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INTRODUCTION

Modernity above all is a project, which can be defined as "purposeful future-oriented activity, geared to the achievement of practical, secular goals, and capable of elaboration into life-governing values and priorities that can make sense of -- and in -- individual life narratives" (Jervis, 1998, p. 3). Modern then suggests purposive and rational activities and organizations aimed to control of both natural and social environments, pretending to be the benefit of individuals and of society.

In a modern society, humans are re-formed as appropriate selves who are capable of carrying the ideals of the project. Thus, individuals are expected to adjust themselves to requirements of the civilizing project. Norbert Elias (1982, p. 232) notes that, "[a]s more and more people must attune their conduct to that of others, the web of action must be organized more and more strictly and accurately, if each individual action is to fulfill its social function. The individual is compelled to regulate his conduct in an increasingly differentiated, more even and more stable manner." At this point, the life of self-become a project which is future oriented and said to be achieved through self-help and self-control. Without doubt the best place to start the instillation of self-regulation is early childhood.

Nicolas Rose once stated, “childhood is the most intensely governed sector of personal existence” (1999a, p. 123). It seems weird to suggest that children did not develop prior to the early twentieth century. Of course, their growth has always been obvious to anyone with eyes to see. “Yet it was by no means self-evident that a systematic knowledge of childhood should be grounded in the notion that their attributes should be linked along the dimension of time in a unified sequence” (Rose 1999a, p.144). This unified sequence has been advanced in the early twentieth century when a new scientific gaze distinguished the man from animals (Hultqvist and Dahlberg, 2001; Rose, 1999a). It was in this context that psychoanalysis and developmental psychology, along with the pedagogy began to “colonize childhood”. Developmental psychology prepared the receipt of the modern construction of the normal child. The work of Jean Piaget assumed a developmental approach to rationality or intelligence describing childhood as a transition to a rational and civilized adult being. Through the measuring, grading, ranking and assessing of children in institutions such as clinics and schools, modern developmental psychology instilled both a deeply held positivism and a rigid empiricism into present-day understandings of the nature of the child (Archard 2004; Walkerdine, 1984).

Developmental norms became the standards of the average abilities or performances of children of a certain age on a particular task. It thus presented what was normal for children as well as enabled the normality of any child to be assessed by comparing with these norms.

This paper seeks to understand the construction of early childhood through the practices of a civil society organization, Mother Child Education Foundation (MCEF, Anne Çocuk Eğitim Vakfı,) whose orientation is early childhood and mothering education. The aim of this paper is to make a discourse analysis of MCEF to see how governmentality techniques¹ are used to

¹ The term governmentality firstly appears in Michel Foucault’s lectures at the College de France in which he defines it as the “art of government”, “conduct of conduct” with an idea of government is not limited to just state politics, that includes a wide range of control techniques. Conceptualized mainly in this sense, governmentality studies ask, “How we think about governing others and ourselves in a wide variety of contexts...” (Dean, 1999, p. 212). Thus, to analyze the governmentality conducts is to analyze techniques and mechanisms that try to shape, sculpt, mobilize and work through the choices, desires, aspirations, needs, wants and lifestyles of individuals and groups” (Dean, 1999, p. 12). This term firstly indicates that the activities of the state took the form government, i.e. conduct of subjects, and secondly in a more comprehensive sense “in addition to control/management by the state or the administration, ‘government’ also signifies problems of self-control, guidance for the family and for children, management of the household, directing the soul” (Lemke, 2001, p. 191). In this sense, governmentality
pedagogize early childhood and to modernize motherhood. By looking at the social imaginary of MCEF I aim to see the ingredients of it that intertwine the modernist and neo-liberal discourses in shaping the “conduct of conduct” i.e. what Foucault has called governmentality. Based on the analysis of MCEF’s Mother-Child Education Program manual, this paper attempts to discuss the discursive space that makes room possible for the construction of new norms and the formation of new subjectivities. The study locates itself within the tradition of governmentality studies and uses discourse analysis¹ to fulfill its premises.

**MCEF and Its Social Imaginary**

The aim of this section is to analyze the social imaginary of MCEF, to take a look to the “big picture” to see ingredients. In this sense, this section focuses on MCEF’s historical background: its establishment, aims, mission, expansion, institutionalization, its partnerships with the groups from the public and private sector and its programs and projects. Hence, it will be possible to see the constituents of the imaginary of MCEF.

Social imaginary is conceptualized in Charles Taylor’s (2001) sense, which is much more than any theoretical vision. It is an “understanding” of the moral order, “the ways people imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlies these expectations” (Taylor, 2001, p. 23). Social imaginary is much more significant in the course of this study in the sense that it entails the way in, which the ordinary people imagine their social surroundings and it also indicates common understanding that makes common practices and widely shared sense of legitimacy possible. Taylor (2001) states that a social imaginary at any given time is complex in that it combines a sense of normal expectations we have of each other, the common understanding that enables us to carry out the shared practices that make up our social life. The social imaginary of MCEF is articulated and finds its meaning within the discourse of Turkish modernization.

In the context of Turkish modernization, it is well known that, the project of modernization had been in an ambivalent relationship with Western civilization. It has been one of the foremost desires of Ottoman and Republican elites. The desire to be modern had been an integral part of the imaginary of Turkish state. In institutionalizing this imaginary, many reforms in education and health and many cultural practices, from clothing to alphabet, have been radically imposed upon the society by the Kemalist elite. However, with coming of 1980s and especially 1990s, civil society organizations (CSOs) had turned to be a site of rearticulating the Kemalist discourse on modernization (Bora, 2000; Yashin-Navaro, 2002). Various CSOs have carried the desire to be agents of Kemalist project producing discourses on modernization, nationalism, secularism and gender. In this sense, MCEF should be considered as one of those sites where the discourses of modernity permanently produced and reproduced “as a lack” through various techniques mainly concerned with those about motherhood and proper childhood.

MCEF was founded in 1993. MCEF’s mission is to make a long-lasting effect on society to improve the quality of individual’s lives through education. Its areas of expertise are set as early

---

¹ Although it is difficult to give a definition of Discourse Analysis as a research method, in Foucauldian sense, it aims to reveal the tactical dimension, i.e. power relations. Discourse analysis is making connections between knowledge and power. It can also reveal the ways in which meanings are socially produced, communicated and mediated. It enables to find out the ontological and epistemological assumptions and the hidden motivations behind a text, a project, and a statement.
childhood and adult education. It develops and implements various training programs and projects both within Turkey and abroad. On its website, it is told that MCEF is guided by three fundamental beliefs; equal opportunity in education for all; learning is a lifelong process that must begin in early childhood; the child as well as his/her immediate caregivers must be educated and supported (2008a). It is also stated that MCEF has reached 400,000 mothers, fathers and children at 81 provinces. Having such power of effect MCEF aims to increase public awareness about the importance of early childhood education, to increase implementation of its training programs in order to reach more beneficiaries, to focus on research and development of new projects, methods and models, to increase collaboration with both local and international NGO’s, the state and the private sector and to be a reference institution in policy formation and strategy development about early childhood and adult education (2008a). The fundamental problematic of MCEF is early childhood education and motherhood that include so called “educational needs” of children, child health protection, hygiene, pedagogy, and scientific rational child-rearing.

**Pedagogy as a governmentality tool**

Historically speaking, modern childhood has been linked to the emergence of capitalist economies and the formation of nation-states (Hultqvist and Dahlberg, 2001, p. 4). New modes of modern reasoning about the person, identities and power imposed a certain kind of childhood and ways of rearing and educating children. “The modern child has become the focus of innumerable projects that purport to safeguard it from physical, sexual, or moral danger, to ensure its ‘normal’ development, to actively promote certain capacities of attributes such as intelligence, educability, and emotional stability” (Rose, 1999a, p. 123). Nicolas Rose (1999a), in his work entitled “Governing Soul”, investigates how the childhood has turned to be a governmentality object through the device of pedagogy. He asserts that “in different ways, at different times, and by many different routes varying from one section of society to another, the health, welfare, rearing of children have been linked in thought and practice to the destiny of the nation and responsibilities of the state” (p. 123).

Along with these reasoning of childhood, the child has become an idea and a target of aspirations of authorities. The environment of the growing child became a pedagogic concern through various discourses. Children who actually have little to do with recognition of their rights came to the attention of social authorities as “delinquents threatening property and security, as future workers requiring moralization and skills, as future soldiers requiring a level of physical fitness –in other words on account of the threat which posed now or in the future to the welfare of the state” (p. 125). Hence there appears the notion of early childhood education that represents a point at which many discourses surrounding childhood, families, parenting, schools and education intersect.

These knowledge and discourses are constitutive of, and constituted through, the multitude of institutional and organizational methods for managing and producing childhood in early childhood educational settings. Such methods of management also operate in ways that define possible childhoods, while simultaneously creating and encouraging desire for such childhoods within individual children, parents and teachers” (Ailwood, 2004, p. 6).

It is because of these desires that the family comes to serve as a voluntary and responsible machine for bringing up and moralizing of children. Rose (1999a) argues that such an ethical duty could be accomplished by the images of normality. He asserts that “the images of normality generated by expertise could come to serve as a means by which individuals could themselves normalize and evaluate their lives, their conduct and those of their children. Families have come to govern their intimate relations and socialize their children according to social norms but through the activation of their hopes and fears” (p. 132). It is this notion of normality that makes families to self-govern possible. Normality becomes a technology of
subjectivity. Rose indicates that normality appears under three guises: “as that which is natural and hence healthy; as that against which the actual is judged and found unhealthy; and as that which is to be produced by rationalized social programmes” (p. 133). Among these guises, the third one is perhaps the most important one in that it makes possible to turn the familial space into pedagogical space.

In this context, psychology plays a key role in constructing the norms of childhood, in providing the language for speaking about childhood subjectivity and its problems and in producing technologies for cure and normalization. The soul of infant has thus, become the object of government through expertise.

MCEF’s whole existence is defined within the discourse of early childhood education and it always constitutes itself as an expertise.

MCEF’s mission is to make a lasting contribution to society and to improve the quality of individual's lives through education. In its two main areas of expertise, early childhood and adult education, MCEF develops and implements various training programs and projects both within Turkey and abroad.

MCEF is guided by three fundamental beliefs:

- Equal opportunity in education for all,
- Learning is a lifelong process that must begin in early childhood,
- The child as well as his/her immediate caregivers must be educated and supported.

(MCEF, 2008a)

In this quotation, we see three important expressions that are significant to analysis. These are, expertise, early childhood education, and immediate caregivers must be educated and supported. The discourse of expertise lets MCEF to intervene to the family life without disabling the family mechanism. It also disguises the extension of surveillance and control over the family. As will be discussed later, the notion of early childhood education is articulated within the discourses of developmental psychology that establishes the norms of childhood. The third expression makes possible for MCEF as an expert to instill and shape the personal investments of immediate caregivers, the ways within they formed, regulated and evaluated their lives, their actions and their goals. As will be elaborated later, the education of caregivers is to set the connections between the norms of childhood and images of family life, parenting and motherhood. Through pedagogising the will of the mother to govern her own children according to psychological norms and in partnerships with the expert become possible.

Bernstein (1999) states that the pedagogy “is a sustained process whereby somebody(s) acquires new forms or develops existing forms of conduct, knowledge, practice and criteria, form somebody(s) or something deemed to be an appropriate provider and evaluator” (p. 259). In the context of lifelong learning Basil Bernstein (2001) speaks of the “totally pedagogised society” a society in which the government is “moving to ensure that there is no space or time which is not pedagogised” (p. 377). Similarly Rose (1999b) states “education is no longer confined to ‘schooling’, with its specialized institutional sites and discrete biographical locus. The disciplinary individualization and normalization of the school sought to install, once and for all, the capacities and competencies for social citizenship” (p. 160).

In MCEF’s various programs;

Mothers are reached directly, and provided with training geared toward raising their awareness regarding preschool education of 5 to 6-year-olds. As a result, children's educational needs are met within the home environment. Studies show that children who were not able to benefit from 0 to 6 preschool education exhibit deficient social and physical development, which results in low rates of school success and number of years spent in scholastic pursuit. However, raising awareness among
people in children's close environment, such as their parents, eliminates these harmful outcomes. (MCEF, 2008b)

Mothers are here turned to be the object of the expert in that they also turned to be a technician in child guidance. With the discourse of early childhood education, mother has been attributed a vital role in the development of the child, in maximizing his/her ability to think, to reason, to behave and act. Hence, the early childhood education has transformed the everyday life of household into an educational complex. The mother becomes teacher. Besides, if she plays her role well, the child’s future will be enhanced, if she fails to actualize such a learning scheme, her child will exhibit deficient social and physical development. Thus, the relation of mother-child is governed in the name of intellect, un-deficient development both socially and physically, not through coercion or disabling of familial responsibility, but through the wishes, desires, hopes and fears of the family. The receipt of proper child is inscribed within the Mother-Child Education Program (MCEP), MCEF’s flagship program.

Modernizing Motherhood

The analysis here intends to show the shift occurred through which mothers come to be responsible for the physical, moral, intellectual, and emotional development of children within the nexus of discourse of the modern. With the modernizing discourse, the emphasis turns to problematization of child-rearing in a number of ways and its re-definition along scientific lines with regard to modern, hygienic, and rational principles for developing “productive and responsible members of society.” The elaboration of new motherhood encourages the “rational upbringing of children” and re-defines woman as both a space of the country’s “backwardness” and a sphere of transformation and to be raised up onto enlightened rationality. The raise of the “quality” child becomes new sites of surveillance and of production of new type of bodies and selves. The ingredients of these bodies and selves are at stake in the analyses of MCEP of the MCEF. Yet, undoubtedly, before the elaboration of the program deeply, it would be helpful to describe the program’s features and its way of operation.

Referring to the studies that say that children who are not able to benefit from 0 to 6 pre-school education display deficiencies in social and physical development which in turn result in social dramas, MCEF has developed MCEP, a scientific and home-based solution to pre-school education problem of 5-6 year olds in Turkey. It is this program that will eliminate the harmful outcomes of lack of consciousness of importance of pre-school education among the parents. The program aims the mothers of 5-6 years of children. The program consists of three sections; Mother-Child Education program, Women’s Reproductive Health and Family Planning and, Cognitive Education Program. However, the implementation of the program mainly includes the Mother-Child Education program, the rest is implemented as sub-parts of Mother-Child Education program aiming to strengthen the mother-child relationship. Besides, the program aims to contribute to children’s development, and provide mothers with information and support child development and child upbringing. The program lasts ten to fifteen-week and implemented mainly in a school located in that district.

The idea that is “raising awareness among people in children's close environment, such as their parents” (MCEF, 2007) will enable parents especially mothers, to raise their children to become useful members of society is the rationale of the program. To succeed this mission, mothers are necessitated to master the science of childrearing. The mothers, as the program aims, must familiarize themselves with the systematic, objective, scientific knowledge of biology, psychology, and educational theory. Hence, the program is launched to make mothers acquire systematically appropriate knowledge.

MCEP is supposed to teach mothers how to raise their children in more logical manner and how to take care of their own health. Accordingly, mothers can no longer treat child rearing as a
natural, spontaneous affair based on personal or previous generations’ experience, rather it has to be a rational scientific endeavor since children are supposed to be unique type persons with unique feelings and needs. The manual is actually a manual for mothers to teach to them how to live. Mothers are advised to discipline themselves for the goodness of their children. Mothers have to control their body, their facial expressions, the tone, pitch and volume of their voices so that they can form a stable relation with their children.

Frequently, appealing the ideas of developmental psychology, the manual tells and re-tells what children can do or cannot do. By doing so, the manual determines what mothers can do or cannot do. Dividing the infant’s body into four domains of development as physical, mental, emotional and social, the manual tries to discipline both mothers and children at the same time. In formation of a discourse, what is not said is as important as what is said. The manual deduces any problem related to childhood to a matter of development. The program does not refer to any socio-economic and cultural conditions in which children grow. By totally abstracting the socio-economic conditions, and reducing the matter to an issue of proper development, it becomes possible to make the interrelations of socio-economic and development of children non-existent, and put family into a guilty position. If the child is developed in an unwanted manner and turns to be a “risky, dangerous being”, then the family is guilty, since it fails to provide what children need as prescribed in the manual. Hence, pre-school education becomes something to be given by the family. The development of children is thereby defined as a problem of mothering while being isolated from the political, the economic, and the social.

It can be asserted that, the attempt to pedagogising the family is an attempt to organize and regulate the time, space and movement of mother’s daily lives, train, shape, impress bodies of both mothers and children with the stamp of prevailing historical forms of selfhood, desire, masculinility and femininity.

Another aspect of proper child development as described in the manual is the positive/negative techniques in child rearing. The problematic in this section is discipline, punishment and beating.

Many people use discipline as an equivalent of punishment, however this conception is wrong. The purpose of child rearing is not to suppress and improve children with punishment. Our purpose is to support a healthy development of child’s personality by teaching the kid coherent, responsible and respectful ways of behaving. Corporal and emotional punishments influence negatively child’s personality development and hinders kid to develop internal control (MCEF, 2007, Author’s translation).

Alternative to “old fashioned” discipline conceptions, the manual proposes “internal control”:

However, we want our children not to do unwanted, unaccepted behaviors while we are not with them. This is only possible with child’s self-control. We call this as internal control (ibid).

Alongside the stakes of developmental psychology, the child’s body becomes the site of discipline and self-control. The ideal modern self is civilized, enlightened and rational; a state to be achieved through learning to exert self-control. As seen from the quotation, discipline “entails training in the minute arts of self-scrutiny, self-evaluation and self-regulation ranging from control of the body, speech, and movement” (Rose, 1999a, p. 222). Mothers, throughout the program, are encouraged to train their children self-control of their behavior, emotions and their bodies. As explained in the manual, traditional forms of external control such as physical or emotional punishment are condemned posed as dangers for the healthy development of children; “BEATING AND PUNISHMENTS DO NOT DISCIPLINE THE CHILD; NEGATIVELY AFFECTS HIS/HER DEVELOPMENT [DAYAK VE CEZALAR ÇOCUĞU TERBİYE ETMEZ; GELİŞİMİNİ OLMUŞUZ ETKİLER]” (MCEF, 2007, Upper Case in original).
While these external means of discipline are discredited, more indirect means of discipline are resorted such as those much directed to the child’s body and soul; the regulation of children’s bodily functions and surveillance and control of children’s daily activities. The planning of family is surely another tenet of being modern, which also occupies a respectable amount of time during the implementation of the program.

The section consisting of family planning and woman’s health tells on techniques of preventing from pregnancy. Discourses telling the importance of family planning are absent in the manual. The manual, and by extension MCEF pre-suppose the need of mothers as to prevent from pregnancy. However, the idea of family planning and fertility control find its meaning in the course of modernization. Mothers equipped with the information on fertility and family planning are expected to build families with few children who are prosperous, happy and responsible, to raise their physical intellectual, and spiritual abilities, and of their family members, and hence, to respect the interests of the State and society by contributing a stable population size and structure. The idea of family planning and the concern in woman’s health is actually the study of population emerged as a result of the need to control and regulate sexuality and fertility. This is what Foucault calls, “bio-power”. This new regime of power is concerned with population and the docile bodies as the objects of study, control and intervention.

The population’s health, as it is case in MCEP, is concern of modern bio-power. In the manual, mothers are informed about venereal diseases and breast cancer. The bio-power is the mechanism to manage from the micro to macro level of human reproduction and health. In the course of the manual, woman’s body becomes bio-power’s two parallel sites of domination; on the one hand, techniques to exert control over bodies and bodily process, “an anatomo-politics of the human body”, and on the other hand, prevailing social norms and policies serve to regulate mass populations; “a regulatory control: a bio-politics of population” (Foucault, 1986). MCEF’s concern in family planning and woman’s health is the concern in population that aims to ensure the attainment of a “prosperous, equitable, progressive and happy life” for the citizens which is secured in modernization theory.

CONCLUSION

MCEF is well known CSO in Turkey and highly functional that founded to support the state on the problem of pre-school education and spread the idea of pre-school education. In this essay, I analyzed the institutional documents of MCEF including activity booklets and information provided on the web site of MCEF in order to better explicate the imaginary of MCEF.

It is seen that MCEF’s imaginary harmonizes modernist aspirations with neo-liberal emphasis on self-responsibility through articulating mainly three thematic that I called as, pedagogy as a governmentality tool, discourse of early childhood education, and modern mothering. In this peculiar imaginary, which I have tried to discuss in detail, modernist aspirations appear as the core. Reconstruction of childhood as an intensely governed sector of personal existence has been linked to wealth of family and nation. The new reasoning of childhood required new kind of children and ways of rearing and educating children. Along with the new reasoning of children, the child comes to be an idea and a target of aspirations of elites. Hence, the environment where child grows up became a pedagogic space through various discourses. In this sense, pedagogy turns to a governmentality that simultaneously creates and encourages desires which causes family to serve as a voluntary and responsible machine for bringing up and moralizing of children. Families turn to govern their intimate relations and daily flux and socialize their children according to new norms through the activation their hopes and fears. At this point psychology, articulated through the discourse of early childhood education, seemed
to play an important role in establishing the norms, in both providing the language for speaking about childhood and its problems and in producing technologies for cure and normalization.

The psychology the one that is developing, prepare the receipt of the modern construction of normal child. MCEF’s position as an active public actor in the social life is defined by the very existence of developmental psychology. In this sense, MCEF should be considered as site of a distinctive discourse where modernity is continuously produced “as a lack” in the face of a danger. The peculiarity of MCEF’s discourse comes from the domain of articulation of modernist discourse. In this space, family becomes the domain to be intervened via education more accurately pre-school education. In its website MCEF explicitly posits the need for reformation and investment in pre-school education. Pre-school education is defined as a lack and a unique way to provide solution to almost all problems in the society. To eliminate this lack, MCEF develops various projects on the conduct of conduct.

As an ending note, Benjamin (2007, p. 222) once stated that “the tradition of the oppressed teaches us that the ‘state of emergency’ in which we live is not the exception but the rule.” It is argued in this study CSOs, in this case MCEF, always open up spaces of intervention to the people’s everyday life. By abstracting the conditions from its, cultural, political and economic implications in which people live, they are always labeled as the ones who lack of something (in case of MCEF, lack of education, lack of culture, lack of civilization, failed to develop and be modern). Hence, it is possible to construct the state of emergencies as the exceptions, which are legitimate to be intervened and cleansed throughout the society. However, as Benjamin stated, the conditions constructed as the exceptions always remain in society and are never to be cleansed. This takes us to idea that constructing the rules as exceptions only is to make legitimate the operation of power on people’s daily experience. Child rearing, appearing as an exception became a public responsibility, essential for the construction of moral, productive and efficient citizens of the nation.
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