

FARM LABOR INTERMEDIARIES IN SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL
WORK IN ADANA - ÇUKUROVA

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ÖZGÜR ÇETİNKAYA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

DECEMBER 2008

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Kayhan Mutlu
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör
Supervisor

Examining Committee

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör (METU, SOC) _____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Şen (METU, SOC) _____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bülent Gülçubuk (AU, AGRI. ECON) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Özgür Çetinkaya

Signature :

ABSTRACT

FARM LABOR INTERMEDIARIES IN SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL WORK IN ADANA - ÇUKUROVA

Çetinkaya, Özgür

M. Sc., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayse Gündüz-Hosgör

December 2008, 133 pages

The general subject of this thesis is about farm labor intermediaries who are important not only because they are transferring and organizing seasonal agricultural work but also they have social relations and interactions with other actors of seasonal agricultural work. This analysis elaborates multi dimensional relations of farm labor intermediaries and construction and reproduction of these relations. These social relations which can be accepted also as social capital and their nature are important for both understanding farm labor intermediaries and seasonal agricultural work in Turkey. Adana is determined as research field because of its long history about seasonal agricultural work. Moreover, changes and transformations in terms of social and agricultural structure taking place in Adana for 20 years are very important factors with regard to understand how farm labour intermediaries reproduce social relations.

Labor intermediaries are the people who are providing and organizing seasonal labor force demanded by employers in labor intense agricultural production in different regions of Turkey. Delegate, backer, or sarge is the some local names of intermediaries using in Turkey. As it can be understood from the function of labor intermediary, it is arbiter between employer and worker. Family, relatives, friends and neighbors are seen as the labor force resources of intermediaries. From the

eyes of the seasonal agricultural workers, intermediaries are not only the people who are finding job for them but also they are the people who meet their basic needs. This is very crucial point, since seasonal agricultural labor force is supplied from very poor regions in Turkey. At the same time intermediaries are important actors for employers due to their controlling functions of agricultural work process. However, the relationship between intermediary and employer is simply defined as business where mutual interests are important. In this context labor intermediation in Turkey has lots of meaning other than finding job for workers and worker for employers.

Labor intermediation is a legal job which is controlled and regulated by law. However, both pervious researches and this study demonstrate that this job is mostly executed as informal. The main determinant factor for this informal execution of the job can be related with working style of intermediaries, namely, face to face social relations that has been institutionalized within time.

Keywords: Seasonal agricultural work, agricultural worker, Elci, farm labor intermediary, Adana, social capital.

ÖZ

ADANA'DA MEVSİMLİK TARIM İŞÇİLİĞİNDE İŞ VE İŞÇİ BULMA ARACILARI

Çetinkaya, Özgür

Yüksek Lisans, Sosyoloji Anabilim Dalı

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Ayse Gündüz-Hosgör

Aralık 2008, 133 sayfa

Bu araştırmanın temel konusu mevsimlik tarım işçiliğinde sadece emek transferini sağlaması açısından değil sistem içindeki diğer aktörlerle arasında var olan bağımlılık ilişkilerinden dolayı da önemli bir oluşum olan tarım aracılardır. Araştırma tarım aracılarının çok yönlü sosyal ilişkileri ve bu ilişkilerin kurulma ve yeniden üretilme pratiklerini sorgulamaktadır. Aracıların sosyal sermayesi olarak da görebileceğimiz bu sosyal ilişkilerin içeriği hem mevsimlik tarım işçiliğinin hem de tarım aracılarının anlaşılması açısından önemlidir. Araştırma bu kapsamda mevsimlik işçiliğin uzun zamandır gerçekleştiği Adana ilini kendisine çalışma sahası olarak belirlemiştir. Adana'nın son 20 yılda hem tarımsal hem de sosyal anlamda yaşadığı değişimlerde aracılarının sosyal ilişkilerini yeniden üretmelerinin anlaşılması açısından önem taşımıştır.

Tarım aracıları emek yoğun tarımsal üretimde ihtiyaç duyulan tarımsal işgücünü örgütleyen kimselerdir. Aracı, emek yoğun tarımsal üretimde hasat öncesi işverenin ihtiyaç duyduğu işgücünü genellikle kendi sosyal ilişkilerini kullanarak bir araya getirir. Bu anlamda aile, akrabalar, komşular, hemşeriler gibi sosyal ağlar aracının temel işgücü kaynaklarıdır. Aracı beraberinde çalıştırdığı işçilere sadece iş değil, genellikle işçilerin içinde bulunduğu yoksulluktan dolayı ihtiyaç duyulan birçok sosyal ve ekonomik alanda ön plana çıkar. Aynı zamanda çalışma

süresince işlerin yürütülmesini denetlediğinden işverenle arasında da karşılıklı çıkara dayalı önemli bir ilişki gelişir. Bu haliyle Türkiye’de aracılık mesleği basit bir iş ve işçi bulma olayından daha fazlasıdır.

Aracılık, çeşitli yönetmeliklerle denetim altına alınmış ve çalışma şekilleri belirlenmiş bir iştir. Ancak, Her ne kadar denetim altına alınmış olsalar dahi mevsimlik işgücü üzerine gerçekleştirilen çalışmalar aracılığın halen ağırlıklı olarak enformel olarak yapıldığını göstermektedir. Bu kayıt dışılığın temel belirleyicisi olarak aracılardan süreç içinde ağırlıklı olarak yüz yüze sosyal ilişkiler aracılığıyla kurumsallaştırdıkları çalışma sistemleri görünebilir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Mevsimlik tarım işçiliği, mevsimlik tarım işçisi, Elci, tarım aracısı, Adana, sosyal sermaye.

To all seasonal agricultural workers losing their lives for bread on the seasonal migration roads in Turkey.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In acknowledging all the people who have contributed to this thesis, I should mention foremost to my advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör for shaping me in terms of opportunities she gave me as a recognized academician. I am grateful for her support in dealing my problems both in my personal and academic life as well as sharing her ideas with me.

I would also like to thank Mustafa Şen and Bülent Gülçubuk for their constructive criticisms which enabled me to reshape and reevaluate my approach and for their support encouraging me during this thesis process.

Although writing thesis process is based on personal effort, friendship and solidarity among friends are very valuable to form this effort. I would like to thank to my dearest friends Çağdaş Gemici, Anıl Mühürdaroğlu, Füsun Tuncer, Merve Çağşırılı, Hande Erintaş, Esmâ Özge Ocak, Özgür Arun, Gökhan Topçu, Ayşegül Özbek, Tanju Kuruöz, Ertan Karabıyık, Ceren Kuşçuoğlu, Gül Çorbacıoğlu, Atakan Büke, Kağan Evren Başaran, Nurhayat Köklü, Kemal Ördek and Aslı Özden for their entity in my life.

I would like to thank participants who shared their knowledge and ideas with me by attending to interviews within the context of fieldwork and my dearest friend Selim Can who has a big contribution to the research by his interest, support and friendship during the days I spent in Adana.

I would like to thank my soul mate and life companion Esra Arı who has never left me alone at any time and gives her love and heart to me from the beginning of our relationship besides her special support in this thesis process.

Finally, I would like to express my thanksgiving to my family for their support all the time and for the opportunities they provide for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Research Problem(s)	4
1.2 Research Field	5
1.3 Research Methodology.....	6
1.4 Importance of the Thesis	8
1.5 Restraints of the Field Research.....	8
2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Conceptualization of Social Capital.....	9
2.3 Social Capital Conceptualization of James Coleman.....	15
2.4 Social Capital Conceptualization of Robert Putnam.....	17
2.5 Social Capital Conceptualization of Bourdiue	20
2.6 Conceptualization of Social Capital In Terms of Research Problems	25

3. RURAL TRANSFORMATION AND SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL WORK IN TURKEY	29
3.1 1923 – 1945: Early Republic Period	29
3.2 After 1945: Opening to the World and Transformation of Rural Structures.....	33
3.3 Differentiation of Rural Areas and Seasonal Agricultural Works.....	35
3.4 Debates on Capitalization in Agriculture and Rural Transformation	40
3.5 Agricultural Structures and Seasonal Agricultural Work in Çukurova and Adana.....	49
4. FINDINGS OF THE FIELDWORK.....	56
4.1 Introduction	56
4.2 The Legal Dimension of Farm Labour Intermediary In Turkey	58
4.3 Types of Farm Labour Intermediaries, Agricultural Workers and Employers in Adana	66
4.4 Demographical Findings about Farm Labour Intermediaries Interviewed.....	70
4.5 Histories of Beginning to Work as a Farm Labour Intermediary	71
4.6 Farm Labour Intermediaries and Seasonal Agricultural Workers	75
4.7 Continuity of Relationship between Agricultural Worker and Farm Labor Intermediary	81
4.8 Farm Labor Intermediaries and Employers.....	91
4.9 Farm Labor Intermediary/ Employer Conflicts and the Maintenance of Relationships	95
4.10 Organization and Relationships among the Intermediaries	99

5. CONCLUSION	106
REFERENCES.....	117
APPENDICES	123
A. QUTATIONS IN TURKISH WITHIN THE FINDINGS CHAPTER TAKEN FROM INTERVIEWS	123
B. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	130
C. DEMOGRAPHICAL DATA OF THE PARTICIPANTS	132

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Poverty in every regions of Turkey, but especially in South and East Anatolia Region leads to migration of thousands and hundreds of thousands people to different parts of Turkey temporarily and mandatorily, moreover results with the participation of these people to unskilled labor market. People and families who are dwelling in rural, but cannot able to earn their livings through agricultural activities or have not any land in their settlements and cannot find a job in urban to earn their lives are the most important segments constituting seasonal labor force.

Since there is no statistical data about seasonal and temporary agricultural workers in Turkey, their number are being attempted to be determined approximately through some variables like size of the land, number of workers needed for a specific size of the land and so forth. There are a lot of seasonal agricultural workers in labor-intense activities such as cotton harvesting in Çukurova, tobacco and cotton harvesting in Aegean Region, hazelnut and tea in Black Sea, onion, black pepper and sugar beet productions in Central Anatolia. In this respect, seasonal agricultural activity is a kind of mechanism that can be seen in many regions in Turkey. Most important actors in this mechanism are owners of the land, agricultural workers and farm labor intermediaries who regulate affairs between land owners and agricultural workers, and distribute workers to several regions in Turkey through their networks.

Basically, farm labor intermediary provides labor force (seasonal agricultural workers) for land owners (employer) in regions labor-intense agricultural production is widespread. In different part of Turkey, these intermediaries are

called as **delegate, backer** or **sarge**. As it can be understood from the definition of farm labor intermediary, it is arbiter between employer and worker. It is close to both employer and worker. In these periods that seasonal agricultural activity is started, neither employer sees his workers or vice versa. Organization of work is done by farm labor intermediary who represents both sides. The main responsibility of intermediary against employer is to find workers on time and make workers to do their jobs properly. His main responsibility against worker is to help for anything during working period. Briefly, farm labor intermediaries are the communication bridge regarding the duration of work, housing conditions, transportation, wages and so forth between employers and workers.

As it can be seen from this basic definition, arbiter has network of relations in both directions. This duplex communication and relationship provide intermediary dominant status and role in this structure. In other words, the power of intermediary results from bringing together the duplex network of relations and therefore making dependent both parties to him. For instance, when we are thinking about a cotton producer (if he is not using mechanical agricultural technique), he needs a tremendous labor force. If we assume that he has a medium land, he needs at least 50 workers. In this case, employer should search and find 50 workers and bring them to production field. If we think that he cannot find 50 workers at the same time and place, he should spend extra time and money in order to find these necessary workers. This situation directs employers to farm labor intermediaries who can access necessary labor force by himself easily. By this way, the role of intermediary between landowner and worker is determined.

Besides, this kind of organization requires other substructures. Firstly, for instance, certain number of workers should be found who will go to Çukurova in certain times in a year. In addition, these workers should be reliable and in a position compelled to such a work. Several factors such as unemployment, poverty, lack of opportunity to access education make people to be obliged to such a work in South East and East Anatolia Regions of Turkey, and the portion

of people who should work in these kind of jobs increases rapidly. In other words, workers who find a job through intermediaries appreciate to him. Because it is the intermediary who finds the job they need. Furthermore, they are their affinities, brothers, uncles or backers. This kind of obligatory relation empowers the status of intermediary. In this scheme of three-actor structure of seasonal agricultural activity, intermediaries look like human resources because of their duplex relations network and their social and economic determinant position in this organization. He combines demand and supply. Intermediary is fed economically and socially by both supply and demand in this process. If everything goes well, the organization like this is guaranteed next year.

The working system of farm labor intermediaries can be defined briefly like this: to communicate with landowners before harvest and learn the amount of labor force required for that year. In addition, he notices workers when they should be on land. This kind of communication includes only verbal agreement. There is not any written or formal agreement between landowner and intermediary. Commitment is a kind of assurance. However, especially employee sometimes wants to sign a bond with intermediary to guarantee himself/herself in case of unexpected situation. The bond includes advance paid by employee to intermediary. The intermediary uses this advance payment to meet needs of workers working with him/her. If he intermediary cannot get enough advance payment from employee, he/she meets needs of workers by using his/her own economic resources. In addition, since they have not any regular job and income in the place they are living, agricultural workers are condemned to this advance payment or meeting their daily needs by intermediary. By this way, intermediary enchains workers to himself through these ways in order to make them participate to labor force when necessary. Meeting workers' needs and advance payment can be seen as a work contract between two sides.

When it is the time of working, the responsibilities of intermediaries differ with regard to workers' types that whether they are temporary or settled. If the workers

of intermediary come from outside the working place, the intermediary arranges transportation and brings them to previously determined residential area. On the other hand, if the workers both live and work in same place, their daily internal transportation is arranged by employee. Completing works on time, satisfying employer's demands and workers' needs can be seen as the prior responsibilities of the intermediary. In addition to this, when the workers come to working place temporarily responsibilities of the intermediary is increase. Regulating temporary residential area, ensuring the security of this place, providing clean drinking water, meeting daily needs of workers, preventing conflicts among the workers, health problems and so forth of workers can be counted as some important responsibilities of the intermediary.

Farm labor intermediary is not an informal job. Legal framework of farm labor intermediary in Turkey is determined through some regulations by Labour Institution (İŞKUR) and Ministry of Labour and Social Security. In other words, farm labor intermediaries are "real and corporate" on the basis of state. However, both previous studies related to subject and findings of this study clearly indicate that intermediaries mostly work out of this legal frame.

1.1 Research Problem(s)

It is a solid fact that seasonal agricultural work is still widespread in Turkey. The context-specific historical development of seasonal agricultural work in Turkey has been examined in various researches and the conditions of organization of such labor have been put forth many times. General socio-economical and cultural character of seasonal agricultural work has also been explored in these studies. But, the number of detailed sociological studies about agricultural labor intermediaries, who compose a crucial social category within seasonal agricultural work and who acquire different characters in the social stratum depending on the characteristic of the work, is limited. On the other hand, since the seasonal agricultural work became visible in 1950-60s, it still continues to be affected by

many social and economical developments in Turkey. Forced migration, increasing poverty, agricultural structures changing due to economical and ecological policies are naturally closely related to seasonal agricultural labor.

This research, departing from the points mentioned above, intends to look in depth to who the farm labor intermediaries are and how they work through the social and economical relations and networks formed within seasonal agricultural work. Social relations of the intermediaries are very crucial for the issue of seasonal agricultural work. The intermediaries can continue or not continue their professional activities both depending on the quality and quantity of their social relations and trying to reproduce these relations in changing conditions. In short, who is known and recognized and how they are known becomes very important in seasonal agricultural work as an organization. Thus, as much as individual attributes, social relations that intermediaries develop and reproduce can also be seen as what differentiates them from other seasonal workers who are mostly their relatives, neighbors and friends and whom they work together with. In my opinion, economic accumulation and social status which are the main parameters that differentiate the intermediaries from seasonal agricultural workers with whom they almost share the same social stratum, is closely related to social capital they own and the practices to develop this social capital. Dependent character and unequal structure of intermediaries-seasonal agricultural worker relationship can be inquired in formation and development of these social relations. In this context, this research aims to move from the concept of social capital and hence discuss the content and results of multi dimensional social relations of the intermediaries.

1.2. Research Field

This research will focus on only the farm labor intermediaries in Adana-Çukurova region due to economical restrictions. The main reason of this can be juxtaposed as in the following:

- The requirement of high labor force in the Karataş and Seyhan lowland of Adana due to production of vegetable, citrus and cotton,
- These production requires more working period compared to other agricultural products in hoeing and harvest terms and therefore this facilitates the access to labor intermediaries,
- The intense of seasonal work force is higher than other regions as previous researches have already demonstrated,
- Labor intermediaries are dwelling more than any other regions as related researches shows,
- Labor intermediaries who are working in Adana are organized under “Çukurova Farm Labor Intermediaries Association”,
- There is a long history of seasonal agricultural activities in this region because of the cotton production, especially the production of cotton in this region began in the late Ottoman Empire period,
- Labor intermediaries prefer to work in this region, since here is close to Şanlıurfa, Diyarbakır, Adıyaman, Kahramanmaraş where most of the labor force is provided from.

1.3. Research Methodology

In this research, a desk-top review and qualitative interview¹ techniques were used. Within the desk-top review previous research, reports, related statistics and historical materials were collected. In the scope of fieldwork, I went to Adana and I interviewed with 10 farm labor intermediaries profoundly. In addition to this, I interviewed with The President of Çukurova Farmers’ Association, The President of Çukurova Farm Labor Intermediaries’ Association, Regional Representative of TURK-IS (Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions), Adana Branch of Turkey Labour Institution. The reason why I used qualitative method is that there is no certain number of farm labor intermediaries. This job is mostly performed informally. Under normal conditions, as we have already stated farm

¹ Interview questions are given an Appendix B.

labor intermediaries should be registered to Labour Institution in order to perform this job. However farm labor intermediaries do not prefer this and therefore it is impossible to access realistic data in this respect. In addition, since there is common working condition of intermediaries, they have information about themselves and they can explain general framework of themselves, I prefer to use qualitative interview technique.

In addition to first hand data, the findings of the research named “*Baseline Survey on Worst Forms of Child Labor in the Agricultural Sector: Children in Cotton Harvesting in Karataş, Adana*” supported by International Labor Organization Turkey Office in 2002 were used. The researcher participated in this research as a field staff for 15 days and conducted almost one hundred surveys in 2002.

The farm labor intermediaries² participating interviews were selected randomly. Within the context of fieldwork, two of the intermediaries interviewed are boarder, two of them were retired and the rest of them are members of the association. Intermediaries who are the members of the association and retired were reached by the help of association. Interviews with the members were held in the head quarter of the association. On the other hand, interviews with retired ones were conducted in Adana-Doğankent where they live.

Interviews with broader intermediaries were held in Yemişli village of Karataş district of Adana. These intermediaries were reached by the help of the officers from Social Support Center of Yemişli Village established in 2005 for children working in agricultural works. Interviews were conducted in this center.

² Detailed informations are given an Appendix C.

1.4. Importance of the Thesis

As mentioned before, there are researches about seasonal travelling and temporary agricultural labor and they develop different point of views about this phenomenon. The reason why farm labor intermediaries are included in these researches is that they are also part of this system. However there is limited research that evaluates farm labor intermediaries as a single agent. This situation reflects the significance of this thesis. I believe that this research which analyzes the detailed role of farm labor intermediaries within the system will contribute to literature with respect to structure of seasonal agricultural activity.

1.5. The Restraints of the Field Research

Because of the time and economic restraints, field research and study area were limited to Adana. At the same time, because of the mentioned restraints field research was conducted for one week. In this short period, detailed interviews with agricultural workers could not be done. This deficiency of thesis was tried to minimize by the observations and field notes taken by researcher during the above mentioned field research in 2002 in Adana- Karataş.

In the period of field research, an appointment could not be taken from Adana Branch of Turkey Labour Institution which is one of the most important sides of the research subject. Therefore, planned interview with this institution could not be done. However, statistical data related to labor intermediaries since 2002 were obtained from the institution

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Introduction

This thesis focuses on the farm labour intermediaries within the structure of seasonal agriculture work. Two conceptualizations will be employed simultaneously. As seasonal agricultural work and farm labour intermediary are not immediately emerged phenomenon, rather both are closely connected with the dynamics in the transformation of rural in Turkey. For that reason, in third chapter will attempt to explain related transformation and discussions about how seasonal agricultural activity and farm labour intermediaries being widespread in different regions of Turkey based on labor intensive agricultural production. On the other hand, because of that farm labor intermediaries and their social relations within the seasonal agricultural work is main subject matter of the thesis, the concept of social capital giving unique clues about social relations will be firstly tried to explain with respect to main proposes of the thesis.

2.2. Conceptualization of Social Capital

Basically, the definition of social capital “is capital captured through social relations with expected return in the marketplace.” (Lin, 2001). If we divide this definition into its subjects, the most important concepts are capital, social relations and benefit gain expectation through using these relations. While having a general look through the issue, these subjects also reveal the cornerstones of the concept. Briefly, the reference of social capital is “relations are important” (Field, 2006) and these relations can be used and modified on the basis of some expectations and can lead to different returns like status, power and profit.

John Field (2006) basically discusses two arguments of the concept in his collected work related with social capital. The first is that individuals live within a social structure and construct relations through social networks. These networks and communication resources can be shared with others if it is the right time. Other important argument is that individuals can deal with their problems which are difficult to handle without anybody by mobilizing their relations within a social structure.

The significant point in social capital is having a network and activating relationships within this network when necessary. When examining this issue generally, social networks can be beneficial for both individuals and groups. For instance, these benefits can be an employment procedure or acquiring a critical position through using social capital obtained while working. As can be seen from this picture, there is a close connection between social capital and social networks. According to some theoreticians like Lin (2001), Field (2006), social relations frequently lead to a powerful social capital.

As for Nan Lin (2001), powerful social networks have four main advantages on social capital. First one of them is "information richness and flow". This makes easy to mobilize resources. In addition, standing in a critical position within a market or specific field (e.g. seasonal agricultural activity) also improves the quality of information. This kind of information obtained through such networks can also be used in order to acquire an important position or improve competitive capacity. Secondly, the value of the quality of social ties can influence the decision making process of individual. This effect empowers the position and status of individual. The importance of resources and possessing them will improve the effectiveness. Thirdly, possessing important resources and social networks will affect social and status validity of acts of individuals positively. By this way, an individual can strengthen his/her social capital by valid and powerful networks and resources and obtain new opportunities. Finally, according to Nan Lin, social ties and their active use have an assistive role on the acts of individuals

and it improves recognition and reliability of that individual within the market. Possessing important resources and mobilizing them when necessary improves the credibility of an individual within his/her group or related sector. This kind of support allows flexibility in the acts of individual and opens the ways for him/her to access more critical resources.

In this context, social networks and social ties of an individual are the basis of social capital. These kind of resources whether obtained from family or any status groups should be improved through making investments. One of the elements that make social ties and communication networks “capital” is this investment necessity. Furthermore, the beneficial returns from these social relations to individual are also an element that makes the whole of the social networks and connections to capital.

We should trace back the concept “capital” in order to understand historical roots of the social capital. Capital can be accepted as a tool for investment. The final aim of this tool is to obtain profit. Therefore, we can handle capital as a tool that is used for obtaining profit. In this respect, capital is related with the value arising from this investment and introduction of products obtained from this investment into market for exchange purposes. As it can be seen, we can discuss two processes with respect to accumulation of capital. These are production and consumption. In the first stage, capital is the tool for producing consumption products and it defines resources that can be transformed into investment. Investment is used for providing means of production and labour force needed for production. After then, profit is obtained through introduction of these products into market for exchange. This profit can be transformed into investment tool, in other words in to capital in order to increase profit. Briefly, capital is continuously within circulation in the process of production and obtaining surplus value.

In the classical understanding of capital, capital is money or a piece of land. The main value of capital is obtained through transforming it into profit by production

with the use of money or piece of land. Briefly, the functionality of capital is acquired through the purpose of taking benefit from it. According to Marxist approach, capital is owned by capitalists and bourgeoisie class (Lin, 2001). A capitalist transforms the capital, for example money, firstly into product, and then surplus value by exchanging it in the market and finally into again capital as a different investment tool. In this way, shortly through investment, production, profit and again investment accumulation of capital is provided. The possessions of a capitalist such as physical equipment, factory, means of production and so forth demonstrate the capital owned in the production process. Labour force and the value obtained from product introduced into market at the end of the production process are variable capital. In Marxist approach, working class has no capital in the process of accumulation of capital and it is away from all the processes related with capital. At this point, exploitation of non-owners of means of production by owners of means of production is the most important issue with respect to accumulation of capital.

The conceptualization of capital discussed above has more economical structure. Classical perception and use of capital has been altered afterwards. As a result of this modification, new capital approaches have been developed different from economical understanding. These approaches have used capital on the basis of humanities and culture. Human capital, cultural capital, social capital and symbolic capital are most important concepts obtained from these approaches (Lin, 2001). In fact, the functionality and nature of capital are similar in all these declinations. Capital is labour that is accumulative and exchangeable in different capital approaches. However, related resources and way of investment differs in these understandings.

For instance, human capital is more related with individual abilities and talents. In other words, things that an individual can do are his/her capital. The improvement of an individual with respect to his/her talents and abilities through education is the process of accumulation of capital. In this way, an individual can

differ from others that were similar with him/her. Human capital and the development of this capital positively influence the value and position of an individual in the market. Briefly, the declination of capital in the context of human is the process of self investment. In a capitalist society, this investment supplements economical value to an individual's labour. The most important point here is that new types of capital are thought far from investment and profit that is the natural result from investment. However in the final point the development of capital has an economic focus. In this situation, as already stated by Bourdieu (1986), capitals other than economic capital can be reduced to economic capital and at the end it can be explained by it.

Just like human capital, other types of capital constituted from social relations and networks reflect another point of view. Just like the classical understanding of capital, appreciation of resources in the social capital like knowledge, status and power is provided through investment of social relations and mobilization and exchange of products obtained from this investment (Lin, 2001).

For instance, if an individual knows the best car repairman in that environment, this is his/her social relation, in other words social resource. This resource is valuable only for the owner if it is alone, however if it is shared with another individual who needs that resource, it appreciates within the social network between owner of the resource and the individual benefit from that resource. This sharing gains surplus value within reciprocal criteria.

Within this conceptualization of social capital, reciprocal expectation and trust and responsibilities as a result of this expectation are very important (Field, 2006; Lin, 2001; Bourdieu, 1988). As exchange of relations constructed and developed around social capital is important. In fact, in this picture, there is no exchange of relation, but the value within the meaning of relation is exchanged. For example, this can be provided through knowing a car repairman or having some important information about an issue. Individuals and groups included within the same

social networks support each other on the basis of some expectations related with the structure of that network. Briefly, this condition can be accepted as appreciation. If someone offers a solution to anybody's problem by using his/her relations within a social network that s/he is belonging to, this leads to help of that person to other persons in the future when s/he cannot solve his/her problem by him/herself. This mutual relation provides the continuity of relations as a tool of investment. As we can see in the following pages, Coleman (1988) exemplifies this situation clearly that is very significant in the context of social capital concept. Briefly, as Coleman states in the relationship between A and B, all the things done by A for B makes B responsible for A in the future. Therefore, norms and values included in communication networks are very important with respect to social capital in order to construct social loyalty.

The concept of social capital is used frequently in academics and there are several different researches in order to explain it. According to Putnam (2000), this concept has emerged six times during 20th century. This concept was used for first time in 1916 by L. Judson Hanifan who was an American religion instructor (Putnam, 2000; Arneil, 2006).

The explosion of this concept in academic field corresponds to 1980s. Halpern (2001) demonstrates this by analyzing the social capital as a key word in the articles written before and after 1980. According to this analysis, this concept was used 20 times before 1981. It was used 109 times between 1991 and 1995 and the use of this concept increased to 1003 between 1996 and 1999.

It is very difficult to include all researches and uses in the scope of this paper, because there is an accumulated literature about this issue. Because of this limitation, the historical development of concept will be examined by theoretical contributions of Coleman, Putnam and Bourdieu who have significant effects on the development of concept and who are commemorated directly with this concept. Field depicts the different contributions of these theoreticians like this;

Bourdieu shares with Marxism concern questions of unequal access to resources and the maintenance of power; Coleman takes as his starting point the idea of individuals acting rationally in pursuit of their own interests; Putnam has inherited and developed the idea of association and civic activity as a basis of social integration and well-being. (Field, 2008; 15)

2.3. Social Capital Conceptualization of James Coleman

James Coleman, an American sociologist, is known for his studies on education. His first inferences about the concept of social capital took form during his studies on education. According to Field (2006), Coleman's interest on social capital stems from his studies on social inequalities and academic success. To Coleman, social capital is a resource that one possesses. The use of this resource includes common values, mutual trust and the communication networks that lie beyond the individual (Coleman, 1988). Roots of his studies on social capital lie in his belief that there is a relation between human capital and social capital. Coleman thinks that both kinds of capital are interconnected and facilitate each other (Coleman, 1994). Besides, in his article "*Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital*" in 1988, he points out the common points of both capitals as follows: "Just as physical capital and human capital facilitate productive activity, social capital does as well." (Coleman, 1988:19). As it is seen from this quotation, common function of different capitals is to facilitate the activities of individuals or groups.

In the same article, Coleman defines social capital based on "functionality";

Social capital is defined by its functions. It is not a single entity but a variety of different entities, with two elements in common: they all consist of some aspect of social structures, and they facilitate certain actions of actors – whether persons or corporate actors – within the Structure. Like other forms of capital, Social capital is productive, making possible the achievement of certain ends that in its absence would not be possible. (Coleman, 1988:16).

Coleman draws the limits of the concept by its function of facilitating the activities of individuals or groups. Besides, for Coleman, aim of the capitals other than the social capital is similar. The concept, by its definition, clearly shows us what it is used for but not what it is. Additionally, two important facilities of social capital should be highlighted again which are seen in the definitions and explanations of the concept. One of these facilities is its function as a facilitator for an actor's activities in a social structure as well as being a facilitator for that social structure itself. Another important factor for social capital to undertake such a role is the condition that individuals or groups (even corporations for Coleman) within the social structure are in communication among each other.

After all, the facilities of the social structure, within which communication between individuals and groups flow, are also important for social capital to take form and its functions (Coleman, 1988; Field 2006). Dependence, reciprocity and liabilities within the structure influence forming of social capital. Coleman illustrates it within his article as follows;

If A does something for B and trust B to reciprocate in the future, this establishes an expectation in A and obligation on the part of B. This obligation can be conceived as a credit slip held by A for performance by B. If A holds a large number of these credit slips, for a number of persons with whom A has relations, then the analogy to financial capital is direct. These credit slips constitute a large body of credit that A can call in if necessary – unless, of course, the placement of trust has been unwise, and these are bad debts that will not be repaid. (Coleman, 1988:20).

This example shows how social capital is formed in the context of interpersonal relations and in the presence of values within the structure. Coleman states that, besides the forming of social capital, information channels and values within the system (customs, morals, traditions, societal norms etc.) are also effective on social capital. Besides, these resources which take important roles in forming social capital can also arise and improve by utilization of social capital for

Coleman. In short, it can be said that there is a reciprocal relation between the source and its premises.

Even though it seems the formations of social capital and use of social capital within these formations have characteristic of having a tendency towards creating inequalities in favor of the ones possessing resources, for Fried (2006), social capital as it is used by Coleman, is harmless. The prime reason of this view is that even Coleman sees social capital as a personal resource; he thinks its use and results have positive effects on the actors within the structure. What creates such an effect is the fact that individuals are in constant communication within their social structure via their social capitals. Social capital, which maintains reciprocal relations of individuals, keeps them help each other and drives them to get together for common interests, ensures a sort of self checking of the structure by constructing and spreading the values, norms and societal regulations via communication channels. As a result, societal outcomes are derived in the use of a personal resource. These outcomes can serve to form a more substantial social life. Within this context, for Coleman, outcomes of social capital can be public as much as being private (Field, 2006).

2.4. Social Capital Conceptualization of Robert Putnam

Another important theorist in the literature of social capital is American theorist Robert Putnam. Putnam, who is a political scientist, has come to the fore by his studies on social alienation and weakening of solidarity in American society. We can trace social capital in two of his studies. First of them is, his study, carried out in 1993, on the comparison of participation of citizens in northern and southern Italy and its results. In this study the concept of social capital is “(...) used to shed further light on these differences in civic engagement.” (Field, 2008:34).

In his article, “*Making Democracy Work : Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*” (1993), Putnam defines social capital, by referring to that of Coleman’s, as

follows: “Social capital here refers to features of social organization, such as trust, norms and networks, that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions.” (Putnam, 1993:167). As it is seen from this first definition, trust and norms have, once more, taken their places within the concept of social capital. Besides, its features of facilitating social organizations and coordinated actions are parallel to the basic function of Coleman’s idea of social capital.

The core of Putnam’s reference to Coleman is the example that had been given by Coleman over a rural community. This example clearly demonstrates the parallelism shown above. According to Coleman, practices like supporting each other during the harvest or lending and borrowing agricultural tools among the members of the community are outcomes of social capital. Social capital makes it possible for the farmers continue their agricultural activities with less physical capital (Putnam, 1993).

Actually, this example is not unfamiliar for those who know Anatolian rural culture. What Coleman gives as an example is similar to what it is called “*imece*” in Anatolian villages. The fact that villagers make use of their neighbors and relatives especially in terms of labor, not only for the common good but also for their personal activities, is an important feature of “*imece*”. This support is reciprocal. Thus, it creates norms and values like trust and appreciation in practice which were pointed out by Putnam and had been highlighted by Coleman before.

Furthermore, two main theses that had been put forward are “that if a region has a well-functioning economic system and a high level of political integration, these are the result of the region’s successful accumulation of social capital” (Siisiäinen, 2000:2). The “political integration” mentioned here should be understood as participation of citizens. It can be claimed that, for Putnam, within his perception of social capital, the ways of participation are non-governmental organizations

After this study, “*Bowling Alone*” (2000) which brought him the actual reputation in terms of social capital literature, had been published. Putnam spared this study on analyzing the weakening social capital in American society and its possible results. Putnam tried to show the change in the concept of social capital, the way he defines it, statistically with the help of the databases he had been utilizing over the years.

Before giving Putnam’s definition of the concept, we can demonstrate what he understands from social capital by looking at the title of his book and some indicators he used in his work. The title of “Bowling Alone” refers to someone who bowls by him/herself. Actually, bowling is a team game. Amateur bowling leagues are collective activities during which people from different origins get together and communicate. American bowling leagues “function as a metaphor for an organizational activity which brings relative strangers together frequently, help them to form a set of broad communication networks, generate and maintain values facilitating general reciprocity and trust, which supports mutual coordination.” (Field, 2006:44).

Thus, social organizations appear as the important points for the improvement of social capital. These organizations can be bridged clubs or voluntary organizations. For Putnam’s perception of social capital, what matters is the existence of such opportunities for people from different origins to come together. Lack or diminishing of such opportunities means falling of social capital. This is what Putnam tries to show in the book that has been mentioned. For this study, results of probes on American society’s participation to voluntary organizations, life style surveys, participation to electoral campaigns and general social surveys had been used.

As a result, Putnam, in his study on social capital and American society, points out that the essence of social capital is communication networks, being valuable, effecting the actions of individuals and groups (Putnam, 2000). Although social

capital is a personal resource, it can undertake some roles, by its existence and functioning, towards facilitating solidarity and cooperation. And this brings us to social wellbeing (Lin, 2001). Voluntary organizations in the social structure and active participation they receive not only strengthens social capital but also help creation of values and trust that are necessary for maintaining social structure and its well-being. Under these conditions, Putnam and Coleman share the same denominator. Besides, apart from the societal dimension of social capital, associating the use of capital with concepts like effectiveness or efficacy is another common point of the two theorists. Lastly, the dark side of social capital cannot be seen clearly in Putnam's works (Field, 2006; Lin, 2001; Arneil, 2006).

2.5. Social Capital Conceptualization of Bourdieu

Bourdieu is the man who attempts to reveal mystified dimension of social capital. Different from Coleman and Putnam, Bourdieu abstains from the perception of social output, collaboration and volunteer participation of social capital. Instead, his main aim is to explain inequalities in social structure and sources of these inequalities (Field, 2006). Just like other types of capitals that Bourdieu uses, social capital is one of the conceptual tools belonging to this effort.

Pierre Bourdieu is the one of the most influential key theorist in terms of the notion of the capital and its different forms. His important subject matters are power relations in social structure and inequalities deriving from it. Reproduction and transformation of power, also, plays crucial role in his studyings. Therefore, capital and its forms should be thought with respect to these main subjects of Bourdieu.

Capital, according to him, is "accumulated labor" (1988; 241) and accumulation of it needs time and energy. Apart from economic capital he described two other

forms of capital in his well known essay called "*The Forms of Capital*" (1988).

According to him;

Depending on the field in which it functions, and at the cost of the more or less expensive transformations which are the precondition for its efficacy in the field in question, capital can present itself in three fundamental guises: as economic capital, which is immediately and directly convertible into money and may be institutionalized in the form of property rights; as cultural capital, which is convertible, on certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalized in the form of educational qualifications; and as social capital, made up of social obligations ("connections"), which is convertible, in certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalized in the form of title of nobility. (1988; 243)

According to Jenkins, "field, in Bourdieu's sense, is a social arena within which struggles or maneuvers take place over specific resources or stakes and access to them." (2002; 84). It can be said that struggling for resources consists of power relations of different social positions, both individualistic and institutional, in the field. Therefore, the field can be perceived as a system structured by struggle of resources. In that sense, forms of capital represent themselves as these resources (Jenkins, 2002).

Concerning only economic capital and its results may not be represent whole picture of power relations and dominations in the field. What Bourdieu underlines is that other forms of capitals must be evaluated in that sense with related to economic ones. It is true that economic capital is important in many respect, however according to Bourdieu, without thinking all forms of capital together we can not catch the reality hiding under the power relations and inequalities. Dominant classes or social groups in one society may be gain privileges by mobilizing their economic resources. Moreover, they use that economic power to subordinate to others who have not sufficient resources. However, the important

thing is sustaining power and domination. According to me, Bourdieu's other forms of capitals have made sense in that process.

In his brief explanation of forms of capitals, we can see the relation between capitals and their tools of sustaining domination, in other words, reproduction of powerful having sufficient resources. For example, in cultural field, educational investments have played vital role for reproduction and transformation of economic capital. Besides that, not only education but also cultural goods like music, books, pictures and etc. which are defined as objectified state of cultural capital by Bourdieu (1986) can be seen as the created tools by powerful social classes in order to maintain their dominance on others. Educating in good schools and having taste of cultural life are mostly thought as elites' practices in the most societies. In other words, a figure of door keeper listening to Bach can be "interesting" news for media, but a figure of CEO supporting Bach concert can be represented by media as natural. That is, what Bourdieu have told us is that dominant social groups have invested in cultural capital in order to maintaining their naturalness.

According to Bourdieu, social capital is the one of the effective resources of this situation, too. Bourdieu defined social capital as;

The aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition- or in other words, to membership in a group- which provides each of its members with the backing of collectivity-owned capital, a "credential" which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word. (1988; 249)

In here, social capital emerges as an existing thing and as including possible social relations. In addition, social capital perception of Bourdieu is a resource possession that a specific group has (Field, 2006). When we are taking into consideration his use of social capital as superiority of a social group over others

and attempts to resume this superiority, this perception is normal. In this context, social capital is a resource belonging to an elite class in a society. Just like in cultural capital, elites attempt to resume their position in the social structure by investing their social capital, in other words their networks.

In Bourdieu's conceptualization, the extent of social capital is measured through the number of social relations and other capitals related with these relations (Bourdieu, 1988). However, just having these relations is not enough. The important point in here is to resume and conserve these social relations and networks. When we remember his definition of capital, social capital is also accumulated gradually and its accumulation requires time and effort. Therefore, individuals should conserve the value of their social capitals by making investments to it. The possibility of transformation of social capital and related other capitals into profit and benefit from this profit as an individual or as a member of that group or network, mutual trust, recognition and loyalty should be constructed (Bourdieu, 1988). In this framework, loyalty should be taken as common attempts of the members of a group who want to obtain profit finally.

So that, the most intelligent investment strategy for individuals and groups within the context of social capital is transforming social relations to useful resources after a while consciously or unconsciously. According to him;

This done through the alchemy of consecration, the symbolic constitution produced by social institution (institution as a relative- brother, sister, cousin, etc.- or as a knight, an heir, an elder, etc.) and endlessly reproduced in and through the exchange (of gifts, words, women, etc.) which it encourages and which presupposes and produces mutual knowledge and recognition. (1988; 250)

By this way, it can be said that institutions such as affinity or family and created high values constitute the resource of social capital. Moreover, reciprocal exchange between these institutions that is the resource of social relations can be

accepted as a strategy to resume these relations. These kinds of investment done within the same social group (e.g. within a social structure called as elite) allows related social group to reproduce itself through these relations and guarantee their social capital. This reminds me the affinity marriages done in order not to divide possessions or marriages between children belonging to partner families who have companies within a sector and organized in order to resume their partnership.

Bourdieu obtains facts about capital and inequalities by studying on the French elites and concludes that marriages between the same or similar classes, business partnerships, mutual gestures, bestowings and similar acts reproduce this elite class economically and culturally and support their continuity by legalise their relations. Bourdieu exemplifies this by discussing the functions of organizations such as night parties, receptions, inaugurations and traditional balls and how these kinds of organizations allow them to become more powerful and by this way he determines the effects of social boundaries at the level of access to capital resources (Bourdieu, 1986). Therefore, according to him, although resources and investments made on resources are individualistic, the share of their return depends on class.

In here this question arises: are only the elites who construct social relations?

When we define social capital as social relations and networks belonging to an individual or group, we should accept that all individuals in a social structure have social capital more or less. According to Field (2006), Bourdieu is frequently criticized, because he deals with capital as a specific possession of an elite class. In this point, the focus and subjects of Bourdieu's researches should be emphasized. Since Bourdieu attempts to explain universal inequalities in the framework of reproduction of capital, in here the issue is the class which is believed as dominant –elites-, this class's relation with capital and power obtained from this relation.

Surely, ordinary people in France have their own relationships within their sociality. However, these relations and profit obtained from mobilization of these relations cannot be the source of inequalities within the social structure while we are looking at macro level. Network of relations of ordinary people can cause some inequalities in micro level. In my opinion, Bourdieu tries to demonstrate the main point inherent in the relation of power and exploitation and reasons of inequalities in macro level, because their production and reproduction shape the whole social structure. In this context, I think instead of focusing who owns the social capital, what are important in Bourdieu's studies are the inequalities caused by the production and reproduction of social capital by dominant classes.

After all, as for Bourdieu economical capital constitutes the origin of other types of capitals. Though social and cultural capital cannot be always reduced to economical capital, generally its results depend on economical structure.

2.6. Conceptualization of Social Capital in terms of Research Problems

While we are juxtaposing the important names of social capital, we also discuss different meanings attributed to it. On the one hand Coleman and Putnam deal with social capital through its positive meanings; on the other hand Bourdieu examines social capital with relation to other capital types by presupposing it as a source of inequalities within a social structure. In the theory of Coleman and Putnam social capital can be owned by everybody, however in Bourdieu it is the whole of networks that dominant class enjoys.

In this sense, although social capital is theorized in different ways, the common point is that it is a source constituted by social relations and networks. This source becomes more valuable when it is put into use or social relations of an individual or group mobilize for an aim or expectation. Though the source of social capital is not material, benefits obtained by using social capital may be material or symbolic like status and power. The basic idea that can be inferred

from the discussions of social capital and theoretical declination of concept reveal that the social relations constructed within life world can be used and transformed into profit just like physical capital.

How will we define and use social capital in this thesis?

Generally speaking, when we briefly examine discussions above, social capital has different definitions and practical meanings from different point of views. In sum, the use of concept depends where you approach the issue from. While we remind studies of theoreticians leading to development of concept, this condition becomes clear. We have a concept whose field of use is very flexible and differs according to focus of view. For instance, while Putnam deals with social capital as an active participation and social collaboration and welfare as a result of this active participation, Bourdieu demonstrates how this whole of social relations is used so that it results with inequalities in a social structure.

This research focusing on delegates conceptualizes social capital in a way to show social networks between farm labour intermediaries. In other words, social networks of farm labour intermediaries both in the direction of workers and employers are their social capital. In this respect, it is important for our research to use this concept on the basis of that whole of social relations as a source and the owner of this source taking advantages from it within a social structure.

The job of intermediary more or less leads for intermediary to have social capital, because the practice of this job requires a communication network in both directions. Mobilizing different communication networks for a common purpose increases the credibility of intermediary within a social network. In addition, capacity to mobilize these relations also increases the value of intermediary in the market.

While some of the intermediaries who are living in Adana only work in Adana, some of them work other regions in Turkey where labour-intense agrarian activities are seen. On the one hand, labour-intense agricultural activities still continue, and on the other hand intermediaries can work in this field due to their social relations. This communication networks is their social capital.

The most important point here is that this study has not any claim to measure intermediaries' social capital quantitatively and empirically. The important issue is that they have a social capital more or less within their activity field. Some of intermediaries have 30 workers and some of them have 300 and bring them together with employer emphasize the importance of this point.

In addition, as we discussed above the nature of job demonstrates clearly the requirement of social networks at some level in order to practice and resume this job. In the first stage, limited social source of social capital is provided by family and affinity. These types of networks as basic resources gain importance over other social relations such as relations of affinity and family and social relations other than affinity and family develops the social capital of an intermediary. A developed social relation increases both material and symbolic benefit of an intermediary.

Briefly, in this research in what level an intermediary has social capital is not an essential point. The important points in research are the source of social capital, mobilization of it and acquisitions obtained from it within the seasonal agricultural work. Furthermore, it is attempted to be analyzed how the process of obtaining returns from these social relations influence the agricultural workers negatively and how social capital creates inequality between some groups within a social structure.

Within this context, while we are taking into consideration the approaches of theoreticians on social capital, Bourdieu's problematization of social capital gains

importance for this research. Surely, social capital approach of Bourdieu is more meaningful while handling it with relation to other types of capital. Moreover, his conceptualization of social capital closely related with privileged class in the social structure. In this respect, using Bourdieu's approach on social capital without any modification will be very difficult for this thesis. First of all, farm labour intermediaries do not constitute a privileged class within society. However, social capital approach of Bourdieu will be used selectively on our findings about intermediaries.

Bourdieu's conceptualization will help us to understand the importance of social relations and how social capital leads to inequalities within a social structure. Although intermediaries do not constitute a privileged class in society, they are very dominant in the communication network of seasonal agricultural activity between agricultural workers and agricultural employer. Despite the fact that workers and intermediaries may share the same economical roots before, the acquisition of social capital in both directions makes intermediaries dominant over workers. In addition, the necessary relation between worker and intermediary due to economical and social poverty makes intermediaries dominant over workers. Moreover, the evaluation of the continuity of these relations through different investment strategies by taking into consideration the approach of Bourdieu on social capital is also important factor for us.

While Bourdieu's basic emphasis on power/inequality gains importance for this thesis, Coleman's ideas on values such as trust, appreciation, reciprocity and responsibility will also assist us to comprehend how such social relations become constant. In this respect, the instance of Coleman above mentioned that shows how relation between two individuals becomes valuable will be more concrete in this thesis.

CHAPTER III

RURAL TRANSFORMATION and SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL WORK IN TURKEY

Rural Turkey has experienced an important transformation. Village communities and congregations who were closed and produce for themselves rather than the market changed form. One of the dimensions of this transformation is social development, social progress. The other one is stratification, becoming landless and migration. (Akşit, 2007:31)

The period of 1950s and general economic and social developments afterwards have been important key turning points when we deal with the transformation and change dynamics of agricultural and rural structure of Turkey. Two key developments of the period are the Marshall aids that were put into action by USA with the end of the Second World War and Turkey's accession to the multi-party system with the Democratic Party government. The impacts of both developments have been so much significant in terms of their effects both on the agricultural production and rural areas. It is useful to take a brief glance to the previous period before the effects of social change on the rural areas. Because, in the early periods of the Republic, during the re-structuring and modernization of Turkey, important policies were formulated concerning the rural areas and the first seeds of transformation with the 1950 were delivered to the land.

3.1. 1923 – 1945: Early Republic Period

The tendency of the founders of the Republic to focus on agriculture and rural areas should be interpreted as compulsory when we think of the conditions of the

era. Agriculture and agricultural accumulation was critical for the Republic, which lacked capital accumulation and economic independence, both for realizing the planned policies and meeting the needs of the existing population. On the other hand, the fact that most of population resided in rural areas and that they were employed in agriculture shifted the focus of the economic policies to agricultural production (Tekeli and İlkin, 1988; 37). According to Pamuk and Toprak;

(...) in the first years of the Republic “%80 per cent of the total population of 13 million was living in rural areas and approximately 6 million people were employed in agricultural sector. In the midst of 1920s, the share of agriculture within the total production or GNP was %48.” (1988; 12)

Within this framework, with the establishment of the Republic, the state pushed for new agricultural policies, like from education to technological modernization, from financial support to establishment of inner market and the development of possibilities of marketing products (Tekeli and İlkin, 1988).

The abolishment of tithes (*asar vergisi*) in 1925, strengthening private property, property and land reforms studies were all important policies within the specified era in terms of both the support for micro producers and the increase of agricultural production (Pamuk, 1988). With the abolishment of the tithes which had been the main stay of the Ottoman land system, the villagers started to be encouraged to agricultural production and also taxation started to be done over gains rather than products. According to Pamuk, the new taxation system meant the elimination of a barrier in terms of the development of the capital accumulation possibilities in rural areas. The civil Law which was ratified in 1926 ended the old land property applications and “accepted that there can be limitations to property rights for the sake of the public good while enabling individuals all kinds of property rights and management on their lands.” (Sencer, 1971; 86).

The demand towards land reform and giving lands to landless villagers could not be passed into law until 1945 although it had been voiced by the founding team of the Republic in the first years of the new state. The land reform which was legalized in 1945 was faced by objections made by big land owners, merchants, parliamentarians and bureaucrats. The 17th article of the new law which provided that share croppers and seasonal agriculture workers can have management rights over the lands they work on was the main reason of these objections (Avcioğlu, 1973). This article of the law which seemed to be highly revolutionary and egalitarian had never been applied. Within the framework of law that pushed for increasing the agricultural production by landing the villagers, the lands had been delivered till 1962. After the ratification of the law, 1427 families in 29 villages of which preliminary studies were completed and in 1962, 307 families in 2007 villages were delivered lands together with being debited (Sencer, 1971). Sencer evaluates the application which is generally assumed to be unsuccessful:

The Law of Giving Land to Farmers (No: 4753) which was put into force in 1945 could not realize the effects that were expected. Really, this law which aimed to give lands to farmers who have no or little pieces of lands could not benefit from the lands which are supposed to be obtained by expropriation of large private properties and was empty of the possibility of realizing its aim within non-fertile and narrow land resources. In that sense, giving lands to farmers became just to deliver the lands which belonged to treasury. Besides, when treasury lands became inadequate in terms of time and space, pasture fields and non-fertile fields started to be delivered. The job of delivering the lands after their fertilization was not the option. Many farmer families were created with just little pieces of lands. (1971; 93)

Encouragement of mechanization in agriculture by state is another significant development of the era. In the first years of the Republic, agriculture was based on animal force and plow. The new state assumed an encouraging role by making various investments for achieving mechanization in agriculture and making the rural population accept the technological developments of the period. The

encouragement of the agricultural mechanization gained importance for the state staff in order to substitute the labor force which decreased due to the wars. The exemption of those who have tractors and motor vehicles from the military duty can be shown as an example of state's incentives (Tekeli and İlkin, 1988). Mechanization and technology usage demonstrate the difference between the agricultural producers in the first years of the Republic. While tractors were used by big land owners or farmers, plows were used by small enterprises or producers (Toprak, 1988).

While the number of tractors in 1924 was 500, it is increased to 1750 in 1948 (Toprak, 1988). Mechanization was much more effective and rapid in places like Aegean and Çukurova where industrial agricultural products for the market are intensive (Şeker, 1986). In this term, Ziraat Bankası made important investments and worked for making farmers own tractors within the framework of agricultural mechanization. Unfitness of tractor technology of the era for rough lands, the difficulties of small producers in terms of financing technological inputs and the economic crisis in 1930s limited the usage of the modern equipment of the term in the first period of the Republic (Avcioğlu, 1971; Pamuk, 1988). Besides the encouragement of tractor and plow, seed betterment attempts, artificial fertilizing and chemical drugs for agricultural innovation had been applied to the Turkish agriculture (Toprak, 1988, Tekeli and İlkin 1988, Ecevit, 1999).

To sum up, on the way of agricultural modernization, important steps were taken with the consideration of different dimensions of rural areas and agriculture. Although the plans concerning the property relationships and land ownership could not be realized, state policies which laid the groundwork for the rural transformation in the 1940s and 1950s. The modernization policies which were organized by the state pioneered for making the rural capitalistic and besides, the importance given to the railway, establishment of product stock markets, the steps taken in terms of price policies resulted in the emergence of an internal market and commodity production of the rural (Toprak, 1988). But, "the consequences of

the reforms and industrialization attempts which aimed to realize important changes in the economy and social structure in 1920s and 1930s could be seen after 1950s.” (İçduygu and others, 1998; 221)

3.2. After 1945: Opening to the World and Transformation of Rural Structures

The 1950s was a turning point for Turkey’s rural life. According to Gündüz-Hoşgör (1999), two significant developments were evident in 1950s which profoundly affected the rural life. The first is the beginning of the multi-party system. This accession brought two important developments together. With the multi-party system, Democratic Party (DP) came into power, which carried out the liberal market economy and opened Turkey to outside world. Truman Doctrine, Marshall Aids, accession to European Council, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and International Monetary Fund (IMF) formed important steps of establishing networks with abroad.

According to Avcıoğlu (1973), the land reform which highly occupied the parliament agenda and the objections against this reform were two important reasons of the formation of DP. Besides, till the end of 1940s, in which the establishment and institutionalization of was intensive, the strengthening and development of land owners, merchants and bureaucrats played important roles in the birth of DP. For Pamuk (1988), Republican People’s Party’s (CHP) putting the burden with the great depression and the problems after the Second World War on the shoulders of small producers in the rural areas paved the way for DP’s accession to power. In order to strengthen the support of social classes behind itself and to realize the promises given to people during the election campaign, DP rapidly opened Turkey to the international market and took the steps of integration with the world. In this sense, US and the European countries give important support to the DP (Kongar, 1999).

The most significant support taken from the US is the Marshall Aids. The assumed goal of the plan which is prepared by George Marshall the foreign minister of US in 1947 was announced as to develop the European economy. On the other hand, the most important reason is to attempt to form countries tied to western capitalism against the Eastern Bloc countries pioneered by the USSR. In other words, Marshall Aids can be seen as a step to strengthen the US hegemony in Europe against USSR.

The foreign capital which entered Turkey just for military aims with Marshall Aids in 1948, together with DP's liberal bids started to be taken also for economic investments. The foreign aids taken by DP were used in the modernization of agriculture and the development of highway transportation intensively (İçduygu and others, 1998). "This period symbolizes the beginning of an aimless time when agriculture is considered just from technical perspectives and human element is ignored. State, before, used both the Marshall aids and all other resources to increase the agricultural production." (Şeker, 1986; 43) When we think of the classes DP represent, the areas in which the aids were used do not create a paradoxical situation. In this period of Turkey, the investments in agriculture and transportation played important roles in establishing the internal market and contributed to the development of cities.

The concrete symbol of agricultural mechanization was the prevalence of the usage of tractors. The developed technology after the Second World War increased the functionality of used tractors and these vehicles found a wider use area in rough lands. The tractor numbers which were 1756 in 1948 increased to 16.000 in 1950, to 40.282 in 1955, to 42.136 in 1960 and to 54.668 in 1965 (Keyder, 1988; Makal, 2001). As it can be seen, use of tractors which highly affected the use of labor force in agriculture, with opening abroad increased highly and this increase continued in the following years. Of course, the most important reason of this increase is the state policy of encouraging agriculture

credits to farmers. “The Credits provided by Ziraat Bankası increased to 2.1 million TL in 1957-58 from 25.000TL in 1947-48.” (Keyder, 1988; 164).

The increase in tractors and other machines for agriculture also affected the arable land quantity directly. Even, “it is approached to the limits of arable lands in the midst of 1960s and ‘marginal’ lands became open to plantation.” (Aruoba, 1988; 200). On the other hand, the population increase and the meeting of the needs of this population caused the widening of those arable lands (Makal, 2001). The production increase which could not be realized per unit, tried to be achieved by widening the arable lands. Moreover, low level use of land before 1950 due to the limited market opportunities, together with opening abroad and the development in transportation affected the increase arable agricultural lands. According to Avcioğlu (1973), the equation of large lands, insufficient labor force in the first years of the Republic changed into small land and fertile labor force with the developments in the agricultural developments after 1950s. The agricultural developments continued from 1960s to 1970s. Mechanization, use of fertile seeds, fertilizer usage, chemicals for agricultural betterment and several other biological developments were also witnessed. Both mechanization and biological development increased the agricultural fertility to a rate.

3.3. Differentiation of Rural Areas and Seasonal Agricultural Works

In Turkey, which opened its markets to abroad based on dependent economic relationships, all modernization policies in agricultural area increased the inequalities and income discrepancies in the rural areas (Aruoba, 1988). The most important reason of this is the inequality in land distribution (Avcioğlu, 1973; Akşit, 1988). On the other hand, different sized enterprises intersect in the rural areas. In this sense, developed and big enterprises more easily use modern inputs and techniques compared to others. Therefore, the inequality between those who access to technology and those who do not showed itself. Besides, differences between regions and products can be considered as reasons of inequality in the

rural areas (Aruoba, 1988). There have been differentiations both within the region and among the regions, from land ownership to enterprise size, capital accumulation to investment opportunities and to relations established with the market.

Especially the change in land ownership and types of land cultivation became two important factors that changed the social structure. Because, “land business includes law rules and traditions which regulate individual relations based on ownership system in agriculture.” (Sencer, 1971; 134). Other than land or asset ownership, sharecropping or tenancy are the most widespread land cultivation types. Sharecropping is producer’s giving to the landowner some shares from the production. Tenancy is producer’s managing the land by renting it based on ram or pecuniary wage. Whatever the product at the end of the agricultural production is, tenancy cost should be paid from the beginning. In sharecropping, payments are realized proportionate to the products. Both land cultivation models include some type of exploitation within themselves. However, sharecropping is much more exploitative than tenancy (Kales, 2007). According to Boratav (2004), job sharing relationships between tenants-sharecroppers and landowners change according to the economic conditions, land size and social relationships between the actors. In other words, it cannot be argued that exploitation is inherent in both types (Sencer, 1971).

The important thing for us is that the structural changes differentiated the types of land management and suggested tenant and sharecropper relationships to some extent. Especially sharecropping is an important sharing category within the life areas of landless or small landed families. Mechanization and concentration of lands in the hands of rich farmers who are within the capitalist relation networks, decreased the examples of sharecropping and contributed to the increase the labor surplus in the rural areas (Sencer, 1971). Besides, these developments, caused the change in the sharecropping system, the decrease of sharing against the interest of the sharecropper and the worsening the life conditions.

Agricultural modernization and capitalist relations' infiltration to the rural areas profoundly shaken the social structures and traditional relations. Especially, small producers and landless villagers have been the most disadvantageous groups affected from this process. A majority of active rural labor force detached from the land gradually. Especially beginning to use tractor in agricultural activities actively leads to decrease requirement for agrarian labor force. Moreover, division of agricultural lands into more small pieces due to traditional inheritance system reduced the income obtained through agricultural activities. These developments have started the adventure of rural population that is migration from rural to urban and it still continues. Therefore, rural to urban migration became the most important consequence of the change of rural structure with capitalist relations. The development of highway transportation and the increase in the motor vehicles were the factors enabled migration to speed up. Moreover, starting from the early republican period, the indispensable state policy of industrialization and the increase in service sector, enhanced migration to a high rate. People who live in rural areas gradually tended to take part in urban labor market.

On the other hand, the transformation of rural areas made seasonal agricultural work more visible, more institutionalized and continuous. Families who could not migrate to urban and attempted to earn a living in their small lands with agricultural activities were obliged to deal with economical crisis and

(...) these agrarian families tried to accommodate themselves to these transformations through new living strategies. On the one hand the relationship between human being and soil differentiated and on the other hand migration from rural to urban, international worker migration and seasonal migration have become predominant life styles in Turkey. (Ertürk, 1994:xx)

By taking into consideration to this argument, Ertürk (1994) claims that agrarian families transform to soil-dependent / freely-moving labor within this transformation period in order to adapt themselves to the process. This labor force

remained between rural and urban in between 1950s - 1980s that was the period in which rural transformation was experienced very deeply and it was employed both in agricultural and non-agricultural activities. In several cases, one or some of the family members worked in seasonal employments (for instance father and adult sons just like construction labor), however in some cases all of the family members participated in seasonal migration (like seasonal agricultural activity).

South East and East Anatolia Regions can be seen as the motherland of the seasonal agricultural workers. Generally, Şanlıurfa, Diyarbakır, Kahramanmaraş and Adıyaman are leading provinces in these regions related to agricultural labor force (Şeker, 1986; Gülçubuk and others, 2003; Yıldırak and others, 2003; Özbek, 2007). In Turkey, Seasonal agricultural works have mostly accompanied with temporary migration through regions where labor intensive agricultural production is dominant. Workers' families and processions including these families have made up backbone of the temporary migration. Therefore, it is possible to say that seasonal agricultural activity is a tremendous organization in itself. In some cases, tent groups may be 100 houses. If it is assumed that approximately 5 people dwell in each tent, it already indicates that a travelling group includes a high population.

Seasonal and regional differences of the agriculture in Turkey have made possible to working in agricultural production almost whole year for workers;

If we summarize in terms of the eras, it has been come to Çukurova starting from January. Firstly, in citrus gardens then in the land plantation is tried. Potato, onion, cotton hoeing, peanut and then onion harvest follows this. From there, one part of it goes to Ankara – Beypazarı, roads of cumin and sugar beet. Towards the midst of August, it is gone to Düzce, Giresun and Ordu for nut collection. Again, one part of them returns to Çukurova for cotton harvesting. Briefly, in order for them to survive, a tour of 8-10 months is experienced. (Gümüş, 2005; 23)

Furthermore, this kind of organization needs time and other kinds of relations. Some important points such as determining place to work, communicating to employer, providing agreement on wage can be given as example to this. It is apparent that an employer is not directly related to these kinds of issues. Employer cannot search hundreds of workers who will work in his land, if he wants to find them, this cause for him to spend extra time and money. As a result, there should be another person or institution to do this. There is no such institution for seasonal agricultural activity that is organized informally and does not constitute a denominational structure. Instead, seasonal agricultural activity ascertains its own institution: farm labor intermediary.

The invisible and not considered seasonal workers gradually created their own institutions and determined the working types within the framework of traditional and face to face relations of each other. The farm labor intermediaries who are named as delegate, sergeant in different regions emerged as an important social stratum among seasonal agriculture workers.

The research I participated in 2002 indicates clearly that the labor intermediary in agriculture is a very dominant institution in the system. According to research results, 97.6% of the agricultural labor families find jobs through intermediaries. In this sense, it looks very crucial that this institution which reveals itself as the main element of the system is studied in depth. Not only it is the dependence in finding jobs, but as we will try to explain in the next chapter, agricultural labors are dependent on the intermediaries in many other ways.

Most of the workers that labor intermediary finds are his townsman, affinity or neighbor. Especially, traditional structures such as tribe system in South East and East Anatolia Regions in Turkey gain importance in the process of finding workers (Gülçubuk and others, 2003). In some cases, whole of the village or district become workers of a land through the agreement provided by labor

intermediary. Poverty and survival endeavor supplemented to this ties make this collaboration easier.

3.4. Debates on Capitalization in Agriculture and Rural Transformation

The structural impacts of modernization attempts which was developed on the basis of dependence on abroad and accession to multi-party system on rural areas and agricultural sector, contributed to the emergence of a rich literature related to rural and social transformation. Noted developments in different periods have been tried to discuss both on theoretical and empirical senses. Some of important points of the literature, which is constituted by discussions of the mentioned developments, will be explored under this topic. The essence of the structural transformation in agriculture and rural areas can be found in the integration of the country to the capitalist relationships system. But, because agriculture and rural areas show differences both in same regions and between different regions, their articulations to capitalism also show differences. For instance, regions like Çukurova where the production of industrial plants is intensive, starting from pre-republican periods continued their development by establishing relations with international market, however rural areas like Middle Anatolia where cereal production is intensive, integration to the market and capitalist relationships followed a slow pattern. Despite their differences, the main goal of the public policies which were formed both in the rigid statist era and the period when liberal economic opening abroad policies were applied after 1950, were to develop capitalism throughout the country and to take an active part in the international capitalist system.

According to Aydın (2001), agriculture and the problem of being a villager did not occupy an important place just in social sciences in Turkey between 1960 and 1980, but also social science literature of the world. The discussions occupied by the analyses of the capitalization process also demonstrated themselves in related

elimination of being a villager, small commodity production, transformation typologies in rural areas, sharing types and proletarianization.

The most important discussion about the transformation dynamics which are experienced by agriculture and rural areas had taken place between Korkut Boratav and Muzaffer Erdost. According to Aydın, the greatest contribution to the literature had come from these two scientists' differing perspectives.

The beginning of the discussion was Boratav's article in 1969 which was the summary of his book named "*Income Distribution in 100 Questions*" (originally *100 Soruda Gelir Dağılımı*) and the article was published in Emek which was Turkish Worker's Party's (TİP) magazine. According to Boratav (2004), we can mention about three production relationships: small commodity production, capitalist production and feudal –semi feudal production. Among those, small commodity production is widespread. Small commodity production defines "the situation in which indirect producer essentially owns the means of production and produces by using his/her or his/her family's labor, for the market" (Boratav, 2004; 52). Therefore, the relations of small producer with the capitalist market can be limited and his/her resources of capital accumulation for investment can be insufficient. In this form, small commodity production needs merchant or usurious capital to obtain needed resources. In other words, small commodity production is open to trade or usurer exploitation. According to Aydın;

Boratav argues that relations between simple commodity production and trade or usurer capital are exploitative and they are the primitive forms of capitalist exploitation. The fact that a great proportion of agriculture is under primitive capitalist exploitation is followed with the fact that this type of production is dominant in Turkey. (1986; 182).

On the other hand, for Boratav, agriculture in Turkey is not capitalist in its pure sense. Boratav argues that small commodity production constitutes the %80 of rural population since he demonstrated that feudal or semi feudal sharing

relationships constitute an unimportant rate by using village inventory studies. Because the insignificance of feudal relations enables merchant and usurer take one step further, Boratav argues that in Turkey backward capitalism exists. (Aydın, 1986; 182-183).

The first serious objection to Boratav comes from Erdost. Against Boratav, Erdost argues that capitalism in Turkey should be characterized as feudal or semi-feudal (Aydın, 1986; Başaran, 2007). As a determinant, Erdost claims that big land ownership is predominant compared to others. As a result, amount of land which is owned used as a valid indicator for semi-feudal relationships. Erdost, moreover, argues that Boratav had used sources which were not reliable in demonstrating the prevalence of small commodity production. Mainly, for Erdost, small villager enterprises are intensive and therefore it can be argued pre-capitalistic relations in agriculture. Erdost relies his argument upon the fact that villagers produce for their own sustenance. In this situation, capitalist exploitation is limited since market relations are also limited. Besides, there are small producers who produce for the market however their level is low (Aydın, 1986; 187-188).

Aydın criticizes both views and the use of the indicators for both views. For him, the misuse of terms like production type, relations of production and use and amount of landownership as indicators, can be misleading in less-developed countries where different types of production exist together. Aydın's main focus is on the type of the discussion. For him, the question should not be whether capitalism is in rural areas or not, the focus should be on with which means or types of capitalism directs its attention to rural areas. Because, although they are small villager enterprises, due to the capitalist relations which spread to the country, production and reproduction conditions are changed (Aydın, 1986; 188-189).

Keyder (1988) discussed the widespread character of small commodity production after 1945 both historically and theoretically as Boratav claimed before.

According to Keyder, the agriculture policies of pre-1945 era did not create qualitative differences in rural areas. Before the second world war, villagers had not been small commodity producers yet, they lived in villager relations in which commodification is weak and market relations independent of individuals were ineffective (Keyder, 1988; 164-165). The increase in technological input and modernization, development of private property, increase in arable lands, increase in possibilities to reach markets and determination of change rates by the market rather than individuals have become factors that spread the small commodity production. These developments enabled to access to small commodity production from being a villager. For Keyder, state sponsored agriculture policies also had an active role in spreading the small commodity production. The spread of small commodity production played a role that prevented capitalist transformation. Because, it is very difficult to proletarianize small producers who have property rights and continue producing (Keyder, 1988).

Despite the prevalence of small production in Turkey, big land ownership and big capitalist enterprises are also evident. Mostly, in Southeast, East Anatolia and in Çukurova, big land ownership is well-known. Besides, in terms of the products, the existence of agricultural enterprises which are integrated to capitalist system- as it is the same in Çukurova, cotton production – is a point at issue.

In that point Akçay (1987) claims that large scale enterprises in Turkey have historical and geographical originalities. Besides, Akçay mentions about two ways in the formation of large scale enterprises. The first of these is the enterprises emerged after mechanization and the second is the enterprises transformed after mechanization. The first group includes small and middle scale enterprises that were transformed into large scale enterprises by obtaining suitable accumulation possibilities with modernization. For Akçay, this kind of a transformation is a limited situation in Turkey where small scale production is widespread. Although limited, the transformation of small and middle scale enterprises into large scale enterprises with modernization fits the fact that this development is based on

inequality. Regional differences, closeness to the markets and the quality of the produced good play important roles. Akçay shows that this transformation can be realized by land intensification by giving references to the studies conducted in Çukurova in 1960s and 1970s.

The second category shows the transformation from large landownership to large scale enterprise. *Aghas* and hordes have been characterized with large landownership. The capitalization of *aghas* is related to the use of waged labor instead of sharecropping in the management of large lands for Akçay. Moreover, mechanization has been very effective in landowners' integrating the lands which could not be cultivated. Akçay gives the result of his research in Sinan and Korukçu villages of Bismil, Diyarbakır in 1981 as an example to the transformation in the second category. It is useful to examine these results which are highly important for our topic. In Sinan village, a land of 30000 *dönüm* (12,120 acres) belongs to a family. Some parts of the land are managed by the family based on the traditional sharecropping relationship. According to Akçay, all the villagers are landless. Before 1950, landless families all have right to manage approximately equal amount of land. Because the labor force is insufficient, the relationship between landowners and sharecroppers is balanced and sensitive.

The village which showed a stagnant situation before the mechanization, with the tractors that were brought to the village after 1950 changed. As we mentioned before, the cultivation of lands without the need for more labor force changed the sharecropping system and the conditions became against the sharecropper. In Sinan village too, the amount and quality of the lands given to the sharecroppers were dropped and the mentioned process had been lived. Besides, the landowners had not given lands to new families after new marriages which resulted in an extra labor force on these lands. As a result, the marginalization of sharecropping affected the sustenance relations in the village which at the end results in temporary and constant migrations.

What Akçay mentions about the developments with the mechanization in Sinan village fits into our discussion well. Although Akçay does not define the quality of the migration, it is possible for sharecropper families or labor surplus to do temporary agriculture work in or outside the region as a life strategy. Cities like Diyarbakır and Urfa are very close to Adana which is our research area where cotton production created an informal labor market. Moreover, even today, very few temporary agriculture workers come from these cities mainly.

Long before Akçay, there have also been crucial village researches conducted about rural transformation during 1960s and 70s.³ At this point we can name Mübeccel Kıray and Bahattin Akşit as having big influence on the literature. Kıray, a crucial scientist in Turkish social transformation literature, has a research conducted in Karadeniz Ereğli in 1962 which says;

The tradesmen/merchant in the town and the small producer in the village who produces strawberry for the market reveal the transitional tampon relationship of the villagers and show that in this transition period usurer merchant capital has dominated the producer villagers. (Akşit, 1987; 13)

Kıray's later field research with Hinderink has been conducted in four villages in Adana between the years 1964-65. This research has important conclusions about the capitalist transformation in Adana and Çukurova which are our field of study as well. According to Akşit some of the important findings in these villages in Adana are;

³ Although here we mentioned more about the Turkish scientists' works, there are also crucial studies conducted by foreign scientist about transformation of rural areas and social transformation in Turkey after 1950. some of these are; Frey, F.W., (1968) "Socialization to National Identification among Turkish Peasants", *The Journal of Politics*, C. XXX, S. 4, 1968, s. 956-975; Hiltner, J., (1960) "Land Accumulation in The Turkish Çukurova", *Journal of Farm Economics*, C. 42, S. 3, s. 615-628.; Kıray, M. and Hinderink, J. (1970) *Social Stratification as an Obstacle to Development*, Praeger Publishers, NewYork.; Stirling, P. (1965) *Turkish Village*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson. For further information; Akşit, B. (1987) "Kırsal Dönüşüm Araştırmaları", *11. Tez Kitap Dizisi: Türkiye'de Tarım Sorunu*, Sayı 7, s. 11-29, İstanbul. Uluslararası Yayıncılık.

Social differentiations such as the production of a new kind of cotton in Çukurova as a commodity, migration of some of ortakçı to the cities due to increased use of tractors and rise of capitalist farms, elimination of share croppers through wage-laborization of the remaining villagers and arise of a capitalist agha, wage laborers and other small producer farmers, labor force organizer (elçi) and a new type of village head. (Akşit, 1987; 13)

At the same time, these research results indicate that different villages in the same region follow different transformation paths. One of the villages has not gone through a massive change and remained closed, while in the other one capitalist relations have developed and the third one remains in the transition period. (Avcioğlu, 1973).

Akşit tried to demonstrate different sides of rural transformation with some research he did both in Antalya and in Ankara in 1996. The main problematic of the research conducted in Ankara is defined by Akşit as; “ Will the observed commercialization, commodification, mechanization, land polarization, social differentiation and concentration of lands in the hands of a few in the villages where cotton production done of which %100 per cent is marketed, be seen in the Middle Anatolian villages where wheat is produced?” (Akşit, 1987; 15). So Akşit, found the opportunity to compare the findings of his rural transformation research between the villages which are integrated to the market and those who are not. Although the villages are differentiated according to the closeness or distance to the central Ankara, his difference does not show structural social differences in both villages.

Akşit combined the research findings of the study conducted then with Keyder in between 1978-1981 and his previous findings, and then they together reached to a quad classification (Akşit and Keyder, 1981; Akşit, 1987). According to both Keyder and Akşit;

The transformations of villages within the capitalization process depend on the structure of land property, the type of product and accumulation opportunities, the type and dimensions of the struggle between producers and landowners, the time of the transformation, the structure of political power in the transforming country, class alliances and state policies towards agriculture, structures of cities and industry, speed of development and migration movements, the period of the world capitalist system. (1981; 10)

In this classification the first category is formed by villages in which migration occurs due to the non-fertility of the lands, the second category is constituted by small scale lands where urban and rural working, textile and gardening is done, third category is where commercialized merchants use modern vehicles and family labor to produce industrial plants or wheat for the market and the last category is formed by those villages where we can see capitalist farms. Capitalist village category belongs to Keyder and it can be observed in Southeast Anatolia which is characterized by a certain geographical area and a sui generis historical background (Akşit, 1987). Capitalist village is the situation, as Akçay mentioned before, where most of the lands belong to same person and due to the modern inputs, the types of production is differentiated.

As a result, the point that we should underline in this part which is about the contributions of empirical and theoretical studies to the literature, is that rapid modernization and the spread of capitalist relations after 1950s resolved the social and economic structures of rural areas and created radical changes. As Aydın (1987) points out capitalism and market relations in that or other way entered the agriculture sector and rural areas. In that point, the classification that Akşit and Keyder provided is significant since it demonstrated how the results of capitalist relations undergo a change due to the historical and geographical features of rural settlements.

What is important for us is that policies of integration to the market and modernization created a labor surplus. Together with population increase, social

transformation became much more rapid. Poor villagers who are oppressed under large scale enterprises and their big landowners, who are motivated by profit, moved to cities and started to be merged into industry, manufacturing and service sectors. When cities' and these sectors' assimilation capacity of those masses became narrow, informal sectors came into playground and they developed.

Those who are landless and have little pieces of land, against the possibility of living difficulties, formed the spine of the informal working in agricultural production by establishing seasonal migration ways. The thing that should be underlined here is not that seasonal agricultural work appeared after these processes but with the transformation for the rural areas it became more visible and a survival strategy.

The land properties of agriculture workers which takes place within the results of the research of Şeker (1986) on seasonal agriculture workers in Çukurova region in 1978, supports the situation above. According to the research, the %59 per cent of the agriculture workers defined themselves as landless. %82 per cent of the %30 of those who pointed out that they are landowners, expressed that they do seasonal agriculture work in their spare times. The high rates of agriculture work demonstrate that this group cannot survive due to the insufficient land. The labor surplus in rural areas caused by the change in sharecropping system and its decrease was mentioned before. Şeker's research shows the direction of this situation towards seasonal agriculture work. The %65 of the agriculture workers who were interviewed pointed out that they did sharecropping before and that they left sharecropping because of the pressure of the landowners (1986: 102).

24 years after Şeker's research in Çukurova, the results of the research about the land existence which I participated concerning child labor in seasonal agriculture work in Karataş, Adana in 2002, are significant since they demonstrate that the situation has taken a more serious position comparing to the results of Şeker. The %29.7 per cent of 119 households who work in agriculture work is landowners.

The rate of those households who do not have lands is % 69.4. % 69.2 of the households who are landowners have 20.000 square meters or less. Besides, %88,2 of the households defined themselves as agriculture workers. Those who perceive themselves as farmers constitute %5.6 of all (Gülçubuk and others, 2007). As can be seen, the time passed transformed seasonal agriculture work into a simple survival strategy.

It can also be mentioned about the ignorance towards the seasonal agriculture workers when their working and living conditions are considered. The most meaningful example of this ignorance towards them is the lack of statistics that show seasonal agriculture workers' rate within the agriculture sector. Generally, their number is demonstrated in academic studies approximately above the average labor force within labor intensive agricultural production types. Seasonal agriculture workers survive in 21th century Turkey as cheap labor open to exploitation lacking the right to social insurance.

3.5. Agricultural Structures and Seasonal Agricultural Work in Çukurova and Adana

In Çukurova, to define agriculture workers from other cities, terms like "moving", "temporary", "migrant" are used. These terms are all valid according to whom they are defined by: for those who observe from outside, they are "moving". The social security acquies, formal institutions and muhtars name them "temporary". For the landowners, they are "cheap" and "seasonal". In terms of the social and economic quality of the work, they are "waged" labor, in the sectoral sense they are "agricultural" and in terms of human geography they are "migrants". For the poor villagers of Urfa, Mardin, Reyhaniye, Batman, Diyarbakır, Siirt, it is the "sustenance" resource. (Gümüş, 2005; 22)

Çukurova, due to the production of cotton, which is called as white gold, has been hosting seasonal agriculture workers since the last periods of the Ottomans. Since cotton, which lost its hegemony in the region today, is an important industrial

plant, it highly contributed to the development of Çukurova and Adana inevitably.

The use of modern techniques and their development started with the governor of Egypt Mehmet Ali Paşa's seizing and dominating Adana against the Ottomans (1833-1840). The cotton production in this era was realized by agriculture workers brought from Egypt who are called '*fellah*'. In the era of Mehmet Ali Paşa's son İbrahim Paşa, important regulations had been done for agricultural workers. Among these regulations, reporting the working times, determining of working time as 5,5days and payment according to 7 days, the establishment of commissions which determined the wages and discussed the problems of the representatives of workers and employers (Aksoy, 1969 cited in Şeker, 1986).

In the book named "*An Outlook to Adana throughout History* (originally *Tarih Boyunca Adana Ovasına Bir Bakış*)" written by Kasım Eren in 1960 İbrahim Paşa is mentioned as;

(...) In the times when he stayed in Adana, he behaved to his people in a good manner and gave importance to the agriculture of the region which is the fortune of Çukurova (...) İbrahim Paşa considered the agriculture worker problem well in terms of the widening of the arable lands and prepared the irrigation project of Tarsus. The working type of agriculture workers of Çukurova, with what to feed them, the problems of rem and pecuniary wages were all regulated by him. Nevertheless, both with wheats and sugar canes imported from Syria and Egypt created a huge capacity of work for the workers. (191-192)

The cotton production in the region awakened during the emergence of raw material problems in the American independence War (1861-1865) and continued its importance till the end of the war. The decrease of cotton production started to increase due to the Anatolia-Baghdad railway network which connected Adana and Mersin together. It will not be wrong to argue that the capitalist relations in the region, where important industrial plants were grown, transportation opportunities bettered and production is made for external markets, started since

the last periods of the Ottomans.

Till the first years of the republic, the non-Muslims had been the important entrepreneurs and landowners. The commercial areas of textile also had been maintained under the control of the non-Muslims until the Republican period (Özbek, 2007; Ayalp, 2007). The land ownership started to be changed in the region because of the population exchange of non Muslims to other countries. Besides, there are so many lands which were idle. Muslim or villagers that came from outside started to own these lands (Avcıoğlu, 1973).

The land struggle of landowners had started. A class of land aghas had emerged who gained their power from the party and obtained the titles of the lands which resulted in the widening their lands. These new land aghas let villagers to stay on the lands they cultivate with the condition that they should give the half of what they produced. (Avcıoğlu, 1971; 626-627)

Thus, the capitalist relationships which started to develop before the republic; national bourgeoisie attempts and modernization policies immediately transformed the region and caused the intensification of lands. Besides, the region became an attraction area with the increase in the possibilities of market. In Adana and Çukurova, the tendency which started by using of modern techniques and means in agriculture continued due to the opportunities created by the state.

With the republican period cotton research centers were found and new kind of cotton started to be tested (Çalışlar, 1998). The cotton congress which convened in 1925 examined the conditions of the time and underlined the fact that there was a need for the latest agricultural modern technology. In the same congress, there had been some discussions about the agriculture workers too. The discussions mainly mentioned about the lack of workers and related production problems. The congress highlighted the need for “worker” offices which would work under the trade ministry. Moreover, it was pointed out that there was a need for taking

measures to eliminate the transportation, health and accommodation problems of the workers (Second Cotton Congress, 1925 cited in Şeker, 1986).

As can be seen, the cotton intensive production which has continued since the early republican periods, created a certain labor market. Working has always been a significant subject in the region since it includes a labor intensive process during harvest or picking off time although mechanization had entered the region more immediately compared to other regions. The agricultural production increase which is brought by the development of arable lands due to mechanization played a role of increasing the labor force need where the production of labor intensive industrial plants is done. In 1930s, governor of Adana Hilmi Uran pointed out the mentioned situation as such;

Adana has not been able to cultivate the arable lands which are suitable for cotton agriculture yet. Besides, the excavation machines enable the preparation of lands and arable lands that are cultivated by the power of the people, gradually increase the demand for agriculture workers. (Uran, 1939 cited in Şeker, 1986; 58)

It is normal to witness the channelization of the labor surplus, which is created by the rapid population increase due to the modernization in agriculture and effective entrance of capitalist relations to Turkey's rural areas after 1950s, to the region. Moreover, it can be argued that closeness of the region to the Southeast and East Anatolia which experienced unequal modernization under the traditional institutions like large scale land ownership and the system of *aghas*, inevitably contributed to region's becoming an attraction center within the framework of agricultural work. The development of non-agricultural areas like trade and textile by the development of Adana and Çukurova due to the industrial agricultural production made the region the last station in terms of the phenomenon of rural to urban migration.

According to Yurdakul (1982), mountain and forest villagers in Adana also take place within the supply of agricultural labor force mainly provided by the Southeast and East Anatolia till the 1980s. These villages, where small agricultural activities are intensive, come to the savanna in order to work in cotton production due to the low income. But, forestry activities, by creating alternative survival opportunities, started to banish this group from seasonal agricultural work. Another important claim of Yurdakul is that the activities of Seyhan Dam increased the irrigated lands and it positively affected the incomes of small scale producers, they also started to use this labor surplus in their agricultural activities. This situation has the feature of increasing the demand of labor force in the region (Yurdakul, 1982; 88-109). The information given by Yurdakul about the features of regional labor force are important due to its demonstration that the regional population is proletarianized. Because, the capitalist relations that affected the rural structure of Turkey were differentiated Adana in the same sense. In this framework, the capitalist transformation in agriculture both made the region an attraction center in terms of agricultural production and it reflected the general transformation in Turkey.

It is obvious that the seasonal labor force demand in the region is tied to the economic and social developments in Turkey. The Southeast Anatolian Project (GAP) which is applied in the Southeast of Turkey that is the most important source of agricultural labor force increased the agricultural production in the region since 1980s. The first of this increase is the cotton production. The cotton cultivation lands in 1985 were 8.945 hectares increased to 295 000 hectares in 2005 in GAP region⁴. Normally, that this increase played a role that increased the seasonal agriculture workers particularly in cotton production. The return of this increase to Çukurova can be read as a deficiency in labor force. Şeker (1987) provided that in the case of an increase in cotton production, the cities of the region could send workers to Çukurova just in the citrus collection time. Besides,

⁴ Source: <http://www.gap.gov.tr/Turkish/Tarim/t131.html>

Şeker underlined the rapid population increase. In other words, the increased cotton production and population may result in the labor surplus for the region. According to Özbek (2007), the region (GAP) in which landless households and unemployment are high is important still in the case of seasonal agricultural work. Özbek's finding is meaningful when we think of the demand of seasonal labor force in West Black Sea, Aegean and Middle Anatolia.

However, some of the social and structural developments which Şeker could not expect affected Adana and Çukurova after 1990. Cotton production left Adana gradually since 1990. Some of the reasons can be counted as the cotton production in GAP, the increase in the costs of cotton production, the problems in pest eradication and the cotton import from abroad. The arable lands for cotton which was 195 hectares in 1995 decreased to 50.000 hectares in 2003 (Agricultural Master Plan of Adana, 2005). Briefly, cotton is not a profitable investment means at all. This leave resulted in the proportionate decrease of the seasonal agriculture workers coming from other cities.

The decrease in the power of the white gold in Adana increased the importance of citrus production and greenhouse farming. The cotton production with an arable and cultivated land of 16.500 hectares continues its intensification in Karataş (Mater Plan, 2005). Because of that reason, seasonal agriculture workers from other cities come to Karataş. However, the interviewed intermediaries and employers argued that due to the ambiguity in the wages, seasonal agriculture workers prefer going to Aegean rather than Çukurova. Moreover one of the intermediaries from Şanlıurfa claims that increasing cotton production in GAP and particularly in Şanlıurfa has turned some part of agricultural workers to share croppers. These situations can be seen as one of the reasons of the problem of labor force in the region. Another reason of this labor force problem is the hesitation of settled workers to work in the same region for the same reasons.

Citrus and greenhouse farming creates an important labor force demand in the region. According to the findings of the field research, as Şeker claimed

temporary labor force migration from GAP for the new production patterns, is very limited. The most important reason of this is that the temporary or migrating workers of Adana in 1970s became the settled or regional agricultural labor force. The workers who tended to settle to places where they work started to strengthen this tendency due to the forced migration arising from political instability in Southeast and East Anatolia after 1985s. As a result of the migration, workers who settled down to Adana, live in Doğankent, Solaklı, and Merkez which belong to Yüreğir. For example, the population of Doğankent became 11.000 in 2000 while it was 6.000 in 1990. This population increase cannot be explained by natural population increase. For this group, agriculture work maintains its importance together with the employment opportunities of the urban sphere. The areas in which those workers have been employed are the new agricultural production patterns which were developed after the cotton production.

The point that should be brought out is that employment sources, both agricultural and non-agricultural, that are produced increasingly by Çukurova and its capitalist transformation, diversified the ethnical and social structure of Adana together with emigration. Turkish, Kurdish, Arabic people and people from different beliefs that are living in that region today, indicate the multi-cultural structure of Adana (Özbek, 2007). The distribution among statutes in agricultural employment is mostly differentiated as Turkish people are the employers on the other hand Kurdish and Arabic people are workers. Difficulties and discrimination that these ethnic differences create were rarely mentioned in the interviews conducted by intermediaries coming to the region from cities of Southeast and East Anatolia.

Like agricultural structures and seasonal agricultural work, these changes have affected labor intermediaries and resulted in of intermediary's practices. According to me these differentiations can be easily observed by analyzing intermediaries' social relations and interactions with workers, employers and each other.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE FIELDWORK

4.1. Introduction

As we have already discussed in Introduction and Conceptual Framework sections, the basic function of farm labour intermediary institution is bringing together the employer and worker in labour-intensive agricultural production processes. In this respect, people who have a role in this process are accepted as farm labour intermediary. In Çukurova where we execute our research, farm labour intermediaries are called as “elci”. There is no information about the origin of the word or the reason why it is used. However, the real word can be “elçi” (delegate). One of the farm labour intermediaries in the research field define “elci” as “the person who provides peace and mediates” and this definition increases this possibility. The dictionary meaning of delegate is that “*Person who is send to someone in order to provide consensus or end the job; person who is talebearer and makes this habit*”. The dictionary meaning of delegate shows that the word of “*elçi*” can transform to “*elci*” in daily speech or regional accent and have become to be used as “*elci*”. Since farm labour intermediary delegates between employer and worker, he represents each category against other. In addition, farm labour intermediaries are known as “*çavuş*” or “*dayıbaşı*” in different parts of Turkey. As it can be seen from here, the names attributed to farm labour intermediaries have a status meaning.

There is no consistent historical information in literature about different names of farm labour intermediaries in different regions. Although rural transformation and capitalization of agricultural production in Turkey that is discussed previous section briefly is related with farm labour intermediary institution directly or indirectly, there is no exact data about how farm labour intermediary has begun

and how it has evolved within time. The oldest resource about this issue is “*Adana Ziraat Amelesi (The Agricultural Workers of Adana)*” that was written by Hilmi Uran in 1939. In this paper, Hilmi Uran talks about farm labour intermediaries as in the following:

Workers are controlled by “*elci başı*” (intermediary) as a big or small group. “*Elci başı*” is professional job. This job has distinctive qualities, privileges, rights and responsibilities. Delegates should represent both workers and landowners, since they are the medium of these distinct groups. The bargaining for workers of landowners is done by “*elci başı*”. (Uran; 19-25 cited in Şeker, 1986) (*– all the italic text are my emphasis*)

As it can be seen in Turan, farm labour intermediary has a long history as a job in this region. The long history of farm labour intermediary institution is also supported by the date of quotation above. Although the status and position of farm labour intermediary might be different from the present in these times, the responsibility of farm labour intermediary has not changed within time. The other point revealed in this paper is the existence of an entity that regulates labour force in temporary agricultural activities. In my opinion, the reason of the existence of such an entity is to void the responsibility of employer to spend time with each of the worker and work with an institution which represents the category of worker and have right to act and speak in the name of that group. In other words, employer uses this institution in order to save time and money. It is possible that someone in the group might become more independent and begin to act for own interests within the transformation process of social and economical structures. For instance, in the novels of Yaşar Kemal and Orhan Kemal, there are somebody regulating and controlling countrymen who are migrating to lowland to collect cotton. These regulators are sometimes headmen or privileged people in village.

Consequently, farm labour intermediary has a long history as a job and it is observed if temporary agricultural workforce exists. In this scope, farm labour intermediary is not specific to Turkey. For instance, in the United States of

America, there is an institution called as “farm labour contractor” and functions as the institution of farm labour intermediary in our country. In addition, in a research about seasonal agricultural workers executed by Murat Şeker (1986), travelling notes⁵ written one of the most famous writers in America John Steinbeck is included, these travelling notes are the records he keeps while he was travelling and they also talks about farm labour intermediaries who regulate agricultural workers.

4.2. The Legal Dimension of Farm Labour Intermediary in Turkey

Basically, Turkish Labor Institution (ISKUR) is responsible from farm labour intermediary in Turkey. However, the responsibilities of institution in this respect give right to third parties through the confirmation of “*Charter About Employment Agency of Farm Labour Intermediary*” in 1978. In other words, farm labour intermediary has become a legal institution and obtained a legal ground by this charter. 15. 05. This charter entered into force through being published in Official Journal in 1978 and it is related with the working conditions of farm labour intermediaries. This charter was revised in 2004, some of its articles were abolished by Ministry of Labour and Social Security and it was published again in Official Journal in the 14th March of 2004. Charters dated 1978 and 2004 are not very different from each other with respect to their contexts. Charter dated 2004 was combined with the charter dated 1978 which includes the inspection of intermediaries and named as “*Allowing Employment Agency of Farm Labour Intermediary in Agriculture and Regulation about the Inspection of Intermediaries.*” Since the contexts of these two charters are not very different from each other, only the regulation of farm labour intermediary or just regulation will be used in the following sections without stating their dates.

⁵ The related book of John Steinbeck was written 1960 and its name is “Travels With Charley: In Search of America”. It includes the ground travelling notes of the writer.

Regulation gives the execution right of employment practices in agriculture to Turkey Labour Institution (it was Employment Agency before). This institution is accepted as official farm labour intermediary in Turkey. The way for corporate or real people to work as a farm labour intermediary is the article that allows farm labour intermediary to assign his authorization to third parties on the condition that he is not organized with İŞKUR or not effective although he is organized. Therefore, people who are not organized with İŞKUR but satisfy the requirements determined by İŞKUR can work as a farm labour intermediary. In this framework, this job institutionalized informally, but legalized and recognized by state due to acceptance of İŞKUR that it is not effective in this field generally. If the internal dynamics of farm labour intermediary are taken into consideration, it is normal to think that İŞKUR is not sufficient in this field. Structuralization of farm labour intermediary institution and the use of labour force in the sector of agriculture are very different from the normal employment practices of İŞKUR in other fields. Moreover, the responsibilities of farm labour intermediaries who will act on the behalf of İŞKUR or act under the inspection of İŞKUR in accordance with regulation demonstrate that temporary agricultural activity is very difficult to handle for that institution.

This regulation defines farm labour intermediary as:

(Article 3) – In agricultural activities in Turkey, people who are allowed to find employers and workers by Turkey Labour Institution or people who are corporate are defined as farm labour intermediaries.

Moreover, employers and workers who are working in agriculture, the charities and associations who are acting for common good, or organizations founded around them are allowed to acting in employment works by Employment Agency.

The qualities necessary for farm labour intermediary are as in the following according to 4th Article of Regulation:

(Article 4) – Qualities necessary for farm labour intermediaries are as in the following:

- a) Being a citizen of Turkey,
- b) Being older than 18,
- c) Not being deprived of public rights,
- d) Not being sentenced to penal servitude due to disgraceful offence such as debit, embezzlement, commission bribe, theft, cheat, forgery, abuse of believes, even if it is pardoned.
- e) Being literate.

As it can be seen from here, corporate or real individuals who apply to İŞKUR and satisfy the requirements above can work as a farm labour intermediary. According to Şeker (1986), this regulation gives right to work as a farm labour intermediary to individuals who are working in charities or for common good, and this is an indicator that approach of politicians to the perception of farm labour intermediary is not sufficient and well-developed. Because, as for Şeker, the roles of intermediaries and the intermediary perception of agricultural worker show that this job is beyond to simple mediating. When this job is taken in this respect, it is difficult for charities to take such kinds of responsibilities. In fact, farm labour intermediaries in Turkey do not only bring together employers and workers and regulate the contract between them, they have more responsibilities beyond these. As it can be seen from the following of this study, farm labour intermediaries define themselves as *“father or mother of agricultural workers”*. The detailed analysis of this definition also supports the critics of Şeker directed to farm labour intermediary definition of this regulation.

The definition of farm labour intermediary remained the same in the regulation revised in 2004, however crime circumstances determined in the “d” subclouse of regulation were extended. Crimes against directly to state, revealing the secrets of state, fiscal evasion and tender disturbances were added to crime circumstances. In the regulation dated 1978, education status defined only as being literate, however with the revision in 2004, “being at least graduate of primary school” was added to education criteria of farm labour intermediaries.

Generally, individuals who are satisfying these conditions can apply to take intermediary authorization. The validity of intermediary documents is determined as one year by this revision. If renewal is not demanded by the owner of the document, the expired document is cancelled. The meaning of this cancel is that that individual cannot work as a farm labour intermediary until he applies to take intermediary document.

Regulation makes employer and farm labour intermediary sign a contract that is prepared by İŞKUR. This contract officialises the business between employer and farm labour intermediary. By this way, working duration is determined exactly and problems arising after business are voided for both of the parties. The content of contract includes the beginning date of workers to work, wage of workers and pattern of paying (daily, weekly and monthly), whether advance will be paid or not by employer, whether worker will be paid for the days he cannot work for several reasons, cautions that employer will take for the health and security of workers, the transportation costs of workers and the wage of farm labour intermediary after he provides workers. Contract should be prepared as three copies and one of them should be given to İŞKUR.

Furthermore, intermediary should deliver a report to İŞKUR at least once in a year. The context of this report is also determined by İŞKUR. The scope of working report contains the employers that intermediary works with during a year, number of works and places where workers went, the types of works and the number of men and women workers, the number of agricultural workers younger than 18 and the suggestions and complaints of intermediary.

The responsibilities of farm labour intermediaries according to regulation are:

(Article 11) – The obligations of real or corporate people who are permitted to be farm labour intermediary in agriculture are as in the following:

- a) Agriculture employers should organize labour contacts in Institution or if they organize it outside from Institution they should send it to organization within two weeks after the organization date of the contract,
- b) They cannot take fee, expenditure or wage payment without this contract that is approved by Institution,
- c) They should deliver a notification that includes information about workers, who will work in that seasonal agriculture period to Institution during renewal period,
- d) They cannot take payment from workers, only they can demand wage from employers for their service,
- e) They should inform workers about their job, wage and any other issues before the start of activity,
- f) They should take away and bring forth workers fast and securely and in this process they should check and inspect everything directly,
- g) They should provide each worker to take their wages properly (Daily, Weekly or Monthly) and directly from employer,
- h) They should provide that the daily gross wages of workers is not less than the wage determined by Commission of Fixing the Minimum Wage.
- i) They should provide that housing, nourishment and drinking water of workers are appropriate to general health and housing conditions.
- i) They should defend the rights of workers against employer and should inform Institution about illegal and injustice applications immediately.

As it can be seen from above, the activities of farm labour intermediaries are determined comprehensively through the 11th article. 11. Notification in the “c” subclause of article is about the collection of workers. The context of this notification includes how many workers can be found for which types of agricultural works, the number of workers according to their settlement places and the working fields that workers can be brought. In addition, it is asked to farm labour intermediary whether there is anybody who will guarantee to him on the basis of this notification.

The corresponding regulation determines the farm labour intermediary and the activities of employment. Especially, the main aim of the 11th article which is

related to responsibilities of farm labour intermediary is to protect the rights of workers and create ideal conditions for workers. In this respect, this regulation “is very humanist basically and gives several responsibilities to farm labour intermediaries” (Yıldırak and others; 2003: 52), however it is always ignored by farm labour intermediaries and employers.

The most apparent indicator of this is the data obtained from researches about seasonal agricultural activities and farm labour intermediaries interviewed. For instance, in a research about child labour in cotton production executed in Karataş village of Adana, only the 58.1% of 44 farm labour intermediaries interviewed had working license (i.e. permission document) to work as an intermediary (Gülçubuk and others, 2003). Parallel to this, in a research done by Agricultural Labour Union in 2003 and is related with the problems of women in seasonal agricultural activities shows that 23.4% of 64 farm labour intermediaries have not any working license. If it is reminded that working license should be renewed once in every year and if it is also taking into consideration that related farm labour intermediaries have not renewed their working license, the number of farm labour intermediaries who have working license is less that findings obtained from these researches.

According to official statistics of Adana Branch of İŞKUR provided during field research numbers of labor intermediaries having working license in years between 2001 and 2007 are 73 in 2001; 73 in 2002; 81 in 2003; 98 in 2004; 122 in 2005; 158 in 2006 and 101 in 2007. The result from these findings demonstrates that although farm labour intermediary is handled in a legal basis, it is informal. Because approximately numbers of members of Çukurova Farm Labor Intermediaries’ Association was 500 when it was first founded in 2000. In other words, generally farm labour intermediaries are working without the inspection of İŞKUR.

The proportion of having intermediary license and registration to İŞKUR is very low and this normally leads to misapplication of contract signed between employer and intermediary. This does not mean that there is no agreement between these two parties. Parties have another contract other than the contract discussed above. This sign is more related with a check or bond. Such a kind of contract, the main aim is to guarantee wage related with the valid job. The working and living condition of workers are determined according to traditional perceptions constituted through the repeatedly practiced applications. Briefly, system is resumed as it is known or practiced generally.

If we think that contract is a legal tool to obey certain rules, contracts that are not signed provide some flexibilities for employer and farm labour intermediary. In fact, this contract has a power to solve the problems experienced by both the parties of it and the workers who are the cornerstone of this contract. Today seasonal agricultural workers have significant problems with respect to their lives and job security. One of the most important problems of seasonal agricultural is included in an article of regulation related with the responsibilities of farm labour intermediaries. For instance, there are several problems in the transportation of workers, determination of wages, informing workers before they begin to work, the working and living conditions of workers. In addition, some of the farm labour intermediaries also take money from workers. In this respect, providing the application of regulation correctly and increasing the possibility of its applicability can be good tools for solving the problems stated above. However numbers given above, policies and responsibilities attributed to farm labour intermediaries demonstrate that well known problems still exist.

On the other hand, one of the most common problems between employer and intermediary is not paying the wage of intermediary or not perform the promised job of employer and these kinds of problems can be solved through such a contract. If there is no such a contract, parties choose their own ways to solve these problems. Sometimes other delegates mediate between these parties or

parties apply their own rules to solve their problems. In these kinds of wage problems, workers cannot demand any wage if their wage is not paid. In this respect, the traditional relations between intermediary and worker also make worker dependent to intermediary. By this way, the informal ties of actors within structure strengthen and obtain a loyalty pattern.

The main question that should be asked here is why employer and intermediaries abstain from this legal framework constituted by İŞKUR. There can be several explanations in this respect. However in my opinion, the main reason lying behind is that seasonal agricultural activity and dependent farm labour intermediary institution have developed its own traditions and conventions and all these traditions and conventions has shaped the all related applications.

At the beginning of the section, we said that farm labour intermediary has been existed for a very long period of time if publishing dated 1939 is taken as a reference. The institution of this old seasonal agricultural activity was legalized and its applications were validated in legal sense in 1978. In other words, intermediaries perform their job without any legal framework for a long period of time. In this time period, developed values and traditions from the point of view of both worker and employer and accepted perceptions were caused by the practices of some applications repeatedly during a long time. State recognized farm labour intermediary as a job in 1978 through a regulation, however that regulation was not exactly different from the applications of previous years. As it was stated above, this regulation was revised in 2004. However they have protected their first positions. In fact, a great deal of time has passed and a lot of thing has changed and agricultural structures and seasonal agricultural workers of 1970s have changed tremendously.

Briefly, although this regulation prepared by looking above the issue reflects the problems of seasonal agricultural activities and gives responsibilities to employers and farm labour intermediaries in order to solve these problems, it ignores several

perceptions lying in the relationship between intermediary-employer and worker. In this respect, both intermediary as a job and seasonal agricultural workers continue to exist informally. As we discuss with details in the following sections, intermediaries attempt to set aside İŞKUR and want to organize in Çukurova by themselves and aim to be both practitioner and inspector.

4.3 Types of Farm Labour Intermediaries, Agricultural Workers and Employers in Adana

Before discussing the findings obtained from interviews, it is necessary to define the meaning of some concepts that intermediaries use frequently. It is possible to say that there are two different kinds of agricultural worker, farm labour intermediary and employer in Adana.

Farm labour intermediaries distinguish two as *boarders* and *settleds*. Generally, settled farm labour intermediaries are living in Adana and working in Çukurova. Boarder farm labour intermediaries are living in cities such as Bingöl, Şanlıurfa, Adıyaman and temporarily coming to Çukurova for work.

Such a distinction is also valid for agricultural workers. Generally, *settled workers* worked seasonal agricultural workers for a long time and while they were coming regularly to Adana for work, they decided to settle here. The constant dwelling place of these workers is Adana. Districts such as Yüreğir, Solaklı, Doğankent, 19 Mayıs are generally founded by these workers in Adana. Basically, these workers are not from Adana originally, however in interviews they were defined as local by farm labour intermediaries. Other group of workers, *boarders* is generally travelling seasonal agricultural workers. Commonly, they come to Çukurova with their families in certain months of year and they dwell in tents and they turn back to regions they are living in. Majority of these workers work in the collection of cotton or production of watermelon.

Employers can be distinguished as *firms* and *farmers*. Farmers cultivate their own land. Firms are agricultural production companies that have emerged as a result of production of vegetable and citrus in Adana and its number continues to increase depending upon the production of these products. These firms sometimes rent land in this region and make agricultural production. Other than, contract farming is the important work form of these firms.

These differentiations between important actors of agriculture show the altering structure of agricultural production in Adana. The main reason of this differentiation is that production in Adana tends to change from cotton to other agricultural products. The President of Adana Farmers' Association explains this situation as in the following within the scope of this research;

“Çukurova has become lowland that produces the 7% of cotton, because production of cotton is not beneficial anymore. We have a dirty ecology and struggle in this ecology means increase in expenditures. When we take into consideration to this kind of expenditure, production of cotton is not a beneficial investment in Adana anymore. Production of cotton shifts place to GAP region and Aegean Region because of its quality. What has increased in here? Production of watermelon and greenhousing.”
(1)⁶

The decrease in production of cotton that once upon a time thought as a white gold and equivalent to Adana also minimized the number of laborer that we watched in movies. In addition to this, transition to machinery production of cotton also lead to decline in the requirement of seasonal agricultural workers. The supplement of permanent migration to this process has altered the seasonal agricultural activity structurally. Tribes migrating from cities in East and South East Regions to Adana has settled here and become permanent population. Surely, this process is acceptable for scale of Adana that is our research field. According to farm labour intermediaries interviewed, decrease in the production of cotton

⁶ The original Turkish forms of the quotations obtained from interviews are given Appendix A.

and the indeterminate wages in this production field has canalized migration from East to Aegean, Central Anatolia and West Black Sea Regions.

The differentiation in agricultural production from cotton to citrus and greenhousing also has affected the use of agricultural labour force. Namely, cotton production requires a great deal of work force in certain months of year. The more the labour forces the fast the collection of cotton. Collection wage was determined according to kilogram a worker collects in a day. Citrus and greenhousing is daily works. In other words, workers take their wages daily. Since the production of citrus and greenhousing is done in winters, and it requires some qualities for workers, they are not good for boarder workers who are in lowland in summers and autumns. In this respect, people who settled Adana while they came here as a seasonal agricultural worker and nowadays are working as local workers participate in the production of citrus and greenhousing. They are also preferred by employer, since their dwellings are in Adana and this decreases some expenditure for employer. Furthermore, agricultural workers who are living Adana tend to depart from cotton production and canalize to another production fields. The reason of this alteration is that production of cotton is “*dirty*” and demanding and the wages are ambiguous.

In fact, due to decrease in cotton production in Çukurova, it has been replaced with the production citrus and greenhousing. This does not mean that people who are living in Adana and working in temporary agricultural activity do not participate in seasonal migration. In interviews, we see that still some people go to Central Anatolia and Black Sea Regions in order to work as a seasonal agricultural worker. However, this number is too low. Because the production of citrus and greenhousing take long and wages are good enough not to look for other jobs. On the other hand, although number of seasonal agricultural workers decrease in lowland, the available work force canalizes to other regions for the production of cotton, onion, sugar beet, caraway and hazelnut. Furthermore, there some workers who temporarily migrate to Adana in order to work in the

production of citrus and greenhousing. These workers commonly live in the place where farm labour intermediary found. However, in this kind of production patterns, agricultural workers do not come to work with their families like cotton. Mostly, father and adult son migrate in order to work. In this framework, agricultural activity can be associated with construction working.

The transformation in this lowland can be explained with the words of The President of Adana Farmers' Association;

“If we take into consideration to case of Adana, intermediary and unskilled labor has minimized in relation to production of cotton. The reason of this is that production of cotton is not beneficial. Therefore, use of labor force for digging and collecting decreased. On the other hand, machinery use has increased in the collection of cotton. This means that there is no need for labor force for this process. These machines can collect cotton in a very short period of time compared to use of labor force. There is enough to do this. Workers for collecting cotton that were included in so many movies decreased. What has increased in here? This kind of unskilled labor force has shifted to production of watermelon and citrus. My observation about this is that most of this labor force constituted by urban labor force. These people come to work in mornings and turn back to their homes after time is over. Like working in a factory. However, people set up tents to the lowland before 20-30 years. Because the production of cotton contained in one and a half million decars. People especially came from Gaziantep, Diyarbakır, Adiyaman and mountain villages of lowland. The reason of the selection of this job was to activate unskilled labor force. People from 65 years old to 12 years old were coming to lowland in order to collect cotton.” (2)

The importance of this transformation is that it leads to emergence of unskilled labour in the city. This labour force constitutes the poor class in the city whose relations with land and rural was broken. Seasonal agricultural activities are the way of making money for working families. Different from the previous scheme, now the adult members of a family work in different jobs in order to earn living.

Citrus and greenhousing, construction, street trading, cowbat and seedling or confection/textile factories for young women are new working fields for people.

The effects of this transition also will be used as a part of our farm labor intermediaries. After explaining the transition of lowland briefly, we can begin to discuss general qualities of intermediaries interviewed and their histories to begin farm labour intermediary job.

4.4. Demographical Findings about Farm Labour Intermediaries Interviewed

Within the scope of discussion, I interviewed with 10 intermediaries in Adana. Two of these intermediaries worked as an intermediary for about 20-25 years and then left the job. Other two of these intermediaries bring worker from Şanlıurfa to Karataş village of Adana for cotton hoeing and harvest. The other six of these intermediaries are living in Adana and they are the member of association. One of these six intermediaries is the old president of Çukurova Farm Labor Intermediaries Association and other is the present one. One of the members of this association is woman.

One of the broader intermediaries is 40, the other is 42 years old. One of them is literate but never attending school and works as a farm labour intermediary about 11 years, and the other is illiterate and continues to do this job for about 25 years. These two broader intermediaries have no other job except from intermediary. Finally, neither of them has working license from İŞKUR and they stated that they were not registered to İŞKUR.

The ages of the members of the association ranges 40-45. Woman interviewed did not go to school, but she is literate. Within other five members of the association interviewed, the highest education level is intermediate secondary school. Only one of these five members is graduated from intermediate secondary school. These intermediaries are not from Adana originally. They settled Adana

approximately 30 years ago. Their families have agricultural working history and migration to Adana is directly related with seasonal agricultural activity. The most important reason lying behind the migration is hard living conditions and difficulties in satisfying livelihood standards. Since this region has become famous through seasonal agricultural activities, Adana has been the mostly preferred city to work as an agricultural worker. In addition, intermediaries interviewed also stated that friends and affinities who settled to this region also affected the migration process of them.

It is stated that migration has become effective after 1990s and the stop point of migration is Doğankent district of Yüreğir village. The population of Doğankent was 960 in 1960, but it increased to 11.000⁷ in 2000. The two-fold increase in population between 1990 and 2000 is parallel to dates emphasized in interviews.

Farm labour intermediaries interviewed as the members of association have registration in İŞKUR and they stated that they renew their permission documents each year. However, except from being registered to İŞKUR, it is observed that they do not fulfill some of the responsibilities determined in regulation. On the most apparent disobedience to regulation is that they do not sign a contract with employers.

4.5. Histories of Beginning to Work as a Farm Labour Intermediary

By taking into consideration the interviews done within the scope of field work, it can be claimed that there are four important routes to begin to work as a farm labour intermediary. First of these routes is taking over the job from his father, the second is shifting to work as a farm labour intermediary while working as an agricultural worker, the third one is while he is working on his own land, he also works as a seasonal agricultural worker or while providing work force for himself,

⁷ Resource: <http://www.yerelnet.org.tr/belediyeler/index.php?belediyeid=129803>

he learns the job and finally beginning to work as a farm labour intermediary completely from outside the seasonal or familial agricultural activities.

Most of the boarder delegates took over the job from their fathers. In addition, this intermediary stated that he is in the job from the age of 12. One of the farm labour intermediaries who have been doing this job for 11 years began as an agricultural worker and an employer wanted worker from him and then he began to work as an intermediary. This delegate explains the reason of beginning to work as an agricultural worker as the insufficiency of the production of his land to earn a life. Afterwards, when he began to work as a farm labour intermediary, he left the agricultural activities.

The same is also acceptable for farm labour intermediaries who are the members of association. Woman farm labour intermediary and one of the man farm labour intermediaries have begun to this job while they were seasonal agricultural workers before. Two of the other man intermediaries took over the job from their fathers and the other two learned the job through their own agricultural activities.

Except these, there are some farm labour intermediaries who began to job neither by taking it from their families nor doing agricultural business. These kind of intermediaries interviewed decided to do this job due to its acquisition. However, since the most important issues in this business is experience, trust and powerful relations, commonly these kind of farm labour intermediaries go bankrupt due to lack of these qualities, because they do not know employer and worker. In here knowing employer and worker is not just recognizing them, it knows how the relationship between employer and worker can be balanced and regulated. One of the farm labour intermediaries who began to do job afterwards is defined as in the following:

“Intermediary can be accepted as a family job.” Others who do not belonging to an intermediary family cannot be successful.

Man may be a craftsman. This man decides to do this job. One day three to five men came to here. They said that they had been living in that building and had been aggrieved. I said I hope nothing is wrong and asked who they were. They were from Şırnak and one of the man deceived them by saying that he would find a job to them. They were 25 men. The man who promised to find a job settled them to a derelict house after earthquake. We went to their house, they were living in a demolished building with 25 men. There was no toilet. They had not money to buy bread. Everywhere was dirty. This man is a craftsman in Adana, goes to Şırnak, collects men and then escapes from them. He went bankrupt and decided to do this job. This job is not easy. It requires responsibility...”

One of the farm labour intermediaries who aped the earning from intermediary business and began to do this job defines the situation as in the following:

“After the foundation of this association... The ratio of intermediary was 8-10%. After the foundation of association, the bother of intermediaries was explained and wages has increased. When this wage has been heard by others, people said that I have 15 people in my family and there are 15 people in some other family, I can also do this job. This has become the general perception. The job of intermediary attracts people's attentions. I am angry to intermediaries. They earn money and buy jeep. They park it in front the coffee house. Jobless people emulate to them and think that they can also do this job. The reason why the number of farm labor intermediary is increasing is related with this. There is also exhaustion in this job. Some of them can do one or two years. And then their car and house disappears. This job is attractive, they sit in coffee house and they calculate their money. This number of worker means this amount of money. If he has three or four children, he says why I don't do this job. He come to gather with two or three people and starts to do this job.”

Different from beginning later to do this job, some of the farm labour intermediaries have been matured within this job. The only woman farm labour intermediary interviewed is an indicator how seasonal agricultural activity is

related with hopelessness and solidarity. Mrs. Meral⁸ is 42 years old and from Adiyaman. When his husband's business in Adana went to bankrupt, she began to seasonal agricultural activities with his children. Since she was hardworking and disciplined, she was promoted to head of laborers, in other words she became a serge. In these times, she began to construct good relations with workers she is working with. Afterwards, she became their "Meral Abla". While she was in hospital due to a kind of illness, she met with a wife of an employer and she was encouraged by her to be a farm labour intermediary, then she built a group including 15-20 workers. Mrs. Meral is working with 350-400 workers today. According to her, the reason for her to do this business is completely related with her friend in hospital. Since she is highly trusted and hardworking woman, she does this job very well.

Mr. Ahmet and Mr. Mehmet began to work as a farm labour intermediary by taking over the job from their fathers. Mr. Ahmet worked in several jobs before his father quitted the job. Since he grown up in farm labour intermediaries and agricultural workers, he was not far away from the job. When his father decided to quit the job, his brothers stated that they did not want to work as a farm labour intermediary and he began to do this job in 2000. Since his father had already a reputation within workers and employers, he constructed reliable relations with both parties automatically.

One of the other important groups who begin to do this job is petty agricultural producers. One of the interviewees Mr. Hamdi who is from Diyarbakır is an example for this group. With his own words;

"I have brother-in-love here. I started this job with him. My brother-in-love has his own land, we were digging it. We were dropping potato and onion. I observed that our district is poor. My wife is a little bit skillful, I said that we have a land, let's

⁸ Since the interviewee given her/his job history information under the seal of secrecy, name used in this thesis is not real.

cultivate there. And also our neighbors participated. We have started as let's take this potato and that pepper. I brought them to my land. Then my wife wandered around the district and we have begun to cultivate onion in one year and pepper in other year. Then workers said that if you find job to us we can come with you. We agreed with workers. Brother of my brother-in-love has so much work to do. He has always works in summers and winters. We extended our network after starting 15-20 people. Then I had an accident with my brother and swore not to cultivate land. Already I became alone. I began to spend time with workers. In these times there was a lot of work. I turned back to my home in the evenings and I went to work in the mornings. I said that two works could not continue at the same time. In fact, we can earn much more while we are cultivating land, it depends on your chance. We started like this, and I have been doing this job for 10 years.”

Briefly, the way to begin to do this job is an important issue for the success in onward periods. Taking over the job from father or beginning to work as a farm labour intermediary after working seasonal agricultural activities is very crucial for obtaining and developing social capital. The importance of recognition and reputation with respect to social capital and use of social networks is emphasized in previous sections. An intermediary who takes over the job from his father also takes over the whole of the social relations and networks. Therefore, the importance of social capital acquired through the accumulation of family has become apparent with respect the success of this job. On the other hand, intermediaries who begin to do this job after participating seasonal agricultural activities constructs social networks with both employers and workers within time and after obtaining necessary social relations they mobilize their relations. The unsuccessful enterprise of people who decide to do this job completely outside from this sector can be explained with the lack of these social relations and networks, in other words the most important investment in this job is social relations, namely social capital.

4.6. Farm Labour Intermediaries and Seasonal Agricultural Workers

As it was discussed in the previous sections, the most important resource of social capital of farm labour intermediaries is workers he is working with. These workers are not just people he is working with, they are his neighbors, affinities or friends. In this respect, social relations of a farm labour intermediary are very complex in itself.

All intermediaries interviewed have certain number of workers working with him. However this number is not stable. It depends on the quality of the job. In addition, it is impossible to say that certain number of workers always work with the same farm labour intermediary. Even so, it can be said that farm labour intermediaries have a group of workers he is in contact with on the basis of the job. Although intermediaries and workers are loyal to each other, their relations with respect to work include several workers and intermediaries. The most apparent indicator of this situation is defined by an intermediary, he said that "*in pocket of a worker, there are at least cards and telephone numbers of 3-4 intermediaries*". Briefly, the most important point in here is that although the relationship between an intermediary and a worker is profound, they are not strictly depending upon each other with respect to job.

Most of the intermediaries interviewed generally dwell with their workers in the same neighborhood, district or town. Since greenhousing and production of citrus is very intense in this region and wages are paid daily, workers do not prefer to work outside from Adana. In addition, since they are living in Adana, they turn back to their homes after time is over. According to farm labour intermediaries in Adana, this is a reason why workers in Adana do not prefer to work outside from Adana. The broader intermediaries and workers interviewed within the scope of the research are generally neighbors of themselves. In other words, workers who come to lowland as a broader worker settle to this city and they begin to live here. Broader workers define this situation like this; "there is nobody in country side,

all of them migrate to Urfa. My village had 150 dwellings, but now it has 30, and the population remained is very old. We left all of our lands. There is no drinking water in our village. There are some bores, but they are full of mud.” (6) Different from farm labour intermediaries living and working in Adana, there are more affinity relationship between broader intermediaries and their worker group.

As we already stated in the previous section, affinity and family are natural social networks that farm labour intermediaries have. Especially, these social networks are very significant at the beginning of the job. Şeker and (1986) and Gülçübuk (and others, 2003) discuss the importance of citizenship and tribe ties with respect to collecting workers. This situation was apparent in interviews.

For instance, one of the farm labour intermediary from Urfa stated that when he had began to do this job 11 years ago, all of his workers had been his affinities. At the beginning he began to work with 30 workers, and then this number increased to 230 and approximately 50-60 of them was his affinity who came to lowland in order to work. Other broader intermediary interviewed emphasized that 25-30% of his 100 workers are his affinities. Choosing affinities to work with highly related with solving problems more easily in the process of working. “Since workers and intermediaries know each other, solving problems and communicating becomes easier and solidarity between each other may be greater.” (Yıldırak and others, 2003: 61).

However, this situation is not acceptable for all farm labour intermediaries who live and work in Adana. Although they accepted that affinity ties and neighborhood are important points at the beginning of the job, it is not important any longer due to their extended social relation in this field. There can be several explanations in this respect. One of them is that local intermediaries work in fields which require high labour force. It is inevitable to construct new social relationships with the advancement of the job. The advancement of the job means that intermediaries have begun to work more than one employer and hence they

need more workers to resume their relationships with employers. The more the job the more the earning. Conversely, broader intermediaries stated that they only work for the collection and hoeing of the cotton and they are curios to work with only one employer. Surely this claim cannot be generalized just by taking into consideration the interview with two broader farm labour intermediaries and their specific working conditions. However, according to Şeker (1987), if the issue is travelling agricultural workers, farm labour intermediaries may want to keep their working field small. This situation may be exemplified with our finding that demonstrates the desire of broader farm labour intermediaries wanting to work only with one employer. In such a kind of perception, there is no reason for farm labour intermediary to find a lot of workers.

Briefly, it should be emphasized that the work load of the intermediary determines the size of work force of a farm labour intermediary. For instance, while I was telling the job history Mrs. Meral I stated that she has approximately 400 workers. One of the most important reasons of this is that Mrs. Meral sometimes goes to Bolu in order to collect hazelnut and sometimes she goes to Antalya in order to collect pine cone. Furthermore, Mrs. Meral provides work force for cowpat and seedling factories during 12 months of a year. This high work load also leads to developed social relations and networks. Moreover, these advanced work ties are also key element for workers to have a regular job. Creating work fields actively, finding enough work force for these working fields, workers' preference to work with an intermediary who has ability to create new working fields are highly related with each other. This circulation is an important motivation resource for an intermediary to develop his/her social capital.

The development of the social capital depends on new social relations without affinities. In this point, neighborhood, friendship, citizenship gain importance as other social Networks. Especially if the dwelling of intermediary locates in a district where the population of workers is high, this means that he is very close to obtain required work force.

If we put broader intermediaries aside, the transitions and migration experienced within 20 years has affected the resources of social capital of settled farm labour intermediaries. The importance of family and affinity institutions with respect to social networks has been replaced with secondary social relations such as neighborhood and friendship. Even it can be said that affinity has lost its importance and the most important issue has become finding a worker. What this means is that although the primary social networks is so crucial at the beginning of being a farm labour intermediary, it is replaced with other secondary social relations within the process.

Except from dwelling in the same district and neighborhood, the other significant issue with respect to constructing new social relations is associated with the reference of the worker. Especially, if it accepted that social relations such as affinity and extended family ties is not very important any more, the power of the relationship between farm labour intermediary and worker depends on the work quality of them. Reference of a worker is an indicator for the reputation of worker. If an intermediary is reliable and he is liked by workers, this means that obtaining new labour force for that intermediary is easy. The opposite of this is the destruction of work relationship between an intermediary and worker and resulted with escaping worker from intermediary. This is not specific to today. Older intermediaries that I talked about the history of this job stated that is an intermediary has a positive image between workers; he does not face with difficulty while looking for new workers. This situation is explained as in the following in interview;

“You went to production of hazelnut and there are 10 intermediaries (Ahmet, Mehmet, and Mrs. Meral) in a one village. Others job continues 15 days. For instance they stay 40 days and work 10 days. But the workers of Mrs. Meral stay 50 days and work 45 days. Mrs. Meral pays money as cash beforehand, but other man puts into trouble workers. Citizens find Mrs. Meral regardless of where they come from, they give their telephone numbers and say we want to work with you in

the next year. In this way, Mrs. Meral has workers from Siirt, Adiyaman, and Diyarbakır.”

If I want, I can find 1000 workers. If the intermediary is reliable, worker keeps in touch with him. That’s not important where you are living. Workers are talking between themselves. We went to production of hazelnut. But I always say that thanks to our intermediary, he paid the money on time, found me job and when the weather became colder, he said enough and we turned back. I say this intermediary is this. Other says that give me his telephone number and asks whether he brings us or not.” (7)

As it is seen from what is transferred from the interviews, if the farm labor intermediation is perceived as honest, dependable and someone who defends workers’ rights; then the farm labor intermediation comes to a position where he/she can use his workers’ network to find new workers. In the opposite situation, workers leave the farm labor intermediary for good if there are not any other binding relations between the two parties. This situation spreads through the social communication network of the worker. As a result, the farm labor intermediary suffers a great deal of loss of trust and, accordingly, labor force.

The first think that comes to mind within this frame is that the farm labor intermediary, who suppresses and exploits workers, will be excluded from his profession via the process of receiving and spreading information within the social relations network he uses. Besides, it is an imperative to behave honest and fare to workers to be known as a good farm labor intermediary. However, the reality is different than what it is thought it should be. Under normal circumstances, the choices that had been drawn out through logical thinking cannot be put into practice since the farm labor intermediaries develop different kinds of relations. Certainly, this is a generalization. There are farm labor intermediaries who enmeshed into the situation mentioned above and lost his job or bankrupt as the ones who had been interviewed name it. For example a respondent said; “workers say that that intermediary did not pay my money in the coffee house. He does not go to work with him. He waits to take his money.

Intermediaries who went to bankrupt go another places and other intermediaries appear.” (8) But it had been also expressed that some farm labor intermediaries with bad reputation still continue doing their jobs. One of such farm labor intermediaries is trying to go on with his job by finding unemployed youngsters and workers coming from out of Adana to the lowlands or finding workers who had some problem with other farm labor intermediaries.

Examples of the farm labor intermediaries with bad reputation who continue doing their jobs, or farm labor intermediaries loosing trust in the eyes of workers highlight the importance of workers’ ideas about farm labor intermediaries in the network which is shaped during the relations between the two parties.

4.7. Continuity of Relationship between Agricultural Worker and Farm Labor Intermediary

After the relation and social network are shaped between the parties on the basis of what was mentioned above, what farm labor intermediaries do to ensure the maintenance of those relations come to the fore. As it is seen in the explanations related to social capital, an important point about social capital is how existing or constructed social relations acquire continuity. This is mainly explained by the necessity of investing in social relations. Farm labor intermediaries try to maintain the relations they have made with the workers they work with by fulfilling some of their roles that they have undertaken. What farm labor intermediaries that had been interviewed expressed dealing with workers as a part of their job is seen as investments according to our theoretical frame. Certainly, it cannot be posed that all these investments are conscious behaviors. What keeps the two parties together can sometimes be the solidarity coming from social bonds like friendship, neighborliness etc. and sometimes it is a conscious act to prevent skilled workers from working with another farm labor intermediary.

It is mentioned above that farm labor intermediaries who had been interviewed say that they are not running after the workers but it is the opposite. If it is the fact, then, one can ask why farm labor intermediaries act in a particular manner to maintain their relations with workers. An important reason for this act is to have the status of a person who protects and favors workers in the eyes of them. Because, farm labor intermediary is the person who provides jobs for the ones that is working or will work with him. This perception of workers that they have constructed in time, made farm labor intermediaries see themselves as parents of the workers they work with. That being said, in the times of peak seasons of cotton production farm labor intermediaries become the eyes and ears of the workers coming from outside to the lowlands. They solve every problem on behalf of the worker. The reason of the expression “*the workers does not know the employer, they only know the farm labor intermediary that they come to work with*”, which had been repeated many times during the interviews, is the role farm labor intermediaries undertake.

Another important reason of this situation is the competition among farm labor intermediaries. After the completion of cotton season, other labor intensive forms of agricultural production still need significant amount of labor force. Unfortunately, there are no statistical data on temporary agricultural labor force in Turkey, which obliged the assumptions, about whether a region has too much or few labor force, be drawn from the interviews that had been carried out during the field study. According to some of the farm labor intermediaries, there is a current shortage of labor force in Adana. On the other side, according to some other farm labor intermediaries, there is an overflow of labor force in Adana. This overflow of labor force causes the typical relations between workers and farm labor intermediaries to change. If there is a shortage of labor force, farm labor intermediaries should be running after workers, not vice versa. But, during the interviews, both local/settled and boarder farm labor intermediaries said that circumstances are changed and workers are now running after them. On the other part, if there is an overflow of labor force, this time it would be reasonable to

assert that farm labor intermediaries would not care about their relations with the workers.

I think this situation can be explained as follows. It is a fact that a certain amount of local labor force is canalized towards agricultural production in Adana regardless of the shortage or overflow of labor force in the region. The reason of increasing competition among farm labor intermediaries for the labor force that they had claimed to be running after them is not the quantitative aspect of the labor force, but the overabundance of work fields that the labor force is canalized into and the number of farm labor intermediaries.

From my point of view, in such a situation agricultural workers are attributed more value than their default values for farm labor intermediaries. However, the value of workers is revealed especially in citrus and greenhouse production since more skilled ones, compared to the ones working in cotton production, are preferred for this type of work. There might be an overflow of labor force as some of the farm labor intermediaries mentioned. But the increase in the number of farm labor intermediaries makes it reasonable why they struggle to maintain their relations with workers. The reason of workers running after farm labor intermediaries might be the overflow of labor force as well as the increasing number of alternative working fields mentioned above. Besides, increasing number of farm labor intermediaries means increasing alternative sources of income and jobs for workers. In this case, other than labor intermediaries going to neighboring and their own villages and gathering workers before the cotton season (Şeker, 1988), today, workers contact, by the season, with the farm labor intermediaries they work with and let them know they are ready to work and learn which jobs are available for them. Besides this changing relation between workers and labor intermediaries, at the times of intense work when labor force is needed, farm labor intermediaries running after workers are still seen at a certain level. In short, gathering of workers is now performed with both old and new methods.

Beyond from which side the relation is constructed, the actions being performed to maintain the relations between workers and labor intermediaries is the focal point for us. We mentioned that the backbone of the theory of social capital is formed by social relations among individuals or groups. Maintenance of these relations is important in the use and accumulation of social capital. This situation is maintained mainly on the reciprocity of the social network that individuals are placed into. The reciprocal nature of relations brings trust and liabilities with itself.

Generally speaking, reliability is an important indicator of farm labor intermediaries. The factors that make a farm labor intermediary reliable are, from the point of employer, bringing agreed number of workers in time to the field or garden, ensuring completion of the job in the way employer wants swiftly, ensuring that workers and the employer comes together face to face at a minimum level; from the point of workers, receiving payments on time as much as possible, ensuring to find reliable and long term jobs, meeting the economic and daily needs during the time of work. A farm labor intermediary, who proved himself about these factors, as it is highlighted at the part where laborers' reference is important, builds up trust in the relations network he has. To do that, farm labor intermediary has to handle laborers and employers at the same time as much as he can. According to the farm labor intermediaries that had been interviewed, a "*durable*", "*honest*" and "*calculating*" farm labor intermediary never suffers shortage of workers or jobs.

Poverty and providing jobs for agricultural workers who suffer greatly from poverty are factors that are strong enough for the maintenance for relations between workers and farm labor intermediaries. This is the most important factor although it is not created by farm labor intermediaries and it affects his social capital as an external factor. Anyone who wants to work in a labor intensive agricultural production, meaning being an agricultural worker, he or she is connected to labor intermediaries. A poor individual's obligation to be included

into someone's or some groups' network of relations is different than the social capital literature mentioning individuals' obligation to invest in their relations to be able to harvest some benefits out of it. Because, what we mention as the obligation of being under the initiative of farm labor intermediaries is a result of a more macro level social and economic indicators than farm labor intermediaries. What farm labor intermediaries, consciously or unconsciously, do is using this existing reality to augment their social capital composed of relations with workers. But, during the interviews, it had been mentioned that some farm labor intermediaries deepen agricultural laborers', or poor people's circumstances they are living in to maintain their relationships with laborers and provide labor force for them. The process which is called "borrowing" especially in the studies of seasonal agricultural labor (Karabıyık and others, 2002; Gülçubuk and others, 2003) is a process during which some farm labor intermediaries give money and meet the needs of economically weak individuals or families to compel them to keep working with the same farm labor intermediaries. The President of Çukurova Farm Labor Intermediaries Association expresses this situation as follows;

"Intermediary comes and makes contract for cheap daily wage. We do not intervene if a complaint does rise. Because we have not such an authorization. However if a worker complaints, we attempt to solve the problem with our means. Workers afraid and they do not say anything, because they think that they cannot find a job next year. Corsair intermediary distributed money in winter and made them dependent to himself. They lose the chance to work in other place. Now he works with interest ratio.

"He makes dependent workers in winter and workers lose the chance to do something different. He makes poor people in debt. They cannot defend their rights anymore. It is not known that how much money corsair intermediary pays to workers. He does not know how much money he will earn." (9)

Respondent farm labor intermediaries call such people as "pirate farm labor intermediaries". According to them, a pirate farm labor intermediary is a person

without any connection to an institution who ignores values of farm labor intermediation which they believe had been developed during the course of time. According to the president of Çukurova Farm Labor Intermediaries Association, such people deceive agricultural workers by making use of disorder in the system of seasonal agricultural labor and employers' desire to minimize labor costs. "Borrowing" process is to make workers the slaves of farm labor intermediaries to whom they owe money. This process is also a clear example of how reciprocity and liability of social relations can be abused.

Respondent settled and boarder farm labor intermediaries highlighted that all farm labor intermediaries are perceived in the same way because of the situation mentioned above. Actually, it would be unfair to generalize this to all farm labor intermediaries. Farm labor intermediaries are people who make their living over the workers they work with. But this does not mean every one of farm labor intermediaries oppress and exploit the workers they work with.

With the data drawn from the interviews, it is possible to mention some humane behaviors other than "borrowing" within the context of maintenance of relations. The factors maintaining the relations of the parties are solidarity and perception of farm labor intermediaries as sources of reference by workers. In other words, whatever the humane approach stemming from the practices of solidarity or relations of being friends, neighbors, relatives etc. within workers' and farm labor intermediaries' own social sphere; in the professional context, the steps of both parties that they take for each other have the potential to create relations of mutual interest in the future.

Farm labor intermediaries see what they do to maintain their relations with workers as a natural part of their jobs. For them, farm labor intermediary is not only about bringing workers to the arranged places on time, but also about dealing with the problems of workers when they are working or not. Besides the factors of being with them all the time and existing social bonds, farm labor intermediaries

see themselves a bit above in terms of social and cultural aspects which is another important factor within this context. What a respondent farm labor intermediary says about this subject seems to be clarifying the issue;

“Low income group is not well educated. Children see their mother three hours in a day and see intermediary 16-17 hours in a day. After a moment, you have become their mother and father. Farm labor intermediary deals with uneducated people.”(10)

It would not be wrong to pose that this is a perception that is shaped during the period of migratory agricultural labor within the context of worker- farm labor intermediary relations. For example, when the periods during which people come from out of Adana to Çukurova for cotton season come to mind, farm labor intermediary was the only figure connecting workers to the city in terms of meeting their needs. Farm labor intermediary is the person who can talk to employers, goes to city center, providing the needs of workers like clothes, food, cleaning supplies etc., solves problems within the workers tents, decides who will do what. So, farm labor intermediaries, according to Şeker (1986), resemble “*ağa*”s who are important figures in the East and South East Anatolia;

(...) farm labor intermediaries who are like “*ağa*”s and migratory agricultural workers brought with them have such functions. They solve problems between workers, protects them from the ‘pressure’ of local people and employers and they provide economic support when it is necessary. As a result of authority of farm labor intermediary reached within this relation comes with great control over agricultural workers. It is impossible to be in relation with agricultural laborers excluding labor intermediaries. (1986; 95)

It is very difficult to talk about, Şeker’s idea of a farm labor intermediary which is the reflection of *ağa*, as an important figure for agricultural workers of the East and the South East Anatolia, in the seasonal agricultural worker today. Dissolved familial and tribal bonds with the effect of urbanization and migration, has

weakened the idea of farm labor intermediary, who tries to gather workers from cities instead of villages, as the reflection of ağa. It is difficult to talk about an authority of farm labor intermediaries over workers in the urban context. Authority is something a farm labor intermediary has to have when it comes to, in their words, bring order to the group which is composed of a bunch of migrant strangers who have to work in the same field and live in the same tent for three months. But today, agricultural workers Adana are urban dwellers. They rather come to work in the morning and go back to their homes in the evening. They do not work together with the whole family. In such a milieu, especially respondent settled labor intermediaries, see themselves as parents who are harsh and tender from time to time, rather than an ağa with absolute authority.

Farm labor intermediaries provides support to workers in a wide range of situations like from their marriages to sponsoring rental houses, from reconciling problems within families to helping workers living with sick relatives. Besides, they provide money to the workers in need before the pay day and find groceries and variety shops where they can do their shopping on credit.

The experiences respondent labor intermediaries told about what they do in terms of their relations with laborers can clarify this issue;

“One day I experienced an event... I was living here, one of the man would marry with a girl in Yunusoğlu. He called me with telephone and asked “Hamdi is there anybody who knows Yunusoğlu”. I called one of the intermediaries and asked there is a situation like this, how this family is. He answers as yes or no. I say yes or no according to answer I take. We made so many marriages like this.” (11)

The fact that farm labor intermediaries have various relations in their own social milieu as a result of the nature of their jobs makes them a valid point of reference as mentioned in the quotation above. Farm labor intermediaries are important sources of information in issues like marriage, lending, sponson etc. through the communication networks they have or have the chance to access via their relations

with laborers and other farm labor intermediaries. Their ability of reaching information that other people in their communities need is an important indicator of their status. Being such a source of information and reference makes the bonds between workers and farm labor intermediaries stronger.

Another farm labor intermediary, while talking about his relations with workers, gives some clues about how important their positions in the eyes of workers;

“Intermediaries have so many responsibilities. We pay in our pockets when they lose their money. I remember one day I came to house, we were in dinner and bell of the door ringed four times I sat to dinner and I could not eat anything, because of workers. One of them said my mother was ill, the other said I had no shoes, other said my tube finished, other said we went to travel. We should satisfy all the demands of workers. Workers want from us. Worker does not recognize employer. We take care for workers, we defend their rights. This does not depend on where they are. Their families come, they cannot take their money. What should we do? We should do what they want. They are right. He may be uneducated but I should behave professionally. He comes to work whatever happens, this means that he needs that job.” (12)

As it is seen in this example, farm labor intermediary tries to explain how laborers see him as “the a to z” of them. workers’ urge of calling for the help of labor intermediary for any problems proves that farm labor intermediation is beyond the work of finding laborers.

Another farm labor intermediary’s words about his relations with workers are meaningful in exhibiting the fact that they have to help and act with solidarity so that to protect his future interests in the last instance;

“You should behave worker to bring to here. We take care them like their parents. For instance, one of them became ill, we brought him to hospital and waited in hospital when he was operated. These are important. They will come in the next year,

if you deceive them, not take care of them, they do not come with you. They escape from you.” (13)

Another farm labor intermediary’s ideas, talking parallel to the things mentioned above, show that farm labor intermediaries need workers, as much as, workers need farm labor intermediaries to work.

“Bringing workers to the land is not end of the job. They call you at 2 a.m. and say my child is ill. Which employer takes care at that time in the night? Or he says I haven’t any money, you give money to him. You should take care of them, because you earn money from them.” (14)

As a result, the internal dynamics of workers -farm labor intermediary relations reflect mutual interests of both of the groups. Both parties need each other to survive. The main strength of the perception of farm labor intermediaries in the eyes of workers come from their connections with employers and relatively high economic conditions. Thus, farm labor intermediary can fulfill the role of parent that workers give him which he accepts. When it is considered that the negotiation power of labor intermediaries’ with employers come from his potential to provide labor force, they have to prioritize relations with workers. Accordingly, it would not be wrong to perceive the responsibilities farm labor intermediaries undertake within the context of their relations with workers, as investments for augmenting their social capital. As quoted from the last farm labor intermediary’s words above, they gain income via mobilizing their individual relations with workers.

On the other part, it would be wrong to reach the idea that farm labor intermediaries do everything to maintain his relations with workers and they behave every single worker nicely. That might be what labor intermediaries try doing but it is a common situation that parties do not make each other happy. As mentioned repeatedly before, when farm labor intermediaries underpay or cannot fulfill their role of parenting, the relations between each other can be destroyed. In such situations workers, as farm labor intermediaries say, turn to the farm labor

intermediaries who can satisfy their needs. Therefore, respondent farm labor intermediaries express that every workers has the contact information of more than one farm labor intermediaries. This is normal for the respondent farm labor intermediaries, since workers are also needers in the eyes of them. In fact, these show weakening of authority and control in the context of workers - farm labor intermediary relations that Şeker talks about.

Because of these reasons, farm labor intermediaries do not want to work with complete strangers considering the possibility that there might be time that he cannot meet the needs of workers. Therefore, despite the fact that familial and affinity relations have lost their importance of being sources of work force as a result of urban migration and increasing work load, long term acquaintance and collaboration are still important for farm labor intermediaries in harsh times. Acquaintance and collaboration is also important for farm labor intermediaries from the point of reliability. Especially workers who do not come to work on time or tend to leave the job and work with another farm labor intermediary upon smallest problems are problematic for them. That is why reliability coming from acquaintance and ability to support each other is essential in relations with workers. One farm labor intermediary expressed this as follows;

“We can regulate them if they are from the same village. Because they know how things go. But if intermediary is not from the same village, everything is confused. Foreigners do not know. They say that intermediary take and exhaust him. Therefore we want to work with known workers who can do something when a problem occurs. But people can handle these problems for two or three months. Men collect tomatoes at 40 degree. What can this man do? He has not any chance to do. He lives with money earned from here. There are some men working for 12 months.” (15)

A farm labor intermediary can leave a worker as well as a worker can leave a farm labor intermediary. Farm labor intermediary mostly leave worker who cause problems, do not do their job well, demand too much and are not trusted.

4.8. Farm Labor Intermediaries and Employers

It is often said that connections with the employers is another important communication network for intermediaries. The relationship between the intermediary and the employer is a totally professional one. Unlike their relationship with workers, social bonds or profit-based solidarity and cooperation relationships are usually uncommon in the intermediaries' relationship with the employers. This is simply because of the different social, economic, and cultural backgrounds of these two groups. Although intermediaries may sometimes have friendly relationships with some of the employers, this is mostly because of the peculiar character of the intermediaries.

The labor power which is under the possession of the intermediary is realized in the employers' network. Having even a thousand workers under control is meaningless for an intermediary if he does not have contact with sufficient number of employers. In order to be able to consider his relationships with his friends, neighbors, and relatives as social capital, the intermediary has to be in contact with employers. Otherwise, his resources for labor power have no importance.

The relationship between the farm labor intermediary and the employer can be established in different ways. One of the most effective of these is the taking over of the occupation from the father or family along with the contacts of the previous generation. By this way, the intermediary can proceed from where his father or family left the job. Another way is to start working as an agricultural worker and turn into an intermediary by time along which the contacts with workers and employers are also established. Thirdly, the employer may demand the list of the registered agricultural intermediaries from İŞKUR and get in contact with them. Finally, the intermediary may establish his contacts with the employers with his own effort.

According to the intermediaries who participated in our study, the last two methods are risky because employers have to know and trust in the intermediaries with whom they will work. This is an important detail in the agricultural sector in which a large amount of money is invested. An intermediary who did not keep his promise may be very costly for an employer. It was often expressed in the interviews that reliable and large-scale firms or farmers do not work with every intermediary. However, in certain cases intermediaries can agree on lower daily wage or laboring wage with the employer. According to the intermediaries who participated in our study, the ones who make such agreements are mostly pirate intermediaries, while the employers with whom they work are usually untrustworthy farmers or firms.

As it is the case in the relationship between the worker and the intermediary, the references of the employer plays a significant role after establishing the contact in above-stated ways. The intermediary who is appreciated by the employers with whom he worked can find new work opportunities by using the network of the employers. Thus, the social capital of the intermediaries in his relationship with the employers can be constructed and developed on the bases of acquaintance and trustworthiness. From the point of view of the employers, a good intermediary is to be able to support the employer and be flexible in case a problem emerges during the payment period.

The intermediary and the employer are mutually dependent on each other. However, considering their reliance on labor power for agricultural production, employers' relationship with the intermediaries is more important. In addition to this, even though they can get in contact with the workers, employers' capability to deal with them one by one is highly unlikely. In short, if they have sufficiently large and reliable labor power, intermediaries have a relatively powerful position in their relationship with the employers. According to the elderly intermediaries, they had an important position in their relationship with the employers especially in those periods when cotton production in the meadow was widespread, work to

be done was too much, and labor power and labor intermediaries are scarce. The significance of intermediaries for employers in those periods is described by the president of Adana Farmers' Association as follows;

“The existence of such a system is natural and necessary. You went to Yeşilova Village of Urfa. Do you know anybody? There should be such a person. You can take the list of them from İŞKUR. Generally everybody works with an intermediary. They meet with each other and everything goes well, they continue to work together.” (16)

As can be seen, the fact that employers cannot find agricultural labor power and that intermediaries are able to control it is what makes the latter indispensable for the former. Having a contact with an intermediary for a long time is significant for the agricultural activities of employers. By this way, employers consider that that secured the necessary labor force in times of harvest. As it was stated by the president of the association, if the intermediary is skillful and trustworthy, this relationship satisfies both parties. The importance of the role of intermediary can be seen in the statements of the one who took over his occupation from his father;

“In previous days, there were two intermediaries in our village. One of them was my father. There were 3-4 intermediaries in Doğan kent. Land owners cultivated cotton in 500 acre or 1000 acre, work was overloaded and requirement to work force was tremendous. Land owner cultivated cotton in 1000 acre and believed that he could pay the wages of the workers. He wanted only as many workers as possible. They run after us. One of the land owners came to my house in Siverek two times. The reason of his visit was finding as many workers as possible. Land owners went to East part of Turkey in order to find worker. Nowadays it is not exact that whether there is an intermediary or not.” (18)

Stories of employers who are going to the village or the city of the intermediary and trying hard to agree with them in order to save their products on the field are told by almost all the intermediaries during the interviews. The President of Çukurova Farm Labor Intermediaries Association expressed the significance of

the intermediary with reference to the entire agricultural sector as follows; “Agriculture sector would collapse if there were no farm labor intermediary. Nobody takes care to other, nobody trust anybody. The efficiency and quality decreased with respect to labor.” (18)

However, it is difficult to say that this mutual relationship exists today. Intermediaries’ constant reference to the past is an indicator of this change. According to the participants, the reason of their diminishing importance is the increasing number of intermediaries who are working on the meadow. This means that since they have a lot of alternatives, employers no longer have to try hard to find workers and intermediaries. Some of the participants states that they heard about some intermediaries who paid money to employers in order to work with them. However, this claim was not verified by data which was collected during the research process.

According to the intermediaries, another reason for their diminishing importance is the increasing involvement of the mediating agriculture firms with the emergence of new production patterns due to the diminishing cotton production. One intermediary summarizes this situation in the following way; “In previous days, land owners were agas. They had a huge authority. Money of the workers was paid regardless of the benefit of aga. All these have been disappeared.” (19) An elderly intermediary defines the situation with respect to his experiences as follows;

“Contemporary agas are strange. They have become craftsmen. We had agas who were the owners of huge farms. Now everything is very difficult. Money of workers was always paid. Now it is also given, but if money should be spent for workers, intermediaries should pay it. There might me delay in payments, but money did not disappear. Now man escape and disappear. Money of the worker is too much now. Ages were in stabile place. We were dependent to Worker Institution. We could take our money if the employer went to bankrupt. In our times, there were only workers. It was strictly determined. Your money

never disappeared. Nowadays men are escaping. Farmers lose money.” (20)

The emerging imbalances in the market for intermediaries due to the increasing number of intermediaries, and the solutions of some of the intermediaries to this problem will be elaborated in the section on the relationships and organization among intermediaries.

4.9. Farm Labor Intermediary/ Employer Conflicts and Maintenance of the Relationships

To put it shortly, the main problem between the intermediary and the employer is the wage. Disagreement on wage or advance payment and delays in payments are among the most widely experienced problems. Boarder intermediaries have additional problems related to the accommodation and working conditions of the workers who they brought. Accordingly, organization of water supply, place for accommodation, transportation of the workers to the fields, and dealing with the problems that emanate workers’ use of the spaces that belong to the villagers are other problems that the intermediaries have to solve. For the employers, other problems that may be faced with, aside from the disagreement on wage, is the insufficiency in the number of workers that the intermediaries brought or the failure in organizing the process.

Since there are no written contracts that set the conditions of the relationship between the farm labor intermediaries and the employers, problems that emerge during the process is usually solved by personal methods. For example, the employers try to solve their labor power problem by changing their intermediaries or being in communication with several intermediaries at the same time. In case the employers can prove that they are swindled, they either report the situation to the law enforcement, or, as it is expressed during the interviews, resort to violence. In such cases, intermediaries sometimes reply in a similar fashion. In

addition to that, intermediaries may disseminate information about the employer's attitude in their own network and block the supply of labor power to that particular employer by other intermediaries. However, participants stated that, as a result of the increase in the number of farm labor intermediaries, this last method is hardly applicable today.

Amount of wage is, of course, the most significant issue for the farm labor intermediaries among the problems that we mentioned above. According to the president of the association;

“Commission of Determining Minimum Wage makes meeting in Ankara. We demand from Governorship to make them organize a meeting for this respect. The reason of the meeting of this commission is to determine the wage of farm labor intermediaries. It is not related with workers. Workers take the gross rate of minimum wage. It is prohibited to pay to workers less than this. In this respect, Chamber of Agriculture and Association of Farmers oppose this and they say that we should take our money from workers. We are against this. We want our Money from employer. In other words, employers are prohibited to pay workers less than minimum wage. We want a right in addition to this. We want 5-6% as a Labor Institution. We claim that this rate should be added to wage of workers. We distribute the information about the amount of minimum wage and intermediary commission to all companies. Some of them oppose. Some of them reject to make such a payment.” (21)

During the disputes which spark in the commissions that were gathered in order to agree on the amount of wage, the intermediaries sometimes threaten the employers by using the labor power they control and try to show that they still are powerful in the meadow. The president of the association continues;

“We have no any right to going strike, but what are we doing? We slow down working. In other words, we use the work force. Today if a firm cuts 1000 kg fruit, it cannot stand two-day break. Because contract has already signed, products should be exported. If we stop working, problem is solved. This happens in every year.” (22)

Low amount of wage means the diminishment of the amount of money that the intermediary will take⁹. In other words, the more the worker is paid, the more the intermediary will take as a share. The disputes in the wage commissions usually emerge because of the disagreement on how the share of the intermediaries will be paid or the objections of the employers to the daily wage which is calculated on the basis of the minimum wage before tax. During the research process, the amount of daily wage for the agricultural worker was 21 YTL. 2 YTL was cut from this amount as the share of the intermediary. The main source of disagreement is the demands of the organized farm labor intermediaries for adding their share, which is 10% of the total amount, to the existing amount that is paid to the worker. Thus, they want employers to pay 23 YTL to the workers from which they will again take their 2 YTL of brokerage. By this way, workers will earn the minimum wage before tax for 30 days of work. However, since the employers refuse to pay this amount, the share of intermediaries is taken from the wage of the workers and the income of the workers is still below the minimum wage although this is illegal. The strikes that were organized by intermediaries via taking the workers that they work with away from the fields or other protests like slowdown are mostly reactions against the amount of payment which is below the minimum wage.

For the purpose of this study, the important development for us is the efforts of farm labor intermediaries to get organized and act against the employers.

⁹ According to the regulation on the farm labor intermediating that was mentioned at the beginning of this section, it is prohibited for intermediaries to take charge under the label of intermediating share or take share from the agreed upon amount of wage. Payment for the service of intermediation has to be paid by the employer. In addition to this, the income of the workers should not be below the minimum wage before tax. However, in practice the employers pay the daily wage of 21 YTL to the worker as 19 YTL for their labor and 2 YTL as the share of the intermediary. Under these conditions, the income of the worker is below the minimum wage. The share that the intermediary takes is presented as a part of the wage of the worker and so, the income of the workers for 21 days of work appears, on paper, to be at the level of the minimum wage before tax according to the amount for the year 20007 (638,70 YTL). Thus, it can be said that the employer cuts the amount that he should pay to the intermediary from the wage that he should pay to the worker. In some cases, the intermediaries take additional share from the net wage of the worker (Gülçubuk *et al.*, 2003). Naturally, intermediaries who participated to our research denied that they make such wage deductions.

Although they are not anymore as indispensable for the employers as they were in the past, by using the labor power that they control, they try to show that they still have some power. Surely, not all the intermediaries who work in this area take part in these protests. According to the intermediaries, the ones who do not participate to their actions are the pirate intermediaries. The pirate intermediaries are also accused of by the participants for enabling the employers to pay low wages.

News on a strike which was issues in the internet copy of *Evrensel Gazetesi* (*Newspaper*), dated November 28, 2007¹⁰, is quoted here in order to exemplify such activities which are organized by the farm labor intermediaries;

“Farm workers achieved in forcing the land owners to abandon their decision to lower the daily wages, which was previously decided by the Commission of Agriculture which was attended by the representatives of the Ministry of Labor and Social Security, Adana Governorship and Labor Institution, to 15 and 16 YTL.

Stating that their protest was successful, the president of the Çukurova Farm Labor Intermediaries Association said that the firm owners contacted with them and that they accepted to pay 21 YTL which they demanded. Emphasizing that this was the success of the workers, He, stated that fifty thousand workers attended to the strike (Adana/EVRENSEL)”.

It is possible to say that the positive effects of these protests on the wages of farm workers increased the value that is attributed by the workers to the intermediaries and the institution of intermediating. Another dimension of these protests for further analyses is the fact that these strikes or slowdowns were organized by intermediaries rather than farm workers themselves.

¹⁰ Source: www.evrensel.net

4.10. Organization and Relationships among the Intermediaries

Both solidarity and competition can be observed in relations among the intermediaries. The main function of the communication networks among intermediaries themselves, other than labor and employer networks, is sharing information about the situation of the market they work in together. At the same time this information could be effective in terms of creation of common professional values. In these communication networks, information about both employer and labor and other intermediaries are circulating constantly. For example, a farm labor intermediary who thinks that he is cheated by an employer shares this with other farm labor intermediaries in his network; in this way he both launches the employer and tries to protect the intermediaries. Likewise, farm labor that creates problems for the intermediaries can be punished by not being employed for a while or forever in the network of the intermediary. In terms of solidarity, an intermediary can form partnership with other close intermediaries to handle a bigger project. Besides, intermediaries that can form partnerships or work together through their kinship or friendship relationships can also use these social ties to solve problems about employers or labors. Borrowing money or getting labor support from another intermediary when there is lack of labor can be examples of these situations.

It may be thought that, as people working in the same sector, the intermediaries come together very easily. But increasing competition and job opportunities complicate the situation. Besides, pirate intermediaries, which are seen as the biggest problem by the intermediaries in the last years, also have a negative effect on creation of common application and professional values because they act together with other intermediaries on a minimum level.

Despite all these, Çukurova Farm Labor Intermediaries Association that has been established in 2000 and is today active in Adana can be seen as an attempt to get

organized and institutionalized. According to president of the association, the goal of the establishment of association is as follows:

“In the past, we were dependent to Labor Institution. However, we discover that Labor Institution cannot find solution to our problems. Our elders decided to an association to solve our problems by ourselves. We founded this association in 2000 like this. Today if you cannot take your Money from a firm, Labor Institution cannot do anything. We only pay fee there monthly. On the other hand it cannot do anything for our big problems such as the unemployment of one of our intermediaries or requirement of a firm to a worker. It cannot solve such these problems. And finally we decided to found our own association.”(22)

The association is effectuated by the attempts of the seven intermediaries which is the compulsory number to form an association. Their objective was to become an organized power against the problems faced by intermediaries in the markets. According to the president, the number of members has increased to 500 at some point. Today the president says that there are around 200 members. During the process, they lost members due to problems about membership fees. The fact that the number of members has increased up to 500 should not be perceived as the intermediaries' passion for organization. Interest based individual work is the main principal for the institution of intermediation. The reason for the increase of number of members is to reach the number mandatory for becoming a chamber, which is the main goal of the founders of the association. For this reason, both intermediaries and relatives and friends of the intermediaries who have nothing to do with mediating have been made members of the association. To quote from the interview conducted with the president and member intermediaries, the process has evolved as follows;

“ (...) When we were founding our association, we aimed to be legalized and became a legal chamber. We had 60-70 members in these times, and we took information that if we could not have at least 200 members in a specific time, we should become 500 members in order to be accepted as a chamber. We fastened

the process. We completed the number through making our brothers member. The Director of Association of Chambers said that if you completed 201 members, this is your chamber. We completed this number under very difficult condition, we made necessary enterprise, we made some correspondence with Ankara, however we took an answer that says there is no legal job as farm labor intermediary. Afterwards, we demanded the acceptance of this job as a legal job. Then we took an answer, it says that we will examine your demand in the next meeting. We had tremendous aims. If we legalized, we can also solve the problems of workers.” (23)

The efforts to become a professional chamber show that the intermediaries are conscious that they cannot get over legal processes that they are uncomfortable with or they see as inefficient through the association. Thus, it can easily be argued that the association is a step for the foundation of a chamber, which is the main goal of the intermediaries.

To acquire the status of professional chamber simply means to control the professional market as a monopoly. The chamber becomes responsible from all related issues such as the professional principles and working applications. For example, to work as an architect you have to register the chamber of architects first. After this registration, all professional activities are subject to supervision of the chamber. To give more concrete examples, a hairdresser chamber founded in a city by the hairdressers of that city determines the minimum price for haircut, thus organizes the market for the interests of its members. In short,

The chambers are incorporated professional institutions with public institution status that are founded in order to meet the common needs of its members, facilitate professional activities, develop the profession in accordance with the common good, protect the professional discipline, ethics and solidarity to provide honest and trusting relationship among members and between members and society, and to fulfill the responsibilities and services that are stated in this legislation about the chambers.¹¹

¹¹ Law of Turkish Union of Chambers and Exchange Commodities No. 5174, Article 4

By considering the content of this definition, it would not be wrong to claim that the most important reason for the intermediaries to try to become a chamber is to control the market for their interests. The association, as stated by the intermediaries during the interviews, can only provide professional arrangements on their members on the basis of volunteerism. Only a legal status to be acquired through becoming a chamber would make every active intermediary or future intermediaries subject to the general rules.

Since the last eight years, in relation with the ignorance of farm labor intermediary as an occupation, the demand of intermediaries, who have been organized around the association, can not able to achieve a reply? Long-term waiting for the achievement of their demand and also the money that had been collected through the members of the association resulted with the decrease of member population or with the words of my informants to the escape of intermediaries from the organization.

In the first stage, establishment of organization had also created problems between the employers and intermediaries. According to an organized intermediary, this organization had bothered the employers;

“At the beginning, this association bothered the Chamber of Agriculture and Association of Farmers. Their point of view towards us was really bad. They were afraid of our cooperation. We were accepted as illegal organization. We were taken under supervision. Some of friends in security came to see us. They told how they inspected us during 8 months. After then, they thanked to our works.”

“At first, this organization had bothered different parts like Trade association of Agriculture, Farmer’s Union. They had looked at us with different ideas and see us different. They had been afraid for the unionization of us. Even our names had been recalled with the illegal organizations. We were under police custody. Friends from the security of Ankara had come here to talk with us. They have told us that how did they followed us all eight months. Then they have thanked to us.” (24)

With the increase in the number of intermediary and especially the ones who can get together well with the employer and in this vein the power and benefits that employer get in the bargain process can be a reasonable explanation for the opposition of the employers to the organization attempts of intermediaries. Apparently, the attempt of this organization in order to transform to a trade association is not an acceptable thing. Throughout my interviews, they have implied me that their unsuccessfulness in the attempt for being a trade association may have strongly related with the organizations of employers.

Even though still they have not been able to get the status of a trade association, the intermediaries who have been organized within the organization try to standardize the rules of the market and the relations with the market. For instance, according to the rules of organization it is strictly forbidden for members to make a contract with an employer for the wage of the agricultural laborer and fee of an intermediary cannot be below than the life salary. As an another example for the standardization, esp. for the citrus agriculture workers work load of a worker like depending on the weight of the harvest has been determined by the association.

Apart from the standardization of the market, agriculture workers working conditions, organization offers several services to its members. For instance, sometimes workers or sometimes employers have been investigated by organization in order to minimize the possible problems that an intermediary may encounter. On the other side, association instructs the employers about the intermediary that they are going to work together. By such a service, they can both increase the volume of business and to create fair competition they fight against the other intermediaries, who may decrease the price. In conclusion, according to declaration of association's head, actions of the organization try to give back the prestige of intermediaries and to raise the trust that people feel for intermediaries. In other words, they just want to brisk up the golden age of intermediaries in the period of cotton.

In all those processes, intermediary does not only just protect the right of themselves but also the rights of workers. However, there is not even one registered worker in the organization and it is not necessary according to the comment of intermediaries. If there will be any need for the representation of a worker and for the defense of his rights, association will take the all responsibility. What I have seen in my interviews is that the transportation of workers by buses or trucks, the problems of boarder workers for taking attention the national print or strikes in every kind of problems have been showed as the act of this group.

It is not surprising to hear that intermediaries are doing something for workers especially while they were trying to create a solidarity network between worker and employer. The acquisition that intermediaries have raised for the right of laborers, by this way they reproduce the clean, trustful and powerful image of intermediaries. Most of the time intermediaries who share the same social and cultural environment and earn money through their common social network with the laborers can be accepted as innocent characteristics of intermediaries. However we should keep in our mind in the condition of today's capitalist market, intermediaries only defend the rights of workers only if they will get a benefit.

It is not going to be wrong to say that the lack of the organized workers in the association and the defensiveness approach for the name of other laborer is a kind of an obstacle for the consciousness of the organization. Thus in the issue of seasonal agricultural worker intermediaries and the employers meet in blocking the organization right of workers thus reproduce the socio economical system.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

It is not difficult to see that there is an important tie between intermediaries and social relations when we examine the interviews done with farm labor intermediaries. Social and economical practices that are done by farm labor intermediaries within the scope of construction and development of these social relations give us some clues about the content of intermediary activities. The face to face relations of intermediaries and maintaining these relations during organization of seasonal agricultural activities are fundamental for farm labor intermediary job. The reason of this is that, as one of the intermediaries participated to interview states, the more people you know, the more workers and employers you have. In this respect, social relations as social capital of an intermediary have significant role on executing and resuming farm labor intermediary job. In other words, if we take into consideration the contemporary form of the job, a person who does not know enough people and employer cannot do this job. The informal structure of the job is another reason of the necessity of this situation.

In the process of seasonal agricultural activities, since there is no social relation between employers and workers, and since the communication network of these parties is restricted, the role of farm labor intermediary within this process can be distinguished in two categories as relations with farm workers and relations with employers. When we accept that social capital is the social relations of a person and a social network developed within these relations, farm labor intermediaries represent the workers and employers who are very independent from each other. Therefore, the reason why farm labor intermediaries are important as such is that they bring together these two independent groups.

As we have already stated farm labor intermediaries and seasonal agricultural workers are in general from South East and East Anatolia Region. The extended family and kinship structure of these regions, which is a highly observed feature in these regions, brings forth the social environment that is the cornerstone of farm labor intermediary job. In addition to this, the poverty and unemployment of this region force people work as farm labor intermediaries necessarily. Hence, the quantitative dimension of social capital of intermediaries does not only depend on their investments to social relations, but also it is related to the historical and social conditions of these geographical regions. In my opinion, extended family and poverty are two important determinant factors for this region.

Since these external factors or in other words, the existence of specific conditions that cannot be controlled by intermediaries are valid for the social strata of farm labor intermediary, one of the most important issue that should be analyzed is how farm labor intermediary-agricultural workers differentiate from each other within this social stratification. In this respect, we can say that individual differences and qualities have great impacts on this situation. Especially when we take into consideration seasonal agricultural activities which take place in Aegean and Çukurova Regions, the important role of intermediaries becomes apparent since in these regions, while employers are generally Turkish workers are generally Kurdish or Arabic. If the first periods of agricultural activities after 1950's is examined, I think speaking, bargaining, solving problems with employer became a big trouble because of this language difference.

On the other hand, being literate can also be evaluated in this respect. When we remember that being literate was an important status indicator once upon a time in Turkey, only being literate could make a difference between farm labor intermediary and agricultural workers. One other factor is the level of risk that people, who cannot make a living in their environment and want to create alternative sources for earning money, can take within the process of seasonal agricultural activities. For this reason, the risks taken and individual experience

acquired may be thought as factors which make one person labor intermediary and the others seasonal agricultural worker in the same social stratum. Both two old aged intermediaries that I interviewed stated that they came to Adana and other cities at first to find employment. Apart from agricultural labor, especially construction and any other work they could find have been important for them. It is not unlikely that people, who could leave their villages for employment and income and who found opportunities to know different regions, recruit their social environment, which is already in need of any kind of employment like agricultural labor.

Another issue that should not be overlooked is the existence of labor intermediation job already in the years before seasonal agricultural labor became a crucial life strategy in the region. What I quoted in the previous section from Hilmi Uran, the governor of Adana in that era, indicated this point. It should be noticed that the importance and influence of intermediation activities in those days, whose content and quality we don't know but can only make speculations, might have affected the following intermediaries. It is also possible that people, who come to region for various other employment opportunities, somehow find seasonal agricultural work and learn the organizational aspects of the job, get to know the employers and realize that they could use these relations as a source of income.

Landless villagers or villagers who cannot subsist on their own land, passing from these processes first laborize their own families. Because what makes the main income in collecting cotton, which determined the fate of seasonal agricultural work back then in Çukurova, is the total amount of collected cotton. That is; the more cotton, the more money. Thus, the household appears as the main labor unit in collecting cotton where even the labor of 5-6 years old is used. Despite its harsh work conditions, harvesting cotton is important for rural poor because it can employ all the labor force in the family. This process of laborization that begins in the family then extends to relatives, neighbors, and then everywhere within reach,

shaping the social capital and economic income of the intermediary. Because, from now on, for the intermediary *the more people, the more labor; the more labor, the more income.*

However, extensive social relations network is not the only condition for the continuation of intermediation. Together with quantity, these social relations should be preserved and developed. In my opinion, the process of acquiring quality for the social capital of the intermediaries begins when they start to invest in their social relations. Factors such as providing continuous jobs, making workers earn sufficient amount of money, protecting the labor against the employer, being honest, even location and facilities for temporary migration based seasonal jobs which necessitate intermediaries' effort have positive reflection on the relationships with the agricultural labor. Satisfaction provided by the intermediary in these issues is important to continue the social relationship between labor and intermediary for seasonal agricultural labor as well. Thus, the issue of trust has a massive part in labor-intermediary relationship in developing the social capital and increasing the benefits.

Apart from trust, another factor that has a role in the process is the social and economical inequality between the intermediary and agricultural worker. Deprivation and poverty usually makes the workers depend on the intermediary who live in better conditions again because of labor of the former. This dependency creates a relationship of dependence and becomes effective for the social capital of the intermediaries to gain quality. In fact this dependency starts in the moment when the agricultural workers agree on being represented by intermediaries. The fact of being the "only one" in agreement with the employer, agreement on wage, determining the work place, and resolving conflicts that might occur during work prepares proper environment for the intermediaries to assume power over the workers. This dependency, beginning with the right to represent, increases with the advance payments when the worker is in need of money. Besides, especially in seasonal jobs depending on temporary migration,

being away from the city, the inexperience of living in the city, communication problems for those who don't speak Turkish, in short not knowing anyone other than intermediary in the host city makes the intermediary stronger in this relationship. The notion of "*the intermediary knows and resolves everything*" that is created in the perception of the worker is also crucial factor. The intermediaries know that every step they take to "*please*" the workers, to keep the workers and continue their flow of income also strengthens the existing relations between them.

Setting out from emphasizing the need to invest in relations to develop the social capital for our conceptual framework, we could evaluate the activities that the intermediaries engage in, to meet the social and economical needs of the agricultural workers as investment tools to gain quality for their social capitals. These investment tools and results that feed from the social and economical deprivation of the workers can be guiding in understanding the content of unequal relations between the parties. Because, in supplying the needs that occur in mutual relations, on the one hand it develops the social capital of one party, while on the other hand it establishes the dependency on the side of the agricultural worker who could only payback with their labor. Thus, the fact that the intermediaries defined themselves as "*mother and father*" of the workers in the interviews is an expression of unequal conditions and relations more than being an expression of glorifying themselves. "*Help*" and "*protection*", which usually denote solidarity relations by the influence of kinship, friendship, neighborhood ties and the poverty of the worker, become tools of reproduction of dependency to intermediary, when the issue is the organization of seasonal agricultural work.

Where this social capital, which is shaped by the relations with the seasonal agricultural worker, becomes valuable is the employer connections the intermediaries have. These employer networks are a part of intermediary's social capital because of his middle position in the process. However, business connections and social relations between the intermediaries and employers are not

as complex as their relations with the workers. Mostly, mutual advantage based on business is the issue. The employer demands labor and intermediary meets this demand. For the relations between them to continue as desired, the labor intermediary should find the demanded labor and in return the employer should pay the wages on time. Besides, if the employer is pleased with labor arrangement and timing, this strengthens their relations with intermediaries. This mutual advantage relation, which does not involve any written and legal agreement practices, can also gain flexibility due to face to face relationships which are prevalent in seasonal agricultural work. The intermediary sometimes has a tendency to assume a humble attitude against the employer in times of various problems, in order to keep his contacts with the employers. On the other hand trust is also important for this business relationship. The references of the intermediaries who provide labor on time and without problems will increase and influence the development of intermediation activities. How the intermediary is known is important for his social capital including his relations with the worker.

At this point how the intermediary begins the profession and their level of experience becomes crucial. Especially labor intermediaries who inherit the profession from their fathers continue their work by using the prestige and established connections of their fathers. Defining these intermediaries as “*son of intermediary Ahmet*” indicates a successful mediation in the family history; either father or another member, is crucial for establishing trust. On the other hand, those who begin working as agricultural worker and attend all the processes, and thus gain experience and strengthen their relations in time may also be considered as trustworthy intermediaries in the eyes of the agricultural workers and employers.

Nevertheless, social relations of the intermediaries are also destined to change and reshape. Social transformations, social and economical developments Turkey goes through, inevitably affect the social capital of the intermediary. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the changes in labor intense agricultural processes

within which the intermediary acts also affects his social relations. Changes especially within the last 20 years in Adana have affected directly or indirectly the intermediaries whose relations we are studying. That is why in the section on empirical findings, social relations of intermediaries have been divided in two eras as in the past and at present.

The production of cotton that was predominant in Adana beginning to leave the plains and temporary migration of the seasonal agricultural workers becoming more permanent in the last 20 years are two important developments that affect the social relations of the intermediaries that we found out in our research process.

First of all, permanent migration of seasonal agricultural labor to Adana in certain numbers and getting closer to urban lifestyle opportunities affected the dependent nature of the relationship between workers and intermediaries which were shaped by social deprivation and similar factors. In the past, seasonal agricultural workers who had come to Adana with temporary migration would provide communication through the intermediaries whereas now, they have become the local labor force of Adana. Thus, the opportunities the city presents, from health and education services to meeting basic needs and alternative ways of subsistence, have dissolved the dependent relationship about these issues. But in this process that we can consider as spatial relocation of poverty, most of the workers economic conditions have not changed and this still provides opportunity for their relations to continue on a dependency basis. Because most of the time, when a worker is in need of money, the first person to lend money is the intermediary. Moreover, due to developing relations between the worker households and intermediaries in time, intermediaries are the first resource to ask for money in such a position.

It should be noted here that just like seasonal agricultural workers, the intermediaries have also begun to settle down in the region and run their business specifically in Adana. On the other hand, it would be beneficial to mention here some points about the relation of intermediaries with migration. The intermediary

also mediates between the rural and urban. By looking at the roles they have in the migration of rural populations to the urban spaces for temporary periods, it is possible to say that intermediaries lower down the rate of migration from to some extent by providing the poor segments of the region temporary agricultural work which does not force them to leave their living space permanently. On the other hand, it must be accepted that through these temporary migration routes the intermediaries establish, they carried many rural poor people to many parts of Turkey and hence may have had a motivating affect on permanent migration. In short, the intermediaries are crucial for social transformation in terms of having a share both in preventing and influencing the migration from rural to urban. If we also take the still existing political instability in Southeast and Eastern Anatolia, from where most agricultural workers come, and voluntary and forced migration processes that this instability created, we can make a better judgment about how the different regions of Turkey introduced by the intermediaries might be crucial for the workers.

The cession of the cotton-based agricultural structures and the intensification of new production patterns like citrus and glasshousing in Adana, influence the work organizations and, as a result, the relationships of intermediaries with both employers and workers. Citrus production and glasshousing is much more attractive for the agricultural workers because they take more time compared to cotton collection work and wages are given on daily base. Therefore, it is a profitable process for the intermediaries too. The basic difference in the intermediary's social relations as a result of the change in the production pattern in Adana, is that it highlights the labor of each member of a family, which is the labor unit in cotton production, in citrus and glasshousing.

The effect of urbanization should not be ignored. The process of migration of all the family members during the cotton production time has weakened due to the urbanization. Because, the urban life areas create various job opportunities for the young members of families. These jobs which are mainly in the informal sector

ease the detachment of young members of families from agricultural works. Moreover, according to sharecroppers, citrus collecting needs much more strength and to an extent qualification; therefore child labor between the ages of 6-14 has been limited as it is in cotton production. Children have turned into a labor form which works in the streets with urbanization. Therefore, intermediaries can employ only a part of households instead of all of them in citrus production or glasshousing. The situation which is considered as being limiting the labor force capacities of intermediaries can be seen as not affecting the intermediaries when we think of urban poverty and populous families.

This change, which has been experienced in the agricultural structure, differentiated the employer relationships compared to the labor intermediaries. Intermediaries, who work with family enterprises in the cotton production, establish relationships with agricultural production and agent companies which are called “business firms”. As it can be remembered from our empirical findings, this situation differentiates the organization of seasonal agricultural work on the basis of thrust relationship of farmers whose hometown is known. According to intermediaries, the amounts of frauds that are experienced have increased due to the works done with the firms. Besides, the communication between intermediaries and firms, which aim profit maximization, is not flexible and it limits face to face relations. Again this situation increases the competition between the intermediaries. Working conditions and wages which are very important in the continuation of the relationship between intermediaries and agricultural workers, complicates the conditions of intermediaries due to the problems experienced with firms. For this reason, the importance given to the social ties with workers by intermediaries in changing conditions is valuable in the sense of decreasing the costs that can be experienced in the organization of the work. The point that should not be forgotten is that these kinds of processes are generally valid for the intermediaries who live or work in Adana. Although there have been changes in the relationships between workers and intermediaries who

bring workers from other cities for cotton production, the content of the relationship maintains its traditional structure in part.

For me, the association works that are organized and operated particularly in Adana by settled intermediaries can be evaluated within these changes. It is meaningful that a group of intermediaries tend to organize to solve the problems emerged as a result of the decrease in the relationships between employers and workers. For intermediaries who do not sign contracts with employers and keep themselves away from the legal framework, associations are seen as a guarantee. Some of the works conducted by the association tend to monotype the working types, as it can be remembered from the findings. The desire that these kinds of approaches minimize the problems due to the increased competition between intermediaries, is repeated often during the interviews.

Other advocacy of workers' rights that the association upholds is worth to examine within the framework of these changes. At this point, the local worker perception which is the result of the permanent migration of seasonal agricultural worker to Adana, is important. The protection and watch of the workers when the seasonal agricultural work, which continues for approximately 90 days in a year, is dominant, started to develop on the basis of workers' rights with the process of urbanization. In that sense, the association works as a trade union. It should not be ignored that the politicization process which have been shaped by temporary strikes and work restrictions pioneered by intermediaries, strengthened the relationship between intermediaries and workers in the urban areas. The increased competition, the changed quality of employers and the changed nature of seasonal agricultural work in particular in Adana, as mentioned before, cause a loss of trust in worker-intermediary relations. Thus, the workers' rights-based efforts of intermediaries who are organized under an association are meaningful when we think of the direct link between the income of intermediaries and workers they employ. The labor intermediaries, who were regarded as the 'parents' of workers in the past, have turned into the unionist representatives of workers and form a

new dependence relationships on the basis of trust as a result of their efforts to organize workers. At the same time, the negative effect of interest-based rights advocacy, while strengthening the social capital of intermediaries, on the organization for workers and their becoming conscious in terms of their efforts of supporting their interests, should be examined.

Lastly, the brief consequence of our research for social policy makers is that; the labor intermediation in agriculture is much more of the work and workers finding permission document which is provided by the state to the third persons when the state is not sufficient in doing that. On the other hand, this excessive meaning is open to everyone to be evaluated as the indicator of the insufficiency of the state in that point.

The discharge of the intermediation institution thinking of the seasonal agricultural work in contemporary Turkey seems to be highly difficult due to the ties between the intermediaries and workers established during the working times. Although the sphere which is filled by intermediaries and its results are criticized, the significance of the complex relationships should not be ignored in terms of their contribution to workers' struggle to survive. For this reason, the intermediation institution, which has been institutionalized by intermediaries because of the conditions which diminish the opportunities of the workers, can be transformed into a different form only insofar, the rights of agricultural workers to organize and determine their own futures is supported.

REFERENCES

Aanonymus (1978). *Tarımda İş ve İşçi Bulma Aracılıđı Hakkında Tüzük*, 15.05.1978 tarih ve 16288 no'lu Resmi Gazete. [Charter About Employment Agency of Farm Labour Intermediary]

Aanonymus (2004). *5174 Sayılı Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birliđi ile Odalar Borsalar Kanunu* [Law of Turkish Union of Chambers and Exchange Commodities No. 5174]

Aanonymus (2004). *Tarımda İş ve İşçi Bulma Aracılıđına İzin Verilmesi ve Aracıların Denetimi Hakkında Yönetmelik*, 14.03.2004 tarihli ve 25402 no'lu Resmi Gazete [Allowing Employment Agency of Farm Labour Intermediary in Agriculture and Regulation about the Inspection of Intermediaries]

Akbıyık, Nihat. (2008). “Türkiye’de Tarım Kesiminde İşgücü Piyasalarının Yapısı”, *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Spring-2008 V.7 N.24. p. 220 – 237.

Akçay, Adanan. (1987). “Türkiye Tarımında Büyük Topraklı İşletmelerin Oluşum Süreçleri Üzerine Notlar” in **11. Tez** Sayı 7. İstanbul: Uluslararası Yayıncılık.

Akşit, Bahattin and Keyder, Çağlar. (1981). “*Kırsal Dönüşüm Tipolojisi*”. Yeni İmece 1981, p. 8-13.

Akşit, Bahattin. (1988). “*Kırsal Dönüşüm ve Köy Araştırmaları (1960-1980)*” in **Türkiye’de Tarımsal Yapılar** (1988). Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.

Akşit, Bahattin. (2007). “*Toplumsal Kalkınma/Gelişme ve Nüfus:Türkiye’de Yapılan Araştırma ve Yayınlar ile İlgili Eleştirel Bir Tarama*”, Kentsel ve Bölgesel Araştırmalar Ađı Web sitesi, http://www.kbam.metu.edu.tr/published/toplumsal_kalkinma_gelisme_nufus.pdf

Aksoy, Suat. (1969). **Tarımda İş Hukuku**. Ankara: Türk Zırai Ekonomi Derneđi Yayınları No: 1

Anonymous (1925). *İkinci Pamuk Kongresi Zabıtnamesi*, Ticaret Vekaleti, Ticaret Müdüriyeti Umumiyesi, Dahili Ticaret ve Ticari Müesseseler Müdüriyeti, Matbaayı Amire, İstanbul.

Arneil, Barbara. (2006). **Diverse Communities: The Problem with Social Capital**, Cambridge, UK ; New York : Cambridge University Press.

Aruoba, Çelik. (1988). “*Tarımda Teknolojinin Deđişimin Gelir Dađılımına Etkisi*” in **Türkiye’de Tarımsal Yapılar** (1988). Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.

Avcıođlu, Dođan. (1973). **Türkiye’nin Düzeni Dün, Bugün, Yarın I – II**. Ankara: Cem Yayınevi.

Ayalp, Ekrem. (2007). **Restructuring Agriculture and Adaptive Processes in Rural Areas : The Case of Cotton Sector in Adana-Karataş**. Unpublished Master Thesis, Ankara: METU Graduated School of Social Sciences

Aydın, Zülküf. (1986). *Kapitalizm, Tarım Sorunu ve Azgelismis Ülkeler (II)* in **11. Tez Sayı 4**, İstanbul: Uluslar arası Yayıncılık.

Aydın, Zülküf. (2001). “*Yapısal Uyum Politikaları ve Kırsal Alanda Beka Stratejilerinin Özelleştirilmesi: Söke’nin Tuzburgazı ve Sivrihisar’ın Kınık Köyleri Örneđi*”. Toplum ve Bilim, Bahar 2001. p. 11-31

Basaran, Kaan Evren. (2007). **Petty Agricultural Production and Contract Farming: A Case in Turkey**. Unpublished Master Thesis, Ankara: METU Graduated School of Social Sciences.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1986). “*The Forms of Capital*” in J. Richardson (ed), **Handbook of Theory and Reserach for the Sociology of Education**. NY: Greenwood, p. 241-248.

Burt, Ronald S. (2005). **Brokerage and Closure: An Introduction to Social Capital**, Oxford; New York : Oxford University Press.

Çalışlar, İzzeddin., and Unlimited (1998). **İptidar**. İstanbul: Mavi Jeans Yayını.

Coleman, J.S., (1988). “*Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital*” **The American Journal of Sociology**, Vol. 94, Supplement: Organizations and Institutions: Sociological and Economic Approaches to the Analysis of Social Structure. p. 95-120.

Ecevit, Mehmet. (1999). **Kırsal Türkiye’nin Değişim Dinamikleri: Gökçeada Köyü Monografisi**. Ankara: TC Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Eren, Kasım. (1960). **Tarih Boyunca Adana Ovasına Bir Bakış**. İstanbul: Berksoy Matbaası.

Ertürk, Yakın. (1994). **Patterns of Child Labour in Rural Turkey**. Ankara: ILO Yayınları

Field, John. (2008). **Social Capital**, New York, Routledge.

Gülçubuk, Bülent., Karabıyık, E., Tanır, F. (2002). **Türkiye Tarım Sektöründe En Kötü Biçimdeki Çocuk İşçiliği Temel Araştırması (Adana İli-Karataş İlçesinde Pamuk Toplamada Çalışan Çocuklar Örneği)**. Türkçe Basılmamış Araştırma Raporu, Ankara: ILO

Gümüş, Adnan. (2005). “Çukurova'nın Ötekileri”, Tiroj, Mayıs-Haziran 2005, p. 22-26.

Gündüz-Hoşgör, Ayşe. (1999). “Women's Diverse Positions in Rural Transformation: Evidence from a Villiage in Turkey”. Conference on Gender And Rural Transformation in Europe: Past, Present and Future Projects, 14-17 October 1999, The Netherlands.

Halpern, David. (2001). “Moral Values, Social Trust, and Inequality, Can Values Explain Crime?”. Biritish Journal of Criminology, 2001, Vol:41, No:2, p. 236-251.

Halpern, David. (2005). **Social Capital**, Cambridge, UK ; Malden, MA : Polity.

İçduygu, Ahmet., Sirkeci, İbrahim., and Aydınğün, İsmail. (1998). “Türkiye’de İçgöç ve İçgöçün İşçi Hareketine Etkisi”
http://www.migrationletters.com/sirkeci/Icduygu_Sirkeci_Aydingun_1998_turkiyede_icgoc.pdf

Jenkins, Richard. (2002). **Pierre Bourdieu**, London ; New York : Routledge.

Keyder, Çağlar. (1988). “Türk Tarımında Küçük Meta Üretiminin Yerleşmesi (1946-1960)” in **Türkiye’de Tarımsal Yapılar** (1988). Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.

Kongar, Emre. (1999). **21. Yüzyılda Türkiye 2000’li Yıllarda Türkiye’nin Toplumsal Yapısı**. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Lin, Nan. (2001). **Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action**, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Makal, Doç. Dr. Ahmet. (2001). “*Türkiye’de 1950-1965 Döneminde Tarım Kesiminde İşgücü ve Ücretli Emeğe İlişkin Gelişmeler*”. Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt 56 Sayı 3. p. 103-140.

Milli Prodüktivite Merkezi (MPM). (1982). **Tarım ve Orman İşçilerinin Sorunlarına İlişkin Çözüm Önerileri Semineri**. Ankara: MPM Yayınları.

Özbek, Ayşegül. (2007). **New Actors of New Poverty: The “Other” Children of Çukurova**. Unpublished Master Thesis, Ankara: METU Graduated School of Social Sciences.

Pamuk, Şevket and Toprak, Zafer. (eds.) (1988). **Türkiye’de Tarımsal Yapılar**. Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.

Pamuk, Şevket. (1988). “*İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yıllarında Devlet, Tarımsal Yapılar ve Dönüşüm*” in **Türkiye’de Tarımsal Yapılar** (1988). Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.

Putnam, R. (1993) “*The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life*”, The American Prospect, Volume 4 No: 13, p. 11-18

Putnam, Robert D. (2000) **Bowling Alone : The Collapse and Revival of American Community**, New York : Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.

Putnam, Robert D. (1993) **Making Democracy Work : Civic Traditions in Modern Italy**, with Robert Leonardi and Raffaella Y. Nanetti. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Şeker, Murat. (1986). **Türkiye’de Tarım İşçilerinin Toplumsal Bütünleşmesi**, Ankara: Değişim Yayınları.

Şeker, Murat. (1987). **Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi Sosyal ve Ekonomik Sorunlar**. Ankara: V Yayınları.

Sencer, Muzaffer. (1971). **Türkiye’de Köylülüğün Maddi Temelleri**. İstanbul: Ant Yayınları.

Shusterman, Richard (ed) (1999). **Bourdieu : A Critical Reader**, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Siisiäinen, Martti. (2000). “*Two Concepts of Social Capital: Bourdieu vs. Putnam*”, paper presented at ISTR Fourth International Conference “**The Third Sector: For What and for Whom?**” Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland July 5-8, 2000.

Tarım ve Köy İşleri Bakanlığı. (2005). **Adana Tarım Master Planı**.

Tekeli, İlhan and İlkin, Selim. (1988). “*Devletçilik Dönemi Tarım Politikaları*” in **Türkiye’de Tarımsal Yapılar** (1988). Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.

Toprak, Zafer. (1988). “*Türkiye Tarımı ve Yapısal Gelişmeler (1900-1950)*” in **Türkiye’de Tarımsal Yapılar** (1988). Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.

Uran, Hilmi. (1939). **Adana Ziraat Amelesi**, İstanbul: Vakıf Cep Kitapları, No 12.

Yıldırak, Nurettin.; Gülçubuk, B.; Gün, S.; Olhan, E.; Kılıç, M. (2003). **Türkiye’de Gezici ve Geçici Kadın Tarım İşçilerinin Çalışma ve Yaşam Koşulları ve Sorunları**. Ankara: Tarım İş Sendikası Yayınları.

Yurdakul, Doç. Dr. Oğuz. (1982). “*Adana İlindeki Geçici Tarım İşçilerinin Sosyo-Ekonomik Sorunları*” in **MPM** (1982). Ankara: MPM Yayınları.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUOTATIONS IN TURKISH WITHIN THE FINDINGS CHAPTER TAKEN FROM INTERVIEWS

(1)

“Çukurova Türkiye pamuğunun yüzde yedisini üreten bir ova haline geldi. Çünkü burada pamuk artık karlı değil. Kirli bir ekolojimiz var, bu ekolojide mücadele etmek masraf demek. Bu masrafı da koyduğunuzda Adana şartların pamuk karlı bir yatırım olmaktan çıktı. Pamuk ekimi daha çok GAP bölgesine ve kalitesinden dolayı da Ege bölgesine kaydı... Buna karşılık ne arttı? Karpuz ekimi, narenciye ve seracılık.”

(2)

“Adana için konuşursak tarımda elcilik ve vasıfsız işgücünün miktarı pamuk tarımına bağlı olarak minimize oldu... Çünkü burada pamuk karlı bir yatırım değil. Bu nedenle, kazma ve toplama için işgücü kullanımı azaldı. Bir diğer nedende artık pamuk toplama makineleri kullanılıyor. Bunun manası toplayacak işçiye gerek yok demektir. Bu makineler bir buçuk ayda toplanan pamuğu çok kısa zamanda toplayabiliyor. Yeterli miktarda var. Asıl o filmlere konu olan pamuk toplama amelesi azaldı. Buna mukabil ne arttı? Karpuz ekiminde ve narenciye hasat mevsiminde bu tarz işçilikler mevcut. Onlarla ilgili gözlemimde şu, daha çok bu şekilde çalışan insanlar daha çok şehirli iş gücü. Bu insanlar sabah geliyorlar, mesai saatleri bitiminde de mahallelerine, evlerine gidiyorlar. Bir sanayi işine gider gelir gibi. Ama bundan 20-30 yıl önce ovanın her yanına çadırlar kurulurdu. Çünkü bir buçuk milyon dekarlık bir pamuk ekim sahası mevcuttu. Bilhassa Gaziantep, Diyarbakır, Adıyaman ve az miktarda ovanın dağ köylerinden gelenler olurdu. Bu işin tercih edilmesinin sebebi kalifiye olmayan işgücünün aktif hale gelmesiydi. 65 yaşında babaları ile 12 yaşındaki çocuğu ailecek pamuk toplarlardı.”

(3)

“...Elciliğe genelinde baba sülale işi olarak bakılabilir. Bunun dışından gelenlerde pek başarılı olamaz. Adam esnaftır. Bu işe soyunuyor. Bir gün buraya üç beş kişi girdi. Abi dedi biz şu binada kalıyoruz, mağduruz dedi. Hayırdır dedim, kimsiniz

diye sordum. Şırnaklılarmış, adamın biri bunları kandırmış sürekli size iş vereceğim diye buraya getirmiş. Depremden terk edilmiş bir binaya yerleştirmiş bunları, 25 kişiler. Birlikte kaldıkları yere gittik, yıkık bir binada 25 kişi. Tuvalet yok. Ekmek alacak paraları yok. Pislik içinde. Bu adam işte Adana’da esnafılık yapıyor, gidiyor Şırnak’a işçi toplayıp getiriyor sonrada terk edip kaçıyor. Kendi işinde bitmiş, bu işe atılmış. Kolay değil bu iş. Sorumluluk ister...”

(4)

“Bu dernek kurulduktan sonra.. Eskiden yüzde sekiz veya ondu elcilik payı. Dernekle birlikte, elcilerin bu sıkıntısı dile getirildi, ücretler arttırıldı. Şimdi çevrede bu kazanç duyulunca, vatandaş dedi ki benim ailemde 15 kişi var, bilmem kimde de 15 kişi var, ben bu işi yaparım demeye başladı. Herkes böyle bakmaya başladı. Çekici gelmeye başladı. Kızıyorum aslında elcilere. Parayı kazanıyor hemen jeep alıyor. Kahvenin önüne geliyor park ediyor. İşsiz insanlar özenmeye başlayıp ben de bu işi yapabilirim deme başlıyor. Artmasının nedeni budur. Bitende vardır bu işte. Bir iki sene gidiyor. Sonra, arabada evde gidiyor altından. Çekici gelen bir iş, kahvede oturuyor, hesap yapıyor... Şu kadar işçi bu kadar para eder, bir de günlük şu kadardan servis parası var. Bir de ikişer üçer çocuğu varsa diyor ki ben niye yapmayayım diyerek başlıyor. İki kişi bazen üç kişiyle birleşip başlıyor.”

(5)

“Benim bir bacanağım vardı burada, esastan ben onunla başladım. Bacağın kendi tarlaları vardı burada, onları ekiyorduk. Patates, soğan işiyle uğraşıyorduk. Baktım mahallemiz fakir bölgesidir. Benim hanımda biraz beceriklidir, dedim nasıl olsa tarlamız var, gel burada çalışalım diyorduk. Kendi çevremizden komşular. Gel şu patatesi atalım, gel şu biberi atalım diye başladık. Kendi işime götürüyordum. Hanım sonra mahalleyi dolaşıp, bir sene soğana bir sene bibere çevremizi götürmeye başladık. Sonra işçi dedi ki sen bize iş bulursan biz seninle gelecez dediler. İşçiyle anlaştık. Bacağın abisinin işi çok oluyordu, o dedi ki işçi çıkart. Onun sürekli işi oluyordu, yaz kış. Orda 15-20 kişiyle başlayıp çevreyi genişlettik. Sonra biz bir kaza geçirdik kardeşimle, o zamandan beri yemin ettim tarla ekmeyecem diye. Zaten tek başıma kaldım. İşçiyle uğraşmaya başladık. O zamanda iş çok oluyordu. Akşam eve geliyordum sulamaya gidiyordum, sabahta tekrar gelip işe gidiyordum. İki iş birden yürüyemez dedim. Aslında bizim kazancımız tarlada daha çok olurdu, çünkü tutarsa tam tutar. Böylece başlamış olduk, 20 yıldır yapıyorum.”

(6)

“... köylerin işi bitti, hepsi Urfa’ya geldiler. Benim köyüm 150 haneydi, şimdi 30 hane kaldı, onlarda yaşlılar. Tarla tapan her şeyi bıraktık. İçecek su yok bizim orada. Kuyular var çamur, yetmiyor.”

(7)

“... Fındığa gittiniz ve gittiğiniz köyde Ahmet, Mehmet, Meral Hanım... bir köyde 10 elci var. Diğerlerinin işi sürer 15 gün. Mesela 40 gün kalırlar, 10 gün çalışırlar... Ama Meral Hanım işçisi 50 günde 45 gün çalışırlar. Meral Hanım parayı peşin verir, ama diğer adam işçiyi uğraştırır. Oradaki vatandaş nereli olursa olsun gelir Meral Hanımı bulur, telefonunu verip seneye bizi de alın der. Böylece Meral Hanım’ın Siirt’ten, Adıyaman’dan, Diyarbakır’dan da işçisi olur.”

“İstesem 1000 tane de işçi bulurum. Eğer sağlam aracı bulursa işçi bırakmaz. Siz nerede oturursanız oturun. İşçi kendi arasında konuşur. Ya biz gittik fındığa bizim elci bizi rezil etti. Ama ben derim ki bizim elci sağ olsun zamanında parayı verdi, bir sürü iş verdi, hava soğuyunca da yeter artı dedi döndük. Derki kim bu elci, bilmem kim işte... ver bana telefonunu, arar sonra derki ya seneye bizi de götürür müsünüz?”

(8)

“... işçiler kahvede diyor ki bu benim paramı vermedi. Onunla işe gitmiyor. Parasını almak için bekliyor. Batan elciler gurbete gidiyor, yada başka elcilerle işe gitmeye başlar”

(9)

“[Elci] Geliyor önceden ucuz yevmiye burada anlaşma yapıyor. Biz şikayet gelmediği sürece müdahale edemiyoruz. Çünkü böyle bir yetkimiz yok. Ama bir işçi gelir de şikayet ederse kendi imkanlarımızla sorunları çözmeye çalışıyoruz. İşçiler korkuyor söyleyemiyor, çünkü seneye çalışma şansı kalmayacak diye düşünüyorlar. Korsan aracı kışın para dağıtıp bunları bağlamış. Artık onların başka yerde çalışma şansı kalmamış. Artık faizine çalışıyor.”

“Kıştan işçiyi avansla bağlıyor, sonra işçinin hareket şansı kalmıyor. Fukaraları borçlandırıyor. Artık onlar konuşamıyor. Korsanın işçileri kaçta çalıştığını bilmez. Ne kazanacağını bilmez.”

(10)

“Dar gelirli insanlar okumamışlar. Çocuklar beş saat üç saat anasını görüyor ama günde 16-17 saat aracıyla kalıyor. Bir yerden sonra anası babası oluyorsun. Bir tarım aracısı okumamış, vasıfsız kimselerle uğraşılıyor.”

(11)

“ Bir gün başıma bir olay geldi... Ben burada oturuyorum Adana'dan biri Yunusoğlu'ndan kız alacakmış. Telefon açıyor, soruyor 'Hamdi Abi Yunusoğlu'ndan tanıdık kim var diye. Ben açıyorum oradaki bir elciyi arıyorum, diyorum böyle böyle bir durum var bu aile nasıl. Evet der veya hayır der. Bende ona göre evet ya da hayır diyorum. Böyle bilmeden çok yüzük taktık.”

(12)

“Elcilerin sorumluluğu çok var. Parası kaybolursa cepten öderiz. Diyelim eve geldik, bir gün hatırlıyorum, akşam yemekteyiz, dört defa zil çaldı. Yemeğe oturuyorum bir lokma alamadan işçi arıyor; biri der annem hasta, biri der ayakkabım yok, biri der tüpüm yok, biri der gezmeye gidecez.. Biz bunları mecbur yapamaz. İşçiler bizden ister. Adam ağayı tanımaz. İşçilere biz sahip çıkacağız, onları biz savunacağız. Ha burada ha orda ha nerdeyse. Bunların ailesi gelir, diyelim parası gecikir... Ne yapacağız? Başımız üstüne, kafamızı eğeceğiz. Adamlar haklı. O cahilse ben cahil olmayacağım. Demek ki ihtiyacı var yağmur demeden çamur demeden işe geliyor.”

(13)

“Buraya getirdiğin ameleğe iyi davranacaksın. Şimdi biz bunlara bir ana baba gibi bakıyoruz. Mesela biri hasta oldu gittik ameliyat ettirdik başında durduk. İşte bunlar önemli. Seneye senle daha fazla gelirler, eğer yüzüne bakmadın mı sahtekarlık yaptın mı gelmez senle. Kaçarlar.”

(14)

“Şimdi sadece tarlaya getirip işçiyi bırakmakla iş bitmiyor. Gece ikide telefon çalıyor, abi çocuğum hasta. Şimdi hangi işveren gelip o saatte senle ilgilenir. Veya harçlığım yok der, çıkarır verirsin. Onu beslemek zorundasın çünkü sen o adamın sırtından para kazanıyorsun.”

(15)

“Şimdi aynı köyden insanlar olunca idare edebiliyoruz. Çünkü işlerin nasıl yürüdüğünü biliyorlar. Ama dışarıdan olunca elci kötü oluyor. Yabancılar bilmez. Elci aldı yedi bunu derler. Bu yüzden tanıdık işçilerle, sorun olduğunda idare edebilecek kişileri tercih ederiz. Ama insanlarda etse etse iki üç ay idare eder. Adamlar 40 derece sıcakta domates topluyor. Ne yapsın adam. Adamanın başka işi yok gücü yok. Burada kazandığıyla yaşıyor adam. 12 ay boyunca çalışanlar var böyle.”

(16)

“Şimdi bu sistemin olması da biraz doğal ve gerekli de. Urfa'nın Yeşilova köyüne gittiniz. Kimi tanırırsınız, kimi bilirsiniz. Böyle birinin olması gereklidir. Bunların İŞKUR'dan listesini de alabiliyordunuz. Genelde ama herkesin çalıştığı biri vardır o gelir. Tanışılır, devam etmesi içinde herkesin mutlu olması gerekir.”

(17)

“Eskiden bizim köyde iki kişi [elci] vardı. Biri babamdı. Doğan kent'te 3-4 elci vardı. Çiftçiler 500 dönüm 1000 dönüm pamuk ekmiş, iş çoktu, işçi sıkıntısı vardı. Adam 1000 dönüm pamuk ekmiş, ben bu işçinin parasını vereceğim zaten diyor, ha şimdi vermişim ha sonra vermişim. Adam yeter ki bana işçi getirsin. Onlar arkamızdan koşuyordu. Bir çiftçi bir keresinde iki defa Siverek'e geldi, bizim eve. [Babasına] İşçiyi bana getir de başkasına götürme diye. Ağalar Doğu'ya gidip de elcileri buluyordu, işçi getirsin de pamuğum yerde kalmaması diye. Şimdi elci var mı yok mu belli değil.”

(18)

“Tarım aracısı olmadan tarım sektörü işçilik konusunda çöker. Kimse kimseyle uğraşmaz, kimse kimseye güvenmez. Verim ve kalite olmaz işçilik anlamında.”

(19)

“Eskiden ağalar ağaydı. Ağılık yapılarıydı. Ağa zarar etse bile işçinin parasını öderlerdi. Bunlar kalmadı artık.”

(20)

“Şimdiki ağalar değişti. Şimdi tüccarlara döndü iş. Bizim çiftlik sahibi ağalarımız vardı. Şimdi çok zor işler. İşçi hakkı yenmezdi. Şimdi de yenmez ama giden elciden gidiyor. Para gecikirdi ama kaybolmazdı. Şimdi adam kaçıp gidiyor. İşçi parası çok para şimdi. [Ağalar] Belirli yerdeydiler. İşçi kurumuna bağlıydık biz. Adam iflas etse bile, paramızı alırdık. Bizim zamanımızda sadece çiftçi işi vardı. Belirli bir kapıydı. Paran kaybolmazdı. Şimdi adamlar kaçıyor. Çiftçiler de zarar ediyor.”

(21)

“ [Ankara'da] Asgari ücret belirleme komisyonu toplanıyor. Bizde bunun üzerine yazı yazıp valilikte komisyonun toplanmasını istiyoruz. Yanlış bilgi olmasının komisyonun toplanma nedeni tarım aracısının ücretinin belirlenmesidir. İşçi ile alakalı değildir. O asgari ücretin brütünü alıyor. [İşçinin] Bunun altında alması zaten yasak. Burada ziraat odasının, çiftçiler birliğinin itiraz ettiği [aracılık ücretinin üreticiden talep edilmesi] gidin hakkınızı işçiden alın diyorlar. Biz buna

karşımız. Biz üreticiden istiyoruz. Yani [işverenin] asgari ücretin altında para vermesi işçiye kanunen yasak. Biz tarım aracısının hakkını buna ilaveten istiyoruz. [İşçi bulma komisyonu olarak] Yüzde beş veya altı. Biz bunun işçi parasının üstüne eklenmesini istiyoruz. Biz bunu [belirlenen asgari ücret ve aracılık komisyonu] bütün firmalara dağıtıyoruz, bilgilendiriyoruz. İtiraz edenler oluyor. Vermek istemeyenler oluyor.”

(22)

“Bizler eskiden işçi bulma kurumuna bağlı insanlardık. Ama, son dönemlerde fark ettik ki işçi bulma kurumu bizim sorunlarımızı çözmiyor. Bunu için bizim abilerimiz burada bir dernek kurma fikri ortaya attılar. Bu anlamda 2000 yılında böyle bir adım atıldı. Bugün bir firmaya paran takıldığında işçi bulma kurumu sana çözüm üretilmiyor. Sadece oraya gidip aidat ödüyoruz. Diğer taraftan büyük sıkıntılara çözüm olamıyor, mesela bir aracımız işsiz kalmış veya bir firmaya işçi lazım. Bu tür şeylere çözüm olamıyordu. Biz de karar aldık, dernek kuralım dedik.”

(23)

“... derneğimizi kurarkende şunu hedefledik; resmileşelim, odalaşalım. Biz baya bir 60 70 üyemiz vardı o zaman, sonra bir haber aldık dediler ki işte şu tarihe kadar 200 küsur üyeyi tamamlayamazsanız yeni çıkacak kanuna göre oda olabilmemiz için 500 üyenizin olması lazım. Biz de süreci hızlandırdık. Kimi borç ettik, kimi kardeşini yazdırdı ve sayıyı tamamladık. Bunu yaparken de odalar birliği başkanı bize net olarak dedi ki siz bu 201’i tamamlayın gelin, işte odanız dedi. Biz bu zor şartlarda sayımızı tamamladık, gereken girişimleri yaptık, başvurumuzu yaptık, Ankara’yla yazışmalarımız oldu ama Ankara’dan gelen cevapta tarım aracısı diye bir meslek yok cevabını aldık. Biz buna mütakip, böyle bir meslek yoksa da bunun meslek olarak kabul edilmesini istedik. Sonra bir cevap daha geldi, sizin istekleriniz bir dahaki toplantıda gündeme alınacaktır diye fakat hala bekliyoruz bir cevap yok. Hedeflerimiz çok büyüktü. Eğer biz resmileşirsek biz tarım işçisinin de sorumlularını çözeceğiz.”

(24)

“İlk başta bu dernek farklı kesimleri, Ziraat Odaları’nı, Çiftçiler Birliği’ni rahatsız etti. Bunu farklı düşüncelerle görüp bize farklı baktılar. Bunlar birleşirse diye korktular. Hatta ismimiz yasadışı örgütlerle anıldı. Gözlem altına alındık. Ankara’dan güvenlikten arkadaşlar gelip burada bizimle görüştüler. Sekiz ay bizi nasıl izlediklerini anlattılar. Sonrada çalışmalarımızdan ötürü teşekkür ettiler.”

“İlk başta bu dernek farklı kesimleri, Ziraat Odaları’nı, Çiftçiler Birliği’ni rahatsız etti. Bunu farklı düşüncelerle görüp bize farklı baktılar. Bunlar birleşirse diye korktular. Hatta ismimiz yasadışı örgütlerle anıldı. Gözlem altına alındık.

Ankara'dan güvenlikten arkadaşlar gelip burada bizimle görüştüler. Sekiz ay bizi nasıl izlediklerini anlattılar. Sonrada çalışmalarımızdan ötürü teşekkür ettiler.”

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Çukurova Farm Labor Intermediaries Association

- 1- How did the idea of association emerge, why did you need to establish it?
- 2- How many members does the association have?
- 3- What is the general member profile of it?
- 4- What are the main activity areas and implemented activities of the association since it was established?
- 5- Generally, how do you define labor intermediaries working in Adana?
- 6- Generally, how do labor intermediaries work in this neighborhood?
- 7- Generally, how is the relationship between labor intermediaries and;
 - Workers
 - Employers
 - Other intermediaries
 - Institutions
- 8- And if there is any problem between them, what is it?
- 9- What is known about the history of farm intermediary and seasonal agricultural work in this region?
- 10- What do you think about the next ten years?
 - What will be the position of the association or what is the intended position for association?
 - How will be the labor intermediaries?
 - How will Çukurova change and how does this change affect both the institution?
 - Intermediary and farm workers?

Farm Labor Intermediaries

Age:

Gender:

Educational status:

Marital status:

Actual occupation:

Place of living:

Place of Birth:

Place of taking workers for agricultural work:

Member of Association: Yes/ No

Number of average workers:

- 1- How did you start labor intermediation?
- 2- Is/was there anybody who is/was labor intermediary or seasonal agricultural worker in your family?
- 3- In order to be labor intermediary, what type of qualities are necessary?
- 4- In general, what do you know about the history of labor intermediaries in your region?
- 5- In general, can you tell about the seasonal agricultural worker working with you?
- 6- What are the general characteristics of these workers?
- 7- How can you find these workers?
- 8- Are there any social ties between you and workers such as affinity, friendship and so forth?
- 9- What do you think about these ties in general? Do they have any negative or positive effect related to intermediation that you have been doing?
- 10- How do you make sure that whether the workers come with you to work or not?
- 11- What kind of amenities do you have to fulfill for your workers?
- 12- How do you communicate with employer?
- 13- Is there any work contract signed between you and employer?
- 14- If there is a problem with employer, how do you solve this problem?
- 15- In general, what are the features of relationship among intermediaries?
- 16- What do you think about the next ten years?

APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHICAL DATA OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Participant Variables	1	2	3	4	5
Age	40	41	43	45	44
Gender	Male	Female	Male	Male	Male
Marital Status	Married	Married	Married	Married	Married
Place of Living	Adana	Adana	Adana	Adana	Adana
Place of Birth	Adiyaman	Adiyaman	Diyarbakır	Diyarbakır	Van
Education Info	Secondary Sch.	Literate	Elementary Sch.	Elementary Sch.	Elementary Sch.
Type of Intermediary	Settled	Settled/ Border	Settled	Settled	Settled
Appx. Number of Workers	100	350-400	50-70	50-70	-
Membership of Assoc.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Participant	6	7	8	9	10
Variables					
Age	45	70	72	42	40
Gender	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male
Marital Status	Married	Married	Married	Married	Married
Place of Living	Adana	Adana	Adana	Şanlıurfa	Şanlıurfa
Place of Birth	Adıyaman	Adıyaman	Diyarbakır	Şanlıurfa	Şanlıurfa
Education Info	Elementary Sch.	Literate	Literate	Literate	Elementary Sch.
Type of Intermediary	Settled	Retired	Retired	Boarder	Boarder
Appx. Number of Workers	50	-	-	100	100
Membership of Assoc.	Yes	No	No	No	No