

REFLECTIONS OF *TACTICS* OF WOMEN IN EVERYDAY LIFE: ANALYSIS OF THE MOVIE “MUSTANG”

Gaye Gökalp Yılmaz

Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Turkey

This paper intends to analyse and discuss reflections of patriarchy, male-dominance and micro-resistance that ordinary women create in their everyday life against social rules and expectations that constrain their freedom in everyday life. Within that regard, an Oscar nominee and 2015 internationally co-produced drama film directed by Turkish-French film director, “*Mustang*”, will be narratively analysed by focusing on everyday life practices of five characters in the film. These five characters are orphaned sisters living in a Turkish village and their lives dramatically change after a day at which sisters play with their school mate boys. Depending upon Turkish social rules and traditions girls are expected to keep their sexuality away from stranger males, thus girls in the film are kept from leaving the house, even for school. Beginning from that time, girls’ house become a space of domination and control and girls start to establish their micro-resistance acts against their uncle and grandmother’s hegemonic rules and prohibitions. These micro-resistance acts will be analysed through Michel de Certeau’s concepts of everyday life “*strategies*” and “*tactics*”. Thus, girls’ mundane acts such as watching football match or wearing short skirts at home against prohibitions of their uncle, can be considered as brave and intelligent *tactics* that intend to erode hegemony of their uncle over their everyday life and their bodies. Therefore, unseen resistance is created in everyday life and girls start to create their tactics to find room for expressing themselves and getting independence.

Keywords: Male-dominance, Strategies, Tactics, Power-relationships, Everyday life.

Power and Patriarchy in Everyday Life

In that paper, the main argument is based on power-relationships that create resistance, especially in everyday life. Within that regard, power is taken into account in Foucauldian terms as Foucault states; “...Both power and resistance as multi-dimensional and ubiquitous, as encountered in every human relationship and potentially part of every encounter” (Foucault, 1998:98). According to that approach, power is considered as a matter of every encounter and every relationship. Thus, every relationship based on power includes potential of resistance, where one is expected to be subservient to the one having the power.

Karner deals with Foucauldian power-resistance connection in everyday life by quoting from Foucault as;

“Power, Foucault states, is everywhere; exercised from numerous points, it constitutes a multiplicity of ‘force relations’. Yet, ‘where there is power, there is resistance’, more often than not ‘mobile and transitory points of resistance’, producing cleavages... (and) fracturing unities. In

other words, Foucault replaces the assumption that power is owned by the powerful and exercised on the powerless with a more nuanced account, which discovers both inequalities and struggle in multiple contexts and on every level of social reality” (Karner,2007: 63).

Karner and Foucault emphasize here that, in order to deal with power-relationship it is sufficient to narrate into everyday life, where any one can find many reflections of power and oppression. However, it is crucial to highlight that the power taken into account is not related with physical force or any kind of relation including harsh and direct interference into one’s life. This kind of power-relationship is more likely to be found in everyday life and in family life, since male and female encounters are constructed on historically patriarchal dominance. Therefore, this paper deals with male dominance and power-relationship that lies behind that justification.

Judith Okely studying on *Traveller Gypsies*, establishes a contributory argument for that paper, regarding husband- women power relationship and control. Okely presents that;

“There is a paradox embedded in the Gypsy women’s role. [At home] she is hedged in by restrictions, expected to be subservient to her husband and cautious with other men. ... There exists formal restrictions on the women’s activities...[Such as husbands] discouraging their wives from learning to drive (which) would give them considerable independence: ‘I’m not having you running about, I want to know where you are’... Nonetheless such controls are...unenforceable. I discovered that women frequently conducted business with men alone and stressed the advantage” (Okely, 1983:205)

As discussed above, *Patriarchy* and male domination are significant phenomenon shaping every day and social life. In everyday life and especially in family, male strategies are designed to sustain male domination. Within that regard, women are suppressed and forced to obey rules and regulations, in Certeau’s terms *strategies*, designed by men to provide more room for male hegemony. Thus, the term “*patriarchy*” appears as a significant issue in everyday and family life. Therefore, it is crucial to begin with epistemological background of “*patriarchy*”.

Wilson defines the term patriarchy by quoting from Kate Miller;

“In her ground breaking book *Sexual Politics*, Kate Miller (1970), introduced the feminist use of the term *patriarchy*. The term *patriarch* derives from the Old Testament, paternal ruler of a family, tribe or church, and a patriarchy is a sociological or anthropological category for societies organized into kinship groups and governed or dominated by the elder male” (Wilson, 2000: 1493).

As mentioned in the definition above, male dominance in family and kinship, derive from historical ties and social establishments. Thus, social structures, empowered by social kinship and family ties, provide suitable background for domination of elder male in family. In addition, the scope of male domination and patriarchy varies through social structures and establishments, therefore, definition of patriarchy has been amended within different contexts. For instance, through women liberation movements and feminist studies definition of the term patriarchy has been enlarged with more aspects of male domination in every aspect of life and Marilyn French have provided a more comprehensive definition of patriarchy as;

“The manifestation and institutionalization of male dominance over women and children in the family and extension of male dominance over women in society general. It implies that man hold power in all the important institutions of society and women are deprived of access to such power. It does not imply that women are either or totally powerless or totally deprived of rights, influences and resources” (French, 1985:239; see also Lerner, 1986: 238- 239).

Women are deprived of access to social life, rights and resources through institutional constraints created by male and patriarchal order and women are suffering from lack of equal opportunity for access

to business sector, education and as well as equal rights in family. When patriarchy is analysed narratively, it is obvious to realise, other aspects of male domination in everyday life. For Wilson, the radical feminist theories of patriarchy often are viewed as theories of ideology, analysing the ways that male domination is fostered and perpetuated by culture, religion and science as well as socialization and psychic development and perhaps the most popularized expression of the radical feminist theory of patriarchy has been interconnected realms of reproduction, sexuality and violence (Wilson, 2000: 1494).

Male dominance in family, refers to two different points. One of them is, as mentioned in last quotation, the lack of control of women over their own lives and decisions and most significantly excessive control of women over female body. Control over women's body and sexuality is highly interconnected with reproduction and sexuality. Thus, two significant concepts, sexuality and reproduction appear as significant areas of control where elder male seem as a powerful actor. Women's sexuality and control over women body, brings the concept of "honour" to the forefront, where male dominance and control are justified for protecting "family honour".

In many of the societies male domination, empowered by cultural and religious ties, is a mechanism for oppressing women in family life. Pierre Bourdieu in his "*Masculine Domination*" argues that

"The sexual division is inscribed, on the one hand, in the division of productive activities with which we associate the idea of work, and more generally in the division of the labour of maintaining social capital and symbolic capital which gives men the monopoly of all official, public activities, of *representation*, and in particular of all exchanges of honour -exchanges of words (in everyday encounters and above all in the assembly), exchanges of gifts, exchanges of women, exchanges of challenges and murders (of which the limiting case is war)". (Bourdieu, 2001:47).

As discussed above patriarchy produces male dominance based on sexual division and this division creates taken for granted roles for men everywhere in society. Hull reviews Bourdieu's approach in *Male Domination* as;

The objective structures of the social space shape individual dispositions and people acting and choosing on the basis of these dispositions in turn reinforce the gendered social order. This account of gender difference and inequality differs dramatically from approaches that explain gender oppression as a conscious power play or see gender differences as the product of strategic, performative activity. (Hull, 2001: 351).

Sometimes that kind of oppression may include physical violence, sexual abuse or lack of access to social life or controlling sexual life of women in every aspect by emphasizing the significance of virginity and moral codes. Thus, not only fathers in the family, but also brothers, uncles and even grandfathers become the vein of control, discipline and oppression.

Being a man, in the sense of *vir*, implies an ought-to-be, a *virtus*, which imposes itself in the mode of self-evidence, the taken-for-granted. Like nobility, honour -which is inscribed in the body in the form of a set of seemingly natural dispositions, often visible in a particular way of sitting and standing, a tilt of the head, a bearing, a gait, bound up with a way of thinking and acting, an ethos, a belief, etc. *governs* the man of honour, without the need for any external constraint. It *directs* (in both senses) his thoughts and practices like a force (one that can 'carry him away'), but without constraining him mechanically (he may evade the challenge, not rise to its demand); it guides his action like a logical necessity ('he cannot do otherwise' lest he deny himself), but without imposing itself as a rule, or as the implacable logical verdict of a kind of rational calculation. (Bourdieu, 2001:49).

This taken for granted situation for masculinity and control over women for the sake of protecting family honour, display itself in everyday life oppression. This oppression may be controlling women's body by forcing them to wear longer clothes to cover body, or sometimes controlling women's sexual life

by medical examinations on virginity. Men in the family appear as a source of power, which was inscribed by social structure or moral codes.

Two Significant Concepts on Everyday Micro-Resistance; *Strategies* and *Tactics*

The other significant argument in this study, is based on *tactics* of subaltern groups or people in everyday life against strategies of the male dominated or hegemonic power mechanisms. Within that regard, the film *Mustang* is considered to have significant discourse, displayed in the film, regarding oppression against women in a family in Black Sea Region of Turkey. Therefore, five young girls in the film *Mustang* are taken as a subaltern group oppressed under the domination of their uncle, who grew them up. Uncle appears in the film as a patriarch ruling the whole family, based on traditional and moral values. According to the context and theoretical framework of that paper, in the film *Mustang* male domination is displayed through the character of uncle Erol and his domination is considered to create *strategies* of the power in the family and five young sisters' mundane acts, like wearing short underwear, laughing, escaping from the walls, watching football game and going to football stadium, to resist their uncle and his discipline mechanisms are considered as *tactics* producing micro-resistance in everyday life.

Michel de Certeau, a well-known French scholar on everyday life studies, constructed the most significant aspects of his thinking on mundane practices of ordinary people. Sheringham summarizes that approach on everyday life,

Everyday life invents itself through countless forms of poaching. Poaching is a clandestine use of resources that one does not own, on a territory that is not ours. Certeau places great emphasis on the idea that the everyday has no fixed contents or characteristics, and above all no space of its own. The distinction between tactics and *strategy*, at the heart of poaching is based on the fact that the space of a *tactic* is the space of other. Tactics work within the constraints of a given order, bringing about “manipulations within a system” on the basis of an absence of power, a non-place (Sheringham, 2001:214)

Beginning from mundane activities, Certeau emphasizes two significant concepts, *strategies* and *tactics*, intending to define unseen resistance acts of individuals in everyday life, against any kind of power and power mechanism in their lives. For Certeau, strategies are calculus of force-relationships and assumes a place that can be circumscribed as proper (*propre*) and thus serve as the basis for generating relations with an exterior distinct from it (competitors, adversaries, “clienteles,” “targets,” or “objects” of research). Political, economic, and scientific rationality has been constructed on this strategic model (De Certeau, 1984, p. 17).

Strategies are power mechanisms and regulations that create basis for establishing force-relationships. These regulations can be designing new routes for pedestrians in a city, rules to obey in public transportation or rules of an elderly male in a family that intends to create an order and power structure in a family. These strategies are the words of the hegemon in a power-relationship, that intends to be obeyed by the subaltern one in that kind of relationship. These rules and regulations can be written or non-written in some forms. The significant point to emphasize is that, since hegemon or dominant actor in a relationship creates a calculus of power-relationship and design its necessities and define its borders, the one or group that are assumed to obey these written or non-written regulations, *strategies*, also supposed to create their own mechanisms of resistance against that power structure. These acts, *tactics*, intending to erode strategies of power mechanisms are described by Michel de Certeau as follows;

I call a “tactic,” on the other hand, a calculus which cannot count on a “proper” (a spatial or institutional localization), nor thus on a border-line distinguishing the other as a visible totality. A tactic insinuates itself into the other’s place, fragmentarily, without taking it over in its entirety, without being able to keep it at a distance... It must constantly manipulate events in order to turn them into “opportunities.” The weak must continually turn to their own ends forces alien to them.

This is achieved in the propitious moments when they are able to combine heterogeneous elements (thus, in the supermarket, the housewife confronts heterogeneous and mobile data—what she has in the refrigerator, the tastes, appetites, and moods of her guests, the best buys and their possible combinations with what she already has on hand at home, etc.); the intellectual synthesis of these given elements takes the form, however, not of a discourse, but of the decision itself, the act and manner in which the opportunity is “seized.” (De Certeau, 1984, p. 17).

Tactics that are instantaneous and temporary acts of the weak, can be anything that cannot be considered through the lines of *strategies*, or for a better saying, eroding strategies of the hegemonic one or group. These tactics may not be easily defined since they appear and disappear in a short time, for just getting unseen victory over the powerful one’s strategies. Certeau also defines that tactical manoeuvres in that quotation;

Many everyday practices (talking, reading, moving about, shopping, cooking, etc.) are tactical in character. And so are, more generally, many “ways of operating”: victories of the “weak” over the “strong” (whether the strength be that of powerful people or the violence of things or of an imposed order, etc.), clever tricks, knowing how to get away with things, “hunter’s cunning,” manoeuvres, polymorphic simulations, joyful discoveries, poetic as well as warlike (De Certeau, 1984, p. 19).

As emphasized in Certeau’s terms, “victories of the weak over strong” or clever tricks can be anything in everyday life. Emergence of these tricks and victories depend upon creativity of the weak or subaltern one. Therefore, it is more difficult to draw borders of *tactics* in Certeauan terms. It requires Certeauan approach to grasp and define these everyday acts as *tactics*, since power-relationship, hegemon and his/her/their *strategies* should be determined. However, after determining the calculus of power-relationship, *strategies* and clever acts of the weak as *tactics* appear as seeking the unseen manoeuvres of a mundane hero, that can be found anywhere. Depending upon that perspective, five young girls in a Turkish movie, display how everyday lives of ordinary people can create stories of victory against hegemonic power structures.

Mustang Film Analysis

Mustang, the film referring to free-roaming wild horses, is considered as a movie that emphasize brave *tactics* of five orphaned young girls in their family, where *strategies* are established by their uncle and their grandmother to protect their “family honour” in a patriarchal social setting.

The film begins with a scene that five girls Sonay, Selma, Ece, Nur and Lale, leaving the school and on their way back home they play games in the beach with their school mate boys. Girls got on the shoulders of the boys and played games like that and one woman from the same village starts a gossip and share this play scene to girls’ grandmother. A critique about the film defines the beginning part of the movie and defines girls’ acts as rebellion and fight for victory of womanhood as;

The trouble begins in the first 10 minutes of the film, when some nasty gossip and a misunderstanding turns innocent fun into a minor sexual scandal, leading the girls’ relatives to increasingly shut down their access to the outside world. The Turkish-born French director Deniz Gamze Ergüven balances out the film’s creeping claustrophobia with quiet (and not-so-quiet) acts of rebellion, unexpected humour, and warmth, and the result is a tender and fresh coming-of-age film that honours the bonds of womanhood and sisterhood without taking them for granted¹.

When girls came back home grandmother welcome them with anger and shout at them; “*People tell me that your granddaughters masturbate on neck of boys, since their crotches have touched on boys’s*

¹ <http://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2016/01/mustang-review/423639/>

necks” After hearing these, Nur breaks the chairs in the garden and shouts “*break these chairs also, since they touch our back sides, too*”. Then they rush to their neighbour who was the gossipmonger to tell grandmother about the play with school mates. Lale, the youngest sister, shouts at the gossipmonger; “*You think that these shit- colored clothing makes you the custodian of our morals*” and grandmother slaps on Lale’s face. When uncle comes home, he also beats girls and ask; “*Which one of you act as a whore?*” and take girls to hospital for virginity examination and gets a report that girls are not sullied. After coming home from medical examination, grandmother feels very comfortable and says that, “*If there was any doubt about you it would be impossible for you to marry.*”

After medical reports are taken, uncle and grandmother act together and find it necessary to hide and lock the girls in the house, for keeping girls away from boys that may hurt girls’ purity proved by reports. Then grandmother arranges visits with neighbours and acquaintances and show girls to the visitors for finding possible partners to get married. From that time everything was banned in the house to prevent any connection with outside. These restrictions, namely strategies of uncle and grandmother, were including phones, books, make- up products, computers and toys. Under that heavy restrictions girls were intended to be designed in a new way, with special cooking, sewing and cleaning courses from “expert neighbours” that will lead girls to become desirable housewives. A New York Times Critic about the film states that;

Their real offense is being girls with uncontrollable independent spirits in a patriarchal culture. The anxious grandmother and uncle who look after the sisters forbid them to leave the house, and turn the place into a “wife factory.” Lale, Nur, Ece, Selma and Sonay keep on pushing, sneaking away to see a soccer game, and boys, and the walls keep on closing in. Virginity tests are administered by a doctor; bars are put on the windows; prospective husbands are entertained over tea.²

Patriarchal rules and restrictions which can be considered as *strategies* of the hegemonic power, portrayed in the unpermissive character, uncle Erol in the movie, and inevitably these overdose discipline creates resistance among girls in the house, considered as *tactics* within the context of this study. For establishing these micro-resistance acts, girls first of all, stay together as a unique body and this togetherness are displayed in sunny and bright atmosphere emphasizing the beauties of the girls under sunshine. Girls are displayed as bright and cheerful however, they are not free. They are displayed as prisoned *Mustangs*, corresponding with the name of the film, that are originally free-roaming wild horses.

As emphasized in the film *Mustang*, with the lack of father in the family, uncle becomes the centre of male domination and oppression for his nieces. As supported by the quotations, he uses the empowerment coming from traditions and moral codes and also his mother, the grandmother in the film, creates a strong basis for the production of appropriate girls for potential housewives;

The girls are given instruction by local women in traditional cooking and homemaking as their grandmother sets the wheels in motion to arrange marriages for each of them, starting with the eldest, Sonay³.

While restrictions are intensified and *strategies* of uncle and grandmother become more evident, girls are also banned to wear short and tinny clothes. They are forced to wear dark brown and long dresses, which girls called as “shit-coloured dress” and these dresses symbolize their closeness to the strangers that make them better potential and “*pure*” housewives. These restrictions and closeness arranged by their uncle and grandmother illustrate *strategies* of their uncle, considered as the hegemon in power-relationship in the family. These constraints and bans on girls’ everyday lives, have clear border lines that are obviously stated by the uncle.

² http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/20/movies/review-in-mustang-turkish-sisters-and-traditions-clash.html?_r=0

³ <http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/review/mustang-cannes-review-795711>

Through our analysis in accordance with Certeauan approach, *strategies* constructed by the elderly male in the family are presented through punishment and restrictions in the family. In addition, a subaltern or weak group is required to reveal *tactics* and young girls in the family who are obliged to obey and follow restrictions and bans as *strategies* of uncle, arise as heroic and challenging characters. The most significantly, girls seem to obey the rules or accepting *strategies*, however, they create new manoeuvres and try to find ways to challenge *strategies*. These *tactics* are unseen by the hegemonic people or group and the weak are believed to follow *strategies*. As Ahearne also states; *Strategies* and *tactics* can not necessarily be set against each other as opposing forces in a clearly defined zone of combat (Ahearne, 1995:163).

As creators of brave *tactics*, girls' micro-resistance in the house begin with resisting to wear these clothes, they tear long slits, when they come to their room, they tear of all clothes, wear colourful bras, very short underwear, night robes. Girls in their "limited freedom" in their room, always laugh and have fun since they break the rules, and their uncle and grandmother think that they obey rules.

"As the girls' caretakers add to a list of restrictions—no school, boys, digital technology, sports games, revealing clothes—to avoid them being corrupted further, each sister begins to push back in her own way. That might mean slashing a thigh-high slit in a long, shapeless brown dress, or sneaking out with boys, or secretly spitting in the coffee being served to unwelcome guests. The youngest sister, Lale, quickly emerges as the film's wily hero and audience surrogate—as the specter of arranged marriage quickly closes in on the older girls, Lale's fight for freedom grows more desperate. For these girls, fun isn't trivial—it's political. Their elders treat their pettiness, their materialism, their disobedience as signs of disorder that could make them undesirable as wives, and thus as women".⁴

Although there exists many restrictions Sonay, the eldest sister, finds a way to escape from the house and meets with her boyfriend. Moreover, she manages to get married with him and she gets her freedom from despotic uncle. These poaching acts to break rules, display another challenge to the power in the family.

Lale, the heroic little sister, is a football fan and she wants to go to her favourite team's final match which is only open to women fans due to team's punishment. She asks her uncle for permission and uncle Erol answers with anger; "*It is not your place to be in stadium with men*". After that clear and harsh response from her uncle that is form of a *strategical* behaviour, Lale plans to escape from home to go to stadium and arrange all sisters and they manage to escape over the high walls. During the match girls' happiness appear on TV live broadcast. Five sisters seem very happy and their happiness derive from their freedom. This escape from home against uncle's strict restrictions and making house like a prison, display girls' direct rebellion against oppressive uncle's *strategies*. Since uncle is the power establishing rules, acting against his will can be considered as *tactics* of girls against his power.

On the other hand, since girls are forced to marry as soon as possible, grandmother's authority, power and her regulations also increase. She always regulates lives of her granddaughters by forcing them to get married, wear long dress, restricting talking with boys, using telephones and any kind of communication apparatus. In fact, all these restrictions intend to keep girls' hymens and virginity which means protecting the honour of the family, established on women's body. Therefore, keeping girls in a prison-like home in dark brown clothes are believed to bring honour to family. Within that regard, female body becomes an area of struggle through patriarchal *strategies*. Thus, girls in the movie resist in that struggle to get their freedom and free their bodies with micro-actions to be considered as *tactics*.

Grandmother on the one hand tries to keep her granddaughters from male strangers who can sully her daughters, on the other hand, she keeps a book titled "My Sexual Life" in a wardrobe. It seems that she intends to arrange marriages for her granddaughters and also her girls must be desirable women and housewives which will empower the family honour. This also illustrates the hegemony in the family oppressing every aspect of girls' lives. Therefore, Ece's getting into a sexual intercourse, in Uncle's cars

⁴ <http://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2016/01/mustang-review/423639/>

in the daylight when he went to shopping is a clear and direct resistance against her uncle, grandmother and all patriarchal strategies. She directly acts against the uncle's rules and makes love with a boy even she does not know and that free sexual intercourse display Ece's own right over her body, rather than her uncle. These acts are significant and can be considered as *tactics* in Certeau's terminology, since girls seem to obey uncle's and grandmother's rules, on the other hand when they find a room, they act against these *strategic* regulations and open room for their own freedom over their bodies and their lives.

In addition; a TV programme appears in a scene, only voice can be heard and man speaking on TV programme makes some statements about acceptable women and describe features of a "good wife" as follows;

"A girl must be pure, know limits of what is allowed, she should not laugh in front of others, should not make seductive gestures, she must protect her chastity".

In that scene, uncle Erol listens to the man on TV carefully and girls are making jokes each other at the table and they are laughing cheerfully. Uncle, by depending on the instructions heard on TV does not allow girls to laugh at the dinner table and warn Ece and others. When girls continue to laugh, Erol shouts at Ece and dismiss her from the dinner table. Ece leaves the table with anger, goes to her room, closes the door and then a gunshot is heard. Ece commits suicide and she dies. Her suicide is a symbol that she does not accept to live under her uncle's hegemony and restrictions. Instead of obeying his rules, she freed herself from uncle's oppression, by making her own decision to die.

After Ece's death, nothing changes in the house. Uncle seems the same as a despotic character and since there remains two girls in the house, Lale and Nur becomes his new focus. One night when Lale wakes up, she hears and sees her uncle entering into Nur's room, probably sexually abusing her. On another scene, grandmother is warning her son, not to do it again. However, the temperament in the dialogue is very low. Grandmother does not seem angry and moreover, she seems to know that her son abuses her granddaughters many times before. Thus, uncle seems to be hegemon in the family in every manner including, abusing his nieces. Male domination becomes obvious and uncle as a man uses his nieces' bodies that display a direct power-relationship.

Abuse and strategical domination by uncle and grandmother continues in the movie through scenes and then time comes for Lale and Nur to escape when another group of family comes and Nur is forced to get engaged. Following scenes display the shift from unseen tactical everyday life behaviours to a direct rebellion and struggle against oppression from the uncle. Girls lock themselves inside the house at Nur's wedding day, they do not allow any one into the house and they steal grandmother's hidden money and uncle's car. Before that escape, Lale was always looking for key of uncle's car and when she tries she fails to drive. Then for getting ready for escape, she asks for a young man and a friend of her, to tell her how to drive. For driving lessons, little- rebellion Lale, periodically escapes from the house and come back at night. When the day of escape has come, Lale has already learned how to drive a car. After stealing the car, they drive to bus station in the city center and they manage to reach İstanbul and go to their former teacher's address. This scene corroborates Okaly's quotation on Gypsy womens' chance of being independent when knowing how to drive a car. Thus, the new day in İstanbul begins with sunshine, symbolizing their freedom. Their house which became a place of oppression and prison for them has remained kilometres away and they finally gained their freedom with their brave *tactical* efforts. The movie ends with a scene that girls and their teacher give a big hug each other. The happiness in the scene refers to an explicit victory of two girls against their hegemonic uncle. Their tactical manoeuvres have led to an explicit struggle ended with an escape from the place of oppression and domination. Thus, two girls' heroic everyday lives create new areas of freedom empowered with their tactically led struggle.

Discussion and Conclusion

Everyday life is an unseen and unnoticeable area that hides many different ways of micro-resistance acts. These acts may be very mundane and sometimes may be disregarded. According to Michel de Certeau

and Foucault, whose approaches constitute main theoretical framework for this study, in power-relationships, when a hegemon arises and sets up his/her/their *strategies*, then it is more likely for the ones who are expected to be obedient/subservient, to create their own *tactics* to erode and distort power mechanisms. These *tactics* may be considered as poaching that lacks definite borders, limits or places. Therefore, *tactics* are created with intelligence to provide opportunities against limitations.

As Okely states from her study on *Traveller Gypsies*, husband or male domination in the family can be revealed in a mundane everyday life activity and even learning to drive or constraining a women learning to drive, becomes a direct interference to her freedom. Thus, every mundane activity regarding power relationship is highly sociological and requires a focus on power-resistance perspective. Through that perspective, Michel De Certeau's significant term *tactics* fill a gap in analysing everyday life activities of ordinary people. That paper also corresponds with that perspective and intends to illustrate a form of power-resistance relationship in an ordinary social setting, that is displayed in a Turkish movie. Male domination created by an uncle in a family that exerts direct power over his nieces, appears as a reflection of power that constructs *strategical* restrictions and rules and resistance, from five young brave girls, that creates *tactics* to be freed from being subservient.

As a conclusion; like free-roaming Mustangs, these five girls, display different and micro forms of resistance in everyday life against their oppressors. Sometimes, laughing, sometimes playing or watching football or wearing colourful clothes becomes acts of resistance against restrictions imposed in their everyday life. Heroic and unseen everyday life characters display how to produce new forms of resistance to erode patriarchy and all other forms of power mechanisms in everyday life.

Works Cited

1. Ahearne, Jeremy. *Michel de Certeau, Interpretation and Its Other*, Stanford University Press, 1995.
2. Bourdieu, Pierre. *Masculine Domination*. Translated by Richard Nice. Stanford University Press, 2001.
3. De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*, University of California Press, Berkeley. 1984.
4. French, Marilyn. *Beyond Power: On Women, Men, And Morals*. New York: Summit. 1985.
5. Foucault, Michel. *The Will to Knowledge (The History of Sexuality, Volume 1)*, London, Penguin, 1998.
6. Hull, Kathleen. *Male Domination Review*, From: Social Forces Volume 81, Number 1, September 2002 pp. 351-352 | 10.1353/sof.2002.0048, 2002.
7. Karner, Christian. *Ethnicity and Everyday Life*, The New Sociology Series, Routledge, 2007.
8. Okely, Judith. *The Traveller Gypsies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
9. Sheringham, Michael. *Everyday Life: Theories and Practices from Surrealism to the Present*, Oxford University Press, 2006.
10. Wilson, Ara. Patriarchy: Feminist Theory, *Routledge International Encyclopaedia of Women: Global Women's Issues and Knowledge*, eds. Cheri Kramarae & Dale Spender. Pp. 1493- 1497, New York, Routledge, 2000

Internet Sites

1. <http://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2016/01/mustang-review/423639/>, 10 May 2016
2. http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/20/movies/review-in-mustang-turkish-sisters-and-traditions-clash.html?_r=0, 15 April, 2016
3. <http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/review/mustang-cannes-review-795711>, 22 April 2016.
4. <http://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2016/01/mustang-review/423639/> , 22 April 2016.