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Since the debates on Jineolojî have commenced, discussions with different groups have been of great inspiration for us. So far, numerous seminars, panels, various formations on Jineolojî have been organized in different European countries and in the Middle East. Beside these, conferences were held in three different countries: Germany, France and Sweden. During this period, our main aim was to deepen the debate about Jineolojî. The main precondition for the debate is however to share sources that can be examined. Many of the resources available to the Kurdish women’s movement and to the Kurdish society have not been translated into European languages yet even though eventually, we would like to be able to meet the demands of the different groups with whom we have discussed Jineolojî.

This booklet is a summary of the book titled “Introduction to Jineolojî”. It is a small step to meet the demands of those who are interested in the subject. While preparing the booklet, we tried stick to the method we followed in the Jineolojî discussions and seminars. Our aim with
this short introduction is to provide material to deepen the ongoing debates.

While striving for creating new approaches, the formation of Jineolojî, for us, means also an objection. It is an objection to the social sciences, to their method, their cooperation with power, and their orientalist influences... We believe that any thoughts and criticism of the readers of this booklet may also contribute to strengthen Jineolojî.

Jineolojî Committee Europe
INTRODUCTION

“A science which is developed around women is the first step towards true sociology”
(Abdullah Öcalan)

As science, politics, ethics and many social institutions have stated, 21st century will be the century in which the woman’s freedom will triumph. This evaluation is based on the rise of women’s struggles in various geographies of the World, particularly in Kurdistan. Woman’s struggle for freedom, which has incrementally grown with great values until today, has become a main dynamic of the development of social freedom. Women’s freedom, which conditions the achievement of social freedom, has reached a potential to be able to expand more than ever. The social values that have thus been created must meet a scientific expression.

Woman’s science – Jineolojî – defines itself as a social science corresponding to today’s zeitgeist. Jineolojî’s definition originates in Kurdish. It consists of the
words *Jin;* woman and *Lojî;* science. Kurdish people’s leader Öcalan first used this definition in his book ‘Sociology of Freedom’ written in 2008. He explained why there was a need for this kind of conceptualisation as following:

“The lines referring to woman in the masculine discourse, leaving its mark on social sciences like on any other scientific fields, carry propagandist approaches, which do not touch the reality at all. The true status of the woman is covered with this rhetoric, perhaps forty times, just as the histories of civilization cover up class, exploitation, oppression and torture. Instead of feminism, the concept of Jineolojî (woman’s science) can meet the purpose better (Sociology of Freedom, p.226).

This conceptualisation sparked important discussions in Kurdistan Woman’s Liberation Movement. After these discussions reached a certain level, a working group that would play a fundamental role in the establishment of Jineolojî was created at the 8th congress of the Kurdistan Women’s Freedom Party (PAJK). The unit formed, firstly strived to answer the questions of ‘how the need for women’s science arises’, and ‘which needs
can it meet’. The discussion process that started at the academies in the mountains of Kurdistan, gradually spread within society. Jineolojî is currently organized as committees in four parts of Kurdistan, Europe, and Russia. In our meetings, we start by questioning the link between science and being organised, science and society. We also ask the same questions to the readers: Why is there such a great distance between science and society? Why is science’s relation with society so weak? To put it differently, why is science so distant from society? Social sciences that claim to seek solutions to social problems, observe live social nature as a motionless phenomenon. Why has the link between science and ethics weakened? Why is science close to those in power but far away from society? These questions can go on further.

While trying to explain why there is a need for Jineolojî, we will also search for answers to the above mentioned questions. This booklet contains basic headings on the fields of knowledge structures, methods and practice areas on which the theoretical and institutional framework of women’s science arises.

We hope that inside this booklet you can find answers to your questions concerning
the link between science and society, its methods, our criticisms on science’s relation with power, along with our relation with the existing currents of thought that also deal with the expansion of women’s freedom. We hope that it will also become apparent how Jineolojî’s approach differs from the other currents of thought.

Most importantly, we include in this booklet the knowledge that stems from the practical experiences of the Kurdistan Women’s Liberation Movement and which constitutes main resource for Jineolojî. Let us first answer the question of ‘why a woman’s science’. In fact, Jineolojî’s guiding principles derive from the answers given to this question. We believe that even this process, which is just a start in the creation of science, will cause a profound change in social sciences.

We believe that the scientific evaluations that Jineolojî reaches will be a step forward in renewing the conceptual world, thus giving libertarian content to social institutions. Moreover, we believe that, with this initiative, the universal ties we have and will further establish with the women’s movements around the world will strengthen, and the grounds for discussion will grow.
Jineolojî aims to create a transformation not only by altering woman’s self-definition, but also by criticising the state, power systems, their institutionalisations and the mentality formed around them. Therefore, it can play a crucial role in the establishment of democratic modernity, as an alternative to patriarchal capitalist modernity. For this reason, as Kurdistan Free Women’s Movement, we care about the establishment of Jineolojî, and we believe that we will ensure its development with our moral, political and intellectual efforts.

In the first section of the booklet titled as ‘Why Jineolojî?’ we felt the need to define science. We examine and criticise the relation of social sciences with power in its establishment and institutionalisation. We identify the ways in which positivism penetrates science and causes fragmentation in social structures. Further, we inquire ‘In which way has the relation between the social sciences and power developed and how has this relation distorted woman’s ontology?’, and ‘What are the origins of our statement regarding the problem of methodology in social sciences and the need for change?’. You will find the answers in the following pages of the first chapter.
In the second section, we evaluate the basis of Jineolojî. We included elements of Kurdistan Woman’s Liberation Movement’s practical experiences, which constitute the foundations of this scientific initiative. We present our evaluations concerning women’s resistances around the world and experiences of class struggles and national liberation movements. We tried to answer questions like ‘What is the significance of Jineolojî within the paradigm of Democratic Modernity?’ We also discuss the relation of Jineolojî with the Sociology of Freedom. We try to explain the position of Jineolojî in the women’s confederal system and the ideological party. Then we reflect on our approaches to feminism and look into the overlapping as well as differentiating aspects.

The third section is about the methods of Jineolojî. We hope that you can find answers to questions like ‘what kind of methods does Jineolojî envision in its question to go beyond positivism in the social sciences’, and ‘what are the methods for accessing knowledge and strengthening its connection with society’.

The fourth section includes the areas of action of Jineolojî with regards to the
social sciences, our methodological differences, and innovative perspectives.

We hope when you read this booklet you will feel the same excitement as we did, when we first heard about the concept of Jineolojî. We hope it awakens in you the same feeling born from challenging our thought processes and boundaries. If it happens, it means that we are on the right track because Jineolojî means a radical objection to the existing mental structures. Jineolojî will change society to the extent that our objections are acknowledged. It will flow in the women’s world just like a river finding its streaming channel. Thus, it will develop a profound solution to social crises. Women’s hope for future, which relies upon their conscience about themselves, will grow with Jineolojî.
PART 1: WHY JINEOLOJÎ?

What is science?

The most general definition of science would be human’s effort to understand the universe. Science is a product of using the social mind powerfully to stimulate change in the living universe. Science is an intellectual activity that systematically investigates events and facts in the world; an intellectual activity that does not exclude intuition and assumptions while dealing with scientific data. Essentially, it is a small part of philosophy that has reached precise knowledge. Every formation or subject that ensures integrity of rational relations and ideas in its occurrence is the subject of science.

According to another definition, science, as a phenomenon defined by reason, curiosity and aim, is an endeavour that helps people to reach better life conditions, discover unknown facts and learn new things.

It is an ordered knowledge that chooses one part of the universe or facts as its
subject that strives to identify patterns based on experimental methods and the reality.

It is possible to multiply the definitions but we can see that all of them share the conviction that science occurs as a result of human effort to understand the universe and social needs. It is a meaningful category of knowledge for the wholeness of civilization. In other words, the meaning and value of science can change according to societies and civilizations. Thus we cannot question science without firstly questioning the civilization within which it developed.

Social science is a concept that emerged in the context of ‘Enlightenment’. The aim is to produce experimentally confirmed systematic and secular knowledge about the experienced reality. According to social science, there is a common, universal and unchangeable human nature. The aim is to discover this common human nature. Just as natural law can be discovered and nature can be controlled, human nature can be discovered which opens up to the capacity to control people and society. Namely, it may be possible to establish a universal social order. However, what is seen as universal is in fact the social and
intellectual level reached by Western Europe. Therefore, we can say that the definition and formation of social science since its conception is problematic. The adoption of the positivist paradigm, which is the basic way of thinking of capitalist modernity, by the social sciences leads to obscure the social truth. How could a social science that arises from the desire to take control over societies as well as nature, benefit society and bring adequate answers to social problems; or how could it originate from social needs? How can such problematic endeavour pretend to define woman?

We can affirm that sexist gender domination is not only created by the state and power oriented mind-set, but also by scientism. This is the main criticism we direct to science. While claiming to be scientific, it does not get rid of the spiral of the subject-object binarism. That is due to its structure that focuses on power’s aim to increase profit, instead of addressing social needs.

Positivist science started to define itself as the only valid truth and totally excluded mythology, religion and philosophy in 17th century Europe. This understanding of science, whose forefathers were Descartes and Bacon, has declared itself the only
valid method. It also asserted its authority by amassing the rich knowledge of the Middle East. Under the name of ‘witchcraft’ it massacred women’s wisdom that had been accumulated during thousands of years since the Neolithic period. It discarded the alchemists who defined the universe as macro cosmos, the human being as micro cosmos and believed in a synthesis that is like a child coming from the union of the seeds of woman and man. In this scientific understanding, nature and woman’s identity were turned into objects that should be kept under control, subjugated by the male human mind, instead of worshipping the sacred and secret structure of woman and nature. The science, allegedly free of emotions, beliefs, and values, has become an area in which power, sexism and racism have become dominant. The evaluation of Abdullah Öcalan, ‘Firstly a new structuring of the social science is needed for building a more democratic, gender-liberated and ecological society’, reveals the need for the re-evaluation of social science. The frame of this discussion consists of our criticisms towards the misleading sides and the deadlocks of the social sciences.
The social sciences have not found women worthy of study

The most important criticism we direct to the social sciences is that according to it, woman is of no worth for investigation. Even when it deems woman worthy (!) to investigate, partially, we find highly problematic that it tends to investigate women as objects and the sources of problems. However, women are not the sediment of society, but are the core; and the subject-object sum must be enlightened to present objective evidence of her existence and truth.

When history, archaeology, mythology, and many more scientific fields are investigated, we are faced with the truth that women are the creators of humanity, with their discoveries of many firsts in societies. Medicine, economy, ecology, oral literature, dengbêjî (Kurdish traditional music), agriculture, first musical instruments, numbers, writing and many scientific discoveries are women’s core inventions. These creations were seized, and today women being struck by this, does not change the truth. As a matter of fact, Neolithic technical inventions created in the Toros-Zagros region between 6000-4000 BC are comparable to
discoveries that Europe has witnessed only from the 16th century onwards.

While the truth is so clear, in social sciences, women are treated as a source of problem, not as a fundamental element that initiates socialization. The reason of this is social sciences’ understanding that develops on the basis of rejection of all knowledge structures developed before 17th century. After this process, science has been regarded as the only valid method in human’s effort to understand the universe.

With Francis Bacon's book ‘The Masculine Birth of Time’, nature was delivered to the reason of a coarse human mind. Here, Bacon defined nature like a woman; a ‘chaste bride’, where it must be conquered, covered and raped. The book, which was the source of inspiration for Bacon’s approach, was Maleus Maleficarum published by the Church, which contained the ‘fundamental doctrine’ of how witch-hunts should be implemented. This process that was defined as ‘scientific’ went along with the process of stealing woman’s knowledge and alienating women from knowledge. The science was separated from the accumulation of the collective wisdom and experiences of the society. It became the
domain of the ‘bright’ European white man who would make discoveries; thus, wisdom’s bond with women was totally destroyed.

When anthropologists examined a society, they mostly studied men. They even argued that women could not have built up the first societies due to women’s passive constitution. That is, until gender studies researchers rejected this ‘scientific’ thesis with valid data to prove otherwise. In medicine and anatomy, the same mentality came to the forefront, too. For years the male body was taken as a basis (and it still is), the female body was approached only on the basis of certain hormones and reproductive organs. The structure of the X-chromosome, the functioning of a woman’s brain, the fertilisation movement of ovum and sperm are a few examples for this approach. Even though archaeology made discoveries of women’s statues and paintings, instead of interpreting them for their true significance, they were deemed as prostitution because of these prejudices. Science took over these prejudices and mentality from mythologies, religions, and other knowledge structures with dominant male mentality. Subsequently scientific explanations that were concealed with the
cover of objectivity were created with the same patriarchal mentality. This is a circle leading from Zeus who gave birth to woman from his forehead to Aristotle saying that ‘woman is a deficient human being’ and to Freud saying that ‘women are slaves due to their nature and this is an unchangeable reality’.

Even thinkers focusing on values such as freedom, justice and equality were influenced by this mentality. While Jean Jacques Rousseau said, ‘women are the potential origin of disorder which need to be tamed by reason’, Karl Marx defined women as ‘an anthropological entity and a quite abstract ontological category’.

The founder of sociology, Auguste Comte, argued that because of the size of their brain, women would be inferior to ideal race type. While he limited his research subject to European white men, he thought he obtained scientific data.

One of the main objectives of Jineolojî is to overcome this patriarchal stereotyping and to provide the most accurate definition of ‘woman’ that enables women to exist freely.
Positivism pushed women out of the world of knowledge

Jineolojî is a science born out of objections to conventional science. Jineolojî’s biggest criticism is that of the fact that social sciences are shaped by the positivist paradigm. It is not enough to define positivism as a pure methodology. It is a paradigm with ontological, methodological, and epistemological assumptions. So let’s first list our general criticisms.

Positivism has been shaped by facts. In other words, the truth is reduced to the ‘factual’ results experienced in the observed laboratory. Clearly, this methodology has no connection with society. It deals with how society can be dominated, governed or enslaved. Positivism does not constitute an idea according to social reality. It adapts society to its own reality and determines the needs of society. Consumer society, virtual society, visual society, etc. are the products of this understanding.

Positivist epistemology is based on so-called objectivity. Positivism breaks down the whole subjective-objective reality and creates a dichotomy among them. The observer treats the observation in a
mechanistic, robotic manner. However, the relationship between observer and observed is interactive. The observer has become an entity with its mind-set, class, value judgments, preferences and goals. In other words, ‘the truth develops through the way we look at it’.

Reality resides in the whole comprised of subjectivity and objectivity. Knowledge has both subjective and objective dimensions. The trees, water, seeds and soil are the objective dimension of knowledge. It is the subjective dimension that interprets it, attributes meaning, thinks and expresses.

Positivism is mechanical and deterministic. According to positivism, the universe is works like a clock. If the interventions from the outside may cause small deviations, the system will continue to catch the established balance and move in the determined direction. Development and change are determined. Positivism does not accept other internal influences, interactions, chaos, and multiple possibilities that can have an impact. According to this, everything proceeds according to the specified role.

As the universe, society and life are living things, transformation, chaos, and
different possibilities are prevalent. For this reason, there are always different possibilities in life and society. There is a reality that varies from matter to energy, from era to era, from society to society, and time to space. The universe can be understood in multiple ways, such as the theory of relativity (relativism), which considers theories of society and life, with many possibilities and uncertainties.

The positivist paradigm assumes progress. So the next stage of history is more progressive or advanced than the previous one. In positivist progressiveness there is no choice of human will, struggle, choice and preference; it has to be the way it is. In other words, after the natural society it is necessary to experience slavery, feudalism and capitalist modernity. The laws of nature, history and society have made statism and power obligatory.

However, the formation of the universe and society is complex. The universe, society and life are not orderly organized and simplistic. As things don’t stay on the same base, they do not advance on a linear curve. There is classification in developmental phase. The natural society had not been suppressed spontaneously as a result of progress. The monopolistic civilization process that started with forms
of slavery was not more progressive, better and more compassionate. The process that started with slavery and reached its pinnacle with capitalist modernity has been the period of upmost destruction, wars, colonialism and genocides for humanity.

Knowledge is the accumulation that communities have obtained as the result of searching solutions for the problems they face in their lives during historical processes. While knowledge and science are explained by reason, we come upon the reason a capacity only ascribed to human beings. However, the results of quantum physics reveal that reason does not only belong to human, but to all living creatures. It is known at least for now that quarks and all living beings in the universe have reason. Maybe new research will deepen our knowledge in this regard. For now we can argue that, reason in human beings can be explained by the potential of producing systematic information in collaboration with the community; of meeting the life-sustaining needs of humans; of sense-making etc. Humans have developed knowledge by materializing it as a mentality. The results revealed by quantum physics carried knowledge beyond the definition of ‘the reflection of experiment and observation
on human beings’. Therefore, defining knowledge as a social construct does not contradict with being scientific. Such a definition is also in place to give women a deserved share from the construction of knowledge.

As a matter of fact, long term history analyses showed that women played a determining role in obtaining and carrying knowledge. In this process, women gained the ability to gather knowledge and to deepen it by sharing it with the society. In the agricultural period, women were not only in a position of observers. Moreover, they learnt from the practiced knowledge about nature and their labour, and they transferred these findings as a cultural element to the following generations. Although initially women used their flexible intelligence with the aim of remedying to individual and societal problems, they also needed knowledge to maintain the community. They succeeded in turning the knowledge they obtained from nature into a whole system, creating social and economic structures that maintained a solid united and healthy life.

Positivism excluded women from these processes by explaining the formation and development of knowledge with a hierarchical relation between observer
and being observed. It defined knowledge as findings obtained with experiments and observation. With this method, the origin of knowledge was attributed to those obtaining these findings reflection. Knowledge was seen as belonging to a category that was constructed above the social structure. This mechanism constructed above the society was distributed to social fabric via the tools of the male-dominant system. This process was power oriented. Gaining knowledge was treated as an investment just like capital. Knowledge was turned into a power tool above the social structure and it was distributed under control to provide the maintenance of this cycle. Every kind of theoretical infrastructure was formed so that the society became distanced from the fact that they themselves produce and construct knowledge. This infrastructure was oriented towards an ideological formation to regulate the society. As a result, science was turned into ideology by applying the scientific-technical rationale of domination over nature and society. As a result, the scientific-technical rationality established over nature was put together and science was ideologized. That is how scientism was constructed. Acquisition of this knowledge evolved into the desire to dominate nature, society and women.
It can be said that positivism is the knockdown in the process of excluding woman from the world of knowledge. This process that increased the distance between science and woman took its source from a mentality that perceives the nature as the ‘other’. The idea that the processes of nature can be applied to the social nature has become a universal law. The data formulated with physics, chemistry, and biology were given the status of facts. It was also intended to define the human society with the formulas deemed as scientific data. Society, just like the nature, was handled like an object. Universal, unchangeable, rigid laws were defined for the society. In every geographic area, every climate, every historical period, the same solution and methods were proposed to the problems of the society. It was thought that solution methods presented by the ruling powers would bring forth the expected results. Social relations, conflicts and problems were approached within this paradigm.

The ruling power, which wants to make itself constant, created alienation from nature by appropriating knowledge and intelligence. Examples taken from the nature were shown as the source of institutionalising power and presented as
a model of state governance. Social Darwinism, which developed as a reflection of Newton physics, generated a perception of power as necessity by adapting the laws that allegedly existed in nature to the society. On the one hand, human formed a will to dominate nature; on the other hand the nature was turned into a tool for scientific discourse to legitimise power and exploitation. The statement “Science is power - knowledge is power” was turned into the starting point of social science. Because of this understanding equating the possession of more science-based knowledge with having more power, society was dispossessed of knowledge.

With the definition of the ‘wild nature’, the perception that nature was to be kept under control became dominant. The ‘struggle to survive’ between humans, between human and nature, between man and woman spread through all social fabric like a ring of fire. The tamed nature was metaphorically represented as a tamed woman. The conviction that both of them should be kept under control and curbed was disseminated in the society.

The social sciences played a dominant role in this process. The individual who was alienated from his/her own nature was at
the same time alienated from the nature, society, and the universe. The individual was made a servant to the capitalist modernity by being alienated from the environment and women. As a result, society was made vulnerable to power.

The social sciences excluded metaphysics by stating that science would be objective and metaphysics would be ‘irrational’. In order to make this critique of social sciences to be better understood, it is necessary to correct the definition of metaphysics. Metaphysics is a philosophical discipline, which investigates the principles and the reasons of the existence. However, as stated by Abdullah Öcalan, defining metaphysics as searching the existence only in the divinity, in a creator and positioning it contrary to dialectics paved the way to intellectual colonisation just like positivist scientists intended to. However, our criticism on exclusion of metaphysics from science is related to another issue. Merely physical conditions are not influential in the formation of the existence. If it was, according to the calculation of scientists, a human would be defined as an existence that is composed of ‘ten gallons of water, oil from which seven bars of soap can be made, a sufficient amount of coal to make nine thousand pen nibs, iron to make a
middle sized nail, lime to paint a small coop, a trace of magnesium, and sulphur to clean a dog from fleas. We think that nobody wants to be defined like this! A human wants to be defined with physically immeasurable values such as goodness, beauty, compassion etc. If we agree on a more comprehensive definition of a human, then we cannot exclude metaphysics and content ourselves with scientism. As stated by Öcalan, ‘The facts do no represent the entire reality, only de facto part of it’. When Nietzsche said ‘God is dead’, Western Europe was seeing philosophy and science as the source of all morality, values or order in the universe. Nietzsche addressed that explaining everything with science can lead to disengagement from social morality and he defined this process as ‘nihilism’. He placed the potency of meaning in opposition to nihilism. Therefore, we direct criticism to science’s exclusion of metaphysics.

If we define science as ‘the most advanced interpretation of meaning’, such a close association with power means either a defeat of the science or a serious problem in the definition of science. The relation of this problem with positivism is more than we can think of. Although positivism criticises metaphysics and religion very
much, it strives to solve problems with a harsh materialist approach, which is even more regressive than religion and metaphysics. With its statement of ‘objectivity’ concerning exploitation and war, it ignores its responsibility for solving social problems. Therefore, science strongly needs a new interpretation of meaning.

Jineolojî will work to overcome this distortion of science. It will reveal women’s roles and contributions as founders, maintainers, and developers of society in order to develop the meaning of social life. The realisation of this is possible through a scientific approach that goes ‘beyond propaganda and demagogy’. Therefore, Jineolojî undertakes the task to redeliver the knowledge to its first creator by reinstalling its connection with ethics and aesthetics.

**Fragmentation in social sciences can be overcome with Jineolojî**

The multiple fragmentations in the fields as well as the methods of social sciences led to multiple separations in its paradigm. It resulted in a rooted paradigmatic fragmentation among
politics, sociology, economy, history, philosophy, philology, epistemology, archaeology, ethnology, geography, ethics, aesthetics and natural sciences. Instead of interpreting the society as a whole the disciplines started focusing on narrow topical issues never overstepping the limits of what that they were interested in.

This separation among scientific disciplines was explained by the objectivity and independence of the science. While the perception of impartiality brought along a break off from the social values, at the same time it resulted in the failure to deal with the social fabric as a whole. It tried to interpret history by disregarding philosophy. Universal laws were stressed largely and societies have been interpreted independently from the region people lived in. The intent was to construct a science disengaged from ethics. The result was an interpretation of the society in which women were ignored, made vulnerable to every kind of drives. Women were objectified and paralysed. The aim was to construct a social fabric in which women were made inferior. Science has been disintegrated by a scientism shredded by the powers. The society has been disintegrated. Women who were present in all areas of life have been
disintegrated and turned into a lucrative commodity. It is important to realize the role of science in this process and to criticise it radically for the sake of social liberation struggles.

Jineolojî will question why women, who are the essence of the social nature and creators of community, have no place in the social sciences. Jineolojî is aware of the fact that it was a conscious choice of social sciences to not consider women as a fundamental subject of its studies. Therefore, Jineolojî does not believe that the analyses of woman in the social sciences are sufficient enough. We believe in the necessity of a breakthrough that defines comprehensively woman’s existence and thus goes beyond the multiple fragmentations in other fields of the social sciences.

Jineolojî claims to fulfil the assessment of Öcalan, that a “a new structuring of the social science is needed for building a more democratic, gender-liberated and ecological society”. Therefore, whatever subject of social sciences it deals with; firstly it should come to terms with this need of social sciences and struggle accordingly. A radical criticism and evaluation of social sciences, which have become the strongest castle of positivism
and liberalism, from the perspective of woman and social revolution will be the most basic task of Jineolojî.

Proposing, generating and developing Jineolojî is a comprehensive criticism and intervention to social sciences in itself. If it organizes itself in terms of definition-content, knowledge structures, knowing-research methods, and becomes socialized, we can claim that Jineolojî will bear a crucial potential for a solution in overcoming today’s crisis of the social sciences.
PART 2: THE BASIS OF JINEOLOJI

A. The main base of Jineolojî is the Kurdish Women’s Freedom Struggle

The paradigm of the Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK), which tried to organize and develop its quest for making social freedom viable; was influenced by the left and socialist thought streams. However, since its foundation, woman’s freedom struggle was expressed as a must. The belief that woman’s freedom is the criterion for collective freedom is crucial for the concepts and structures of the PKK. From the PKK’s conception, Sakine Cansız (who was assassinated together with Fidan Doğan and Leyla Şaylemez in Paris on 9 January 2013) strived to ensure that an organization of women play a crucial role.

At its third congress, PKK took the first step towards a distinctive organization of women. The core of Kurdistan Women’s Liberation Struggle manifested itself with the first analyses on the personality of
one. The analyses on personal levels revealed important data on how the social reality influenced the formation of personality. The evaluation made by Öcalan at the 3rd Congress of the PKK, "What is being analysed is the society, not the individual; it is the history, not the moment" can be regarded as an important contribution to the analyses for social transformation and the conceptualisation of it.

The first step of transformation of the freedom struggle that started with turning individuals into an organized power was the foundation of the Kurdistan Patriotic Women Union (Yekitiya Jinên Welatparezên Kurdistan, YJWK) in 1987. This organization challenged the construction of woman and family in historical conditions and initiated discussions on the problems of women organizing. With the advent of the YJWK, the liberation of women came to the fore as did perspectives on national and class liberation. The first theoretical evaluations regarding the patriarchal exploitation of women were made in this process. These theoretical evaluations were contextualized and integrated into the social fabric and then compiled in the book by Öcalan titled, ‘Woman and the Family Issue in Kurdistan’.
YJWK, the first women’s organization in Kurdistan, which developed with a revolutionary and libertarian character, played a crucial role in organizing and carried out important work during the period of 1987 till 1993. The achievements women have obtained and the transformations they have instigated through their struggle for freedom in this period resulted in a unique set of views and theoretical framework regarding woman’s liberation within PKK. Breaking with the mental patterns in society this theoretical framework quickly found response in practice. Further fundamental sociological changes took place in the PKK with the foundation of the women’s army in 1993.

The self-power and self-will that had been gained by the armed struggle, through the continuation and comprehensiveness of YJWK found a response on an organizational ground. The woman's army played an important role in the diversification of the experiences of the Kurdish women and was the source of new knowledge gained from these experiences. It generated a space in which women who wanted to get out of the spiral of capitalist modernity and patriarchy could do so. The basis of women’s mass participation in the armed forces of the PKK was founded on
women’s decision to separate themselves from all kinds of hegemonic relations.

Taking up arms in the mountains to fight for the liberation of Kurdistan created very strong experiences for women who wanted to counter all kinds of attacks of capitalist modernity. While Kurdish women fought for their existence against the nation state, they also fought a struggle for their existence against men on the front-line of the guerrilla. Therefore, the contradictory dispositions within the guerrilla revealed that the alliance between patriarchy, capitalism and state has leaked through all social cracks; thus it is not enough to solve the system through the perspective of class struggles and national liberation movements. It was made clear that women’s liberation had to be developed by a profound analysis of the system at its core. At the same time women’s need for alternative, autonomous organisational structures became obvious. The struggle of women against all kinds of marginalisation and discrimination challenged the social fabric constructed on the basis of power outside and inside the movement. In this process which was termed as the ‘gender struggle’ within the guerrilla ranks, women gained consciousness about self-defence against
the implications of male dominance and against direct attacks. Most importantly, it was understood that women’s freedom was not a matter that could be postponed after the solution of the Kurdish question. The necessity of struggling at all times against the dominant male approach constituted the everyday reality in the organisation of Kurdish women.

There is a link between the fact that the women who are in search of freedom are flowing into the guerrilla ranks. They do so because they see PKK as an organization that answers their needs. In this respect, there was an emergence in women escaping from the urban cities where capitalist modernity set limits on. At the same time a serious rise in political activism and search for freedom took place in a comprehensive manner. The experience and accumulation that emerged as a result of the women’s army existence and doings have laid the groundwork for advancing the women’s freedom struggle.

Kurdistan Women’s Freedom Union (Yekitiya Azadiya Jinên Kurdistan, YAJK) founded on 8 March 1995 became another crucial step in the emergence of the link between freedom and organization. Woman’s autonomous organization was
initiated in every domain of the struggle with the declaration of YAJK, which played an important role in achieving the woman’s self-management potential and politicisation. Its scope expanded in organizational terms from the mountains to the cities. The women’s army led to women emerging as a form of will-power, and becoming a strength in the struggle and battle for existence. The resisting women of the colonised people, experienced in a social sense how they could reveal their will power when they became organized.

The organization of YAJK and its results provided groundwork for Abdullah Öcalan’s theory of ‘killing the Dominant Man’. The exploitative, hegemonic, power-crazed sides of men were being questioned. Also, it was defined that men also needed to free themselves from patriarchal patterns. The theory of ‘Eternal Divorce’, aiming to make the issue of freedom visible for both, woman and man, became an important step to enable both genders to become aware of their own reality. This conceptualization contributed to the awareness of women’s self-power, and to strengthen the grounds to empowerment through their life experience.
The Women’s Liberation Ideology, which was declared in 1998 and is still valid today, was opened to discussion as a theory. Moreover, it was not a narrow elite group that carried out these discussions. All men and women in PKK were included in this discussion process. The ideology of woman was conceptualized according to welatparêzî (meaning ‘patriotism’ – but the patriarchal and nationalist co-notation does not apply to the meaning of the Kurdish word; where ‘welatparêzî’ literally means to ‘protect the country’), freethinking and freewill, being organized, consciousness of struggle, and the principles of aesthetics. These principals created new foundation of life for the oldest colony – that of women.

**Summary of Women’s Liberation Ideology’s Concepts**

The basic principles of the Women’s Liberation Ideology are welatparêzî; living on the basis of free thoughts and a free will; self-organization; the determination to struggle and aesthetics. These principles are further outlined below.

*The principle of Welatparêzî* is seen as the principle that links women’s ideology
to the land, production and culture. Against nationalism and colonisation, the love for one’s land is brought to the fore. It is through this notion, the people have learnt, developed, and protected the fabric of their societies, their material and spiritual historical values. It is as a result of this that the women were able to participate in society by having free will and freedom of expression. It became apparent that the development of women’s intellectual power cannot be dealt with only on the level of sexuality. It is through this notion that women are able to question and develop both, their own struggle for emancipation and their national liberation movement.

The principle of Free-Thought and Free-Will is a notion developed to overcome the patriarchal control of women’s minds. A woman, who is deprived of her self-will, cannot be expected to play a determining role in overcoming a patriarchal society. Having self-will is dependent on having knowledge, and hence, to obtain self-will the woman has to first obtain self-knowledge and self-consciousness. In this regard, there is a strong link between being informed and having self-will.

The principle of Organising is a basic necessity for every thought to be able to
survive and to realise visions. Without it, no vision can become reality. The Kurdish people’s leader Abdullah Öcalan said: “Without organising, the individual is powerless. The first forms of organising commenced with women. Women are the ones who should pay fundamental importance on organising to obtain strength”. Through this, the Kurdish leader has advocated women’s organisation through all levels of society. He also notes “women who rely on the mercy of men are destined to lose”.

The principle of struggle is also one of the main tenets of the women’s liberation ideology. Because women need to fight against the patriarchal system, in order to be able to gain knowledge and self-will to form a powerful force. Öcalan points out that, “It is because of a lack of struggle that the identity of women has been bound between four walls”. He notes that women need to put up an ideological, political, organisational, cultural resistance - in short, to strengthen themselves women need to struggle at all levels, in all areas of society and life.

The Principle of Ethics and Aesthetics has also been considered as a tenet of a free life. Importance was placed on the need to conduct a struggle at war, as a
guerrilla, and in politics with consideration of ethics and aesthetics. It was stated that only in this way, women could be liberated and society could be transformed. Beauty is taken beyond the notion of appearing attractive for the man, to be synonymous with freedom, cultural and ethical values. This principle is brought to life with Öcalan’s famous saying that “The one who fights becomes free, the one who becomes free becomes beautiful, the one who is beautiful is loved”.

The first women’s party, called Kurdistan Working Women’s Party (PJKK), was established on 8 March 1999 in order to render the women’s liberation ideology more practical. The foundation of this first women’s party was an important step in terms of gaining a new perception for challenging the patriarchal system of civilization, and all of its variations and methods.

The organisation of women in their own party took place immediately after the international conspiracy against the Kurdish leader Abdullah Öcalan, which resulted in him being imprisoned in isolation on Imrali Island in Turkey ever since. Öcalan, who described the ‘formation of a women’s party’ as one of
his uncompleted works, saw the formation of this party as a way of ensuring the desired development of the theoretical and pragmatic perspectives of the movement. The organization of the women’s party extended the forms and content of the women’s liberation struggle constantly, interacting with the level of consciousness, advancement and enlightenment in society. Thus, the PJKK widened the scope of its organization and its struggle. Against this background, the name was changed at the third congress of the women’s liberation movement in 2000 to the Free Woman’s Party (PJA). PJA was established with the decision to take universal responsibility and to incorporate the experiences of Kurdish women with those of women from other nations. In Kurdistan, PJA made significant progress in the organisation of women and in finding answers to the question ‘what kind of society women should live in?’ In 2002, the PJA prepared a Draft for a Women’s Social Contract and introduced it to other women and women’s organizations. The draft was put on the agenda during different activities and conferences in order to strengthen the cooperation and dialogues with the women from all over the world. In this context the PJA also joined the discussions on a World Women’s Constitution. Further, the PJA
established relationships and networks with different women’s organizations that have been engaged in the fields of human rights, peace and democracy as well as with revolutionary women’s organizations.
Organisational Model of the Kurdistan Women’s Movement

Along with the criticisms of modernity, Marxist and Leninist organisational structures as well as with its determination to create a democratic, ecological and gender liberated society, the restructuring of the Kurdish Women’s movement came on the agenda from 2004. The new structures were composed of the Kurdistan Women’s Liberation Party PAJK (Partîya Azadîya Jin a Kurdistan) in the ideological field, the Unions of Free Women YJA (Yekîtiyên Jinên Azad) within the field of social and political organizing and the Free Women’s Units ‘Star’ YJA Star (Yeknîyên Jinên Azad Star) in the field of legitimate self-defence and the committee of young women in the field of young women’s organizing. YJA Star as anti-militarist defence units has developed a defence force against any form of violence against women and attacks on the progress of a free society.

PAJK has been organised as an ideological party to ensure the advancement of the women’s struggle in all areas of the Kurdish Liberation Movement. However, in Kurdistan where a women’s renaissance was to take place, the need for a more
flexible and comprehensive, confederal women’s organization was put forward. Towards the further development of a women’s confederation, the Women’s High Council KJB (Koma Jinên Bilind) was established in 2005 as a confederal umbrella organization with the participation of women and women’s organizations from four parts of Kurdistan and Kurdish women living in the diaspora. The Youth Movement (Komalên Ciwan) also took the responsibility for the autonomous organisation of young women in its ranks, giving it great significance for the creation of a democratic society. The struggle for the creation of a free identity of young women was carried out within the structures of the High Women’s Council KJB.

In 2014, the KJB was renamed the Women’s Communities of Kurdistan (KJK). Starting with establishing women’s communes and councils at grass-root levels, KJK is concerned with all issues related to women’s organisational, political, social and self-defence activities. KJK is a system that brings together the visions and answers of women struggles in all four parts of Kurdistan. The KJK aims to empower women to become the vanguard of a movement, which is building up a democratic, ecological, and
gender liberated society. It endeavours to enable women to break the patriarchal system by empowering themselves to obtain a free identity in all walks of life.

The Kurdistan women’s liberation movement has continuously progressed through an evolutionary process of forming different organisational structures. Every step was taken with the objective of developing an alternative, a more progressive, way of life for women and for the whole society.

We make no assertion of having overcome the systematic challenges presented by the patriarchal society for women. For this, we need to continue to organise. We do not accept being passive or inactive. We have inherited the theories and ideology of feminism and see it as our mission to advance it further.

Through works such as the creation of the Women’s Freedom Manifesto and the Social Contract, the freedom movement itself made significant progress. These theoretical and practical steps were all taken with consideration towards women’s emancipation. As the emancipation of women is not only attributed to material gains for women, but also to ideological transformation, theory and practice
strengthened one another. As a result, to overcome patriarchy the need was felt for a more intellectual and scientifically organised movement. Jineolojî aims to satisfy this need and will ensure that the 40 years of practical experience of the Kurdish liberation movement will manifest in developing new knowledge and theories. It will make a crucial contribution to the history of women’s liberation. It will provide ideological foundations for the formation of a system that is centred on women.
B. The uprising of the oldest colony: Feminism

“The feminist movement certainly has to be the most radical anti-system movement. Not only the period of modernity but the whole civilisation and all of its hierarchical periods must be examined in relation to women’s mental and physical enslavement. Women’s freedom, equality and democracy require comprehensive theoretical work, ideological struggles, programmatic and organisational activities, and most importantly strong actions. Without this, feminism and women’s work will have no other meaning than that of liberal women’s activities trying to relieve the system.”

We perceive the above points and criticisms mentioned by the Kurdish people’s leader Abdullah Öcalan as relevant for all women that struggle for women’s freedom. While the dominant system perceives developing women’s movements as dangerous, the traps set up by the system aim to effect women the most. These traps will not be overcome by simply criticising or theoretically analysing the system, but only by women developing a comprehensive struggle.
Without overcoming these traps, women’s liberation, freedom and even the guarantee of life cannot be realised.

Feminism is a significant circle of resistance in recent history. After the second half of the 20th century, feminism started to pick up but also to criticise the male discourse of modern social sciences. On the basis of the subject-object dichotomy, women have been put into the position of an object and it is a significant argument that this constitutes the source of all forms of ostracism. Feminism is the most important source of Jineolojî as it has immense experience and value in the struggle for social liberation. Of course, Jineolojî would direct its initial efforts to investigate, analyse and evaluate the enemy of women, which is the patriarchal class civilisation and capitalist modernity. Our criticisms on feminism and existing women’s movements arise from a perspective that regards these problems as our own, while we try to find solutions. We believe that women can advance if they exercise self-critique and reflect. Therefore, when we criticise feminism, it is with the aim to initiate a process of renewal, with a dynamic towards progress. We believe that there is an urgent need to start these discussions. Our criticisms on feminism are listed
below with the awareness that feminism was created despite many hardships, developed with great struggles of women, their labour and pain.
Fragmented Epistemology

Why did we produce so many feminist epistemologies ourselves, while positivism, capitalist modernity, liberalism and sexist sciences have divided us enough? Of course we are aware that each feminist epistemology considers problems of different domains. But we know very well that this feature alone has not been enough to enable success against the patriarchy. For this reason we must critically observe the methods of fragmentation when trying to organise ourselves.

Starting to develop Jineolojî we considered ‘going beyond feminism, surpassing feminism, and to contribute to feminism’, essentially to transcend its fragmented epistemology with which we did not agree. One could maybe argue that with Jineolojî we are adding to this fragmented epistemology. We will of course propel the formation of knowledge about women’s reality as well as the formation of methods to study women. The terminology we use (e.g. to contribute, to exceed, to enhance, etc.) are not used in a competitive sense, typically imposed on us by the male dominated system, but to enable women to understand one another, to encapsulate their experiences, and to go beyond these.
It is possible to have different women’s movements and intellectual thoughts taking place in parallel, and for these groups to support one another. What matters is that we get together, to build up our collective strength to fight against the intellectual and organisational structures of the patriarchal world we live in.

**The effects of Orientalism**

The assumption that the fundamental problem of Middle Eastern people, especially that of women, is that they are unable to modernise, results from an orientalist influence that disregards the moral-political dynamics of societies in the Middle East. Orientalism made it harder for us to see major obstacles that persist when trying to search for our social history. Those in the West that interpret the Middle East need to abandon and overcome this attitude. Especially Middle Eastern intellectuals, politicians, academics and feminists must take a thoughtful stance in understanding the problems and developing solutions with women’s point of view, in order to enable a strong fight against the imperialist policies imposed on the Middle East. Feminism which inclines towards local cultures with originality, authenticity and
a libertarian approach, should strengthen the anti-system stance and help to understand the orientalist influences and the struggles against this perspective. When feminist academicians do research, it is necessary that they question the social sciences’ preliminary assumptions influencing orientalism. When feminists examine the East from the West, they often do not incorporate the theories that arise in Eastern literature which constitutes a weakness of their research. theories developed in the West have progressed through social needs and contradictions, while in other geographies it is a weakness that feminism tried to fill the remaining spaces. This is why Jineoloji should be constructed in various geographical regions by progressing in different forms based upon regional and local knowledge and experiences of women in the respective area.

**Outlook on organising and socialisation**

Despite the immense knowledge feminism has created, it has not sufficiently taken a role and responsibility in addressing the urgency and scope of society’s need for social change and transformation. For this reason, feminist currents cannot be seen as ‘alternative mainstream’ in the eyes of
either society or statist-power systems. They are seen as more of a ‘hope movements’.

Before we go on with the critiques we must say in advance that feminism initiated the development of women’s freedom from the right point. What was this first step? To decipher the anti-woman thought patterns, methods, ideological attacks that the patriarchal system created. Theoretical investigations made in this respect, have provided to be a solid basis for the struggle against the system. However, based on the results of these studies, feminism was not as effective in improving organizational performance. Different currents (radical feminism, anarcho-feminism, marxist-feminism, eco-feminism, etc.) have developed based on different points of departure of the patriarchal system and the explanations they bring to liberation from it. These differences were not limited to just the intellectual field. It has led to the fight against the patriarchal system, which organizes itself in every area of life, in different ways, resulting in a fragmented struggle.

Today people worldwide are aware that political regimes have risen through state power and injustices. These powers aim to
control and determine everything: law, justice, life and death. In doing so, they try to manipulate the people about reality and truth. It is also important to organize against the system as well as analyse the system together. If one is witnessing the realities of the society they live in, and if they do not raise their voice, but only produce information about what should and should not be done, then one cannot be considered to have an anti-systemic stance. However, it is a characteristic of feminism to be an anti-system movement, and for all other anti-system oppositions, feminism is a source of motivation. Feminism is anti-militarist, anti-power, anti-sexist, anti-racist and anti-fascist. When a movement consists of so many “anti”-stances, it would be a contradictory to its character to just produce theoretical knowledge, and do less in practice. It is problematic that feminism has failed on organising itself and building up strong alliances for social change. These problems need to be thoroughly discussed within movements and rooted solutions need to be developed.
Inability to develop an alternative life model to transcend the limits of modernity

Feminism does theoretically critique modernity, but the inability to practise an alternative life model happens to be its other weakness. While some feminists choose to stay out of the political arena to not ‘pollute’ themselves, the Kurdish women’s movement’s presence in the political arena proved to be effective in social transformation as much as theoretical advancement. The co-chair system in the political field provided important experience and achievements for equal representation. Rather than talking about rejecting modernity in a closed group, the Kurdish women’s movement carried this rejection to society through politics. The convincing findings of feminism expressed in the academic field did not go on to provide a strong perspective on how and which organisations and institutions can fulfil practical needs. While refusing to use the institutional tools of the system, they gradually got stuck between academic boundaries of the system. Jineolojî also has for objective the creation of academies. However, the academies are
not constructed within the current system, they are parallel to it. They represent an educational system that women create with their own strength and resources. Although feminism has intellectually made a radical break from the system, it is problematic that it could not materialise institutionally. The autonomous organising of women guerrillas in the mountains of Kurdistan has created a model of communal life for women – not only in the mountains but also in society. Although feminism claimed there were no clear objectives on to develop women’s militancy, it could not realise its utopia as it ignored the important link between freedom, organising and socialisation. As the Kurdish women’s movement, we are trying to spread the principles of Jin (women), Jiyan (life), Azadi (freedom) within the whole of society. Now, in all parts of Kurdistan there are autonomous women’s movements and institutions.

Among other concrete examples of Jineolojî is the construction of ‘JINWAR’ women’s village in Rojava. It is a utopia becoming reality; it is an embodiment of life founded by women. Instead of conscious women focusing on trying to rescue themselves and separating from society, it is important to spread the consciousness of freedom within society.
For this reason, Jineolojî means to strengthen the links between freedom, organising, and the society. This approach also serves to strengthen the radical democracy and freedom in legal institutions, and to strengthen women’s perspectives and will within existing alternative life models.
Ignoring sexuality as a domain of power

In nature, all living beings’ existence and continuity is ensured through nutrition, protection and reproduction. In human societies, reproduction has been identified with sexuality and unvalued labour of women. At the same time, in capitalist modernity Sexuality has gone beyond the provision of reproduction for continuity of existence and has transformed into a domain of power. Women’s sexuality has been controlled for the implementation and continuity of power. Instead of defining sexuality and its social meaning by disconnecting it from a position of power, it has been conserved as an area of so-called ‘free choice’. Feminism has not been able to define sexuality in an ontological sense. In the development of patriarchal material and spiritual hegemony, the role of sexuality has not been solved sufficiently.

Since the 1970s, radical feminism and lesbian feminism have produced knowledge that deciphered the link between sexuality and power. These were efforts to identify with women’s bodies and sexualities. Pornography was criticized as a capitalist production
trafficking women. However, after 1990’s, these analyses that departed from candid points over time fell into the traps of capitalism. So instead of taking a radical stand against the system, the liberal system integrated parts of the feminist movement and their demands, while more and more feminists began to adopt patterns and practices of the system. Sexuality, initially being analysed in the feminist discourses as a problem of enslavement and domination of society, developed to be discussed as a matter of liberal freedom. ‘Sexual freedom’ has been handled as an individualistic matter. As a result of this, it has not been possible to develop a culture of free sexuality, which is free from dominance and slavery. Therefore we need to create a deeper understanding of sexuality, sexual identities and relationships. Should removing men and sexual partnerships physically from women’s life be considered as a reactive outcome or as free choice? Are these relationships really free from dominance and slavery? Are patterns of power and domination also reproduced in gay and lesbian relationships? How can free sexuality really be achieved? What is the role of women and how is it determined? So far there are only limited answers to these questions.
The need for the transformation of men

Feminism has not been able to systematically overcome the current sexual politics, and happens to reproduce them in a different way. Besides sexual relationships, feminism has not presented theories concerning practical solutions on how patterns of female and male relationships could be challenged and re-established. These should concern also the question of developing new approaches of coexistence and partnerships. Critical analyses of the system and defining ideals are one important step. But we also need to consider that we live together in the reality of a patriarchal society.

In response to this, feminist politics mainly have advocated the formation of separate women-only spaces, without paying much attention to develop also policies and common platforms for gender struggle aiming at the transformation of men. This in fact contradicts with feminist criticism on the patriarchal mind-set and system. Through this approach, feminism in fact fails to be assertive and determined in making men see the need for transformation, to get them to recognise
women’s will, and to get them to respect women’s intellect and emotions sincerely.

Feminism didn’t manage to overcome the image of a movement that mostly resists and refuses. It has not been a successful force in creating an alternative to this world in crisis. Even though comprehensive analyses have been conducted on the dominant patriarchal line of thought, the solutions proposed were mainly concerned with the enlightenment of women. Feminism has sufficiently focussed neither on perspectives for the transformation of men, on the acknowledgment of the links between freedom and gender, nor on a way of organising that promotes social freedom.
Approach to History

The prevailing way of history writing has contributed strongly to the construction and maintenance of sexism. One of the fundamental feminist criticism concerning modern social sciences is that history has been written with an androcentric view. History as correctly illustrated by the pun ‘his story’, has systematically ignored ‘her story’, the truth and history of women. This is why feminism gives no credence to written history and the androcentric viewpoint. However, as women’s history has not been sufficiently disclosed, we cannot expect the eradication of the androcentric mind-set that wrote history without an effort to change the patriarchal mind set. Social sciences are also not exempt from this. The longest period of history, that of women-centred societies is yet still to be revealed. Jineolojî does not just aim to include women in the writing of history, but to actually write HERSTORY, the history of women.

It would be unfair to consider and view women’s values historically through the prism of Feminism only. In certain regions around the world, predominantly the Western world, feminist movements have played a leading role in resisting against patriarchy. However, the world has many
different cultures and traditions. For thousands of years women around the world have reviewed and interpreted their role within society. There are archaeological findings that suggest women in certain locations have taken leading roles within society at certain times in history. We think that it is important for Feminism to take these historical findings into consideration when progressing as a movement. In this regard Jineolojî, also endeavours to make meaningful contribution to writing of HERSTORY, the history of women.

Today, women’s local experiences are highly varied in every country. How fair can it be to present their experiences through the prisms of Post-colonial Feminism, Kurdish Feminism or Islamic Feminism? How much do these currents represent the struggles developed by the women in different regions of the world? We think Feminism should ask these questions, because many women who have conducted a struggle against patriarchy cannot identify themselves in these categories. In this regard, not recognising the experiences and the progress made by these women, not placing the names of their organisations in the feminist literature is an important issue that needs
to be recognised and addressed by feminist movements.

We believe that all women’s movements who have represented values of society and resisted within and against the patriarchal civilisation of nation-states as well as women resisting within the axis of democratic civilisation, should get together to create a women’s paradigm. For this reason, we think the recognition of the struggles conducted by women in all parts of the world and their efforts to record their experiences as voiced by themselves in literature, are some of the most important contributions to the women’s freedom struggles around the world.

**How does Jineolojî approach alternative currents of thought?**

Many freedom movements established under the influence of modernity failed to recognise the reality of women’s suppression. One of the main examples of such movements has been the ‘real socialism’. These socialist movements and states failed to see that much of the capital was accumulated through the labour of women. In the same way, the acceptance of notions such as nation-state
and authority as unchangeable laws of progress, have been among the shortcomings of real socialism. In economics, women’s leading role in labour and value creation has been ignored. Jineolojî, unlike the philosophy of other socialist movements, considers women’s resistance, labour, intellectual thought and theories as the basis for social liberation.

It is important to note that even anarchism, as the most radical movement against the system of modernity, has not managed to provide a systematic and comprehensive criticism of modernity. Without a holistic understanding of the evolution of civilisations, the anarchist movements too have failed to recognise, in their analysis of nation-state, individualism and social sciences, that the seizing of the values created by women has been one of the fundamental issues of modernity. While Jineolojî considers anarchism as an important source, it endeavours to fill the gaps that enabled authority to infiltrate the fabric of society.
The impact of Jineolojî on the Kurdish women’s movement

The main argument we have put forward for the formation of Jineolojî, hence, for the emancipation of women and society as a whole; is the need to link the philosophy of freedom movements with the study of social sciences. If we assert that we want to liberate the society, we also need to release social sciences from the control of the forces in power and re-organise them in the interest of the people. The formation of a women’s party, is an endeavour to create an ideological revolution, developed through self-organisation, creation of a confederal system and self-defence forces. In this regard Öcalan’s identification of Kurdistan Women's Liberation Party (PAJK) as a representative of the philosophy of Jineolojî is important. Jineolojî is going to be a social science that will guide the party and its revolutionaries who implement the party’s ideology.

The difference between the women’s liberation ideology and Jineolojî can be provided through Öcalan’s words: “The distance between ideology and sociology has been shortened. The difference between sociology and scientific socialism has also been reduced. By enabling a
more holistic approach to enhance the exchange between scientific, sociological and ideological thoughts, the creation of a more coherent social science is possible.” In other words, when a scientific method has been developed with the consciousness and practices of ideological and sociological movements, it will become possible to enhance its own alternative systems.

Jineolojî as the science of Democratic Modernity

While Jineolojî considers itself as a starting point for the re-establishment of social sciences, we cannot say that it is completely independent from the civilization and modernity that disregards women. If the topic, issues and movements of women are nearly non-existent in social sciences, the real reason for this is the mentality of civilization and modernity, as well as the structures of material culture. By attacking women, society has been attacked, and by attacking the society, women have been attacked. Jineolojî is the science that strives to end the attacks on women and society, to return to their roots and to
analyse them by overcoming the attacks with women’s intellect and emotions.

In order to end the destruction, created by modernity’s attacks on our history, spirit, evolution, on our worlds of emotions and thoughts, on our female and humane values, and all the truths that make us who we are, we propose Jineolojî to create different forms of knowledge and wisdom. There is no life without meaning! We believe that our ability of giving meaning will increase when considering realities through women’s perspectives. But this must happen without interrupting the connections between meaning, life, society, and women.

“Democratic Modernity should acknowledge woman’s nature and the women’s liberation movement as some of its primary forces. It should undertake the primary task of contributing to its development and create alliances between the two while appraising women and the women’s movement within the reconstruction process.”

In reference to this analysis by the Kurdish people’s leader Öcalan, we define Jineolojî as the science ofDemocratic Modernity.
While Jineolojî does not only aim at becoming a reference point for the self-definition of women, but for all social institutions and segments of society, it also carries the mission of contributing to building up Democratic Modernity. The process of a revolutionary reconstruction of science, its reconnection with society and its dedication to animate, protect, and defend society, has to be led by the society itself.

In the story of the formation of women’s identity, there is a connection between quantum and chaos moments and Jineolojî. To us, this is the answer to the question “What is Jineolojî?” It means to analyse the freedom hidden in moments of creation, liberation, and life, in order to contribute to the building of Democratic Modernity. It is the ability to create scientific, philosophical and activist vehicles to express our potential. Jineolojî criticizes and analyses the closed, cookie-cutter methods of the male constructed sciences. Instead, it corresponds to the holistic and egalitarian experiences of women and all oppressed groups and individuals of Democratic Modernity. It analyses the thought structures created by women over centuries to braid social structures. With Jineolojî, women’s nature and liberation movement as the primary
force of Democratic Modernity will be much more motivated to dig out important arguments from the ruins of darkness.

Just as thousands of years ago moral-political societies have been organised around women, similarly, in the 21st century, Democratic Civilization will be organised around enlightening, organising women who unconditionally struggle for freedom. Women will recreate their socialization in alliance with the other forces of Democratic Modernity. For this creation, in the Middle East, where many of the first inventions of social life have emerged with women’s justice, the women’s spindle turns once again today to braid Jineolojî!
The relationship between Jineolojî and the Sociology of Freedom

Should Jineolojî be considered to be a branch in the social sciences or rather a new point of departure? As important as this question is for social sciences in general, it is also crucial for Jineolojî, as it also concerns the development of its conceptual and theoretical frameworks. Our main criticisms of social science theories concern the methods, perspectives on history, and epistemology. We believe that rather than considering Jineolojî as a discipline in social sciences, viewing it as science itself will be more adequate method of interpreting and conceiving of social history through Jineolojî’s lenses.

It is important that Jineolojî develops a strong social-scientific positioning within the cultural sociology, structural sociology, positive sociology and especially in the sociology of freedom. Jineolojî’s sociological point of view will be placed within the ranks of alternative social sciences, both as the most dynamic and revolutionary branch. We regard Öcalan’s definition of a Sociology of Freedom, which he elaborated in the third volume of
his major prison writings, called ‘Issues in Overcoming Capitalist Modernity and Democratic Modernity’ (in English: Manifesto for a Democratic Civilization), as a fundamental perspective for Jineolojî.

It would also be appropriate to think about a name for a sociology which pays attention to the shortest of moments of creation from the perspective of society. This is what we could also call the ‘Sociology of Creation’, the shortest moments, the ‘quantum moments’ and the ‘chaos interval’, primarily concern creative moments in the social sphere and will be useful for developing the sociology of freedom.

Jineolojî will be the energy, soul and foundation of the sociology of freedom. It will be one of its most stable pillars. This science will be the one that brings about the very much needed revolution and ethical point of departure in social sciences. The conclusions drawn from science will contribute to many of the sub-branches of sociology. For women’s full liberation from subjugation to mentally and physically colonizing history, economy, society, and politics, we say: Jineolojî.
PART 3: METHODS OF JINEOLOJI

“A research method deprived of the women’s reality, a struggle for equality and freedom which does not put women at its centre cannot achieve truth, equality and freedom.”

(Abdullah Öcalan)

Method as a concept describes the quickest way leading to the foreseen results in relation with its aims, habits and prudent approaches. Its establishment after long trials is indispensable for its respective followers.

The male dominated mind has developed its methods in all areas of life and proposed them as the one and only valid truths. For Jineolojî, this is one of the main challenges: To break this static attitude and to reach interpretive capacity and richness by its own methodology. Jineolojî will determine its methods by referring to the flexibility of woman’s nature, her fluid energy which does not fit static shapes, the ability of transformation within
women’s biology, and women’s emotional intelligence.

Jineolojî wants to investigate the overlaps concerning the relationships between life-woman, nature-woman, social nature-woman, in order to understand the ways in which the culture created by women has been reflected in society in the past. It wants to inquire in a holistic manner into the reasons, sources and outcomes of ruptures in historical definitions of women and the transformations of the institutions, structures, and concepts surrounding them.

If we were to summarize: Jineolojî wants to expose which methods justify the attempts to install slavery systems in the geography of the Middle East, where for so long life had been constructed around women and resistance.

What are the methods that can be used? This question has been on the agenda since the inception of the discussions on Jineolojî. Jineolojî can achieve women’s truths through multi-directional methods, which put emphasis on the capability to interpret by breaking through dogmatism and by strengthening mental courage.

We believe that it is crucial to develop methods that analyse the relationship
between humans and society in a truthful manner. Jineolojî constantly reminds itself of the nature of the human mind, its operational orders, structures and depths, as well as of the metaphysical character of human beings. Alongside being conscious of the fact that all methods mostly carry the seals of male dominated minds, it also considers to struggle against these realities through mental alertness. This is one of its fundamental principles.

Jineolojî gives meaning to the transformations and developments that result from the dualisms that emerge in every moment of evolution, as well as their interrelationships and interactions. Jineolojî knows that it can use this method also when trying to understand social nature and especially for the liberation of the individual and society. It does not agree with a definition of dualisms which portray dualisms as opposites with the aim of eliminating each other and which assumes development as product of this elimination process. It finds the method of thesis-antithesis-synthesis more appropriate when analysing the operational principles of evolution and social nature.

It does not accept the dichotomous relationship between universalism-
relativism, circularity-linearity, and globalism-localism. It is not possible to interpret methods and ways that are as numerous as human beings. Likewise, unchanging, evolutionist law-like assumptions of universalism, which lead to linear-progressive conclusions cannot be left without critics. Without accepting the two as opposing poles, Jineolojî views them as two situations that exist alongside each other in social realities, with contradictions and in relation to one another.

Jineolojî does neither get caught up in linear-progressivism nor in eternal circularity. It pays attention to giving meaning to moments and sees the progressive capacity of cyclical developments, as well as cyclical character of progress.

It criticizes and wants to overcome metaphysics which “place ‘mental colonialist regimes’ on social nature’s intelligence and which looks like an external creator”. However, it sees and understands metaphysics of “existences that find their expression in sense and thought”. In order to repair the damage inflicted on human minds by positivism, Jineolojî recognizes the importance of metaphysics with its values and sacred
wisdoms for human spirituality, while scientifically struggling against the instances in which metaphysics is used destructively and ignorantly.

Jineolojî methods resort to a mentality which overcomes the subject-object dichotomy advocated in the positivist science. It does not appreciate the Cartesian method which creates opposing poles such as Us-Them, Woman-Man, Nature-Humanity, Body-Mind, God-Servant, Dead-Alive. It prefers quantum physics’ discrediting of the absolutism of subject-object dualism. It does not favour the separation between the observer and the observed. It refuses to choose between a materialism, which takes the object as the absolute, or an idealism, which takes the subject as the absolute.

Jineolojî is aware that with the development of the class society, the loss of the connection between human being’s emotional and analytical intelligence caused big damage by opening the gap between social and individual freedom. It believes that all living beings have emotional intelligence, which has a simple, but instinctive, decisive nature, a secure and sensual structure, which is not easily deceived and which has a tight bond with life. It shows quick reflexes in life
matters, while analytical intelligence is dominant and works faster in matters that concern choices and changes. Jineolojî values a method in which emotional and analytical intelligence will operate in a harmonic, balanced and mutually complimentary way.

In all its observations and experiments, Jineolojî is conscious of the quantum dualism (when you know the space of the phenomenon, you cannot know its time, when you know its time, you cannot know its space). Its observations and experiments are conducted with this dualism in mind.

While quantum and cosmos physics have interpreted natural and social developments, they invalidated the causal, linear-progressivism paradigm that is dominant in the Western thought. The interaction of many factors influences the outcome of events and phenomena, thus leaving many options open. Therefore, numerous and very diverse outcomes are possible. Jineolojî is aware of social nature’s potentials and possibilities for flexibility, freedom, richness, diversity, transformation and resorts to quantum thought and methods in its researches and analyses.
How does Jineolojî deal with knowledge systems?

Another definition for science is the struggle of human beings to ‘understand the universe’. People do not lead this struggle only in the realm with science. It is also possible to observe this struggle in the fields of knowledge systems such as mythology, religion and philosophy, as well as in the contemporary understanding of science, which considers its predecessors as invalid. That is why Jineolojî explores also the results produced by these knowledge structures. Jineolojî will be able to gain insights on women’s truths, by examining the conclusions produced by the different systems of knowledge with all their negative and positive aspects. It will become clear that the methods which patriarchy introduced 5,000 years ago in its mythological stories are still being used today in different versions by the male dominated system.

Ever since thought patterns with emphases on mythology, philosophy, religion and science have developed, the dominant perception of knowledge has been portrayed as men’s monopoly, men’s invention and creation, and an area under men’s experience and diction. In fact, this
widely overlaps with the reality. To the extent to which these four areas of thought have unconditionally helped the development of male dominated power, science has been disconnected from women and women have been disconnected from science. This is why in mythology, the woman, in the personage of Tiamat was killed by her son Marduk. In religion, the woman has been expelled from heaven for picking the fruit from the Tree of Knowledge and sharing it with her partner. Philosophy has imprisoned woman to the definition of an “incomplete man”. The movements of ideas that arose during the Enlightenment period constituted the institutionalisation of scientific thought. Their first work was to tie women to the pole, torture and burn them alive as ‘witches’.

In order to undermine women’s re-encounter with knowledge and science, and especially with wisdom, mythologies have portrayed feminicides as heroic. Religions have rendered woman to be the friend of a symbol which was the most hated and feared by society and especially by men: The angel of whom it is said that it rose up against God, namely Satan. Philosophy has degraded woman as “irrational”, science has refused to acknowledge her humanity altogether by
not finding it important to define woman as an existence that is worth being examined in any discipline.

The patriarchal world, as the design of the dominant male, saw it as its right to give birth to woman through the male’s forehead in mythology, to give divine commands in religion, to create disgust against women in the field which it defines as the ‘love of knowledge’, namely, philosophy, and to submit woman to the worst tortures in the name of science. And with such games, the male mind achieved power.

The patriarchal world denied that the society that was braided around women ever existed. It stole all the valuable knowledge sources and systems from women, confined them to its ziggurats, schools, barracks, research centres and universities, and called them ‘mine’. By removing women from these processes, it posed obstacles to access knowledge. However, in spite of these clever methods, the knowledge of women still prevails in the depths of life, history, and society. By rejecting the idea that ‘knowledge is power’, Jineolojî quests for women’s knowledge. In fact, by subverting the male-produced knowledge through alternative interpretations, it will try to
give back to women what has been taken from them.

The tracks of this knowledge can be followed through the thought patterns listed above. Jineolojî examines and evaluates both, the positive and negative sides of the methods and thought forms used by mythology, religion, philosophy, and science. It takes advantage of these mutually interplaying and contradicting methods used by humanity for thousands of years to the degree that they contribute to the development of free individuals and free societies. It does not consider or exclude any method as absolutely positive or absolutely negative.
If Jineolojî can create solutions for the problems of social life, it means that it is advancing on the correct path. Therefore, Jineolojî can preserve its claim of being a science as long as it puts on a practical level an end to the mentality and the sovereignty of patriarchal institutions that have infiltrated every moment and every field of our life. Jineolojî will create its own perspective in the core areas that are perceived as areas of crises, and will lead the way to find practical implementations and solutions for them. That is to say, it will develop science as a common wisdom, conscience and action of society without falling into scientism.

Jineolojî will examine the historical developments and current situations in relation with each other to uncover the reasons for and solutions to the defeat of women in these fields. It will generate a perspective for organizing these areas with women’s efforts, ethics and aesthetics. The emerging practical outcomes will be turned into a theory that
will contribute to women's freedom. For this reason, each of the social sciences and their disciplines that fall under the scope of Jineolojî are also enormous areas of action.

In order to make women’s presence visible within the natural society and the class-divided state civilizations, Jineolojî makes use of mythology, religion, philosophy and social sciences (mostly develops counter readings). It establishes academies for connecting the pool of knowledge gathered by women with the mentality of society, and produces institutions and living spaces that can be considered as alternative models for realizing itself according to this mental transformation.

**Ethics-Aesthetics**

Jineolojî claims to be the ground for a new understanding, integrity and collectivism in science. Ethics-aesthetics will be the cement that will keep all of the works together within the areas of cooperation and specific fields. Jineolojî does not engage in any struggle and social project that does not have an ethical-aesthetic perspective. This is the main difference that distinguishes Jineolojî from scientism and from the dominant understandings of the social sciences.
Many philosophical theories have tried to define aesthetics, the theory of beauty. Aesthetics has always been regarded as having a twofold, interrelated, and unbreakable relation with ethics in all philosophical definitions. Jineolojî will also produce the science of aesthetics by emphasising its mental change and transformation.

Abdullah Öcalan said that, “The present conditions of women are neither ethical nor aesthetic”. He draws our attention to change and engages us to overcome the existing reality of women in our own personality, and to create a free women’s identity that would be the first step in the development of an understanding of women’s ethics and aesthetics. Any ethical-aesthetic theory that we create without realizing this will remain inconclusive in beautifying science and life. The spell of the concepts and institutions created during the areas of mother-goddess was about women living with their own identity freely and naturally. Jineolojî will develop this ethic-aesthetic in order to regain this spell. One of the reasons for Jineolojî to exist is to regain our silenced words as much as to raise again our silenced voice. In other words, our idea is to regain our literature and lives in a poetical way. It is to regain
our ability to flow our life into words and our words into life. For this reason, the relationship between woman, literature and language will be one of the issues to be addressed by ethics-aesthetics of Jineolojî.

The evaluation of the Kurdish people’s leader, Öcalan: “Ethics is the morality and the consciousness of freedom, aesthetics is to emanate in line with this consciousness” will be the fundamental basis of the perspective and practices of Jineolojî.

**Economy**

The area of economy is the main field where social crime is based. It is through economy that the society is forced to surrender, particularly women. The role of the conditioned despair of society and individuals is very important in this respect. The “learned helplessness” does not have faith in the advance of change, action and willpower in this field. The basic revolution that Jineolojî should make is overcoming this learned hopelessness. Our economic activities will not attain the democratic communal essence if the idea of ‘living in poverty within wealth’ and making a habit of this idea are not changed. Women, who had improved economy at the beginning of social history,
can also embrace this essence of theirs today, provide economic activities in which the whole society can be involved, and restructure economy as ‘the essential structure of existence’.

Jineolojî considers some of the basic principles of economics. It will aim to develop an economic perspective based on a new labour-value theory perspective that is based on the maternal labour of women. Economic analysis will be carried out for the purpose of encouraging economic projects that are inspired by the ones at the time of the mother goddess era. They should contribute to reviving a collective economic culture, for every society and community, aiming to be self-sufficient, enabling neighbours’ mutual cooperation and complementing each other.

Famine, poverty and unemployment are supposed to disappear in history when the field of economy reaches the perspective of Jineolojî. The economic sphere, which is the main pillar of social life, could be reconstructed with this goal and will power. The idea “The problem in economy basically starts with the exclusion of women from the economy” makes us believe that in order to solve economic problems women should reappear in the
economic field. Further, economic activities should be rebuilt with women’s mind, hands and mentality. With the joint efforts of Democratic Modernity forces it will succeed in organizing collective, ecological and just economic activities, which are the basic principles of social existence.

**Demography**

Reproduction and procreation in living creatures in the universe should be understood in their own uniqueness that has their own conception of ethics and aesthetic. The fact that this comes to light through instincts or a certain level of intelligence does not change its essence. Diversifying and continuously procreating is one of the mysterious phenomena of life. It is the most exciting way of the universe expressing itself.

However, the nature has the ability to set boundaries by creating periods of reproduction to procreating that we had underestimated as savage for hundreds of years. Unlike today’s people, there were natural communities who treated nature as their own child and approached it with great love and holiness.

Unfortunately, this character of the society had begun to deteriorate five thousand
years ago. The obsession of having a male child who was believed to continue the line of heritage and take over the power has become the indispensable principle and the core of the dynastic culture. Sexuality has been linked to continuing the lineage by stripping it of all of its ethical and aesthetic meanings.

We believe that the strategic point about demography is to revive the principle of the times when the matriarchal law was dominant. This principle is: “This is my body, I am the only one who can decide when, where and why to carry a second soul and bring it to the world”. This is a principle that will change the destiny of the world.

Another essential principle is to develop the mentality setting forth that ‘continuing the lineage’ becomes more of a philosophical phenomenon rather than a physical activity, in the society at large. Today’s children, no matter whose seed they are coming from, whoever carried them for nine months in their womb, are always faced with the danger of being the children of nihilism, liberalism, rootlessness and brutality.

One of the basic principles of Jineolojî in the field of demography is to analyse the
Malthusian theory of population and to raise an ideological and organized social struggle against it. In contrast to the Malthusian theory, which was established as a means of patriarchal and capitalist state governance to control the society, Jineolojî aims to develop and organize an alternative demographic understanding that is based on women’s self-determination.

Hereby it will demolish the regressive patterns of demography, and thus ensure that the science of demography is addressed with a new mentality.

Demography is also reviewed as interrelated to the other fields of Jineolojî. There is a very tight bond between the mistaken philosophy of maintaining the lineage and its consequences with economy, ecology and all kinds of social fabric, health, education and politics. Demography is sustained with these sciences, and nourishes these sciences by transferring data to them.

**Ecology**

Ecology is a new science that examines the destruction engendered by state civilisation based on dominating the nature, and the relation between the society and the nature. In the natural
society, established around women, the bond between nature and the society was based on respecting the nature. This bond was destroyed with the state civilisation, and as a result, people became alienated from themselves, from women and the society. The same forces exploited women and nature at the same time.

For that reason, ecology is obliged to overcome the artificial conflict between society and nature by merging with other fields of science. Ecology is also obliged to tell the story about the conversion of the cultures that believed in and respected nature, to the system that is the thorn in the flesh of nature. To do this, there is a need for a strong ideological consciousness and a new scientific point of view.

With this scientific perspective – that of Jineolojî - the economic, social and philosophical ways of integration with the natural environment should be rediscovered. Rather than being an environmentalist movement alone, being an ecological movement based on ethic transformation through the perspective of Jineolojî, it is essential to overcome the alienation between woman-nature, human-nature, and society-nature. Ecology, in this sense, is one of the main fields of Jineolojî
as well as one of the ways to reach an ethical-political society.

With its scientific and methodological revolution, Jineolojî is obliged to realize a liberated society as the third nature, which means recreating harmony between the environment that is defined as the first, and humans who are defined as the second nature.

**History-Herstory**

Looking at history with Jineolojî and organizing history - or even better ‘herstory’ - with the values defined by women establishes a very strong connection between the past and the present life, society and nature. Moreover, Jineolojî’s perspective tells us how the recent history and its values, cultures of resistance, languages, ethics, cults, tales and many more are reflected today. Therefore, Jineolojî considers history as an entity within the present moment, a time, a space, and a memory, rather than considering history as a strictly determined phenomenon.

Jineolojî refers to women, who were excluded from the formal history, cultures, social institutions and units, based on the Öcalan’s interpretation: “The history of civilization is, at the same time, the defeat
and the disappearance of women”, and considers women as the real subjects of history.

Jineolojî has an understanding of history, which is integrated and continuing within life not within power. It is based on the accumulation of cultural and social values and binaries that complement each other.

Jineolojî continues to search and reveal women’s resistances as well as all the values of democratic civilisation resisting against hegemony that has organized and maintained itself through accumulation. For that reason, one of the essential responsibilities of Jineolojî is to reach the truth of women, who have lost a great meaning throughout the formal history of civilization. Our methods aim to uncover the reality of women from the darkness as they allow women to reconstruct herstory rather than annexing themselves to the existing history.

Health

Jineolojî believes in “the wisdom and power of female human being” that Jeanne Achterberg expressed in her book called ‘Women as Healer’; “Immediately after the emergence of human beings, female human was considered as an extraordinary source of wisdom and
power. It was her who can give a soul, save a soul; therefore, she was the one who was the healer of sick bodies and purposeless souls. At the same time, she could injure and kill, for this reason; she had served as a passage to dreams, imaginations and senses beyond the world. Women were mysterious and powerful, especially those who gave birth, nourished their babies from their bodies.” Jineolojî does not accept the denial of this wisdom that has been imposed by the positivist view of the West, and the subsequent appropriation of these values based on the Greek mythology. From the emergence of the symbols of the health science to its inventions, it criticizes the approach attributing the origins of these to the western world, namely the ancient Greece. For this reason, Jineolojî struggles to transform the health sector. Especially in the Middle East where the society has been greatly affected by colonisation, massacres and genocides, Jineolojî strives to turn it once more into the healing hands by examining the wisdom and resources of women in the Middle East and other regions that have been colonised.

Jineolojî tries to compile the labour of everyone, who has made a great effort to cure people without expectations, through
the history. It aims to organize health academies where healers of a new generation can be trained and internalise this point of view. It develops an understanding of education that will enable female and male healers to give training in the communes as well as to the graduates of faculties of medicine in its academies.

**Education**

If education is the transfer of the lived experiences and locally transmitted knowledge to new generations by the society, then the first teacher of the people is the nature. Nature created itself in the evolutionary development of the universe in millions of years. A person who has developed himself/herself during this process has drawn a route in the adventure of being human by knowing nature, learning its language, listening to its warnings, lessons and feeling all of them. Women have been the first learners of nature and the first teachers of society. They educated themselves, men and children. Women never forgot their role as being the learners of nature and the teaching mother of society on the long and challenging path of this social adventure. As they did not deny the source of their knowledge, ways of their learning, the
sanctity of teaching, women always knew well for whom, what, how and when to teach.

The goal of Jineolojî is to make the concept of “perwerde” (Kurdish word for education which is related to expressions with the meanings ‘teaching to fly’ and ‘loving’) vital. It expresses nature and the essence of the act of education, and to live according to the meaning of this concept. In other words, the meaning of “perwerde” is to: Protect especially children and young people from the monstrous educational system of capitalist modernity, educate them with love, respect and raise them with the philosophy of freedom and social values. Moreover, it is to enable children and all of society to take responsibility for creating and managing their lives.

As being a precondition of establishing an ethical-political society, Jineolojî will develop any kind of theoretical academic effort to support the constitution of social education institutions. Jineolojî has to deal with educational activities in depth in order to create its own fields of activism and associates. The field of education has become a vital need in every area of social life. It is related to the question of existence – non-existence, and it needs to
be improved with the perspective of Jineolojî. As the first learners of nature, women can carry into effect the scientific-theoretical accumulation of Democratic Modernity only with an extremely comprehensive education system in the fields of economy, ecology, demography, politics, ethics-aesthetics, health, history and other areas that may be needed in the future. If women together with the society manage to establish an alternative education system, they will also have to save the brains that already have been slaughtered by the capitalist system and achieve the transmission of useful knowledge and a new understanding. In order to create this change and transformation, Jineolojî needs to develop a particular educational understanding and style, which will be in connection with the other particular fields of Jineolojî.

While developing an alternative education system, Jineolojî uses historical experiences according to the nature of society and its unique conditions and needs.

Politics

“If the function of morality is to accomplish the best of the tasks regarding life, the function of the
politics is to find out the best tasks.”
(Öcalan)

Jineolojî starts its research and analysis in the area of politics by dealing with the reality of a woman, who created society and has been the creator of the art of politics. Jineolojî cannot achieve its claim to be a new social science, which is being developed by taking economy, ecology, demography, ethics-aesthetics, health, education and history in its scope, without developing political science. Jineolojî should open political questions to debate in a scientific manner with a libertarian point of view and without breaking away from basic moral principles, in all the fields covered by Jineolojî. It needs to configure itself, as a social science upon that political science will be based on. Jineolojî aims to improve the perception of politics in which all social groupings can participate with their own colours and needs, as well as individuals can participate with their own willpower. When examining the notion of the politics, it also analyses who or what is responsible for such alienation between the society and politics. The understanding of politics based on state mentality reproduces the habits of using politics as a means of deception and oppression. Hereby the
society will always be kept out of politics and will be an object of politics. In order to avoid this, society and individuals need to equip their own minds very strongly. The task of Jineolojî comes to light at this stage: Preparing the society and the individuals for the field of politics on a mental level. Jineolojî, eventually, is a science that is being developed to realize its aim of achieving a free society and free individuals. It is clear that freedom will not progress until appropriate politics have been achieved and implemented. Jineolojî will become meaningless if it does not develop a politics that will encourage the society to pursue freedom, equality and democracy. For that reason, the understanding of politics will be enhanced without breaking its ties with ethics, and science.

Creating and implementing social politics will be the antidote to individualism and the logic of profit-making of the capitalist modernity that have destroyed our societies. In order to develop social politics, Jineolojî will aim to improve the societies and individuals’ level of consciousness based on continuing discussions, research-analysis and data obtained from these. Jineolojî will assume playing a role in encouraging the society to recognize its own power and ability to
manage itself. At the same time attaining mechanisms of autonomy and enabling the ability to use it will contribute to developing the ABC of social sciences through a woman’s perspective.
Jineology claims to fulfill the assessment of Abdullah Öcalan, that is ‘Firstly a new structuring of the social science is needed for a more democratic, gender-libertarian and ecological social structuring’. Therefore, whatever subject of social sciences it deals with; firstly it should come to terms with this reality of social sciences and struggle properly. A radical criticism and evaluation of the social sciences, which have become the strongest castle of positivism and liberalism, from the perspective of woman will be the most basic study of Jineology.

Proposing, generating and developing Jineology is a comprehensive criticism and intervention to social sciences in itself. If it organizes itself in terms of definition-content, knowledge structures, knowing-research methods, and becomes socialized, we can claim that Jineology will become a crucial potential for a solution in overcoming today’s crisis of the social sciences.