmesi dolayısıyla, bu varlığa iktidarın işleyişlerinin dışında kalan bir varlık olarak atıfta bulunmak hatalı olacaktır. Bu çalışma da hayatı üreten özgül iktidar mekanizmalarını, Butler’dan farklı olarak global bir çerçeveden ulusal bir çerçeveye çekmeyi planlıyor.

APPENDIX B: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enformatik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Aksan

Adı : Hatice Merve

Bölümü : Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları A.B.D

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : Towards Precarious Politics: Assembly, Mourning and Livable Life

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ☒ Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ☒

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: