

Putting Yourself Into Someone's Shoes: A Postcolonial Analysis About Shoe Wearing Practices And Representations Through Media In Turkey ^(*)

Kendimizi Başkasının Yerine Koymak: Türkiye'de Ayakkabı Giyme Pratikleri ve Medya Temsilleri Üzerine Postkolonyal Bir Analiz

Nurseem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN, Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR ^()**

Abstract

Postcolonialism is rarely examined as a critical theory in Turkey.¹ This might be related to the arguments that Turkey has never been colonized like the countries in the classical colonization history by military power and forces. By complicating this approach to colonization, we will attempt

^(*) This article is a product of the research project carried out by the Student Research Unit of Postcolonial Studies Research Center (PAMER) at Uskudar University between 16th April-1st July under the coordination of Nurseem Keskin Aksay, who is a Fellow in this Research Center and a doctoral Fellow in Freie University Berlin. During the research process several students of this unit have contributed to the participant observation, inter-view sessions, fieldwork reports and organization of the article such as Hasan Süheyl Tokuz, Zeynep Sinem Şeker, Merve Şahin and Tuğçe Gür but the decision on the authors of this article was made according to the degree of commitment and contribution to the writing process itself.

^(**) Authors respectively: Research Fellow, Uskudar University Postcolonial Studies Research Center and doctoral Fellow Social and Political Sciences Faculty Freie University Berlin Graduate School Muslim Cultures and Societies, nurseem.keskinaksay@uskudar.edu.tr, aksay@bgsmcs.fu-berlin.edu.tr; Master Student, Imperial College London Entrepreneurship and Management, ayse.kaptaner15@imperial.co.uk; BA Student, Uskudar University Psychology Department, nursena95@hotmail.com; BA Student, Uskudar University Advertising Design and Communication Department, elgunrabia@gmail.com; BA Student Uskudar University Psychology Department, unzile_dasdemir16@hotmail.com.

¹ Postcolonialism is referred mainly to the context of colonized countries which are under the immediate political control of another country by military forces and related mostly to the context of officially colonized territories. That's why postcolonialism is also not related to the Turkey which was established as an independent Republic. However, if postcolonialism is considered as a critical tool which examines the operation of power in different levels and layers of experience throughout the world in terms of social, political and economic structures, its mainstream connotation extends the materiality of territories and appears in thoughts and practices of people. In that sense, postcolonialism is a critical theory in which the dimension and conceptualization of colonialism is complicated through questioning the power relations and structures in the world. For further discussion on postcolonialism see the works of postcolonial theorists Edward Said, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Homi K. Bhabha, Frantz Fanon, Dibesh Chakrabarty, and Michel Foucault.

Üsküdar
Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler
Dergisi
Yıl:1
Sayı:1

**Nurseem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

to answer how different practices of wearing shoes (wearing/ not wearing shoes in the house or leaving shoes in front of the door or not or wearing slippers or not) are represented in TV series, literature, news, TV programs and how it can be analyzed within the self-colonizing arguments. We will try to investigate how our very daily life practices can be a project of colonization without the use of any military and physical forces but through micro level elements like the representation and knowledge production on shoe wearing practices.

Keywords: *Postcolonialism, Shoe Wearing Practices, Media Representation, Self-colonization, Turkey*

Özet

Eleştirel bir teori olarak “Postkolonyalizm” (Sömürgeleşme sonrası düşünce sistemleri) üzerine Türkiye’de çok çalışılmamaktadır. Bunun Türkiye’nin klasik ve teknik anlamıyla “kolonileştirilmemiş” bir ülke olması konusundaki savlardan kaynaklandığı düşünülebilir. Çalışmamız, bu kolonileştirme argümanlarını sorgulayarak farklı ayakkabı giyme pratiklerinin (evde ayakkabı giymek/giymemek, evin önünde ayakkabı bırakmak/bırakmamak, evde terlik giymek/giymemek) dizilerde, edebiyatta, haberlerde ve televizyon programlarında nasıl temsil edildiğine ve öz-sömürgeleştirme (kendi kendini sömürgeleştirme) teorisi ile nasıl analiz edilebileceğine değinmektedir. Bu makalede günlük pratiklerin herhangi bir askeri ya da fiziksel güç kullanılmadan sadece ayakkabı giyme pratiklerinin mikro düzeydeki temsil ve bilgi üretimleriyle nasıl bir kolonileştirme projesine dönüşebileceği ortaya konulmuştur.

Anahtar kelimeler: *Postkolonyalizm, Medya Temsilleri, Öz-sömürgeleştirme, Ayakkabı Giyme Pratikleri, Türkiye*

Introduction

Remembering the issue of Ali Uçar from Izmir in April, 2015, which is discussed in media for days after a woman has shared his photo in her Facebook account to point his book reading activity by this statement; “*The Keko of Izban (metro system in Izmir) exhausting himself to be seem*

intellectual and pick up girls; I loved your slippers."² will be very ironical to begin this article. In this mentioned photo, Ali was reading book in metro by wearing slippers under his ordinary checked shirt and jeans, while the woman sitting in front of him was labeling him as "keko" which is a Kurdish word meaning man/brother whereas in daily language it is used for humiliating people who are described as naive and uneducated. His answer was ironical as it was illuminating enormously. He declares his answer in his Facebook account. As it is stated by his words, Ali had no education after primary school. He consistently emphasizes that he is not ashamed as he would never attempt to harm one's dignity or honor. Moreover, he continues ironically: "*I shall be ashamed as I haven't still committed any crime!*". He underlines his obedience toward morality and social norms in spite of tough life experiences he went through (e.g. having divorced parents) and eventually he concludes: "*Yes, I have dirty clothes, my slippers are not adequate for subway transportation, but I am still unable to have dirty mind. I have learnt how to manner from books so that I cannot misbehave toward anyone from the society.*"

Referring to Edward Said, this issue reminds us the dichotomies created in the construction of "other" vs. us, West vs East, traditional vs modern, educated vs uneducated as an orientalist ideological apparatus which was also basis in the colonizing practices.³ In relation to context of Turkey, the use of a Kurdish word as a humiliation is also an indicator of the "otherness" of Kurdish community in the history of Turkey. Most importantly media becomes a tool of this discriminating expression in the way of reproduction the dichotomies but also it appears as the most crucial mechanism for "*self-colonizing metaphor.*"⁴ Similarly, in February, 2013, the representation of

²"Terlikli Keko Diye Aşağılayan İzmirli Kıza İnsanlık Dersi", *En Son Haber*; April 15, 2015, Accessed June 30, 2015, <http://www.ensonhaber.com/terlikli-keko-diye-asagilayan-izmirli-kiza-insanlik-dersi-2015-04-15.html>

³ Edward Said, *Orientalism*, (New York: Vintage Books 1979).

⁴ Kiossev refers that "the concept of self-colonizing can be used for cultures having succumbed to the cultural power of Europe and the West without having been invaded and turned into colonies in actual fact" rather this term points selves who are imagining their "imagined community" voluntarily within the European discourse and colonize themselves especially in cultural realms by creating new truths. It would be discussed in coming pages. For more information, see Alexander Kiossev, "The Self-Colonizing Metaphor", Accessed July 1, 2015, <http://monumenttotransformation.org/atlas-of-transformation/html/s/self-colonization/the-self-colonizing-metaphor-alexander-kiossev.html>.

**Nursem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's practice of wearing slippers on plane in different ways by different means of media⁵ shows, on the one hand, the power of media on the meaning attributions mechanism to specific issues and objects like shoe or slippers, and on the other hand the self-colonizing effect of this power of manipulation. Following this argumentation, in this paper, firstly the function of shoes will be discussed according to different contexts in terms of religion and social life on historical basis. Secondly, the effects of secularism and postcolonialism on shoe wearing practices will be pointed out in order to clarify the hegemonic knowledge production structure behind the daily life activities. Last but not least, the role of media by its manipulation power would be examined in order to rethink the various meaning attributions to shoe wearing practices. Based on media analysis on TV series, programs and news and in depth interviews this research tries to understand the system in which the practice of shoe wearing gains different meanings through media representation in the way of creating self-colonizing knowledge, subjectivities and discourses.

The Function of Shoes

Footwear has been a remarkable object in history, mainly about the everyday life of human being. Primarily, it was used for the protection of foot. However, as stated by Walford, its purpose and form has evolved through ages as a consequence of environment, common sense, philosophy, economy, and beauty.⁶ Shoe literally constructs the basis for fashion.⁷ Shoe is the only piece of attire that is used as the regular contact point of a body with the earth, while it is also expected to tolerate dampness, keep the foot comfortable, and be long-lasting and attractive.⁸

Shoes are accepted as part of clothing. While analyzing shoes topic, the concept of "clothing" should be defined. According to the definitions, clothing is the thing that people wear to cover their bodies. In addition to this, it has many functions. Primarily, it provides protection against elements. In

⁵ "Başbakan Erdoğan Uçakta Terlik Giydi", *En Son Haber*, February 25, 2013, <http://www.ensonhaber.com/basbakan-erdogan-ucakta-terlik-giydi-2013-02-25.html>.

⁶ Jonathan Walford, *Shoes*, (The Berg Fashion Library 2005), accessed 8 Jun. 2015, <http://0www.bergfashionlibrary.com.divit.library.itu.edu.tr/view/bazf/bazf00516.xml>.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*

the second place, it can be used as a means of social status.⁹ Individual, occupational, religious and sexual differentiation can be expressed by clothing. In his work Don Yoder argues that “costume, dress, apparel, and garb” words are used as synonymous with “clothing”. “Costume” word in English comes from “consuetudo” and “costum” words in Latin. All points provided a basis for the argument that “clothing is the part of its culture.”¹⁰ And by taking clothing as a style and way of expressing your identity and culture, shoes are definitely part of this culture. Clothing habits has constructed a dynamic form in Turkish society as Turks went through significant phases about clothing: Migrations, acceptance of Islam, caliphate and sultanate (sovereignty), palace and aristocracy, regression and collapse periods, industrialization, establishment of Turkish Republic, clothing reform, fashion, 60s and 80s, and finally, globalization.¹¹ Considering the nomadic Turkish roots, it can be concluded that footwear culture is as ancient as the Turkish culture itself, as Yüce claims.¹² Since migrant societies were living on hunting and livestock, they met their need of footwear in different places and conditions.¹³ As the way of living and habits changed, the culture of footwear has also changed accordingly in a rapid way.¹⁴ Shoe wearing practices have differed according to clothing styles of soldiers, peasants or courts and courtiers.¹⁵ Kuru and Paksoy argued that shoes have seemed as personal status indicators in Anatolia just like everywhere around the world.¹⁶ Walford emphasizes that the adjustment of quality cloth and fine leathers into shoes that were obvious representatives of style and elegance,

⁹ See “Clothes Functions”, *Yiwuamanda*, Accessed June 29, 2015, http://www.yiwuamanda.com/clothes-functions_1185.html; “Clothing and Style: A Brief History of Clothes,” *Know and Vote*, Accessed July 1, 2015; Dorling Kindersley (DK), “Moda: Geçmişten Günümüze Giyim Kuşam ve Stil Rehberi,” trans. Duygu Özen, (Istanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları 2013).

¹⁰ Adem Koç, “Kütahya Merkezinde Giyim-Kuşam Değişimlerinin Çözümlemesi,” *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2009.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Nuri Yüce, “Göçebe Türklere Ayakkabı Kültürü” in *Ayakkabı Kitabı*, (Istanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları, 2003), p. 323.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Songül Kuru Paksoy, Adviye Candan. “Anadolu’da Ayakkabı Kültürü ve Cumhuriyet Dönemi Ayakkabı Kültürü” in *ICANAS Bildiriler II*, (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil Ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu 2008), pp. 821-835.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

**Nurseem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

is the indicator of the purpose of expressing personal status on shoes, by the fourteenth century.¹⁷ As European societies started to be referred as nations of power and wealth, the elite distinguished themselves from the masses through apparent refinement and expensive ornamentation.¹⁸ However, the connotations to religious life and the meaning of this practice in a metaphysical existence have not showed parallels to this rationalized argumentations.

In the Biblical texts, removal of shoes represents the humbleness and obedience. As Nahshon and Prouser stated “*When Moses met God for the first time, in what is commonly referred to as the scene of the burning bush, he was immediately directed to remove his shoes because of the holiness of the ground on which he was to walk: ‘Remove your sandals from upon your feet, for the place upon which you stand is holy ground’* (Ex. 3:5).”¹⁹ As Nahshon and Prouser argue, when Moses was commanded to take off his shoes, he was invited into a closer and deeper relationship with God.²⁰ Actually, while God was placing Moses on the level of a lowly servant, the legitimate force of this interaction is enhanced by the removal of the shoes Moses saw and realized that his life would not be in his own control anymore, as he was being humbled before God and he was obliged to behave according to God’s will, since his degree was the same of a prisoner’s.²¹ As it is declared in the Biblical texts, the act of removing shoes represents humbleness and intimacy. Similarly, for non-western contexts, taking off the shoes or sandals in the presence of a superior is presented as a mark of reverence in several occasions. It is argued that among the “Eastern” nations especially Turks and Arabs put off their shoes when they enter their mosques even though it can vary due to different reasons.²² Hones argues that in most Asian homes, removing the shoes at the front door is a common tradition and a symbol of respect. The custom of removing your

¹⁷ Jonathan Walford, *ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Ora Prouser, “The Biblical Shoe Eschewing Footwear: The Call of Moses as Biblical Archetype”, in *Jews and Shoes*, ed. Edna Nahshon, (The Berg Fashion Library 2008).

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² William Makepeace Thayer, *The Home Monthly: Devoted to Home Education, Literature, and Religion*, 3-4th volumes, (D.C. Childs & Company 1861).

shoes before entering a home, is still practiced in Asian homes throughout the world that this practical design allows for any type of weather, such that all dirty and wet mess can be left in the entrance and does not need to be brought into the home, hence the house stays clean.²³ Hygiene carries an important role in perceiving of wearing/removing shoes. The sensitivity is related also with the idea that shoes are considered ritually unclean in the Muslim faith. In addition to ritual ablutions before prayer, Muslims must take off their shoes to pray, and wearing shoes inside a mosque is forbidden not to bring the unclean world onto holy ground. But beyond the Islamic significance, the dirty and degrading implication of the sole of a shoe crosses all religious boundaries with the hygiene discourses.²⁴ The need for such a radical remaking of the form and content of worship was justified in terms of modern hygienic requirements in order to enhance their attractiveness for the elites.²⁵ However, in any case the taking off activity is related to religious connotations and Eastern contexts so that taken off the shoes are always the Eastern, traditional and religious versus the Western, modern, secular. Thus, with the secularization effect, this action and the represented values through it starts to be underestimated as it is discussed in the following section of this paper.

The Effects of Secularism and Postcolonialism on Shoe Wearing Practices

Elias remarks the uncertainty of civilization term in *The Civilizing Process*, as this term is used in various areas such as techniques, behavior, science, religion and law.²⁶ He emphasizes the naturalization/normalization of the idea, which the Western communities consider themselves in more advanced standards than other communities in former and current periods.²⁷ Another important side of this idea in Western communities is self-praising

²³ Jenny Nakao Hones, "The Asian Custom of Removing Shoes at the Door", 2014, <http://asianlifestyledesign.com/2010/04/asian-custom-removing-shoes-at-door/>.

²⁴ Martin Asser, "Bush Shoe-ing Worst Arab Insult," (BBC-News: December, 2008).

²⁵ Amit Bein, *Ottoman Ulema, Turkish Republic: Agents of Change and Guardians of Tradition*, (Stanford University Press March 29, 2011).

²⁶ Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, (Oxford: Blackwell 1939).

²⁷ *Ibid.*

**Nursem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

due to superiority.²⁸ Considering the contrast of humbleness emphasis in the Biblical texts and arrogance in the civilized and secular context, it can be concluded that the perception of daily habits in Western communities have been changed so far, so do clothing and shoes. Accordingly, Eastern communities adopted such changes in postcolonial era. As Taylor stresses, in order to raise the modernity, the paths of different civilizations are meant to be get together through the disappearance of unsupported religions by losing their illusions in society.²⁹ All these kind of beliefs will gather on rational ground and “*the march of modernity will end up making all cultures look the same*”.³⁰ Thus secularism would be the making of modern selves which are practicing religion in the way that the secular world can tolerate it.³¹

Meriç suggests that the Asabiyyah theory of Ibn Khaldun can help to understand the adoption of secularism in Turkey.³² Even though Asabiyyah term is subjected to different commentaries, it can be defined as “group feeling”, “communal spirit” or “social cohesion”.³³ Asabiyyah of kinship is the dynamic that binds people through their bloodstock, ethnic ancestors and forms “solidarity” to live together on common actions.³⁴ On the other hand, Asabiyyah of reasons interconnects society through their shared values such as religion, nation, homeland etc.³⁵ However, as Guibernau argues, nation-building is considered as an unnatural and fictional process by theoreticians, which was created at French Revolution, as “nationalism” was considered as a political choice and ideology, which Marx claims as manipulation of reality.³⁶ Similarly, Benedict Anderson maintains that nation

²⁸ Bedri Gencer, “Türkiye’de Laikliğin Tarihî Dinamikleri,” *Toplum ve Bilim Dergisi*, Vol. 84, (İstanbul: Birikim Yayıncılık 2008).

²⁹ Charles Taylor, “Modernity and the Rise of the Public Sphere.” in *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1993), p. 214.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of Modern Identity*, (Harvard University Press 1989).

³² Cemil Meriç, *Umrandan Uygurılığa*, (İstanbul: İletişim 1996), p. 149.

³³ Ümit Hassan, *İbn-i Haldun’un Metodu ve Siyaset Teorisi*, (Ankara: AÜ SBF 1977), pp. 173-174.

³⁴ Bedri Gencer, *Ibid.*, p. 154.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Montserrat Guibernau, *Nationalisms: The Nations-State and Nationalisms in the Twentieth-Century*, (Cambridge: Polity 1996), p. 49.

is an “*imagined community*” which is constructed by the media itself.³⁷ Whereas, Asabiyyah is the reason of objective and social incidents which makes it a natural process.³⁸ Namık Kemal et al. were trying to redefine the “Asabiyyah of reasons” while the bonds were getting broken in Ottoman society. While the “homeland” term was forming an upper identity, it would replace the Asabiyyah gained by religion, “ummah”, as Mardin claims.³⁹ The significance of this view for our argument is, as claimed by Gencer, that re-defining the homeland and citizenship back then, as transforming into a new communal spirit, means adopting a new “non-religious” morality as the main principle of commitment.⁴⁰

Similar transformations, which were observed in Turkish society, are also observed in other societies. For instance, Hudson asserts that in the West, Christianity has lost its universal and social qualifications by being sent to collective unconscious and became a mythological element whose main function is the national identity building.⁴¹ In history of Islam, in Umayyad Dynasty, reason of the emergence of “secularism” was replacement of the Asabiyyah of kinship by Asabiyyah of reasons.⁴² Taylor also claims that what forms the public sphere is the common action which leads us to a common mind through the exchange of ideas in society.⁴³ Hereby, in the modern public sphere, something new and external must supervise and control the political power which is actually not the law of nature, God or traditional authority but “reason”, as Taylor asserts similarly to Ibn Khaldun’s concept of Asabiyyah.⁴⁴ Within this context, Taylor argues that secularism causes to a shift in our understanding of what society is grounded on since it depends on common action instead of supreme powers

³⁷ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, (London, New York: Verso 1991).

³⁸ Ümit Hassan, *ibid*, pp. 180-206.

³⁹ Şerif Mardin, “İyiler ve Kötüler,” in *Tarih Risaleleri*, ed. Mustafa Özel, (İstanbul: İz 1995), pp. 61-82.

⁴⁰ Bedri Gencer, *ibid*, p. 156.

⁴¹ Michael C. Hudson, “Islam and Political Development,” in *Islam and Development: Religion and Sociopolitical Change*, ed. John L. Esposito, (SUP: Syracuse 1980), pp. 1-24.

⁴² *Ibid*.

⁴³ Charles Taylor, “Modern Social Imaginaries,” in *Public culture* 14.1 (Durham: Duke University Press 2002), p. 114.

⁴⁴ *Ibid*, p. 115.

**Nurseem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

such as religion, tradition, royalty etc.⁴⁵

The effects of self-colonization can obviously be seen in the cultural atmosphere in Turkey. Kiossev states that “*the concept of self-colonizing can be used for cultures having succumbed to the cultural power of Europe and the West without having been invaded and turned into colonies in actual fact.*”⁴⁶ As he further suggested, in the case of Turkey’s self-colonizing process, it did not take place in an “already existing, stable” environment, but it took place when a new nation state (or Turkish Republic) was being built. Kiossev describes this process as follows:

“Self-colonization took place at a point where the small and marginal nations sprang forth; it was entwined with the act of imagining their ‘imagined community.’ Hence the image of Europe was not associated with actual aggression; it was not coupled with military violence, economic exploitation or administrative duress, all of which went hand in hand with real-time colonization. As it coincided with the birth of a nation, it was carried out voluntarily or even a surge of patriotic zeal shared by elite and population alike. The metaphor ‘self-colonization’ has ‘self’ in it—not because some already existing nations colonized them but because their own ‘Selves’; i.e., cultural identities emerged as a spin-off in the process of Euro-colonial hegemony, in an asymmetrical symbolic exchange with the colonial center.”⁴⁷

A Turkish novelist Tanpınar states that, “*Modern Turkish literature begins with a civilization crisis.*” There existed a conflict between the newly adapted/western/ civilized/progressive and the existing/traditional/ reactionary/backward. Clothing reform was an important aspect of the changes to become more westernized/civilized and progressive. Consequently, Aliş claims that the change in mentality of society is

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

⁴⁶ Alexander Kiossev, *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

revealed by clothes while being mentioned in numerous literary works after the last political reforms in Ottoman state.⁴⁸ She also stated that Tanpınar criticizes snob Turkish people with European style and inferiority complex who imitate the West passionately as he describes their clothes in details in his novels.⁴⁹ Since the beginning of Westernization movement in Turkey, changes in civilization and changes in clothes are expressed and examined together, as clothing is even more visible in forefront.⁵⁰ For instance, making reforms in military forces was considered as changing only the uniforms of army in Selim III and Mahmud II periods in Ottoman state.⁵¹ The roots of perception of self-colonization can be observed at the Ottoman times and is strengthened through the establishment of Turkish Republic.

As Kiossev argues, self-colonizing metaphor can be described as the surrender of a culture to the cultural power of Europe and the west without actually being colonized or invaded by them.⁵² Such cultures are transformed into extra colonial “peripheries” by historical factors, despite being directly affected by means of colonial rule or conflicts.⁵³ However, the same factors led them to accept foreign cultural supremacy voluntarily and automatically adopt the basic values and classifications of colonial Europe.⁵⁴ For Turkey, the sign of self-orientalism with the Republican in Ottoman times can be observed. Furthermore, roots of perception of self-orientalism is strengthened through the establishment of Turkish Republic. When the modern nation-states are built, modern leaders modernize the country willingly. In Republican states it seems like society govern

⁴⁸ Sehnaz Aliş, “Karakter ve Sosyal Statü Açısından Ayakkabı,” in *Ayakkabı Kitabı*, (İstanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları, 2003), p. 57.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 58

⁵⁰ Orhan Okay, *Batı Medeniyeti Karşısında Ahmet Mithat Efendi*, (İstanbul: DergahYayınları 1989), p. 131.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² Alexander Kiossev, *Ibid.*

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

**Nurseem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

themselves without any hegemonic power. However, the appearance of power just shifted in public's perception as Guha indicates it the new form is '*hegemony without domination*'.⁵⁵ Thus, self-orientalism has its place in the stage. Moreover, it preserves itself by keeping touch with colonialists in the post-colonial era.⁵⁶ In the post-colonial era, cultural colonization and perception management is accomplished through media, as analyzed in the following sections of this paper.

Media as a Manipulation Tool of the Postcolonial World

Media is one of the most effective ways to address the audience. Especially, the media's manipulation effect is not so easy to grasp by the audience. Therefore, the communication between people and media increases. Media represents the scenarios which are formed. As Jols and Thoman texts are designed like a building or a road by the system to be persuasive, so it is crucial to know the source of these texts.⁵⁷ Mass media creates its texts for benefit of their producers. Media uses the production of knowledge to maintain its process of manipulation. Thomlinson calls this process as it is the imperialism of media on culture.⁵⁸ The knowledge production is greatly supports the power of media. The reason is that, as Foucault says, knowledge is power and hegemony therefore it controls the daily life.⁵⁹ System uses elements of daily life to serve its aim. After that it practices conviction in order to impose it on society. Two outputs of knowledge production are globalization and normalization. The reason is that when the knowledge controlled by the system it creates its culture. The global culture becomes inevitable and this culture constitutes common discourse among people.⁶⁰ Therefore, things can be normalized in society in the context of the system accordingly.

⁵⁵ Ranajit Guha, *Dominance without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1998).

⁵⁶ Mary Lousie Pratt, "Arts of The Contact Zone", *Prefession 91*, (New York: MLA 1991), p. 33.

⁵⁷ Tessa Jols and Elizabeth Thoman, *21. Yüzyıl Okuryazarlığı: Medya Okuryazarlığına Genel Bir Bakış ve Sınıf İçi Etkinlikler*, (Ankara: Ekinoks 2008), p. 20.

⁵⁸ John Thomlinson, *Globalization and Culture*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999).

⁵⁹ Michel Foucault, "The Subject and Power," *Chicago Journals 8*, no.4 (1982):777-795. Accessed November 9, 2011. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343197>.

⁶⁰ Roland Robertson, *Küreselleşme, Toplum Kuramı ve Küresel Kültür*, trans. Ü.H. Yolsal, (Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları, 1999.), pp. 221-222.

Putting Yourself into Someone's Shoes: A Postcolonial Analysis

Mass media is becoming monopolized. Western developed countries are the biggest program producers and sellers around the world and thus monopolize production of knowledge and 'truths'. These Western powers keep 80% of media activities under control.⁶¹ Thus, mass media loses its reliability because of depending to Western powers and it became questionable. Media uses TV programs and series to catch audience's attention. Consequently, changing starts on the audience's mind. As the center of the change youth are affected by this changing and it also affects the society because of the fact that different and new way of life are demonstrated by social media, series, TV programs and any other sources of online communication. Moreover, for youth it becomes the desired and only possible way of living. Fascinating scenarios which offer traceability of life by using fashion, outlook and characters make TV series followed intensely.⁶² Additionally, popular actors are placed in their cast as the body of this attractiveness.⁶³ Although the effect of media on youth is crucial, media targets and captures public as a whole.

Media uses categorization for people to encode information in their mind. As tools of this categorization media has always dealt with issues about what is new and popular and consistent in a long term by stereotyping, othering and imposing popular media cultures as "facts". Within the light of those arguments, it can be said that the sense of media turns to be as it is the carrier of imperialist messages. Single-sided mass media conducts the information from the center to the target group. It eases the process to suggest and to accustom the messages. The ideologist orders can be seen under the represented characters, family lives and their mottos on the media thus the system of media imposes the ideology to change the national culture.⁶⁴

⁶¹ Kerem Dađlı, "Kapitalist Toplumun İdeolojik D zenleyicisi Medya," *Marksiist Tutum Dergisi*, 2006.

⁶²  mmuhan Yılmaz, "The Effects of Consumption Culture Represented in TV Series on Young People's Lifestyle," (Master's Thesis, Istanbul Arel University 2013), p. 7.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ Sabahattin Şahin "Kitle Haberleşme Araçlarından Radyo Televizyonun K lt r Deđişmeleri  zerine Yaptığı Tesirlerle İlgili Bir Deđerlendirme," Master's Thesis, Istanbul University, 1987), p. 46 cited by Emrah Alpaslan Konukman, "Son D nem Televizyon Dizilerinin Yaşam Tarzı  zerindeki İmgeleri", (Master's Thesis, Ankara 2006), p. 77.

**Nurseem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

Some countries do not colonize with military forces. In contemporary world, there are some other new ways of colonization in which the cultural colonization took the place of colonization with force.⁶⁵ For instance, Turkey has never been colonized with weapons but its culture greatly affected from the cultural colonial policies. Because, colonial states prefer the persistent colonization by suggesting their culture to the others. As social values describe the society and they are the important obstacles of cultural colonization, colonizer states target the social and cultural values of colonized states.⁶⁶ According to Çavdarıcı alienation estranges societies from their national culture, language, tradition and cultural values. As a result, social deterioration starts.⁶⁷ This paper discusses these influences through the specific case of shoe wearing practices in terms of the meaning attributions made for shoe wearing practices and their articulation to impose certain discourses and ideologies.

In early times the colonizer who uses military force also impacts the culture of the colonized society. They benefited from two aspects of colonizing dominantly but now the societies start to colonize themselves. Media is the most powerful actors of this action hence it influences the process of self-orientalism and self-colonization because of the fact that the concept of orientalism which analyzes the Eastern Societies' relationship with modernity has advanced new meaning as self-orientalism of Eastern Societies.⁶⁸ As it is argued before, media has a crucial function to determine concepts on peoples' mind. Media works as the methodology of orientalist ideology as a new way of colonizing. This methodology has been developed in the media specifically, in cartoons and animations, to establish sub-culture.⁶⁹ Cinema, TV and fashion could be identified as they are the reinforcement of self-orientalist paradigm. Particularly, those means

⁶⁵ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *Death of a Discipline*, (New York: Columbia University Press 2003).

⁶⁶ Mustafa Çavdarıcı, "Detrition of Social Values and Cultural Colonization in Turkey," (Master's Thesis, Süleyman Demirel University 2002), p. 11.

⁶⁷ *Ibid*, p. 22.

⁶⁸ Bünyamin Bezci and Yusuf Çiftçi, "Self-Orientalization: Modernity within Ourselves or Internalized Modernization", *Journal of Academic Inquiries* 7, no.1, 2012, p. 140.

⁶⁹ Ren Fukuzimi, "Criticism on Orientalism of the Concept of Superflat-Case Study: Scenes of the Japanese Contemporary Art," *Oriental Metaphor Symposium I*, 2006.

Putting Yourself into Someone's Shoes: A Postcolonial Analysis

are commonly used in the 20th century and they maintain the perception of self-orientalism.

Mass society is constituted with advertisements, reality shows, series and movies which are rapidly increasing. Thus, mass media is turned to a manipulation tool in order to diffuse hegemonic ideologies through entertainment and leisure time resources. In this respect, Adorno and Horkheimer advert to “*the culture industry*” concept.⁷⁰ They indicate that mass media is the most effective tool in culture industry. Additionally, the characters that Hollywood is produced started to affect Turkey like the rest of the world. It has brought certain identities and made them popularized in order to promulgate their ideology. However, how did people accept these codes or knowledge and behave accordingly? At this point, there are lots of arguments on social media that because of the normalization effect of media some values and knowledge become “normal” to society through series, movies and television programs by being exposed to these codes and even practicing them constantly in daily life. People are accustomed to consumption by products of mass media that provides the reproduction and legitimation of the modern lifestyle. What we eat, what we buy, briefly what we consume and how we live are defined by movies and series. Especially when the attitudes of actors in television shows or movies, the features of their character, topics of series and movies have shown similarities with features of audience's interests and pleasures, they put themselves into actors place and they identify with actors the characters.⁷¹ In this article, we especially focus on shoe wearing practices as a self-colonizing activity though the media representations and every day normalizations.

Üsküdar
Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler
Dergisi
Yıl:1
Sayı:1

⁷⁰ Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, trans. Edmund Jebhcott, ed. Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, (Stanford: Stanford University Press 2002), p. 121.

⁷¹ Pars Şahbaz and Arzu Kılıçlar, “Effects of Films and Television Dramas on Destination Image”, *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2009, pp. 31-52.

Meaning Attributions to the Shoe Wearing Practices in Media

Concepts such as “classiness”, “fashion”, “style”, and “aesthetic” raised the importance and became effective on the decisions of people.⁷² Through those concepts, people become willing to accept given things without force and started to like similar things. But at the same time they try to create distinct identities. At this point another issue shows up⁷³: “Individuality” and “independence”. According to Eagleton, mimicry is obedience to law but it is so pleasurable that freedom lies in this kind of slavery in which similarities are stereotyped thus allows you to connect to the hegemonic.⁷⁴ This reminds the fact that the subjectivities are created on the basis of giving consent to all these hegemonic relations through the discourses of desire and pleasure so that acting accordingly become to mean freedom. Person has to consume what he is supposed to demand. Clothing, also fashion are received as a way of communication⁷⁵ since they do not act upon the rules, they act upon the choices.⁷⁶ But, at the same time different reasons limit people in terms of their subjectivities since a person makes his/her choices under the influences of other people upon their contexts in order to gain recognition. When he wears, he wears for others without knowing it, due to the illusion of freedom, pleasure, self-improvement and aesthetics discourses. On this situation media has many effects. As Yağlı argues a person makes his/her choices under the influences of mass media organs which lift the effectiveness of fashion by its irresistible power. One single sample⁷⁷ is Elvis Presley who was imitated mostly by men in

⁷² Bilge Gürsoy, “Tüketim Estetiği ve Medya: ‘Bugün Ne Giysem’ Programı Üzerinden Bir Değerlendirme,” *İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi* 44, no.1, 2013, p. 97, <http://journals.istanbul.edu.tr/iuifd/article/viewFile/1019021818/1019020510>.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ T. Eagleton, *Estetiğin İdeolojisi*. trans. B. Gözkan, H. Hünler, T. Armaner, N. Ateş, A. Dost, E. Kılıç, E. Akman, N. Domaniç, A. Çitil & B. Kıroğlu, (İstanbul: Doruk Yayınları 2010), p. 84.

⁷⁵ Zehra Yiğit, “Modernliğin Arka Yüzü Olarak Gündelik Hayat: Aşk-ı Memnu,” *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 14, no: 2, 2012, p. 128, Accessed July 6, 2012, <http://www.sbe.deu.edu.tr/dergi/cilt14.say%C4%B111%20YIGIT.pdf>.

⁷⁶ G. Senem Gençtürk Hizal, “Bir İletişim Biçimi Olarak Moda: “Modus”un Sınırları,” *Ankara Üniversitesi Dergiler* 1, no: 1, 2003, p. 66, <http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/23/665/8484.pdf>

⁷⁷ Soner Yağlı, “Reconstruction of Culture Via Fashion As a Field of Daily Life,” *İstanbul Arel Üniversitesi, İletişim Fakültesi İletişim Çalışmaları Dergisi / Journal of Communication Studies*, no:3, 2012, p. 4.

Putting Yourself into Someone's Shoes: A Postcolonial Analysis

1970s.⁷⁸ These characteristics or practices of characters become so popular that people begin to practice these lives by themselves through consuming some goods and styles, which are advertised with the name of some famous TV series characters like Sıla's hair clip, Bihter's ring, Hürrem's necklace, Gaffur's pajamas, Kamran's hairstyle and many others came into fashion in some periods. Media play the biggest role on this identification and internalization.

Bilge Gürsoy addresses some points in the program *What Should I Wear Today* by highlighting "wow" voices and showing these voices' effects on human behavior⁷⁹. Also she emphasizes people's intentions to shop with expressions such as "*Fortunately, I bought it.*", "*I like shopping very much.*", and "*I always go shopping.*"⁸⁰ Besides the effectiveness of media about buying, media also influences the decisions about what should be bought or not. As Dellaloğlu emphasizes, "*Now, system says 'You can protect your life and all you have. But from then on, you are a stranger for us.' instead of saying 'think like me or get lost.'*"⁸¹. In the *What Should I Wear Today* program which was featured on Show TV, this ostracism was revealed in the form of "*You are not with us.*"⁸² This sentence is not just a phrase. It has a further meaning. When the juries say "*You are not with us.*" it carries real meaning that the competitor is not chic, or fashionable and cannot be acceptable until jury approves her style. You vs. we categorization is made through the constructed knowledge of fashion. This discrimination is manipulated to the society. "Othering" becomes the part of life. Modernity constructs itself through the creation of the "other", and achieves it by discriminating against humans, groups, cultures and religions⁸³. Especially, clothing fashion legitimizes one style, and refuses others. It strengthens

Üsküdar
Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler
Dergisi
Yıl:1
Sayı:1

⁷⁸ Adem Koç, *ibid.*, p. 256.

⁷⁹ Bilge Gürsoy, *ibid.*, p. 94.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ Besim Fatih Dellaloğlu, *Frankfurt Okulunda Sanat ve Toplum*, (İstanbul: Say Yayınları 2007), p. 126.

⁸² Bilge Gürsoy, *ibid.*, p. 95.

⁸³ Zehra Yiğit, "Türkiye'de 1990 Sonrası Bağımsız Sinemada Alt Sınıf ve Direniş Biçimleri," *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyolojik Araştırmalar E-Dergisi*, 2014:8, Accessed April 7, 2014, <http://www.sdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/makaleler/BagimsizSinemadaZehraYIGITocak2014.pdf>.

**Nursem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

others perceptions.⁸⁴ According to Ayata⁸⁵, when one class tries to make differences through money, the other class finds solutions to make up the difference. Low-priced imitation products are the result of this situation. Disco, party concepts give way to coffee houses, gold days, and other version of new life styles according to the different contexts. On the reproduction of the knowledge on the life practices of “others” media has the mission of being a guide to people⁸⁶. As it is mentioned before, media has a huge effect on people’s lives. Eating, drinking, wearing, speaking, and many others are shaped by this effect. To achieve this power, it has also lots of tools like TV shows, commercials, series and movies, websites, newspapers. Through those, media becomes decisive in society. To gain a clear understanding on the meaning of a micro level practice, namely shoe wearing practices, in our article, the power of media on the knowledge production process of fashion was very crucial to continue by emphasizing various meaning attributions to shoes in media.

By taking G.W. Bush’s (former U.S. President) shoe throwing incident along with Van Gogh’s (Dutch painter) artistic work in this section, we will discuss the importance of meaning attributions to shoes. Shoe was thrown at Bush by Iraqi reporter, Muntazar El-Zeydi,⁸⁷ while Bush was giving his “goodbye to Iraq” speech on 14th of December 2008.⁸⁸ This incident remained on the media for days. Besides, some people want to buy and offered million dollars for these shoes that are made by a Turkish firm. However, what was the importance of the shoe here, which meaning was attributed to shoes in this issue? Why was chosen the shoes for throwing? Muntazar El-Zeydi has done this protest because he wants to reflect situation of people who suffered from American invasion in his country. El-Zeydi used shoe because it is considered as an insult in Iraq culture so that he has showed his reactions by this protest. This protest gains so many support from Arab countries and people rebelled by taking their shoes into

⁸⁴ Soner Yağlı, *ibid*.

⁸⁵ Süleyman Sencer Ayata, “Yeni Ortasınıf ve Uyduken Yaşamı,” in *Kültür Fragmanları: Türkiye’de Gündelik Hayat*, prepared by D. Kandiyoti and A. Saktanber, trans. Yelçe, Z. (İstanbul: Metis 2005).

⁸⁶ Zehra Yiğit, *ibid*.

⁸⁷ “Muntazar El-Zeydi,” accessed 10 June 2015, https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Muntazar_el-Zeydi

⁸⁸ “Shoes thrown at Bush on Iraq Trip,” accessed 12 June 2015, *BBC News*, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/7782422.stm

Putting Yourself into Someone's Shoes: A Postcolonial Analysis

their hands in anti-war demonstrations. In this case the meaning attribution transforms peoples' reactions and protests. The shoes became symbols in people's rebellions and demonstrations. We can associate this event with Vincent Van Gogh's painting *Three pairs of shoes*. According to Heidegger, Van Gogh tries to reflect how the system exploit the human misery and he tried to portray spirit of the age.⁸⁹ The shoe is used as a symbol of exploitation and misery in many artworks. *Diamond dust shoes* of Andy Warhol, *Red Model* of Rene Magritte, and *Live performance* of Mona Hatoum are some of these works that are mentioned in Feyziye Eyigör's article revealing the meaning attribution to the shoe in Bush's shoe - throwing protest.⁹⁰

To show these different meaning attributions and the knowledge they create, some series and programs were reviewed. Especially, programs play an important role to make the interpretation of daily basis practices of shoe wearing. *Yemekteyiz* is one of them. It was published on Show TV every weekday between the years of 2008 and 2012. Thereafter, it continued on Fox TV until 2015. Every week five new competitors, who don't know each other previously, are chosen and each competitor cooks meal on his/her day which is determined by lot. Other four competitors would be the guests and evaluate host's meals by giving points from 1 to 5. At the end of the fifth day, winner would be given 10.000 liras. In *Yemekteyiz*, cameras are focused on peoples' feet when they get home. If guest brings her own shoes, it is emphasized by words. If the person asks for slippers cameras pan across to feet at least four seconds. "*You create a new style by wearing a summer shoes on socks.*" was also told by camera crew. Even if the theme of the program is meal, wearing or not wearing shoes in house is also among the most stressed topics. It shows the interesting discussion of "shoe" topic in Turkey, which also shows and reproduces the manipulation power of media on certain topics.

By analyzing almost forty episodes, it was clear that people's preferences on shoes are different. Some of them feel comfortable with slippers, some of them do not take of his shoes. Under these circumstances, when they

⁸⁹ Martin Heidegger, "On the Origin of the Work of Art," in *Basic Writings* 1st Harper Perennial Modern Thought Edition, ed. David Farrell Krell (New York: HarperCollins 2008).

⁹⁰ Feyziye Eyigör, Ayakkabının Fırlatıl(a-ma)ması, *Rh+Sanart Plastik Sanatlar Dergisi*, 2009, p. 59.

**Nurseem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

go on a visit to each other, interesting dialogs and images are witnessed. They show the differences in perceptions. Some wait directive to do as host says, some don't. Getting confuse is increased when host remains silent. Confusing scenes were caught on camera. One says "*I will enter with my shoes. I thought it doesn't disturb you because you wear shoes as well.*" and another says "*I cleaned them in my car.*"⁹¹ Sometimes host insists on not to take off the shoes, but the guest takes off anyway. Sometimes host asks guest to take off them, but guest does not. One example is dated 2nd March 2010.⁹² Because of the complaints about galoshes that they are making so many noises, Gülay has galosh made for her guests and requests for taking off shoes to wear galoshes instead. Also she asserts her 3,5 years old son as a reason in relation to hygiene discourses. One guest finds the solution good. But yet another guest Sezgin reacts it, and does not accept it. Gülay defenses her arguments just with a few sentences and she accepts and gives permission to take the galoshes off. After the meal, cameras turn to guests and receive their comments. Sezgin reacts galosh issue by using the words "*We don't come from farm.*" Is this a real situation? Would Gülay accept it if the cameras were not there? Or would Sezgin behave similarly when he went to his friends? Drawing attention, being in the public eye can complicate the relations but under any circumstances, the tensions show the connotations of shoe wearing practices with the emphasis on being an urban citizen rather than a farmer which also indicate modern vs traditional dichotomies.

In series the situation is not so different with similar examples. They show numerous scenes and use words about shoe issue. They cannot be accepted just as the part of series' scenario. Most of the popular series like *Aşk-ı Memnu*, *Medcezir*, represent the activity of wearing shoes at home as a "normal" practice for some socio economic groups but in lower class private spheres the focus on taking of the shoes and using slippers reveals the differentiation and dichotomies created by media through a single micro practice. The constructed messages expand through TV series are also stressed by Nazlı, a 52 years old Professor:

⁹¹ Show TV, *Yemekteyiz*, February 5, 2010, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EmLpJ4UFWQU>.

⁹² Show TV, *Yemekteyiz*, March 2, 2010, , <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hwFqqzmBhZI>

Putting Yourself into Someone's Shoes: A Postcolonial Analysis

*"I think that our TV series convey west-centered culture. This may not be done consciously due to the fact that our TV series are either an adaptation or a copy of western productions. In these original productions, they are wearing their shoes inside their houses, because it is a part of their custom and this custom is carried on in our TV series as well. From time to time, there had been discussions on why shoes were worn inside the houses in our TV series. In my opinion, in the beginning it was just a copy of its original. However, later on it was argued that actresses had to look sexier and more beautiful with their high heels on (referring to famous actress Beren Saat)."*⁹³

Especially in some series, in which main characters coming from different economic and cultural backgrounds, the confrontation of families or the persons in the private sphere reveals mostly a controversial position especially in terms of taking off the shoes. In most of the cases, the meeting of the families of potential brides and grooms lead some problems as it is clearly stressed in some series like *Bir İstanbul Masalı*, *Adını Feriha Koydum*, *Aşk Yeniden*. In *Aşk Yeniden*, the rich family Şekercizade visits the family of Zeynep in order to ask for her and her family in marriage. When they enter the home, they confuse because of the slippers which are offered them instead of entering the house with shoes. Mukaddes Şekercizade, who will be the mother in law, says *"Do we have to?"* amazedly.⁹⁴ Zeynep has leading role in *Aşk Yeniden*. She grew up in the middle income family as a daughter of a fisherman. After she met with Fatih Şekercizade, and became the part of his family, she enters this house with shoes except the baby's room contrary to her ongoing practice in her father's middle class home. This reminds us a general remark from the lower income household practices of shoe wearing and its representation in the way of creating dichotomies. Relevantly, Seda, an 18 years old high school student, compares the scenes of families from different economic and cultural background:

"The one from the poor family, holding on to the wall, takes off his shoes while crashing the back of his shoes. This is how I visualize the scene immediately; an ugly housed, crashed and all, and there

⁹³ Interview conducted by Rabia Elgün, 3 June 2015.

⁹⁴ Fox Tv, *Aşk Yeniden*, February 17, 2015, <http://www.fox.com.tr/Ask-Yeniden/bolum/2/part/5>

**Nurseem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

is this person struggling to take off his dirty shoes and then wear his slippers by the door. Camera zooms on the feet with the socks on, etc. In front of the door, just outside the house, there are other shoes. On the other side, the doors are opened before the rich one enters in by others welcoming him with respectful greetings and he just walks in without taking his shoes off. In TV series, I never saw a rich person who lives in a villa and takes his shoes off before entering his house.”⁹⁵

The description of two households made by one of our interlocutors is striking in order to show that the dichotomies between rich-poor, modern-traditional, clean-dirty are already constructed in the mind as it is in colonial time. These cases show us through media shoes can attain new meaning attributions which can lead different articulations in the system especially in terms of hegemonic self-colonizing effect. Our stressing point comes from the question “which is most effective and hegemonic?”. In other words, even if a single object in daily life can gain a meaning which leads important resistance among society, it also create a hegemonic ideology about your lifestyles and way of living. In that sense, the perceptions and understanding of certain daily life practices become your “truths” even if you argue against them. Thus, you wear the shoes according to truths of hegemonic ideologies in the world, in other words you put yourself into someone else’s shoes in a metaphoric sense.

To Conclude: Putting Yourself into Someone’s Shoes, Becoming Someone Else?

Media manifests its arguments as facts in the daily life in which these texts are manipulated to be attractive. People may set an empathy with the characters. Kotaman indicates that TV does not always represent the plain reality of life rather by telling new stories it also repeats the discourse of reality itself.⁹⁶ In this way media, specifically TV offer variety of fantasies to the audience with the help of those stories which creates the facts and reality in different forms. Although, people are conscious toward the

⁹⁵ Interview conducted by Nursena Balatekin, 11 June 2015.

⁹⁶ Aslı Kotaman et al, *Storytelling in TV*, (Istanbul: H2O Kitap 2011), p. 116.

Putting Yourself into Someone's Shoes: A Postcolonial Analysis

presentation of mass media, they may captured by its illusion.⁹⁷ In this sense, with the questions “what shoes telling us in these stories?” and “with which meaning attributions are they represented?” we tried to emphasize a postcolonial critic of media through some examples from media.

From shoe wearing to styles of sitting, each point of our lives is shaped through our decisions. Nevertheless, people have very similar practices and experiences in daily life because of certain discourses. Different people eat same foods, tend to the same brands, and consume the same things. What is the underlying factor in having the similar preferences despite our different features? It was discussed throughout the article. Media has too much influence on people. Media is not just a platform in which televise TV series, news, advertisements have place rather media could be effective on our decisions on our behalf what we choose from the hair styling to the food consumption. This article goes beyond an analysis in which the issue of shoe is examined just as an accessory.

Reminding the knowledge production effect of media, in these cases we can notice that the dichotomies are made through class practices, gender roles and cultural background so that there is a praising and representation of a certain life style as “ideal” to the audience. In which the self-colonization project is supported by presenting the Western, modern and elite life style. The most crucial point is that the epistemological change in people's life can be manipulated even through the practice of wearing and not wearing shoes. This displays again the critical role of media in our micro level practice of very daily life in which the epistemological reproduction about the meaning of a shoe vary according to contexts. In the analysis made on television series, it was highlighted how the shoe issue is treated. Each of these emphasizes, allusions, covered behaviors affects the world of the audience. Clothing plays a part among the other important issues presented to the audience by media. The issue of shoe wearing practice as a part of clothing, presented through the concepts like “fashion” to the audience, which is also interpreted according to contexts by the people. At the same time, these representations and knowledge become a determining factor in

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

**Nurseem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

human life style. She points the importance of shoes with following words:

“It is a fact that we must wear shoes outside and it is essential to the way we dress. Matching shoes are important/ critical for the way we dress when going out. Even if you wear pajamas, you can put a coat on and it will not come to attention. But it is not the same for shoes. Shoes are sheathing/a cover for a person. It is said that a friend looks at your head but a foe looks at your feet. People will judge you by your shoes.”⁹⁸

In this sense, it becomes more than a need for people as an indicator of prestige, status and social position in the name of fashion and aesthetics. Seda continues with these statements:

“If it would just be a necessity for us, we all would have just one or two pairs of shoes but we may have shoes in various colors and various models because it is fashionable or luxurious, I guess it is wannabe. However I think wearing shoes inside the house is forming a perception of status. You asked me if I have friends wearing shoes inside the house, and I said “I wish I have friends like that” and I thought “why”, I guess because it is kind of indication of being modern, rich and elitist. On the other hand I am thinking how wearing shoes inside the house fitted in our world? It is a result of TV series and movies portraying wealthy people.”⁹⁹

Nevertheless, when the issue comes to the practice of shoe wearing at home the answers have similarities that they don't enter the house with street shoes and permit anyone to enter because of their sensibilities. There are two crucial points to refer. One is the street shoes and the other one is the sensibilities. Even though it is not acceptable to wear the shoes you use outside there is a new conceptualization of house shoes which are mostly the same we buy for daily use but the difference is they are only used in house occasions. The reason for this is still the purpose of the protection of elegance and style even at home as undeniable truth regimes. This also

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

Putting Yourself into Someone's Shoes: A Postcolonial Analysis

shows itself in the expression of the sensibilities, reasons, for not wearing street shoes at home. Even though they state their religion as a reason they intend to use health and hygiene discourses in order to strengthen it in a secular form. In other words, as we discussed above secularization also shape our understanding on certain activities. As an example Sevda, a 29 years old psychologist, states her reasons:

“Of course we never come in house with our shoes and I think we shouldn't. There are two concerns of wearing shoes in the house; religious and health concerns. Because we worship in our houses. On the other hand, it is not healthy. Of course maybe it is customary for us not to wear shoes in the house, nevertheless I still think that in general, regardless to the fact that the person is a Muslim or not, or it is customary for them or not, one should not wear shoes inside the house.”¹⁰⁰

The ambiguous situation in these expression is interesting that even if they cannot accept this in their personal life, they also state if the host asks them to enter home with shoes, they could do that and enter home with their shoes. While they are living with their habits and sensibilities came from religious or traditional rules, at the same time they accept the insistence of the modern world with its prestigious offers which provides you to become the modern subjectivity within the “self-colonizing” project. Thus, by practicing the everyday life you are already wearing someone else's shoes with its all ideologies, constructed knowledge and colonizing effect and you become the “other” while you are also creating the “others”.

Üsküdar
Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler
Dergisi
Yıl:1
Sayı:1

¹⁰⁰ Interview conducted by Merve Şahin, 12 June 2015.

**Nursem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adem Koç, “Kütahya Merkezinde Giyim-Kuşam Değişmelerinin Çözümlemesi”, *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2009.

Alexander Kiossev, “The Self-Colonizing Metaphor,” 2010,
<http://monumenttotransformation.org/atlas-of-transformation/html/s/self-colonization/the-self-colonizing-metaphor-alexander-kiossev.html>.

Amit Bein, *Ottoman Ulema, Turkish Republic: Agents of Change and Guardians of Tradition*, (Stanford University Press March 29, 2011).

Aslı Kotaman, Ahu Samav Uğursoy, and Artun Avcı, “Storytelling in TV”, (İstanbul: H2O Kitap 2011).

Bedri Gencer, “Türkiye’de Laikliğin Tarihi Dinamikleri” in *Toplum ve Bilim Dergisi*, Vol. 84, (BirikimYayıncılık 2008).

Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, (London, New York: Verso 1991).

Besim Fatih Dellaloğlu, *Frankfurt Okulunda Sanat ve Toplum*, (İstanbul: Say Yayınları 2007).

Bilge Gürsoy, “Tüketim Estetiği ve Medya: ‘Bugün Ne Giysem’ Programı Üzerinden Bir Değerlendirme”, *İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi* 44, no.1 (2013): 85-98,
<http://journals.istanbul.edu.tr/iuifd/article/viewFile/1019021818/1019020510>.

Bünyamin Bezci and Yusuf Çiftçi, “Self-Orientalization: Modernity within Ourselves or Internalized Modernization,” *Journal of Academic Inquiries* 7, no.1, 2012, 139-166.

Cemil Meriç, *Umrandan Uygarlığa*, (İstanbul: İletişim 1996).

Putting Yourself into Someone's Shoes: A Postcolonial Analysis

Charles Taylor, "Modern Social Imaginaries," in *Public Culture* 14.1 (Durham: Duke University Press 2002).

-----, "Modernity and the Rise of the Public Sphere," in *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1993).

-----, *Sources of the Self: The Making of Modern Identity*, (Harvard University Press 1989).

"Clothes Functions", *Yiwuamanda*, Accessed June 29, 2015, <http://yiwuamanda.com/clothes-functions1185.html>.

"Clothing and Style: A Brief History of Clothes", *Know and Vote*, Accessed July 1, 2015, <http://www.2knowandvote.com/home/11/clothing-and-style/252/History%20of%20Clothes>.

Dorling Kindersley (DK), "Moda: Geçmişten Günümüze Giyim Kuşam ve Stil Rehberi," trans. Duygu Özen, (Istanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları 2013).

Edward Said, *Orientalism*, (New York: Vintage Books 1979).

Enver Ziya Karal, "Selim III'ün Hat-tı Hümayunları-Nizam-ı Cedit" (Ankara: TTK 1988).

Fevziye Antakyalıoğlu, "Modernizmden Postmodernizme Sanat Eseri", 2009, Accessed September 9, 2009, <http://lebriz.com/pages/lsd.aspx?lang=TR§ionID=2&articleID=945&bhcp=1>.

Fevziye Eyigör, "Unable to Throw Shoes", 2013, Accessed February 11, 2013, <http://feyigor-arttck.blogspot.com.tr/2013/02/ayakkabnn-frlatl-masun-able-to-throw.html>.

**Nurseem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

-----, “Ayakkabının Fırlatıl(a-ma)ması”, *Rh+Sanart Plastik Sanatlar Dergisi*, no.59, 2009.

Fox TV, *Aşk Yeniden*, February 17, 2015,
<http://www.fox.com.tr/Ask-Yeniden/bolum/2/part/5>.

G. Senem Hızal Gençtürk, “Bir İletişim Biçimi Olarak Moda: “Modus”un Sınırları”, *Ankara Üniversitesi Dergiler* 1. no: 1, 2003, 64-82,
<http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/23/665/8484.pdf>.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *Death of a Discipline*, (New York: Columbia University Press 2003).

Jenny Nakao Hones, “The Asian Custom of Removing Shoes at the Door”, 2014, <http://asianlifestyledesign.com/2010/04/asian-custom-removing-shoes-at-door/>.

John Thomlinson, *Globalization and Culture*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press 1999).

Jonathan Walford, *Shoes*, (The Berg Fashion Library, 2005), Accessed June 8, 2015,
<http://0-www.bergfashionlibrary.com.divit.library.itu.edu.tr/view/bazf/bazf00516.xml>.

Kerem Dağlı, “Kapitalist Toplumun İdeolojik Düzenleyicisi Medya”, *Marksist Tutum Dergisi*, no.26, 2006.

Martin Asser, “Bush Shoe-ing Worst Arab Insult”, *BBC-News*, December, 2008.

Martin Heidegger, “On the Origin of the Work of Art,” in *Basic Writings* 1st Harper Perennial Modern Thought Edition, ed. David Farrell Krell (New York: HarperCollins, 2008), 143-212.

Putting Yourself into Someone's Shoes: A Postcolonial Analysis

Mary Lousie Pratt, "Arts of The Contact Zone", *Profession 91*, (New York: MLA 1991).

Max Horkheimer and Thedor W.Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, trans. Edmund Jebhcott, ed. Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002).

Michael C. Hudson, "Islam and Political Development", ed. John L. Esposito, in *Islam and Development: Religion and Sociopolitical Change*, (SUP: Syracuse 1980).

Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, trans. by Ş. Aktaş,(İstanbul: YKY 2001).

-----, "The Subject and Power", *Chicago Journals*, no.4 (1982): 777-795. Accessed November 9, 2011, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343197>.

Montserrat Guibernau, *Nationalisms: The Nations-State and Nationalisms in the Twentieth-Century*, (Cambridge: Polity 1996).

"Muntazar El-Zeydi," accessed 10 June 2015, https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Muntazar_el-Zeydi

Mustafa Çavdarıcı, "Detrition of Social Values and Cultural Colonization in Turkey", (Master's Thesis, Süleyman Demirel University, 2002).

Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, (Oxford: Blackwell 1939.)

Nuri Yüce, "Göçebe Türklerde Ayakkabı Kültürü," in *Ayakkabı Kitabı*, (İstanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları, 2003).

Ora Prouser, "The Biblical Shoe Eschewing Footwear: The Call of Moses as Biblical Archetype," in *Jews and Shoes*, ed. Edna Nahshon, (The Berg Fashion Library, 2008).

**Nursem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

Orhan Okay, *Batı Medeniyeti Karşısında Ahmet Midhat Efendi*, (Dergah Yayınları 1989).

Ranajit Guha, *Dominance without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1998).

Ren Fukuzimi, "Criticism on Orientalism of the Concept of Superflat-Case Study: Scenes of the Japanese Contemporary Art", *Oriental Metaphor Symposium I*, 2006.

Roland Robertson, *Küreselleşme, Toplum Kuramı ve Küresel Kültür*; trans. by Ü. H. Yolsal, (Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları 1999).

Sabahattin Şahin, "Kitle Haberleşme Araçlarından Radyo Televizyonun Kültür Değişmeleri Üzerine Yaptığı Tesirlerle İlgili Bir Değerlendirme", (Master's Thesis, İstanbul University, 1987), cited in Emrah Alpaslan Konukman, "Son Dönem Televizyon Dizilerinin Yaşam Tarzı Üzerindeki İmgeleri," (Master's Thesis, Ankara, 2006).

"Shoes thrown at Bush on Iraq Trip," accessed 12 June 2015, *BBC News*, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/7782422.stm

Show TV, *Yemekteyiz*, February 5, 2010, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EmLpJ4UFWQU>.

Show TV, *Yemekteyiz*, March 2, 2010, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hwFqqzMBhZI>

Soner Yağlı, "Reconstruction of Culture via Fashion as a Field of Daily Life", *İstanbul Arel Üniversitesi, İletişim Fakültesi İletişim Çalışmaları Dergisi / Journal of Communication Studies*, no: 3, 2012.

Songül Kuru, and Adviye Candan Paksoy, "Anadolu'da Ayakkabı Kültürü ve Cumhuriyet Dönemi Ayakkabı Kültürü", in *ICANAS Bildiriler II*, C. 2, Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil Ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, 2008), 821-835.

Suna Kili, *Kemalism*, (Istanbul: Robert College 1969).

Süleyman Sencer Ayata, "Yeni Ortasınıf ve Uydukent Yaşamı", in *Kültür Fragmanları: Türkiye 'de Gündelik Hayat*, Prepared by D. Kandiyoti and A. Saktanber, Trans. Yelçe, Z, (İstanbul: Metis 2005), 37-56.

Sehnaz Aliş, "Karakter ve Sosyal Statü Açısından Ayakkabı", in *Ayakkabı Kitabı*, (Istanbul: Kitabevi- 2003).

Şerif Mardin, "İyiler ve Kötüler," in *Tarih Risaleleri*, ed. Mustafa Özel, (İstanbul: İz 1995), 61-82.

Terry Eagleton, "Ideology of the Aesthetic," Trans. B. Gözkan, H. Hünler, T. Armaner, N. Ateş, A. Dost, E. Kılıç, E. Akman, N. Domaniç, A. Çitil & B. Kiroğlu, (İstanbul: Doruk Publications, 2010).

Tessa Jols and Elizabeth Thoman, *21.Yüzyıl Okuryazarlığı: Medya Okuryazarlığına Genel Bir Bakış ve Sınıf İçi Etkinlikler*, (Ankara: Ekinoks 2008).

Ümit Hassan, *İbn-i Haldun'un Metodu ve Siyaset Teorisi*, (Ankara: AÜ SBF, 1977).

Ümmühan Yılmaz, "The Effects of Consumption Culture Represented in TV Series on Young People's Lifestyle," (Master's Thesis, İstanbul Arel University, 2013).

William Makepeace Thayer, *The Home Monthly: Devoted to Home Education, Literature, and Religion*, 3-4th volumes, (D.C. Childs & Company, 1861).

**Nurseem Keskin AKSAY, Ayşe Seyyide KAPTANER, Nursena BALATEKİN,
Rabia ELGÜN, Ünzile DAŞDEMİR**

Zehra Yiğit, “Türkiye’de 1990 Sonrası Bağımsız Sinemada Alt Sınıf ve Direniş Biçimleri,” *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyolojik Araştırmalar E-Dergisi*, 2014:8 Accessed April 7, 2014, <http://www.sdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/makaleler/BagimsizSinemadaZehraYIGITocak2014.pdf>.

-----, “Modernliğin Arka Yüzü Olarak Gündelik Hayat: Aşk-ı Memnu,” *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 14, no: 2, 2012, p. 128, Accessed July 6, 2012, <http://www.sbe.deu.edu.tr/dergi/cilt14.say%C4%B12/11%20YIGIT.pdf>.