DOĞU ERGIL

A SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF HONOR CRIMES IN TURKEY

"INTRODUCING THE CASE OF EXTENDED HONOR CRIME"

Any study which aims to shed some light on honor crimes must begin by delineating the subject matter and relating it to the social content of the concept of "honor".

Honor in many cultures appears to be associated with the social reputation or prestige of an individual and/or of a family. The translation of this concept by the English word "honor" from many Mediterranean languages is only an approximation encompassing several meanings at once. For example "honor" may mean the social worth, the reputation of a person or family in a complex society with competing individuals and groups. It may on the other hand mean the sexual virtue of an individual, especially of women. In the context of this nuance, honor refers to two sex-linked qualities that distinguish the basic moral characters or modes of behavior found in men and women. These are the sexual shame (utanç) of women and the manliness (erkeklik) of men.

With the exception of the miserably impoverished and the gypsy nomads, all individuals with a steady livelihood and some property are assumed to possess these qualities at birth (Montesquieu, 1958: 354 ff.). This by no means implies that reputation for manliness and shame cannot easily be lost in cases of misconduct. Hence to be honorable is not a constant state of being. It requires struggle against cowardice and sensuality, repression of the lust of the flesh (the animal in men). A man must at all times be courageous and unyielding, strong in body and soul. Needless to say, these ideals both indicate and perpetuate the existence of an agonistic society (Campbell, 1964).

In such a milieu, manliness cannot solely be limited to courage; thus, another implication would be the ability to gain new things that enable the individual to pass others. In this sense honor is enhanced by precedence over others. Manliness and shame are complementary qualities in relation to honor. The manly attitudes and behavior of men and the sexual shame and virtues of women protect the family and its members from external insult or encroachment. The equation is constructed as follows: The manliness of men protects

the sexual purity of women; whereas women must maintain their shame in order to protect the manliness of men. Such reciprocal behavior is thought to be honorable. It is therefore not surprising that the ultimate insult that can be directed at a man is to mention his mother's, sister's or wife's name in a distasteful sexual context (Ramos, 1971).

Honor is something which most families are presumed to have, but which they may easily lose if they do not guard it with all their resources of creativity, courage and self-discipline. In societies of limited resources or in groups of lower standing, there is a constant struggle to maintain an ideal state of equality in honor between most individuals and families. In such social environments the loss or downward mobility of a family both validates and improves the status of other families (Pitt-Rivers, 1965; Peristiany, 1966). Thus families and individuals attempt by every means—ranging from gossip to overt behavior—to deny each other their pretentions to honor. The degree of encroachment on other individuals' or families' resources differ according to the strength and courage of that individual and family.

In social formations where the family is the main social unit which supports the individual, a man whose family has lost its honor finds it difficult to possess prestige at all. He may be tolerated, but full recognition is withdrawn from him. Although no positive accusation of dishonor can be pinned on them, imputation of honor is easily denied to indigent families; for a poor man or family is dependent on others for their livelihood (Pitt-Rivers, 1965; Antoun, 1968; Campbell, 1964).

Generally, the honor of a family is symbolized by the head of the family, the man as the bread-winner. The social aspects of honor assure not only the opportunity for those who feel respect to pay it, but it commits them to pay it even if they do not wish to do so. Hence, regardless of individual feelings, they serve to establish and /or perpetuate the established consensus of the society (or sub-society) with regard to the order of precedence.

> "They demonstrate what is acceptable by reference to what is accepted. If the honor felt by the individual becomes honor paid by the society, it is equally the case that the honor which is paid by the society sets the standard for what the individual should feel" (Peristiany, 1966:38).

It seems that the functions of honor are two-fold. Honor forces men to act in accordance with the ideals of particular societies. In this respect, honor is the psychological bridge between social values and expected behavior. The social function of honor is to legitimize the status quo (or existing relations of power) and render the culturally sanctified order of precedence to correspond to the established power relations. Thus "...Whatever *is* becomes *right,*

the *de facto* is made *de jure*. The victor is crowned with laurels, the war-profiteer in knighted, the tyrant becomes the monarch, the bully, a chief. The reconciliation between the social order as we find it and the social order which we revere is accomplished thanks to the confusion which hinges upon the duality of honor and its associated concepts. It is a confusion which fulfills the function of social integration by ensuring the legitimation of established power" (Peristiany, 1966:38).

As the basis of an individual's reputation, honor and shame are synonymous, since shamelessness is dishonorable. However, while certain virtues are common to both sexes, such as honesty, loyalty, concern for a good name, conduct in attaining good reputation depends upon both the status and the sex of the person. The honor of a man and a woman imply quite different modes of conduct (Voltaire, 1774: Vol. 3:438).

Established mores oblige a man to defend his honor and that of his family, a woman to conserve her sexual purity. In this context, shame as timidity, shyness, withdrawal, is accepted to be womanly attributes whereas drive for precedence and out-manœuvering other men appear to be manly qualities. This differentiation also regulates the modes of conduct for the two sexes: each pattern of demeanor is deemed as being dishonorable for the other sex.

This explanation leads to the following definition of honor: Honor emanates from the individual's actions but comes into being in the social womb. Thus, honor is first felt by the individual, is claimed by him, and paid by others (socially). Conversely, *serefsizlik* or dishonor originates from others (as does the denial of honor) and is then imposed on the individual. Dishonor imposed is accepted and then felt. Manliness is the panacea of dishonor because it involves precedence, humiliation of others and defence of familial honor.

However, defence of honor differs according to social class. The moral sanctions of the lower classes, rural or urban (the latter constantly being fed by uprooted peasant groups crowding the cities), have only limited importance for the middle class and almost none for the upper. This, because the hierarchic nature of the society and its value system which emanate from and guarantee the given structure requires or allows the validation of each individual's reputation by his class members (equals), not by his inferiors. The upper class members' lives possess more privacy than the lower classes. Their intimacy is confined to the circles of their peer groups. Outside of these groups they appear as public figures. Gossip enhances their social personality rather than damaging it. For the upper class members' social position is distinguished from his social inferiors by (noble) birth and wealth. Therefore, in a sense it is impregnable to affronts by inferiors. He may be disliked by his peers, but

his honor is very rarely publicly affronted since such an act may reveal the internal dynamics (of the relations) in the social groups higher up who demand constant respect and obedience (Kleiser, 1953: 31-241 ff.; Onians, 1951).

Similarly, acceptance of honor in the form of virtue plays a lesser role among the middle and an even lesser role in the upper classes when compared to the lower strata. The same dichotomy existed between agrarian and urban groups, in the past and also in modern times. The difference between the values attached to honor among the lower and higher classes (middle, upper) mainly originates from the relative emphasis placed upon virtue on the one hand (by the lower strata) and precedence on the other (by the higher strata). Considering that education, prestigious professional background, affinity with legal matters and administrative centers and similiar advantages are effective means to win precedence over the majority, the differential basis of honor between classes is understandable. In addition to these advantages, wealth and accumulated (ascribed) social status (or respect thereof) must be added for the upper class (Voltaire, 1751; Peristiany, 1966).

The outcome of such differences is clear: greater sexual freedom (especially for men) in the middle and upper classes. This is because they are less constrained by the social control of public opinion in the less informal nexus of the urban environment that allows for individual differences.

When attention is focused on the upper class, it can be said that the class which possesses by birth-right most precedence is least vulnerable to the shame determined meaning of honor. But at this social level the difference between male and female honor must be distinguished. The sexual carelessness of women to a great extent relates to their own reputation; for status derived from birth is not uniquely a male attribute. A woman of the upper class receives the status of her husband, but she does not thereby forfeit that which she received at birth (noble or otherwise). On the other hand, the honor of men depends on the success of covering their vulnerability through their women, but more than that complience with the code of conduct expected of their class/stratum, that is to be in constant demand of precedence over other social strata. It is this manner of conduct together with the material parafernalia that sustains a high wall between this class and others to protect the former from scrutiny and questioning of its members' behavior.

The concrete outcome of the difference in both value orientation and degree of social control over the individual whose honor is affronted, is a different form of vengeance or amendment. While in agrarian communities or their urbanized counterparts which constitute the urban lower class it is usually drawing blood and "cleansing the dishonor" with blood, among the higher

(middle and upper classes) it is generally denial of responsibility, rationaliz-ation of the unfortunate event publicly, a divorce or a court case (Onians, 1951: 48, 121). The flexibility of expectations in the higher strata is both due to the fact that, a) the value expectations of its members are different, and b) being law makers and enforcers alike, the sanctions of these strata are more legalistic rather than drastic. It may be added that social control is more dense in the small rural communities and their urban extentions, squatter housing districts that encircle national metropoles (and evince a fierce competition over limited resources), than in the higher classes dispersed over large areas which allow for mobility, discreetness and ambiguity. Needless to say this lack of density is as much social as it is physical.

Among the rural and lower urban strata a woman's shame is deemed as a positive attribute, something which can be lost. Unlike precedence, it cannot be won, nor is it inherent-like status. It can only be preserved by refusing to act like a man. This is necessary for two reasons: such behavior ridicules the men in the family, and because the division of labor puts the women under the tutelage of men (Zeid, 1966; Bourdieu, 1966). Independence is totally a male prerogative among the rural and lower urban strata, and is so to a lesser extent among the middle class families (of lower echelons) in which women do not work outside of the home. Unmarried women of age are under the tutelage of their father until he dies. A widowed woman, although legally independent, is socially deemed as being under the tutelage of her brother(s) and son(s). This rule is less stringent among lower middle class families (Safilios-Roth-schild, 1969).

In the framework of these values, a woman whose shame is not in the keeping of a man is considered to be at least potentially sexually aggressive. As regards the upper class women, they are free from the sanctions of the lower class code of honor. Their honor is socially impregnable and does not depend upon male protection. Their honor is determined by their social rank, and by their sexuality (which ascribes a lower status due to the division of labor in agrarian societies or social formations).

The outcome of this analysis may be that sexual and class status come together to draw up the rules of honorable conduct. The rural (agrarian) and its extention, the lower class urban honor stands at one end of the value spectrum, and the upper class' understanding of honor at the other end. In the former, honor basically comes to mean shame (utanç) and is equated with virtue (namus); in the latter it is equated with precedence (şeref). This differential understanding of honor originates from sexual as well as social differences marked by the rural-urban and lower-upper continua, that is,

by the place of the individual within the social structure/matrix.

Furthermore, special emphasis is put on the dual nature of honor as being "honor aspired" and "honor validated". This duality arises from the act of aspiring to a role and its attainment. Being dishonored is to be rejected from the role to which an individual had aspired. Aspiration to a role and being honored by it is the very process of the search for social identity. The whole gamut of relationships that involve the granting or rejection of honor are the means whereby individuals acquire their role within the social matrix.

"Yet, in a complex society, the structure of common understanding, like the structure of roles, is complex; the criteria of conduct vary, and with them, the meanings attached to the concept of honor... (O)n the one hand, the need for common understandings and mechanisms of social integration (such as the acceptance of the usage of the upper classes) tend to unify its conceptualization, on the other, the demands of the social structure promote differentiation... (T)he confusion of the meanings (of the concept of) honor serve(s) the function of social integration by crediting the rulers with a claim to esteem and a charter to rule. But it is a function which is fullfilled only as long as the confusion is not recognized as such" (Peristiany, 1966:72).

Hitherto the meaning and social function(s) of honor has been discussed. Now the background of the honor crime will be elaborated on.

HONOR CRIME

One of the basic points carried throughout the essay above is that honor refers to an exclusive identification, personal and corporate. The honor of an individual and/or of a group is opposed to the honor of another. This, mainly so because there is an implicit (built-in) comparison between different honors in reference to a pattern of ideal attributes set up by the society or a sub-unit thereof. On the other hand, honor reflects the correct (socially defined) status relations between individuals (in groups) or groups.

Families, groups and communities are in constant friction to realize their interests and to gain prestige. This process inevitably leads men to exploit others and usurp their resources *where and if they can*. Therefore, on-going relations between different individuals and groups always carry the threat of the depreciation of the honor of one for the benefit of the other. Despite the belief that, ideally, the honor of families and communities are equal, individuals and groups (families, communities) must struggle with all their courage, will-power, and resources to maintain their status in accord with the ideals

set by the society's or better, the community's norms. The lowest common denominator of this struggle is not to slip downward from the present status (honor) position enjoyed by an individual or family. In other words, to be paid the respect that one claims.

This struggle is intense, and more so—even violent—among the lower classes, the members of which have few socially recognized or prestigious means of competition except self-discipline and naked force. Under these circumstances, the world is conceived as a dichotomous entity divided into "us" and "they"; into strangers and enemies. This conceptual straight-jacket, needless to say, affects the forms of approved behavior toward friends and foes alike.

"The sociological importance of competition is precisely that it represents a kind of opposition which is often indirect. In this instance protagonists compete for social prestige, that is for something which in material form none of them possesses. Where the prize has this intangible quality, direct attack may be irrelevant. Indeed, since social prestige requires the favorable response of the community to a man's qualities and actions after these have been evaluated in terms of the accepted system of values, it depends overwhelmingly on the opinions of enemies. In this context competition for social prestige, while it clearly encourages that family particularism of which it is itself, a symptom" (Campbell, 1964:264).

The Turk living in the village and the shanty-towns sees himself, after migrating to the cities, as a member of a family more than of any other corporate identity. Consequently, family honor is the chief concern for the individuals sharing the same value system and competing for prestige and precedence within that system. The family supports the competing member in his quest for prestige, for his success is the common success—upward mobility—of the whole family. Consequently, the community supports and hails such a family, because this family's success is in complience with the communal ideals.

Prestige and precedence are impossible without power. Therefore, a massive family, many sons, and wealth in the country-side—and more of the latter in the urban families—is the source of power. These assets are necessary to surpass their individuals and families, as well as to stand firm against affronts on one's honor. Weakness is shameful and inexcusable. Strength is morally good whereas weakness is morally bad. Although arbitrary violence is unapproved (for it destroys the balance in primary relations and groups/communities based on such relations) there is no more direct and conclusive way of exhibiting one's strength than by doing away with other men (Wolf-

gang, 1967). This is taking away one's or a family's most precious belonging in return for some damage caused on ones honor. Considering that honor is the social personality of the person and his family and marks their place in the society in complience with the ideal values of the community, vengeance is the only way to prevent losing that personality (and be extradited: social death). According to the ideal values, one must be brave and ready to return insults directed toward him, and be sexually shameful, and brave all assaults (attempted or successful ones) toward his family's women. Affronts on honor may be of a physical nature, ending in contention, or they may be verbal assaults; both acts which bring shame to and belittle ones manliness. It may on the other hand involve affronts on the virtue of women which run contrary to the expected norms of being modest, pure and virtuous women. These affronts are met by the men of the family when and if they exist, or by defamed women themselves when their honor is in their own keeping (bachelors or if their man is away.) Thus men are likely to attack primarily other men and in the second place women of their own (wife, mother, daughter, sister) whom they deem as the cause of the dishonorable/dishonoring act. Women are likely to attack men to avenge their damaged virtue (although it is not quite repaired once again), and perhaps other women who challenge their social personality by taking away their man, and thus belittle their "womanness" (Safilios - Rothschild, 1969).

In short, an honor crime is an attack on the opponents' life by both men and women who deem themselves dishonored, that is, publicly disgraced and socially deprived of the identity to which they aspired. This identity is a culturally (as well as socially) defined one. Hence an honor crime is an outcome and symptom of the struggle going on within certain strata (esp. the lower and to some degree the middle) to attain and/or to hold on to these identities when there is no other effective means to do so. The existence of alternative means to acquire and to preserve the aspired identity and to gain precedence must therefore diminish the degree of violence — the forceful assertion of honor. Honor then is a socially relative value generating a spectrum of responses ranging from rational normative competitiveness to violent behavior.

THE AIM OF THIS STUDY

The purpose of this research has been to show that honor is a differentially defined concept among classes, and that honor crimes are particularly a lower class phenomenon. Furthermore, this paper aims to substantiate the observation that middle class honor crimes are qualitatively different than

lower class honor crimes. The expected difference lies in the socialisation process of the two classes. While the normative system which heavily influences the urban middle class is to be found in the upper class values and code of ethics, the lower classes normative system in developing countries has its roots in the agrarian society. The urban lower classes in such societies have recently migrated from villages into industrialized or semi-industrialized national metropolises and in most cases preserve their links with their relatives in the countryside. This relationship is generally reinforced by property partnership. Thus, sharing the same or similiar social values and tending to evince similar behavior for the rural and urban lower strata is quite understandable.

On the other hand, the ranks of the urban middle class is partly filled by the upwardly mobile lower classes and wealthier rural (or semi-urban) strata. These elements bring with their own values and evaluations in their relations with other people/groups. It was expected that these individuals could commit honor crimes. But scrutiny of this group revealed a different pattern due to their complex and contradictory socialisation system stemming from the cross-effect exerted on them by two different value systems, urban and rural.

Indeed the Turkish example revealed a clear-cut difference in the pattern of honor crimes committed by lower and middle classes. This difference constituted the basis of my interest on the subject. The part of the research conducted in the countryside lasted four years in the form of participant observation and unstructured interviews with villagers in western, central and eastern Turkey. This part of the research was conducted to understand the meaning of and the functions of honor among the villagers where it was taken most seriously. But a study of honor crimes at the village level was impossible due to the improper recording of such incidents. Order in Turkish villages is maintained by the Gendarmerie (military police) organization. Its records are both extremely hard to have access to, and honor crimes are classified under different titles of causation. Moreover, the vast number of Turkish villages (approx. 60.000) rendered it a difficult task to choose a sample group to study. After studying the police records of the three main Turkish cities (Istanbul Ankara, Izmir) I thought these areas to be optimum sites to find systematic data und compare it along class lines. For the first thing, rather detailed records were avaliable. The social standing of both the offender and the victim as well as a description of the events were recorded. With this as a beginning, a group of trained students of social science collected the data from the police archives of Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir. I continued with my interviews in the shanty town districts of Ankara and Istanbul. It may be useful to know that today 68% of the first city and 50% of the latter's population are composed of rural

migrants crowding the shanty towns encircling these cities. Izmir also takes its share by approximately 48%. Lack of funds and personnel allowed only for the scrutinisation of a period of five years extending from the beginning of 1970 to the first month of 1975.

The following pages summarize the analysis of our findings.

DATA

The number of cases found in the police archives of Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir contained 273 honor-crime cases. 199 or 73% of the offenders were male and 74 or 27% were female. A class differentiation was made by using two relevant criteria: profession/occupation and district of dwelling for no other viable criterion was avaliable in the police records. On the other hand, these two criteria are the best measures of social differentiation in the Turkish case. There is a clear-cut division of low and high living quarters in the three Turkish metropolises (Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir). In most cases the higher living quarters can be divided into upper and medium income levels. A precise mapping of these districts with the help of urban planners and municipal officials made it possible to find out the ecological distribution of honor crimes along class lines.

Similarly, occupation and/or profession, perhaps even more than income, is a determinant of social status and stratification. Using a scale developed from the works of Casparis, E. W. Vaz and J. Petras, the occupational structure of the offenders was prepared to display their class origin (Casparis, Vaz, 1967:51; Petras, 1970:320).

Once the choice of the tools for analysing the data was resolved, 6 tables were produced to substantiate the hypotheses which were predicated. Each hypothesis and the analysis of related data will be presented below.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The first hypothesis is that honor crimes among the lower echelons of the society are likely to be more frequent than among the upper and middle echelons.

Second hypothesis: There is a clear distinction in the perception of honor between men and women. Men are likely to kill the dishonoring person by a direct attack.

Manliness, which is the foundation of masculine honor includes outwardly oriented qualities necessary for precedence over social equals. These qual-

ities will necessarily include courage and readiness for physical confrontation. Given these facts a man whose honor is attacked is likely to attack back whenever he can find the transgressor. Conversely women whose perception of honor is a passive one based on abstention and virtuousness are likely to kill in defense rather than after an intentional pursuit as men would.

Third hypothesis: A man's honor is determined by his manly attributes or behavior on the one hand, and shame of his women (wife, sister, daughter, mother) on the other. Therefore it is likely that a man will kill when his honor is questioned either on personal grounds such as weakness and cowardice, or on the grounds of his women's shameless acts (or acts that bring shame to them by foreign malefactors).

Fourth hypothesis: A woman is more or less contained within the family, and her status is dependent on her family's status, predominantly on her husband's. Since a woman's status is basically determined within the family it is likely that she, especially among the lower strata, will be extremely vulnerable to strife in the family. This strife may be caused by the refusal of her husband or his parents to approve of the respectful membership to which she aspires in the family. This fact may be one of the main reasons to push women into crimes to repair their damaged honor.

TABLE 1

According to table 1., of the 273 honor-crime cases between 1970-75 in the three major Turkish cities, 199 (73%) were committed by men and 74 (27%) were committed by women. Approximately 89% (244) of these crimes were committed by populace belonging to the lower class of which 71% were male and 29% were female.

The middle-class offenders constituted 11% (29) of all offenders. The proportion of male and female middle-class offenders in the total is 9% (25) and 1% (4) respectively. Each sex group's weight in their respective social class is as follows: Among the lower-class offenders 71% are males, 29% are females. Among the middle-class offenders 86% are males, 14% are females.

There was no reported honor crime committed by a member of the upper class in the police archives during the period under scrutiny. Nor has this author come across any such case in the newspapers since 1970 (the beginning year of this research) up to the present time.

As discussed in the first section, the predominant majority of the urban lower classes residing in the principal Turkish cities have a short history, with their roots being in the countryside. The mechanization of agriculture uproot-

ed great peasant masses after the Second World War which continue to possess the agrarian society's values, mores and attitudes whence they have emerged. The same assertion can only partially be forwarded for the middle-class, a portion of which is a mixture of vertically mobile lower strata and horizontally (geographically) mobile rural middle strata, and of course the urban middle groups of the modern and traditional orders. The former two strata/formations are likely to carry on the values and traditions of the agrarian society in which honor is a basic determinant of status and an outcome of a milieu of fierce competition over "limited goods".

Even when the figures cited above are crudely evaluated, it can safely be assumed that honor crimes are basically lower class phenomena. Moreover, men are the main category of offenders. Two basic reasons for this reality were presented earlier: Men are traditionally the bearers of family honor. Being bread-earners they spend most of their time outside their home where they constantly compete for status and precedence (honor). Their honor remains under constant challenge, a situation which necessitates courage, cunning, and aggressiveness (main manly attributes), the ultimate test of which is readiness to give and take life away. On the other hand women are predominantly housewives or unpaid family workers (SIS, 1977: 43, 46). Although it is somewhat different among the educated sections of the middle-class, the lives of the majority of Turkish women are centered around their home. This factor—besides traditional expectations—gives the women a passive, defensive role in the defense of their honor.

When the main reasons behind honor crimes are reviewed for both classes, the most important factor appears to be "husband-wife argument or strife in the family" (25%). There is no difference on this account between classes.

Factors such as husband-wife argument, dishonoring act of woman, jealousy, show that in the man's struggle to maintain his status and to gain precedence (honor) he faces his womenfolk (their shamelessness) as his "soft heel" from where he can be, and is often rendered vulnerable. His frustration is directed against both men and women.

As regards the women's reasons for committing a crime within the category of "husband-wife argument or strife in the family", systematic beatings and continuous insults by the husband or husbands' parents in front or their offspring and neighbors accounts for the majority of the cases. These are aggravating acts which belittle the woman and deprive her of the respect she aspires to as a person possessing shame and virtue. Both of the qualities which render her respectable are denied and her womanly honor is disgraced. The

outcome is an honor crime committed against the dishonoring person.

The second most important reason on table 1. appears to be "dishonoring (act of) women" (22%). The relative weight of this factor is higher among middle-class offenders (34%) as compared to lower-class offenders (20%). "Self protection" and "verbal attack (insult) on ego" share the third place (14%). Although there is no difference along class lines, there are significant variations between the sexes. Verbal attack is only minimally important for women (9% for lower class, none for middle class members) as a reason to resort to an honor crime. This motive is almost exclusively a masculine cause of crime (100% for middle, 91% for lower class males). As regards self-protection, no middle class man has killed in self-defense. This figure for lower-class men is only 19%. Therefore self defense as a motive for honor crimes is important only for the women of both classes. One must, however, be cognizant of the difference of this motive's importance between classes. While "self-protection" accounts for 7% of the crimes committed by middle-class offenders, this ratio is 15% among lower-class offenders. This fact further substantiates the assertion that honor and honor crimes are the result of differential socialisation processes between classes, inducing lower-class members to violent means of competition when they have few other means to acquire status and precedence among their peers and in society in general.

Finally, "jealousy" takes the fourth place (13%). It involves mostly unmarried couples having an emotional relationship, and mothers, daughters versus sons and brothers. The first relationship seems to be more relevant in the middle-class and the second in the lower-class based cases.

There is however a significant difference in the weight of this motive (jealousy) concerning crime between classes. While 12% of the crimes in the lower class are committed for this reason, this ratio is 24% in the middle class.

This last finding may be in order for our assumption that middle-class women are not necessarily dependent on their husbands for their honor, especially when they are personally achievement oriented. The upward mobility and social-economic independence of women often tends to become a source of jealously at home or in an emotional relationship. When we consider the fact that the 13 middle-class women killed by their male peers 9 were working women, the point appears to be well taken.

When the matter is considered from the woman's side, a woman whose main asset is her womanness finds herself at once deprived of her social personality by the existence of another woman as her husbands' actual or assumed lover. This is a disgrace for two reasons: her status as a wife, mother and exclusive focus of affection by the husband in the family is diminished. In the

lower strata where the social status of women is basically determined by the status of males, rather than by socially acceptable qualities at the individual level (qualities which can be acquired by women as well), a man's denigration of his wife's dependent personality leads to reprisal to gain back her damaged status or to wend off the threat. The response may end up in a killing of the husband or husband's lover. The proportion of honor crimes committed by women based on the motive of jealousy is 3% in each class.

Where middle class males are concerned, jealousy accounts for the second most important motive in committing honor crimes (24%), preceded only by dishonoring (act of) women (34%). Husband-wife argument or strife in the family takes the third place (21%). These figures show that middle class men are primarily affected by their women's behavior. Their means of achievement and precedence renders them less vulnerable to direct personal attacks (on ego), contrary to the lower class. This fact brings forth the importance of indirect affronts on their honor, by the dishonorable acts of their womenfolk.

Given these facts we can safely state that women's unruly behavior in both the lower class and the more traditional, rural oriented strata of the middle class constitute the basic threat to men's honor. This is the reason why in all agrarian societies and their extensions in larger urban settlements, should economic conditions allow, it is endeavored to confine women to their homes. Their dresses except on special social occasions and before marriage (when they are up for demonstration) are consciously asexual and formless, in order to hide the womanness underneath. For a woman's affection and sexuality is exclusively reserved for her husband and her children, and is not hers to dispense of freely.

The inter-family feud is totally a rural tradition. While this motive accounts for 10% of the lower-class crimes it is irrelevant for the middle-class. Families migrating to the cities bring this social ill with them. As is well known, the target of the feud is basically men, as this would hurt the strength of the opponent family most. Like its targets (victims), most of the offenders of this crime are also male (76%).

If a general evaluation of the offences which involve middle-class women is to be made, honor crimes seem to be an exceptional form of behavior. There are four such cases (14% of honor crimes committed by middle class offenders). Reasons vary in each case: self-protection (2), husband-wife argument or strife in the family (1), jealousy (1). This variance does not allow for a healthy analysis except for the fact that honor crimes among middle class women are rare and do not reflect uni-directional socialisation. But what comes into relief is that middle-class women, being economically more independed and culturally

less restricted, seem to respond violently only when their social personality is threatened by their husband and other men.

This discussion begs new hypotheses to be tested:

Hypothesis five: Since to be "honorable" requires struggle against other men for prestige and social status, this struggle must be fiercer when a man is young. Therefore the younger a man is, a) the more likely that he may engage in honor crimes as offenders or victims; b) the more likely that most of his victims in the earlier age brackets are to be males.

Hypothesis six: As men grow older, it may be expected that they acquire a higher status than their more youthful counterparts. The respect they receive from their youngers and peers may be hampered basically by the shameful acts of their womenfolk rather than their own failure in life. So it may be that, the older the men get the more likely it becomes that they kill women rather than men.

Hypothesis seven: The above assertion has a class distinction. a) The reason why older men kill less men may be due to the fact that there are younger men in the family, such as sons, raised to defend the honor of the family by giving and taking life if necessary. This fact may decrease the chances of lower class elder men committing honor crimes against other men. b) On the other hand, young men of the middle class are socialized out of honor crimes. But their elders may still carry on and be influenced by traditional mores of the social strata they have emerged from. Moreover they get married and become heads of new households, the honor of which must be preserved and extended further. So it is a likelihood that middle-class men growing older confront both dishonoring men and women personally. Hence it is probable that the ratio of honor crimes among older middle class men is higher than that of lower class men. Conversely the ratio of honor crimes at earlier ages of lower-class members may be higher than that of middle-class members.

Hypothesis eight: It may be expected that the older the women get as mothers and wives, the more established and respected they become on the one hand, and the less threatened they are by both competing women for her men, and other men for her sexual favors. Hence the probability of older women committing honor crimes at older ages in both classes is rather weak.

TABLE 2

Table 2 provides some clues as to the correctness of these assumptions.

The hypothesis stating that younger men engage in honor crimes more often as offenders and victims is substantiated for the males of both classes.

Offenders up to 18 years of age constitute 18% of the lower class offenders. This ratio goes up to 24% for the 19-30 age group. The corresponding figures for the middle-class offenders are 5% and 34%. There is however, a deviation from this pattern in further age groups. While the proportion of lower class male offenders within the total number of offenders in the same class falls down to 13% in the 31-50 age group and to 5% in the next age bracket (51 t) over 50 years old, the corresponding figures for middle-class male offenders in the same age groups are 25% and 14% respectively. These figures show that despite the proportion of honor crimes committed by older middle-class members which are higher than that of lower-class males, the rate of crime falls with age in both classes.

In the category of men killing women, we observe that, although figures decline, lower-class men kill more women then men as they age when compared with middle-class offenders. Lower class male offenders in the 1-18 age group have committed 16% of the crimes attributed to this class by killing men and 3% by killing women. These figures are 4% and 2% for the middle class. In the 19-30 age group the proportion of crimes committed by lower-class men victimizing other men is 13% and women 12%. Corresponding figures for the middle-class are 27% and 7% respectively. In the 31-50 age group the proportion of men victimizing men in the lower class is 4% and women 9%. The same figures for the middle-class are 18% and 7%. In the age groups for 51 years and above, lower-class men have victimized other men by 2% and women by 3%. For the middle class offenders the corresponding figures are 13% and 2%.

These figures show that there is a clear evidence of differential patterns of honor crimes between classes. As stated earlier, a woman's status in the lower social class is dependent on her husband's honor but is not necessarily so in the middle-class, especially if the woman is working outside of her home and highly educated. Thus women in the middle-class may be a contributing factor to family honor. This fact may induce middle-class men to be more sensitive towards dishonoring acts of others on their women, rather than to the dishonoring actions of the women *per se*. This attitude is likely to bring the middle-class man into confrontation with other men.

This explanation may partially shed some light on the higher rate of honor crimes directed particularly at other men by middle class male offenders. Conversely, lower-class males feel more vulnerable by the behavior of their women who are under constant surveillance by the small community and its lingering face-to-face relations.

As regards honor crimes committed by women, the first thing to be no-

ticed is that after they come of age (18 t), although their ratio declines by age, there is a dramatic concentration of crimes in the 19-30 age group. Women who are 18 or younger in general have committed 6% of the total honor crimes (7% in the lower, 2% in the middle-class) in the period under scrutiny (1970-1975), the 19-30 age group 10% (11% in the lower, 5% in the middle-class); the 31-50 age group 6% (7% in the lower, 5% in the middle-class); 51 and above age group 1% (2% in the lower and none in the middle-class).

Table 3 brings us to the conclusion that (*hypothesis nine:*) men, in their struggle for precedence, confront both other men and their womenfolk for whose shameless acts they may easily lose from their endeavor to acquire more honor or preserve the already acquired. So it is likely that men kill both other men and women for matters of honor.

Hypothesis ten: Women's natural target in matters concerning affronts on her honor is likelier to be men rather than other women. This is basically due to the fact that women's modesty and shame—her womanly qualities— are in constant threat by men rather than other women. Other women appear to be judges, but men both intruders and executors.

Hypothesis eleven: Middle-class women may commit less honor crimes than their lower-class counterparts mainly due to the fact that their honor is socially less vulnerable and more flexibly defined. This is because middle-class women in many cases have social qualities equal to that of men, such as education and professional achievements.

Hypothesis twelve: If lower class women are socialized to commit crimes in defence of their honor, there will be less to do for their men in this respect. It may be expected that while lower class honor crimes constitute a larger portion of total honor crimes committed, the proportion of males among the lower-class offenders may be less compared to the proportion of males among the middle-class offenders.

TABLE 3

Taking the crimes as a total, table 3 reveals that the proportion of male offenders is 73%, whereas it is 27% for women. The proportion of male offenders to male victims in general is 43%. The proportion of female offenders to female victims is 2% in all honor crimes committed.

On the other hand men killing women constitute 41% of all male offenders in general. Conversely women killing men constitute 92% of the female offenders. These figures provide sufficient evidence to substantiate hypotheses nine and ten.

In synopsis both lower and middle-class women find men as being the major source of threat to their honor. Considering that two of the four crimes committed by middle-class women were done in self-defence and with the exception of only one, three victimizing men, it can safely be stated that middle-class women rarely commit honor crimes and their target of hostility is the opposite sex. Two additional crimes committed by middle-class women, as we shall later see, are suicide cases.

On the other hand socialized in a different social milieu and by a stricter code of ethics on matters of crime, lower class women kill when their honor is in their keeping, that is when their menfolk are away at the time and place of the crime, or when they are bachelors. Moreover there is a common expectation that Turkish women should show active resistance. For a woman stripped of her honor becomes a man which she shouldn't be. Only after her honor is restored does she revert back to her true sex.

On the other hand the high rate of female offenders in the lower-class (29% compared to 14% in the middle-class) may be partly due to the fact that the judicial system is more lenient towards women for offences committed in the defense of their honor. For example, penalties in cases of honor may be reduced to 1/8 of the relevant period of incarceration in the Penal Code and life sentences may be reduced to 5-10 years of imprisonment. Moreover women may be induced to avenge dishonorable affronts on them (and the family honor) in rural and lower social groups/strata in order to preserve men who are more valuable in terms of labor-power.

The fact that honor crimes reflect the existing divisions in the society along class lines and sex differences can be inferred from Table 4.

New hypotheses may be posited as follows:

Hypothesis thirteen: There is an enticing cultural milieu which serves to induce and support honor crimes and protect criminals (of honor). This is because they (whoever has committed an honor crime) are not labeled as common criminals, but as carriers and enforcers of communal mores and values. The end result of such a favorable social milieu may be: a) Running away of lower class members after committing an honor crime; b) Turning one's self in or being detained at the locale of crime of middle class members.

Hypothesis fourteen: There must, however, be a difference between the responses of male and female offenders. a) Men, composing the majority of offenders, for whom expressing their aggressiveness on every occasion and thus enjoying the honor won (by depriving others) is the general attitude, are likely to run away. First, they do not want to face the charges of criminality (imposed by laws and law enforcers), second, they want to live with the prestige

of having cleansed one's honor and be respected. b) Women on the other hand, whose offence is often committed in self-defense should run away less. Instead they are expected to turn themselves in or be detained at the locale of crime. This difference is also partly due to the differential application of the penalties to men and women.

Hypothesis fifteen: Since significant differences in the value structures of rural and urban, agrarian and industrial societies or their sub-units can be expected, different responses must also be expected of the members of such societies or social groups. If the thesis that class differences in the acculturation/socialisation process of the individual is an additive factor, then quite different evaluations of crimes may be expected of the offenders as well as the social groups/classes they belong to. We know that honor crimes are a part of the life-style of rural social groups and lower urban strata not yet integrated into urban life and its bourgeois culture and code of ethics. The same cannot be assumed of the urban middle class which is historically influenced by the bourgeois value system and which regards any form of crime disruptive (disfunctional) for the system, and therefore an ill to be eradicated.

Hence whether a person kills to defend his honor or not, that person is still a criminal. So the life a middle-class person takes does not add on to his honor as is the case for a rural or urban lower-class member, but rather declares his/her social death. While an honor crime for a lower class person guarantees his/her social reincarnation, such a criminal act removes a middle class person out of his social status and his more advantaged place in the social hierarchy. He/she has acted contrary to the expectations of his/her social class. Perhaps psychologically satisfied but socially condemned, a middle-class person finds no social support which would vindicate his honor. For there is no such social milieu to admit favorable code of honor to revert to. In the lack of social support, the middle-class offender faces an induced status inconsistency. Under the pressure of psychological stress accruing from the feeling of regret after the initial psychic comfort, middle class offenders may be led to punish themselves in order to comply with the social values of their class which they have internalized. The form of this self-punishment may very well be committing or attempting to commit suicide.

TABLE 4

Table 4 provides the necessary evidence for the above assumptions. For example of the offenders who have run away after a homicide, 98% are men and only 2% are women. Moreover among all those who have run away there are no middle class persons.

As regards the behavior of middle-class members, 50% (2) of the women have turned themselves in and the other 50% have attempted to commit suicide. But the most interesting finding of this study is the suicidal leaning of the totality of middle-class male offenders after an initial act of homicide.

THE CASE OF THE EXTENDED HONOR CRIME: HOMICIDE FOLLOWED BY SUICIDE

At this point, the aim of the present research paper must be apparent: the effects of status expectancy and deprivation, expressed as matters of honor and cultural violence associated with these phenomena is being discussed. 'Honor' as clearly supported by the data at hand, is a motive for assaults and murder because dishonourment deprives one of his present status or threatens his future (aspired) status. Although we see the two phenomena, murder and suicide, as essentially two seperate acts, in the case of honour crimes, we do not consider them as the outcome of two separate motivations.

How do we operationalize this proposition in terms of homicide-suicide? Primarily we take Gibbs and Porterfield's (1960) "status loss" theory as our guiding model. Feeling his honor to be challenged, the middle-class member resorts to the ultimate solution (culturally defined): He tries to reassert his status by murder or attempted murder. But given his class socialization where an 'honor crime' does not retrieve his status, or his class membership that does not support him with its values, he commits a 'logical' as well as a 'social' error. The balance between his psychological gain and what he socially has to pay cannot be struck.

There is apparently much variation from society to society and from culture to culture in the rates of reported murder-suicide. Wolfgang's (cf. 1958:272) sample from Philadelphia murders contained only four percent who later killed themselves. West (1966) reporting on Great Britain, found about one third of *suspected* murderers killing themselves. Other studies cited by Wolfgang (1958:273) show rates varying from two to nine percent in the United States, and 22 to 35 percent for the United Kingdom or subdivisions thereof. Landau and Drapkin (1968:12) report in one study from Israel the percentages of murder-suicide by ethnic origin from 1950 to 1964 as follows: Oriental Jews, 11%; Western Jews, 28%; and non-Jews, 2%. These indicate that the effects of culture and social relations within a society may lead to quite different rates by ethnicity. Our data show a rate of approximately 10% suicides among murderers. This ratio is almost equal to that of the Oriental Israelis, higher than that of the U.S. and lower than the United Kingdom.

As far as motivation, Dorpat (1966) seed the murder-suicide syndrome as one in which one of the prominent variables is the psychosis, or mental imbalance of the offender. Wolfgang (1958:273) attributes the greater likelihood of homicide-suicide among males not to psychopathology but to social variables which affect the likelihood of committing both homicide and suicide. This seems a more reasonable explanation since psychopathology should occur as frequently among women as men, and in England for example (West, 1966), suicide is just as common among female murderers as males. As our data indicate, the event is most often seen as the outcome of an argument over trivial matters such as a dirty shirt offered to a husband (retired colonel) by his wife when he manifested the desire to go out. Our feeling is that the males in our murder-suicide sample much like those of the U.S. and Israel statistics: they were likely to kill their victims in anger, as evidenced by the relatively high proportion of acts which preceded arguments (87%).

Wives and other women close to him appear to have played important precipitating roles. Our sample contains a high percentage of attacks upon wives, lovers, fiancées, and would-be mates. One of the striking exceptions was a case in which a father refused to allow his daughter to marry a young man whereupon the rejected party shot several of the family members before committing suicide. Dorpat, like Cavan (1928), believes that separation anxieties precede the murder of the frustrating agent. This is apparently true in a limited number of cases involving younger persons. An example of this was a 31 year old lower-class man (the only suicide case of this class) recently paralysed in an accident who shot his fiancée after she decided to call off their marriage. However, it is not clear that murder or suicide had been contemplated prior to the refusal even though the young man had suffered severe frustration.

Congruent with our findings, Wolfgang (1958:275-276) reports that in the U.S. homicide-suicide cases were significantly more violent than mere homicides. Not only that, but also the relationship between the victim and offender was more intimate than was true of his general sample of homicides. Just as we have found, they were either wives, lovers or former lovers, and inlaws or relatives of the loved one. West (1966) has also found a much greater likelihood for homicide-suicides to occur among family members or loved ones in England.

Hand-guns, often government issue, were the most frequently used weapon, followed by knives. The suicide appears to have occurred relatively shortly after the murder; usually there was only one victim. The murderers were all men, the primary victims all women.

We believe that some evidence is presented to substantiate our initial

assumption that women are on the defensive and that as they grow older they are more likely to be the objects of men's aggression. Based on this assumption, we should like to argue that the murder-suicide syndrome comes at least in part from these trends. When we coded the avaliable information for class and occupation, we did notice a clear tendency for the murderer-suicides to be (1) traditionally urban dwellers, and (2) married middle-class (except for one case) men mostly frustrated in their careers or retired[1]. They are men who have begun a decline in their status, and who are losing their collegial relationships. The police records follow a common pattern. An argument, usually trivial in nature, sparks a stinging retort from the wife, or a mild crisis emerges when a wife gives her husband a dirty shirt; another calls her husband "an old fool"; and yet another goes to the movies without her husband's consent. The husband then commits the "logical error" of attacking his wife with the avaliable weapon in order to teach her respect. The outcome is murder or assault on his part. The frustration level appears to have been raised by oncoming old age, loss of status, and further, attack on that rather restricted status and self-esteem by the wife's 'unruly' behaviour. We should like to consider this decline, immanent or real on status, as having some effect upon the frame of mind of the murderer. It does not, however, explain why a minor family crisis should turn into murder and suicide. The answer, we think, can best be found in the social circumstances which surround the individual in such criminal actions.

Once the crime is committed, we believe, the male reviews his alternatives. He is middle-class and dependent on a past or present position. He is also middle-aged (68%) or approaching this mark (31 and above). Flight is out of the question, there is nowhere to flee, no funds, and he has lost his wife or beloved one. He is an urban dweller with no friends or roots in the countryside to turn to. There is the prospect of a painful law trial and public humiliation. Seeing himself in an untenable position and being unable to redefine himself, he takes the logical way out-suicide.

We cannot, of course, test this explanation since one man can never know the state of mind of a suicidal person, but we believe that this offers a logical explanation of homicide and suicide because it incorporates both a social explanation of object choice and a cultural-cognitive explanation of motivation.

We believe that murder, which falls into the category of "honour crimes",

---

1. 4 retired army officers, 6 civil service retirees, 3 active police officers, 2 active non-commissioned officers, 2 teachers, 4 medium merchants are the leading types in this category.

is not just a phenomenon of the situation. It is, as expressed by many of the offenders[2], in great measure "an attempt to make things better" (Lester, 1968: 83). The subsequent suicide is a complementary part of the original act that was intended, but yet failed to make things better[3]. Hence, we see the suicide as a phenomenon apart from but proceeding from the initial act of murder. Suicide thus completes the 'corrective' response of the threatened individual against status/ honour loss initiated but not solved by the preceding homicide. In this sense, both homicide and the following suicide are complementary parts of a single continuum: defense of honour, or as we call it "extended honour crime".

Coming back to the appraisal of Table 4, we see that while 17% of the lower-class male offenders have turned themselves in and 9% detained at the locale of the crime after committing an act of homicide, 28% have run away, and 36% have been caught by police away from the locale of the crime. Thus 64% of male lower-class offenders have succeeded in or have attempted to run away. This ratio is quite low among lower-class women: while 43% turned themselves in, 33% were detained at the locale of the crime. Thus 76% of lower-class women expected the legal outcome of their offense in cold-blood. Only one (1%) of the women ran away.

The only suicide case in the lower-class involved a male offender who became partially paralysed before his fiancée left him to go to work in West Germany.

These figures openly show both the class and sex-based character of the concept of honor and the struggle to attain it. Let us end our discussion by presenting more evidence along these lines.

Hypothesis sixteen: When age is considered, younger men are more likely to run away after committing a homicide. Conversely, they will either voluntarily or easily be detained as their age goes up.

Hypothesis seventeen: Suicide cases among middle-class offenders may be more frequently witnessed than their younger counterparts.

As table 5 evinces, 70% of the lower-class males who have run away are

---

2. Newspaper accounts of honour crimes are rich in statements made by the offenders such as: "I have cleansed the family honour with blood"; "She had taken the wrong road, I had to defend my honour"; "I had no other choice; only blood could wash away this disgrace" or "It was a matter of honour, he shouldn't have cursed at my mother or sister" etc.

3. For Henry and Short, "...the acts of suicide and homicide are... responses to extreme frustration arising from extreme loss of position in the status hierarchy relative to the status position of others in the same status reference system" (1954:56).

in the 1-18 (27%) and 19-30 (43%) age categories. Only 10% are between the ages of 31-50. Similiarly 71% of the male offenders who have been detained at the locale of crime in this class are 20 years of age or younger. The highest proportion (38%) of offenders in this category are 18 or younger. In contrast, in the group of male offenders who have been detained at the locale of a crime, 31% are in the 19-30 year age category, 56% in the 31-50 age group and only 12% are 18 or younger.

The place of crime is another excellent indicator of differences discussed heretofore between sexes and classes.

Hypothesis eighteen: a) Since the physical mobility of women is, due to societal regulations, rather circumscribed, they are likely to commit crimes not in public places; but rather in their own or in the victim's (separate or mutual) residence should there be an emotional tie between the two. b) Conversely, men are expected to commit their crime in a variety of locales including public areas and place of work.

Hypothesis nineteen: A difference between classes may be expected as to the place of crime. As discussed earlier, middle-class men direct their hostility more to their female peers (48%) than their lower-class counterparts (40%) and the ratio of committing crime in older ages is higher in the middle-class. This data leads one to posit the hypothesis that the place of crime in middle-class cases is more likely to be places which reflect an emotional tie between the offender and victim. Conversely the reverse may be the case in lower-class crimes which reflect a dissociation between offender and victim in part of the cases.

Indeed data offered by Table 6 seems to substantiate these assumptions.

When the lower class offenders are considered, of the persons who have slain their "enemy" on the street, bar, shop, bazaar or other public places, 84% are men and 16% are women. The men in this category constitute 21%, and the women 4% of all lower-class offenders. Among the middle-class offenders which fall into this category, there is no woman, and the men constitute only 7% of all offenders in this class. The relative weight of killing in a public place among lower-class crimes is 25%, whereas it is 7% among middle-class offences.

Similarly, while there are no middle-class offenders which have slain their dishonoring "enemy" in the village place either after a planned pursuit or by chance during a visit to the place of birth, 100% of the offenders who fall in this category are lower-class males. No women seem to carry their grudge that far. However two of the lower-class females (1% of the lower class offenders) are reported to have "washed away their dishonor with blood"

at the place of work of the victim. Both cases involved young women who were seduced, promising marriage only to be later deserted. The women who have initially granted sexual favors in regret and anger have found and killed their seducers at their place of work, usually after a discussion centering around the necessity of marriage. There is no such case concerning a female middle-class member.

Killing in the place of work has an equal weight in the crimes committed by the members of both classes (6%). However 86% of the crimes committed in such places by lower-class persons are by men and 14% by women. The two cases (100%) committed by middle-class persons in a place of work are only by men.

As regards the places of crime which indicate an affinity or emotional attachment between offender and victim the most frequent locale is the home of both victim and offender (25%) and a (common) relative's or victim's home (25%) in the lower class cases. The highest proportion (48%) of crimes committed by middle-class offenders took place in a relative's or victim's home. This finding is in line with a previous assumption that amorous relations are more common in the middle class outside of wedlock. This fact is further supported by the finding that the second most important locale of crime in middle-class cases is a relative's or victim's home (27%) and home of both victim and offender (24%).

The third place is occupied by the locale identified as the home of both the victim and the offender (14%) indicating a strife in the family.

When these figures are compared, the following conclusion can be reached: The lower class offenders' hostility is predominantly directed outwardly, while the middle-class offenders' aggression is oriented more to the persons with which they are associated or from closer social quarters.

Nevertheless, the most interesting finding emerging from Table 6 is the datum obtained on the occurance of honor crimes in the courthouse, but more important than that, in the very courtroom where the legal suit brought against the offender (dishonoring person) was going on. All of such crimes were committed by lower class members, 75% being male and 25% being female. Why is it so?

First of all, legality requires the enforcement of laws. Laws in agrarian societies seldom are enforced in full strength in the countryside and within semi-closed communal formations. If they are, they reflect the hierarchic nature of the society and most of the time work to the disadvantage of the poorer social strata. The knowledge of this fact renders the lower classes suspicious towards the justice and equality of laws and the law enforcers.

Instead they solve their social problems in accordance with their code of ethics and communal values rather than in accordance to an alien value system and the authority which enforces it.

The conflict between honor and legality persists until this very day in the urban strata still bearing the traditional code of ethics and values. Even when his or her family brings the case of dishonor to the court, the dishonored person often feels (as expressed in the police records and newspaper accounts) that to go to the law for redress is to confess publicly that his or her honor is vulnerable. Since vulnerability is a personal weakness, legal compensation at the hands of an alien authority which has always been suspected and not fully trusted would hardly redress the damaged honor. Court cases in such a situation are often deemed as advertisement of the dishonoring act and of the dishonored person. This situation leads to the further humiliation of the dishonored person. So the outcome of this frustration is a violent counter-offensive in the courthouse or courtroom, even by women.

Moreover, long delays in legal cases requires much mobility, substantial sums of funds for the lawyers and other necessary expenses. Additionally the laws are too complicated to encourage lower class under-educated persons to resort to this method for redress. Such social and economic disadvantages further reinforce the traditional forms of compensation.

Out of this data emerges the following evaluation: The concept of honor and perpetuation of honor crimes is a necessary function of a hierarchic society in order to preserve its unequal structure and at the same time camouflage the fierce competition among the less advantaged members and families social-ised into a strict code of ethics which keep them in line by letting each individ-ual (of family) control the other. While in one sense honor is a matter of compliance with the traditional patterns of behavior condoned socially, in another sense it is a quality which is gained and maintained by eradicating the shame which befalls an individual or family as a result of the behavior of others. In a social milieu where social "goods" (jobs, material opportunities for mobility, education, etc.) are limited, one person's or family's gain is some-one else's loss. So the social ideal of honor provides an effective code to main-tain some form of equilibrium in the established order as a means of social control.

"Thus, it is clear that honor and shame which are usually attributed to a certain individual or a kinship group have in fact a bearing on the total social structure since most acts involving honor or shame are likely to affect the existing social equilibrium between the different kinship units... in which (the society or a sub-group thereof) is ordered" (Zeid, 1966:259).

EPILOGUE: SOME PROPOSITIONS

This is by no means a complete study, but a necessary beginning. We believe that the questions raised and the issues somewhat highlighted in this essay will come to better relief if and when the following suggestions are carried out by further research.

1) Data from the agrarian population must be included in the study. To do this, probably a research team has to go to local data collecting organizations like regional courts and police authorities while another follows newspaper accounts. Furthermore, it will be a more prudent approach to obtain such data from all, if not at least two regions of the country, preferably one that is economically most developed (the Turkish West) and the other, poor or economically marginal (Turkish East and South-East).

2) To get a clearer picture of the dynamics involved in violence associated with and the perception of 'honour' among diverse classes, a more complete study (well funded and staffed) must incorporate data from two different periods in time. It will be particularly rewarding if these periods can be selected from among nationally or socially important epochs during which significant socio-economic fluctuations had occurred. For Turkey, these two periods could be the period which we have already analysed (bringing it up to date), and the 1945-1950 period when the Turkish middle-class, whose ascendance had taken place through the bureaucratic service, was still in control of the State apparatus, and its high prestige intact.

With the inclusion of these new dimensions and variables, we believe that not only the class contours of the social process that is called 'honour crimes' will become clearer, but also changes in class behaviour in terms of status attainment and status loss over time and under various conditions will be much better understood.

Faculty of Political Science
University of Ankara

TABLE 1

Motive of Crime by sex of Offender (%)*

Motive of Crime	Sex of Offender						Grand Total
	Lower Class			Middle Class			
	Male	Female	Class Total	Male	Female	Class Total	
Self protection	19 3 (7)	81 12 (30)	15 (37)		100 7 (2)	7 (2)	14 (39)
Inter Family feud	76 8 (19)	24 2 (6)	10 (25)				9 (25)
Husband-Wife Argument or Strife in the family	72 18 (44)	28 7 (17)	25 (61)	83 17 (5)	17 3 (1)	21 (6)	25 (67)
Dishonering (act of) woman	90 18 (44)	10 2 (5)	20 (49)	100 34 (10)		34 (10)	22 (59)
Verbal Attack on ego	91 13 (32)	9 1 (3)	14 (35)	100 14 (4)		14 (4)	14 (39)
Jealousy	72 9 (21)	28 3 (8)	12 (29)	86 17 (6)	14 3 (1)	24 (7)	13 (36)
Others	88 3 (7)	13 0 (1)	3 (8)				3 (8)
Totals	71 64 (174)	29 26 (70)	89 (244)	86 9 (25)	14 1 (4)	11 (29)	100 (273)

* 28 attempted and/or concluded suicide cases are excluded.

Figures in the brackets are "n"s. Numbers on the left hand side of each square give the % between sexes. Numbers on the right hand side give the % within the respective class. The right hand side figures in the "totals" square below represent the % within the total. The totals may not add up to 100 % because of rounding.

TABLE 2

*Male and Female Victims by age and sex of Offender**

Age of Offender	Sex of Offender	Sex of Victim						
		Lower Class			Middle Class			Grand Total
		Male	Female	Class Totals	Male	Female	Class Totals	
1–18	M	84 16 (38)	16 3 (7)	18 (45)	67 4 (2)	33 2 (1)	5 (3)	16 (48)
	F	89 7 (16)	11 1 (2)	7 (18)	100 2 (1)		2 (1)	6 (19)
19–30	M	52 13 (31)	48 12 (29)	24 (60)	79 27 (15)	21 7 (4)	34 (19)	27 (79)
	F	96 11 (26)	4 0 (1)	11 (27)	33 2 (1)	67 4 (2)	5 (3)	10 (30)
31–50	M	32 4 (10)	68 9 (21)	13 (31)	71 18 (10)	29 7 (4)	25 (14)	15 (45)
	F	100 7 (17)		7 (17)	33 2 (1)	67 4 (2)	5 (3)	6 (20)
51 E	M	33 2 (4)	67 3 (8)	5 (12)	88 13 (7)	13 2 (1)	14 (8)	7 (20)
	F	75 1 (3)	25 0 (1)	2 (4)				1 (4)
Unknown	M	81 9 (22)	19 2 (5)	11 (27)	80 7 (4)	20 2 (1)	9 (5)	11 (32)
	F	75 1 (3)	25 0 (1)	2 (4)				1 (4)
Totals		69 56 (170)	31 25 (75)	100 81 (245)	73 14 (41)	27 5 (15)	99 19 (56)	99 (301)

* Suicide cases are included.

Totals may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

TABLE 3

Sex of Offender by sex of Victim (%)

Sex of Offender	Sex of Victim						Grand Total
	Lower Class			Middle Class			
	Males	Females	Class Total	Males	Females	Class Total	
Males	60 43 (104)	40 29 (70)	71 (174)	52 5 (13)	48 4 (12)	86 (25)	73 (199)
Females	93 27 (65)	7 2 (5)	29 (70)	75 10 (3)	25 3 (1)	14 (4)	27 (74)
Totals	69 62 (169)	31 27 (75)	89 (244)	48 5 (16)	52 5 (13)	11 (29)	100 (273)

Cases of suicide committed after an act of homicide are excluded.

TABLE 4

Action Taken by Offender after Homicide (%)*

Type of Action	Lower Class			Middle Class			Grand Total
	Males	Females	Class Total	Males	Females	Class Total	
Ran away	98 20 (48)	2 0 (1)	20 (49)		100 7 (2)	7 (2)	18 (49)
Turned self in	49 12 (29)	51 12 (30)	24 (59)				22 (61)
Cought by police away from locale of crime	86 26 (63)	14 4 (10)	30 (73)				27 (73)
Attempted suicide				71 17 (5)	29 7 (2)	24 (7)	3 (7)
Suicide	100 0 (1)		0 (1)	100 69 (20)		69 (20)	8 (21)
Detained at the locale of crime	41 7 (16)	59 9 (23)	16 (39)				14 (39)
Died later	100 1 (3)		1 (3)				1 (3)
Unknown	70 6 (14)	30 2 (6)	8 (20)				7 (20)
Totals	71 64 (174)	29 26 (70)	89 (244)	86 9 (25)	14 2 (4)	11 (29)	100 (273)

* Suicide cases are excluded.

Totals may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

TABLE 5

Action Taken by Male Offender after Crime by age (%)*

Type of action	Lower Class						Middle class						General total
	1-18	19-30	31-50	51+	Unknown	Class total	1-18	19-30	31-50	51+	Unknown	Class total	
Ran away	27 7 (13)	43 12 (21)	10 3 (5)		19 5 (9)	28 (48)							24 (48)
Turned self in	17 3 (5)	24 4 (7)	24 4 (7)	28 5 (8)	7 1 (2)	17 (29)							15 (29)
Caught by police away from locale of crime	38 14 (24)	33 12 (21)	8 3 (5)	6 2 (4)	14 5 (9)	37 (63)							32 (63)
Attempted suicide								20 4 (1)	40 8 (2)	40 8 (2)		20 (5)	3 (5)
Suicide			100 1 (1)			1 (1)		35 4 (7)	45 5 (9)	20 2 (4)		80 (20)	11 (21)
Detained at the locale of crime	12 1 (2)	31 3 (5)	56 5 (9)			9 (16)							8 (16)
Died later	33 1 (1)	33 1 (1)	33 1 (1)			2 (3)							2 (3)
Unknown		36 3 (5)	21 2 (3)		43 3 (6)	8 (14)							7 (14)
Totals	26 23 (45)	34 30 (60)	18 16 (31)	7 6 (12)	15 13 (26)	87 (174)		32 4 (8)	44 6 (11)	24 12 (6)		13 (25)	102 (199)

* Totals may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

TABLE 6

Locale of Crime by sex of Offender (%)*

| Locale of Crime | Sex of offender | | | | | | Grand total |
| | Lower class | | | Middle class | | | |
	Male	Female	Class total	Male	Female	Class total	
Offender's home	55 5 (12)	45 4 (10)	9 (22)	86 21 (6)	14 3 (1)	24 (7)	11 (29)
Street, bar, shop or bazaar, other public places	84 21 (52)	16 4 (10)	25 (62)	100 7 (2)		7 (2)	23 (64)
Village	100 2 (6)		2 (6)				2 (6)
Place of work, farms	86 5 (12)	14 1 (2)	6 (14)	100 7 (2)		7 (2)	6 (16)
A relative's or victim's home	55 14 (33)	45 11 (27)	25 (60)	86 41 (12)	14 7 (2)	48 (14)	27 (74)
Home of both victim and offender	66 16 (40)	34 9 (21)	25 (61)	75 10 (3)	25 3 (1)	14 (4)	24 (65)
Courthouse or courthome	71 2 (5)	29 1 (2)	3 (7)				3 (7)
Unknown	75 4 (9)	25 1 (3)	5 (12)				4 (12)
Totals	69 62 (169)	31 27 (75)	89 (244)	86 9 (25)	14 2 (4)	11 (29)	100 (273)

* Suicide cases are excluded.

Totals may not add up to 100 % because of rounding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - REFERENCES

Antoun, Richard T.
　　1968 "On the Modesty of Women in Arab Muslim Villages: A Study in the Accomodation of Traditions". *American Anthropologist* 70 (August): 671-697.
Bohannon, Paul (Ed.)
　　1967 *African Homicide and suicide*. New York: Atheneum.
Bourdieu, Pierre
　　1966 "The Sentiment of Honor in Kabyle Society" in Peristiany, *op. cit.*
Bowlby, John
　　1969 *Attachment and Loss*. New York: Basic Books.
Cavan, Ruth S.
　　1928 *Suicide*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Driver, Edwin D.
　　1961 "Interaction and Criminal Homicide in India". *Social Forces* 40 (December): 154-158.
Dollard, John
　　1949 *Caste and Class in a Southern Town*. New York: Harper.
Dollard, John and Miller, Neal E.
　　1950 *Personality and Psychotherapy; an Analysis in Terms of Learning, Thinking, and Culture*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Ist ed.
Dorpat, Theodore L., Jackson, Joan K., and Ripley, Herbert S.
　　1965 "Broken Homes and Attempted and Completed Suicides". *Archives of General Psychiatry* 12 (February): 213-216.
Dorpat, Theodore L.
　　1966 "Suicide in Murderers". *Psychiatric Digest* 27 (June): 51-55.
Douglas, Jack D.
　　1967 *The Social Meaning of Suicide*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
Durkhein, Emile
　　1951 *Suicide*. New York: The Free Press.
Farberow, Norman L., Shneidman, Edwin S., and Neuringer, Charles
　　1966 "Case History and Hospitalization Factors in Suicides of Neuropsychiatric Patients". *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 142 (January): 32-44.
Fenichel, Otto
　　1945 *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis*. New York: W. W. Norton.
Freud, Sigmund
　　1925 *Mourning and Melancholia*. Collected Papers 25. London: The Hogarth Press.

Gibbs, Jack P. (ed.)
  1968 *Suicide.* New York: Harper & Row.
Gibbs, Jack P. and Martin, Walter T.
  1958 "A Theory of Status Integration and its Relationship to Suicide". *American Sociological Review* 23 (April): 140-147.
Gibbs, Jack P. and Porterfield, A. L.
  1960 "Occupational Prestige and Social Mobility of Suicides in New Zeland". *The American Journal of Sociology* 66 (September): 147-152.
Gillin, John
  1948 "Race Relations Without Conflict: A Guatemalan Town". *American Journal of Sociology* 53 (May): 337-342.
Gold, Martin
  1958 "Suicide, Homicide, and the Socialization of Aggression". *The American Journal of Sociology* 58:651-661.
Guttmacher, Manfred S.
  1960 *The Mind of the Murderer.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy.
Halbwachs, Maurice
  1930 *Les Causes du Suicide.* Paris: Felix Alcan.
Hendin, Herbert
  1964 *Suicide and Scandinavia.* New York: Grune and Stratton.
Henry, Andrew F. and James F. Short
  1954 *Suicide and Homicide.* Glencoe: The Free Press.
Kilpatrick, William Heard and Van Til, William (editors)
  1947 *Intercultural Attitudes in the Making,* New York: Harper 1st ed.
Kleiser, Luis Martinez
  1953 *Refranero general ideo'logico espanol.* No. 31-241-31. 474. Madrid.
Landau, Simha K. and Drapkin, Israel S.
  1968 *Ethnic Patterns of Criminal Homicide in Israel.* Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
Lenski, Gerhard
  1966 *Power and Privilege.* Chicago: McGraw-Hill.
Lester, Jean and David
  1971 *Suicide: The Gamble with Death.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Harper & Row.
Maris, Ronald W.
  1969 *Social Forces in Urban Suicide.* Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.
Mergargee, Edwin I.
  1966 "Undercontrolled and Overcontrolled Personality Types in Extreme Antisocial Agression". *Psychological Monographs* 80.
Montesquieu
  1958 *Esprit de Lois'. Oeuvres.* Vol. II. Paris.
Onians, R. B.
  1951 *Origins of European Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Palmer, Stuart
  1965 "Murder and Suicide in forty Non-literate Societies". Journal of Criminal Law, *Criminology and Police Science* 56 (September): 320-324.

Peristiany, J. G. (Ed.)
> 1965 *Honour and Shame*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Petras, James
> 1970 *Politics and social Forces in Chilean Development*. Berkeley, L. A.: University of California Press.

Pitt-Rivers, Julian
> 1965 "Honour and Social Status". In J. G. Peristiany (ed.), *Honour and Shame*. London: Weidenfield and Nicholson.

Pitt-Rivers, Julian
> 1954 *The People of the Sierra*. New York: Criterion Books.

Pokorny, Alex D.
> 1965 "Human Violence: A Comparison of Homicide, Aggravated Assault, Suicide and Attempted Suicide". *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science* 56 (December): 488-497.

Powell, Edwin H.
> 1958 "Occupation, Status and Suicide: Toward a Redefinition of Suicide". *American Sociological Review* 23 (April): 131-139.

Peristiany, J. C.
> 1966 "Honor and Shame in a Cypriot Highland Village" in Peristiany, *Ibid*.

Safilios-Rothschild, Constantina
> 1969 "'Honour' Crimes in Contemporary Greece". *British Journal of Sociology* 20 (June): 153-155.

Schneidman, Edwin S.
> 1969 *On the Nature of suicide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schnore, Milton F.
> 1971 "Psychological Theories of the Causes of Antisocial Behavior". *Crime and Delinquency* (October): 456-468.

Stengel, Erwin
> 1964 *Suicide and Attempted Suicide*. Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Voltaire
> 1774 *Essai sur L'histoire générale et sur les moeurs et L'esprit de Nations*. 7 Vol. s. Paris. 175 Siècle de Louis XIV. Paris.

West, Donald J.
> 1966 *Murder Followed by Suicide*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Wolfgang, Marvin E.
> 1958 *Patterns in Criminal Homicide*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Wolfgang, Marvin E. and Ferracuti, F.
> 1967 *The Subculture of Violence*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Wolf, Kurt H.
> 1967 *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. New York: The Free Press.

Campbell, J. K.
> 1964 *Honour Family and Patronage*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Casparis, John and Vas, Edmund W.
> 1967 "Social Class and Self Reported Delinquent Acts Among Swiss Boys". *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*. XIV, 1-2.

Pitt-Rivers, Julian
        1963 *Mediterranean Countrymen. Essays in the Social Anthropology of the Medi-terranean.* Paris and La Haye: Mouton and Co.
Ramos, Samuel
        1971 "Psychoanalysis of the Mexican" in F. J. Moreno and Barbara Mitriani (eds), *Conflict and Violence in Latin American Politics.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
Zeid, Abou A. M.
        1966 "Honor and Shame Among the Bedoins of Egypt" in J. G. Peristiany (Ed.), *Honour and Shame.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Zilboorg, Georgy
        1936 "Differential Diagnostic Types of Suicide". *Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry* 35:270-271.
State Institute of Statistics (SIS)
        1977 *Yearbook of Statistics.* Ankara.