
Comment 2

Kaoru MURAKAMI

Institute of Developing Economies, Japan

One message of the speakers at today's workshop is that what seems to be the revival of the tradition is in fact a part of modernity. Phenomena such as women's veil in Prof. Obiya's paper, the reproduction of conservative family values in Dr. Sono's paper, or the practice of *jahri zikr* by women as pointed out in Prof. Wazaki's paper, which adopt facets of purely Islamic or Uzbek traditions, are actually a part of the modernity of today's Uzbekistan. Prof. Babadjanov's paper pointed out how SADUM theologians tried to compromise Islamic values with Soviet ideology in order to formulate moderate emancipation of women. Prof. Azimova showed us economic factors behind the nuclearization of the family unit, which is often associated with modernization in general. All the papers understand modernity as something ambiguous and multilayered, evolved out of a cross-interaction of pre-Soviet Islamic tradition, Soviet modernity, post-Soviet Uzbek nationalism, and a market economy. They carefully avoid dichotomous thinking such as "modern versus tradition," or "progress versus backwardness."

In Turkey too, women's new veil similar to *hijob* in Uzbekistan has appeared, while the modernizing reforms of women's status by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the charismatic leader of the Turkish revolution and first president of the republic, have been reassessed since the 1980s. The discussion has resulted in the deconstruction of the myth of the liberation of women by modernizing reforms. I would like to share some of these discussions with you. I hope it helps us discuss Uzbekistan's case from a wider perspective.

Soon after the republic's founding in 1923, Mustafa Kemal and his followers, the enlightened governing elites, launched extensive modernization reforms. A secular Civil Code that introduced equality in the husband-wife relationship and women's enfranchisement was quickly enacted. Reforms were supported and defended by upper- and middle-class women who had succeeded in gaining a place in the public realm.

It was in the mid-1980s that the nature of the modernizing reforms by Mustafa Kemal and his followers began to be reconsidered under the influence of the second wave of Western feminism. While agreeing with the reformist legacy of gender equality and women's advancement in the public sphere, feminists criticized the indifference of the reformist elites to women's position within the private realm, where they had been and still are expected to be self-sacrificing mothers.

Tracking back to the discourses of modernizing reformist elites, Deniz Kandiyoti explored the roots of the problem and noted that women's emancipation under reformist ideology was part of a broader political project of nation building and secularization. Kandiyoti argues that improvement of the status of women was always connected with the improvement of society. In other words, women were assigned the role of cultural boundary markers of a collectivity [Kandiyoti 1989].

While Kandiyoti noted the integration of women into nationalist projects as icons of modernity and/or bearers of tradition and authentic culture, a series of studies by Nükhet Sirman highlighted how women were incorporated into the nationalist project as gendered subjects. In analyzing a series of works by Halide Edip Adıvar, a famous woman novelist, Sirman noted several interesting themes. In early works written toward the end of the imperial period, women appeared as vacillating, subject to short-lived passion, and who lost her head over a lover for whom she felt sexual passion. Later, following the establishment of the republic, the woman was depicted as a subject appealing to reason or soul and choosing a partner who would allow a lasting relationship. The appearance of this kind of subjective heroine implied that the new femininity (of being a chaste wife and mother of the nation), was not

applied to women forcefully, but was rather an identity that women themselves desired, undertook, and internalized [Sirman 2002].

Feminists' re-evaluation of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's modernizing reforms has effectively pointed out the limits of the reform, as well as women's own commitment to it. These women were not always passive objects of the reform, but could be active participants in it. The discussion reminds us of the need to look into women's desires, subjectivity, and agency. Both in Turkey and Uzbekistan, the ambiguous and multilayered nature of contemporary modernity could be better understood by looking into the social world of the people.

■ References

Kandiyoti, Deniz

1989 "Women and the Turkish State: Political Actors or Symbolic Pawns?," in Yuval-Davis, Nira and Floya Anthias (eds.), *Woman-Nation-State*, London: Macmillan.

Sirman, Nükhet

2002 "Kadınların Milliyeti," in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, cilt 4 *Milliyetçilik*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık.