

CLASS-BASED RESISTANCE DYNAMICS OF PETTY COMMODITY
PRODUCERS: SUBJECTIVE ASPECTS OF EVERYDAY LIFE IN A
VILLAGE OF WESTERN TURKEY

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

BY

YEŞİM AKMERANER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION

SEPTEMBER 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

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

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ayata
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. Necmi Erdoğan
Ecevit
Co-Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Mehmet C.
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit (METU, SOC) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan (METU, ADM) _____

Prof. Dr. Metin Özüğurlu (A.U, DLEIR) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Galip Yalman (METU, ADM) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. E. Attila Aytekin (METU, ADM) _____

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 : Yeşim Akmeraner

Signature :

ABSTRACT

CLASS-BASED RESISTANCE DYNAMICS OF PETTY COMMODITY PRODUCERS: SUBJECTIVE ASPECTS OF EVERYDAY LIFE IN A VILLAGE OF WESTERN TURKEY

Akmeraner, Yeşim

M.S., Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit

Co-Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan

September 2014, 155 pages

The focus of the thesis is to understand the change in agricultural relations by analyzing the class-based resistance dynamics of petty commodity producers and the subjective character of everyday life on the basis of the field research conducted in a village of Western Turkey. The thesis attempts to include class confrontations embedded in feelings, values, expectations, images while establishing the relation of small peasants and the general social relations within the context of prevailing class experiences of petty commodity producers in Turkey. The thesis also tries to understand how peasants experience ‘peasant images’ as crucial part of making of class based on resistance dynamics. In order to comprehend resistance dynamics, the thesis also focuses on the character of peasant labour on the basis of master-apprentice relationship within the family as well as its specific work discipline that are marked by the unity of production and reproduction. The thesis argues that such an analysis is helpful to understand the specificities of subordination of peasants that incorporate ‘hegemonic’, ‘non-hegemonic’ and ‘counter hegemonic’ features. In that sense, the thesis argues that petty commodity producers resist against pressures of dissolution constituted by

multiple patterns of class differentiation and cultural diversifications and representations of everyday life experiences based on class confrontations.

Keywords: Petty Commodity Producers, Everyday Life Experiences, Class Confrontations, Cultural Representations.

ÖZ

KÜÇÜK META ÜRETİCİLERİNİN SINIFSAK DİRENİŞ DİNAMİKLERİ: TÜRKİYE’NİN BATISINDA BİR KÖYDE GÜNDELİK HAYAT DENEYİMİNİN ÖZNELİKLERİ

Akmeraner, Yeşim

Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit

Yardımcı Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan

Eylül 2014, 155 sayfa

Bu tez Türkiye’nin batısında bir köyde yapılan alan çalışmasına dayanarak küçük meta üreticilerinin sınıfsal direniş dinamikleri ve gündelik hayatın özel karakterini analiz ederek tarımsal ilişkilerdeki deęişimi anlamayı hedeflemektedir. Küçük köylülük ile genel toplumsal ilişkiler arasındaki ilişkiyi Türkiye’deki küçük meta üreticilerinin mevcut sınıf deneyimi çerçevesinde kurarken; duygular, değerler, beklentiler ve temsillerde gömülü olan küçük köylülüğün sınıf karşılaşmalarını kapsamaya çalışmaktadır. Ayrıca köylülerin ‘köylü temsillerini’ nasıl deneyimledikleri de sınıf oluşumunun önemli bir parçası olarak direniş dinamikleri temelinde anlaşılmaya çalışılmaktadır. Direniş dinamiklerini anlamak amacıyla aile içerisindeki usta-çırak ilişkisi temelinde köylü emeğinin karakteri ile üretim ve yeniden üretimin iç içe geçmesi ile şekillenen küçük meta üretiminin özgün iş disiplinine odaklanılmaktadır. Böyle bir analizin ‘hegemonik’, ‘hegemonik olmayan’ ve ‘karşı hegemonik’ unsurlar barındıran köylülerin baskılanmasının özgünlüklerini anlamaya yardımcı olacağı iddia edilmektedir. Bu

bağlamda, küçük meta üreticilerinin çözülme yönündeki basınçlara karşı çok yönlü sınıfsal farklılaşma ve kültürel çeşitlenme örüntüleri ile sınıf karşılaşmalarına dayanan gündelik hayat deneyimleri içerisindeki temsiller yoluyla direndiği iddia edilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Küçük Meta Üreticileri, Gündelik Hayat Deneyimleri, Sınıf Karşılaşmaları, Kültürel Temsiller.

Mahsulü Allah'ın ambarında

Eli hamurda, sırtı açıkta

Tarlası miras sırtında

Her şeye rağmen tütürür dumanını sigarasının, çıkıp motoruna

Toprağın o inatçı, güzel insanlarına...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to offer my sincerest gratitude to Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit to whom I owe the theoretical constitution of the thesis. He is much more than an advisor for me with his continuous support, patience and friendliness. I must confess that he is a difficult scholar who stubbornly leads his students to interrogate themselves, which creates a priceless opportunity to develop their capacity. I would always be happy to meet and to study with him.

I specially would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan to whom I owe my developing interest in cultural studies. His courses I attended during my graduate education not only has served for my academic background but also developing a deeper understanding of social relations in Turkey. His guidance shed light on my studies when I was in trouble about how to approach the cultural issues that I want to deal with.

I really appreciate Prof. Dr. Metin Özüğurlu not only his allocating time when I consulted him but also his precious contribution to agrarian studies in Turkey that I eagerly followed and benefitted from and I thought it has triggered the refreshment relevant studies. I would like to thank, for sure, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Galip Yalman for his interest and kindness whenever I asked for his advice and for his meticulous efforts in his courses to give a qualitative background for his students. I would also like to offer my gratitude, of course, to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Attila Aytekin not only for his advices and motivation while I was writing my thesis but also his kindness and friendliness.

I also specially would like to thank our seminar group conducted by Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit. Throughout two years that I attended the seminars, I got the chance to discuss and develop my interrogations in a friendly atmosphere. I specially owe Atakan Büke and Burcu Saka a debt of gratitude for their support whenever I need and for their precious contributions to the discussions of my thesis.

I would like to thank specially Deniz Sagular, Barış Sevük and Ufuk Alkan who are my young comrades as well as Egemen İlhan and Merve Gül Hacıbayramoğlu for their technical support. I also thank Ayla Ezgi Akyol with whom I overcome hard times of the writing process. I appreciate a lot to Esra Elif Nartok whose help and support are priceless in developing my thesis. Whenever we fell in despair, we motivated each other by saying that ‘our hope is so crowded’. I could not stand long and tiring nights of studying without her motivations.

I specially owe the hospitable peasants of Hamzabeyli village a debt of gratitude for their patience and help while I was welcomed as their guest. They never refrain from helping me although they hardly believed that I was just a student from M.E.T.U by supposing that I was a police and then an agent of the government, which I will always remember with humour.

I owe a lot to my mother for her everlasting compassion and support, and I must state that I can feel the labour issue deep inside me thanks to her as a proletarian women. I thank my father for his cheer, humour and motivation without which life would be duller.

Finally, I owe a lot to Faruk Adıgüzel who came into my life while I was studying on my thesis and made everything more beautiful and endurable. His strong standing in life and everlasting willpower became a source of hope and resilience for me by reminding our motto of ‘never give up!’. I thank him a lot.

As a last point, I bow respectfully before the memory of Soma mine workers who lost their life in the Soma massacre while I was studying in Manisa. I believe in the diggers of the earth both underground and above the ground who will find the magma that will change the world completely.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Theoretical Framework.....	1
1.2 Methodology.....	10
1.3 Outline of Chapters.....	17
2. CONTEMPORARY AGRARIAN QUESTION AND ITS REPERCUSSIONS IN TURKEY	19
2.1 A New Phase of Agrarian question in the Neoliberal Era?	19
2.2 The Repercussions in Turkey	32
2.3 Concluding Remarks	41
3. CLASS DIFFERENTIATION AND RESISTANCE DYNAMICS OF PETTY COMMODITY PRODUCTION IN HAMZABEYLİ VILLAGE	43
3.1 History of the Village/Background of Petty Production.....	43
3.2 Prevailing Class Differentiation in the Village and the Resistance of PCP	51
3.2.1 Surplus Population Household.....	52
3.2.2 Small PCP'ers	52
3.2.3 Middle PCP'ers	55
3.2.4 Big PCP'ers.....	55
3.3 Commodification of Land and the Resistance of PCP	58
3.4 Subsistence Production within the Framework of Changing Habits of Consumption.....	60
3.5 Culture of Agricultural Production within the Framework of Everyday Life in the Village.....	63
3.6 Concluding Remarks	67

4. CLASS EXPERIENCE OF PEASANTRY	69
4.1 The Character of Peasant Labour	70
4.1.1 Artisan Character of Peasant Labor	71
4.1.2 Working in Factory or Farming?	77
4.2 Hidden Injuries of Peasants	87
4.2.1 So who is the poor; who is the wealthy?.....	88
4.2.2 Subordinated ‘Skins’	94
4.2.3 To speak or not to speak?.....	98
4.2.4 Holding Injuries under Wraps.....	100
4.2.5 Hierarchy of Space.....	107
4.2.6 Moral Weapons of Peasants.....	110
4.2.7 Furious Peasants.....	117
4.2.8 ‘Art of Making Do with’ in Peasants’ Lives.....	121
4.3 Concluding Remarks	126
5. CONCLUSIONS.....	128
REFERENCES.....	136
APPENDICES	142
A. INFORMATION ABOUT THE INTERVIEWEES	142
B. TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	143
C. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	155

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Theoretical Framework

Agricultural debates welcome the neoliberal era with the announcement that small peasantry is getting more and more marginalized and the focus of the studies on agricultural relations predominantly shifts from small peasantry towards the characteristic features of capital except for the studies insisting on small peasantry such as Latin American peasant studies, “new peasantry” studies and Indian subaltern studies. It was such a period in terms of peasant studies that one of the leading scholars, Eric Hobsbawm, announced that “[this] is the first period in which the peasantry became a minority, not merely in industrially developed countries, in several of which it had remained very strong, but even in the Third World countries” (Hobsbawm, 1992: 56). In parallel to the idea of Hobsbawm, Henry Bernstein who is a leading figure in peasant studies declares that small peasants become marginalized even in Third World countries from Latin America, Africa to the Far East, and he criticizes the studies focusing on small peasants, their specific features and resistance dynamics of being populist. It can be said that the hegemonic atmosphere in agricultural studies in neoliberal era is in the direction of the “disappearance thesis” implicitly or explicitly. This tendency dates back to transition debates in Europe while Robert Brenner challenges the understanding that comprehends modern working class in capitalism as the only active agent of history. All in all, Marxist tradition is disabled about its inability in developing an understanding of peasantry and Marx’s “potatoes in a sack” gives its place to Lenin’s “the role in transition to socialism” besides significant contributions from Antonio Gramsci and subaltern studies in India in following decades. So, it is difficult to say that approaches to peasantry could overcome the functionalist trap which is disabled in terms of an essentialist approach following a *rational* and *progressive* path that will *necessarily* turn peasants (or the majority of them) into proletarians.

So the peasant studies in Turkey in neoliberal period are not safe from that hegemonic atmosphere, and the focus of the studies in Turkey also shift from small peasantry towards the characteristic features of capital in the neoliberal era while it can be said that academic interest in agricultural or rural issues has considerably decreased after 1980's and especially after 1990's. The focus of analyses of the relevant literature in Turkey mainly base on peasants' role in economic development and the necessity to modernize them from nation construction period up to 1960's. From 1960's up to 1980's the focus of the analyses begin to slowly shift towards socialist agenda and the academic interest interlaces with political agendas¹. So the focus shifts to the role of the peasantry, which is mostly an ally force of working class, in the making of socialist revolution as well as the mode of production and agricultural structure of Turkey. The focus of the studies heads for agricultural politics centered at the adaptation process of European Union in 1990's. It can be said that both academic and political interest decrease dramatically from 1980's up to today. What is specific in terms of the literature about peasants and agriculture in Turkey is that while peasantry was seen as a significant constituent in the analysis of Turkey besides the strong emphasis on feudal or semi-feudal features that should be eliminated in order to be a "modern" or "developed" country before 1980's, such a tendency all of a sudden disappears and the peasantry marginalized by losing its analytic importance after 1980's. On the other hand, contemporary studies are marked by the analyses prioritizing the concepts such as "globalization", "commercialization", "commodity chains", "agri-food relations" and "transnational corporations" (TNC) under the hegemonic atmosphere mentioned previously. It can be said that contemporary studies in Turkey shares a kind of common foresight in terms of peasants' becoming "proletarian in their land", "agricultural worker", "peasant-based worker" as well as "being dissolved by means of class differentiation". In both cases, before and after 1980's, it can be said that peasantry is

¹ In terms of a general feature of the development of social sciences as a discipline in Turkey, it can be said that majority of the rural studies were developed by focusing on social and political though rather than scientific concerns. Rich findings that these studies provided cannot be developed into scientific theories (Ecevit, et. al, 2009: 45).

seen as something that must *necessarily* or *essentially* to turn into something else under the guidance of certain relations, and such an approach can be said to presuppose *destined pathways*.

The main direction of the structural change of peasantry progress is towards inner differentiation, disintegration and elimination. That direction, as it is known, is the direction of capitalist development... Neoliberalism, the form of historical capitalism that stand against small peasantry, lead many analysts to be convinced about the ultimate elimination of small peasantry (Özüğurlu, 2011: 10).

On the other hand, the studies that offer an expansion to postmodernism such as the studies of Jan Douwe van der Ploeg attempt to go beyond the economy political analyses while his analyses seem to be challenging against the successors of the ‘disappearance thesis’ that gather around the assumption of ‘global depeasantization’² arguments in neoliberal era.

The author shows how family agricultures in the North and in the South, confronted with increasing dependence of globalized markets, adopt or update forms of resistance or distantiation to the capitalist production logic. These various resistance practices characterize, according to the author, a process of repeasantization, including in industrialized European countries where the peasant societies as described by anthropology or sociology have disappeared. (Sabourin, 2014).

In spite of the general tendency which focuses on disappearance of peasantry or depeasantization process in agricultural studies, the aim of the thesis is to analyze the change in agricultural relations within the framework of class differentiation of PCP’ers on the basis of their resistance dynamics and their subjective experiences on the basis of everyday life. The thesis argues that class differentiation of PCP’ers

² Global depeasantization is expressed in *derurulization* (depopulation and decline of the rural areas of the world) and *overurbanization* (massive concentration of peoples and activities in growing urban centers of the world), both of which are in turn reflective of a pattern of differentiation of geographical space particular to the post-World War II development of world capitalism” Farshad A. Araghi (1995) *Global Depeasantization, 1945-1990 The Sociological Quarterly*, Volume 36, Number 2, pp. 337-36.

proliferates and diversifies, which would be evaluated within the framework of PCP'ers' resistance. The thesis also claims that the analysis of class differentiation on the basis of production relations should be added another dimension which include subjectivities of PCP'ers. The thesis argues that the concept of 'small peasantry' should be used on the analysis of these subjectivities as another dimension of the agricultural relations in spite of differentiations on the level of production relations. Notwithstanding that the study is aware of the arguments in the relevant literature against the use of 'small peasantry', the thesis benefits from the conceptualization as another dimension of the agricultural relations. Throughout the study, the concept of peasantry refers to small peasantry in parallel with the framework and the focus of the thesis. However, it does not mean that the thesis sees peasantry as a homogenous unit. The thesis includes subjectivities of 'small peasantry' into analysis because it claims that this level reveals certain kinds of resistance dynamics. In accordance with that aim, the thesis argues that PCP'ers have a strong tendency towards keeping their relative autonomy in terms of use of labour power, use of time, way of conducting production process and so on. The thesis also argues that PCP'ers are sensitive to a certain kind of labour, or in order words, they define themselves as peasants and farmers, which contributes to the resistance dynamics of PCP'ers. The experience of 'being peasant' on the basis of confrontations outside of the village life would be claimed to support the resistance of PCP'ers. In that sense, the thesis does not refrain from using the concept of 'small peasantry' in the analysis of their experiences of that image. The thesis benefits from Ploeg's studies without engaging in "peasant essentialism"³ within the context of resistance dynamics which he summarizes as "*fight for autonomy and survival in a context of deprivation and dependency*" (Ploeg, 2008: 7). The thesis focuses

³ "Peasant essentialism can be constructed around various qualities of "pleasantness" by various analytical methods and with various ideological effects (and intentions). Those qualities include such familiar notions as household farming organized for simple reproduction ('subsistence'), the solidarities, reciprocities, and egalitarianism of (village) community, and commitment to the values of a way of life based on household and community, kin and locale..." Bernstein, Henry; Byres, J. Terence. From Peasant Studies to Agrarian Change.

resistance dynamics without universalizing these features as well as without attributing resistance as an “*essential part*” of small peasantry.

In parallel with the aim of the thesis, the thesis focuses on petty commodity producers as small peasantry constitutes the most rooted and common element of the agricultural relations so that it is theoretically more consistent in the sense that the specific character of peasantry is its capacity of resistance and adaptation for a long period during capitalist development (Özügürü, 2011: 15). However, the thesis accepts that focusing small peasants is not enough to understand the specific features of peasantry and agricultural relations of Turkey and the question of how to focus or how to study peasantry becomes a necessity. Thus, the thesis focuses on the resistance dynamics of peasantry to understand the change in agricultural relations within the framework of comprehending specificities of the agricultural relations in Turkey as well as subjectivities of peasantry. In that sense, peasants become active agents of social change in the meaning that their subjectivities enabling resistance define the forms and extent of change and subordination. However, such an analysis cannot be made via the approaches only focusing political mobilization in the search for resistance. So what is significant in terms of prevailing studies is the strong tendency to portray peasants as passive objects of neoliberal policies and exposed to great structural changes. In such a perspective, it gets harder to analyze small peasantry on the basis of class struggle because class struggle, within such a perspective, predominantly connotes to movements, strikes, and occupations that peasants of Turkey have rarely experienced. In that sense, the thesis aims to comprehend small peasantry as a living force and active agents contradictorily both bearing counter-hegemonic features and features subordinating to hegemony at the same time⁴. It is meaningful to look at peasants’ daily life, subjective experiences of class confrontations, their traditional values and cultural patterns in order to realize the resistance dynamics. The significance of such an approach is its understanding class

⁴ Throughout the study ‘hegemonic features’ refer to the features that complicate the survival of petty commodity producers as well as the ones that corrode their cultural patterns which, in turn, provide the basis for their resistance against the pressures of dissolution.

as a formation and relation⁵ and it has the ability to perceive and evaluate the operations of class in the absence of class consciousness and political movements⁶. As Thompson states that:

... objective determinations do not impose themselves on blank and passive raw material but on active and conscious *historical* beings. Class formations emerge and develop 'as men and women *live* their productive relations and experience their determinate situations, with in "the *ensemble* of the social relations", with their inherited culture and expectations, and as they handle these experiences in cultural ways (Thompson, 1978: 150; cited in Wood, 2008: 100).

Thus, focusing on small peasants is not enough and it is necessary to analyze their experience; however, the analyses of experience is not enough and it should be made by means of an approach that is sensitive to subjective experiences of peasants. Such kind of an analysis can better understand the disintegration and resistance issue of small peasantry as well as the problematic of why some of the peasants (some regions) resist while some others (other regions) disintegrate.

However, it can be said that classical sociology problematizes village and rural relations without establishing its relation to the general social relations and handles village as a homogeneous unit. As a result, it universalizes those homogenous features. In terms of the method it develops, it can be said that it either applies to "universal" method of analysis without taking the specific features of the object of analysis into account, or it applies to a "peasantist" method by absolutizing these specific features as unique. According to Mehmet C. Ecevit and his friends, rural sociology neglects the transformation of rural society in general and never

⁵Understanding class as a process and a relation means that "class *formations* and the discovery of class consciousness grow out of the process of struggle, as people 'experience' and 'handle' their class situations. It is in this sense that class struggle precedes class" Thompson, E.P. (1978).

⁶ "The great strength of Thompson's conception of class is that it is capable of recognizing, and giving an account of, the operations of class in the absence of class consciousness; while those who adopt the kind of structural definition his critics seem to have in mind have no effective way of demonstrating the efficacy of class in the absence of clearly visible self-conscious class formations, and no effective response to the claim that class is nothing more than an ideologically motivated theoretical construct imposed on historical evidence from without." (Wood, 2000: 79).

problematizes that transformation within capitalist social relations, and it has a content solely emphasizing the rural change. Rural sociology studies focused on the results of the changes took place in rural parts rather than theoretically problematizing it on the basis of whether these changes cause a change in general society (Ecevit, Kırkner & Büke, 2009: 42).

On the other hand, historical approach problematizes village and rural relations by establishing its relation to the general social relations. It can be said that its starting point is general relations and then it comes to the village and rural relations, which leads to the underestimation of small peasantry in terms of its distinctive features as a *phenomena* as well as an *analytic category*. Historical approach does not head for non-structuralist reservoir of the world view and it becomes restricted with the concept treasury of political economy (Özüğurlu, 2011: 71). The analyses basing on globalization, commercialization, circulation of capital, and so on that proliferate in neoliberal era can be said to be share such a standpoint.

The contribution of the thesis to the literature is supposed to be its effort to establish a relationship between small peasants and general social relations on the basis of cultural field without elimination of the role of political economy because "class differences find expression in status distinctions that rank individuals and groups on scales of social honorability rather than in terms of economic interest alone" (Swartz, 1997: 151). Settled on that ground, the thesis applies to discourse, experience and agent in terms of methodology and it handles small peasantry both as a *phenomena* and an *analytic category* without attributing *essential* characteristics to it. In parallel with that aim, the thesis aims to contribute historical approach by means of including the analysis on the basis of class confrontations, hidden injuries, class experience, practice of everyday life, tactics of peasants, peasant and working class images as well as "art of making do with" in peasants' lives within the framework of the relation between small peasantry and the general social relations by focusing on its specificities without presupposing a given relationship between the two. The conceptualizations mentioned just above are adopted from the studies outside of agricultural studies with the idea that they can be useful in understanding

contemporary situation of small peasantry, and consequently agricultural relations in Turkey in terms of the aim of the thesis to make a contribution in literature via cultural analysis.

As it is previously mentioned, “men and women experience the ensemble of social relations with their inherited culture and expectations”; so he and she contributes the constitution of “class” by means of encounters on the basis of differences that are personally experienced. "Class happens when some men, as a result of common experiences (inherited or shared), feel and articulate the identity of their interests as between themselves, and as against other men whose interests are different from (and usually opposed to) theirs" (Thompson, 1978: 1). In that sense, class experience which is constituted and reconstituted by means of encounters is a matter of personal experience. Within that perspective, the thesis aims at analyzing class experience of peasants on the basis of their subjective encounters. These encounters bear the encounters of certain images experienced, and the thesis supposes that class experience of peasants can better be understood via their experience of peasant images that are constituted from outside and upside. To the extent that “class is a factor that conditions the most intimate levels of their personal lives”, hidden injuries engage in “daily realities of inequality” (Howard & Wajeman, 1978). By means of the conception of “hidden injuries”, it is aimed to reveal the experience of differences and analyze their role in class experience constituted on the basis of “daily realities of inequality”. The conceptualization of “hidden injuries” is adopted by Richard Sennett who uses the term in order to understand the American working class upon how they define themselves and how they feel when they experience class confrontations on the basis of ability as a source of legitimacy in terms of unequal relations and power as well as loss of dignity by tracing certain defenses that they develop that are hidden in their everyday life. In that sense, the concept of “hidden injuries” constituted on the basis of class encounters is used in parallel to the aim of the thesis to establish a relationship between small peasants and general social relations on the basis of cultural field within the context of everyday life experiences of peasants. Besides this, it can be said that peasants develop certain forms of

resistance against those “injuries” and the thesis includes moral values, feelings and the way they interpret these feelings, and the experience of personal encounters into the analysis in parallel with the theoretical focus of the thesis on the resistance tendencies of small peasants. The thesis argues that the experience peasants have outside of village life becomes a source of their subordination via appearance of peasants and the way they speak which supports their ‘peasant’ and ‘farmer’ identities, and it contributes the resistance dynamics of PCP’ers.

In accordance with the aim of handling small peasantry as a living force, the conceptualization of “art of making do with” is used to reveal the resistance of peasants in their everyday practice. “Art of making do with” which is put forward by Michael De Certeau refers to the subordinated people’s act of “escaping without leaving” which means using the field and rules of the dominant by turning it to their benefit. The thesis adopts the conceptualization of De Certeau in order to evaluate peasants’ tactics to use the cooperatives which restricts peasants’ activities by turning it to their benefit. That kind of operations of peasants evaluated by means of the conceptualization of “art of making do with” is included into the analysis in order to show that peasants are not passive objects of the structural adjustments in agricultural relations, and it is necessary to handle small peasants as an analytic category as well as problematizing its characteristics features methodologically in order to discover that resistance. Within that context, the thesis argues that PCP’ers develop certain tactics to resist against the subordinating implications of the government.

So the conceptualization such as class confrontations, hidden injuries and “art of making do with” is used in the thesis with the aim of servicing that methodological stance in parallel with the aim of comprehending peasantry as a living force and active agents contradictorily both bearing counter-hegemonic or non-hegemonic features and features subordinating to hegemony. Their defenses can be evaluated in the sense that they are not totally absorbed by the hegemonic processes and it can be meaningful to think about the different operations of hegemonic processes upon their resistance practice taking place in the realm of everyday life, in the field of feelings

as well as values while establishing the relation of small peasants and the general social relations.

To sum up, the thesis focuses on the resistance dynamics of peasantry while establishing the relationship between peasantry and the general society on the basis of experiences of class confrontations in order to understand the contemporary agricultural relations by capitalizing on the experiences, feelings, expectations and discourse of peasants. In the final analysis, the thesis concentrates on how peasants resist rather than how they are dissolved in order to understand the prevailing agricultural relations because their ways of resistance reveal the specificity of their subordination that take place in the field of their everyday life that is characterized by means of the class encounters in which peasants experience differences subjectively.

1.2 Methodology

This study handles historical materialism as a conceptualization that reveals the social agent, which refers to a standpoint that comprehends the social structures as *phenomenological* rather than *essential*. That phenomenological comprehension of structures includes the *relative* and *contingent* processes or features of social relations contrary to *absolutizing* the structures. On the other hand, this study does not absolutize the *relative* and *contingent* features. This study cares about such a standpoint in terms of comprehending the variety and diversity of class conflict in the process of class formation. Within that context, class struggle is handled as an explanan of the social relations in the sense that the dichotomy of the *political* and the *economic* is aimed to be overcome. In that sense, class conflict is not *determined* by phenomenological features but produces and reproduces social relations in multiple ways as a heterogeneous process. So it can be said that “objective determinations - the transformation of production relations and working conditions - never impose themselves on 'some nondescript undifferentiated raw material of humanity' but on historical beings, the bearers of historical legacies, traditions and values” (Wood, 2000: 92 quoted from Thompson, 1966: 194). This study handles

class conflict by problematizing it within the context of historical specificities around which surplus labour is seized and the specificities of subjective experiences of that process within which class conflict is experienced in everyday practice within the framework of inherited cultural codes and values. Thus, the thesis focuses on the resistance dynamics of petty commodity producers by handling PCP'ers both as a phenomena and an analytic category without applying a *sui generis* form because "the specific character of peasantry is its capacity of resistance and adaptation for a long period during capitalist development, so it is theoretically more consistent to focus on the question of how they resist" (Özuğurlu, 2011: 10).

Within that context, class is perceived not as a mere matter of wealth but also a matter of subjective confrontations including the confrontations of values, feelings, expectations and images. "Class matters to us not only because of differences in material wealth and economic security, but also because it affects our access to things, relationships, experiences and practices which we have reason to value, and hence our chances of living a fulfilling life" (Sayer, 2005: 1). Within that perspective, class struggle includes hegemonic, non-hegemonic and counter-hegemonic forms realized in the specificities of everyday life experience that might be in the form of active resistance or resilience. Such a standpoint is significant in terms of realizing the agent in the making of social formation or social change when it does not reveal itself openly from a perspective that analyzes social agent on the basis of movements, strikes, occupation and so on. This thesis aims to comprehend peasantry as a living force and active agents contradictorily both bearing counter-hegemonic features and features subordinating to hegemony at the same time. In that sense, the thesis aims to analyze the subjectivity of peasants' subordination in the sense that it is not externally imposed (through force, through economic and political structures), but it is internalized by the peasants themselves (Arnold, 2000: 46). The thesis applies to the subjective experiences of unequal relations on the basis of everyday life accompanied by resistance dynamics through which agency reveals itself. In that sense, "...agency is not some natural originary will; it takes shape as specific desires and intensions within a matrix of subjectivity – of (culturally constituted) feelings,

thoughts, and meanings” (Mitchell, 2007: 5). Thus, resistance of petty producers is not handled as *sui generis* and the experience of everyday life is not a homogenous process.

The thesis aims to overcome the dichotomies of peasant-worker, capitalist-pre-capitalist as well as modern-pre-modern. This thesis also does not come to terms with *rationality* that evaluates the social process in non-capitalist relations on the basis of a certain *rational* that assumes a *causal* relationship with the development of capitalist relations and the dissolution of peasantry or petty commodity producers by supposing non-capitalist relations as “pre”- capitalist. Accordingly, the thesis also aims to contradict the *universalization* of that *rational* which connotes to a certain path that PCP’ers are expected to follow within the context of a dichotomic understanding that expects peasantry *essentially* to turn into something else such as proletarian, semi-proletarian and so on in capitalist society. In that sense, the thesis does not *reduce* the formation or dissolution of a class to the economic and social development capitalist forces. Finally, the thesis tries to establish the relationship between the petty commodity producers and general social relations without reducing it to a relationship that the surplus is extracted because the class experience is also the experiences of differences in terms of values, feelings, expectations, images on the basis of class confrontations. In that sense, subjectivities of petty commodity producers becomes a crucial point in order to understand the contemporary experience and condition of PCP’ers and peasantry. As a last point, the thesis does not retain from the conceptualization of peasant or peasantry in parallel with the argumentation of the thesis about understanding the contemporary experience and position of PCP’ers on the basis of class confrontations as well as the experience of class differences which cannot be comprehended and analyzed without the conceptualization of peasant/peasantry as it comprises the social, personal, akin, communal relations that surround PCP’ers life.

In search of the problematic explained above, I conduct a field research in Hamzabeyli village of Manisa. The reason why the city of Manisa is chosen is that it has sophisticated and advanced relations in terms of both agricultural and non-

agricultural production capitalizing its geographically close position to İzmir. Also the Aegean region is significant in terms of the resistance of agricultural petty commodity production, which means that it is a suitable field for the objective of the study. The reason why the village of Hamzabeyli is chosen is that it is a village of petty producers and the basic source of income is still agricultural production in the village. It is also close to the city center (20 minutes). It is rich in diversity of relations and class differentiation. In parallel with the aim of the study to reveal diversified relations and richness of class differentiation, the field research comprises of big, middle, small PCP'ers and surplus family household that gives up agricultural production by taking into the inner differentiations of each as well as the PCP'ers who work in a factory or working as agricultural wage labour in neighboring villages at the same time. In order to deepen the diversity of the relations, the field research is sensitive to gender and age by including female, young and old peasants. The interviews are conducted by means of semi structured interviews. I benefitted both from 'one on one interview' and group interview, and I recorded the interviews.

It might be meaningful to mention about certain notes on the field research. First of all, I visited Manisa Provincial Directorate of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (Manisa İl Gıda, Tarım ve Hayvancılık Müdürlüğü). I got general information about the features of agricultural production of the city. However, it should be noted that the state registers about petty producers is not convenient for the studies analyzing petty production or petty producers as they are not producer-based but rather product and the scale of production are used as a base. Learning about the specific features of petty producers can be possible via the interviews made by the people who know the region for a long time or by local people.

Upon the information I achieved as a result of the interviews made by local people, agriculture engineers who had been working in the region for a long period and mukhtars of a few village, I chose Hamzabeyli village for the field research following a visit to the village. The field research consisting of 4 visits to Hamzabeyli village took approximately 6 months from November to May in total. It can be said that field research does not stand for verification or a concrete example of

the theoretical analysis but rather provides new perspectives to be developed and to contribute the framework of theoretical analysis, which the study tries to put forward especially in the 4th Chapter of the thesis.

In addition to this, how petty producers themselves make sense of the process or conditions that has changed to the detriment of petty producers especially since 2000's is significant in terms of understanding both the change in production relations as well as the class relations according to this thesis. In that sense, the thesis tries to benefit from discourse analysis capitalizing on the field research that was conducted by semi-structured interviews that enables petty producers to share more freely their ideas, experiences, feelings, expectations and forecasts about their future as well as the destiny of PCP'ers in general. As it is previously mentioned, focusing on petty producers that constitutes the most common and rooted element of agricultural relations for a long period of time is theoretically consistent in terms of understanding the change in those relations. It can also be stated that focusing on petty producers by including the subjective experiences of them might contribute to the theoretical standpoint mentioned above. Within that context, conducting a field research has significance in terms of methodology in parallel with the theoretical concern of the study rather than portraying a sample of the relations that are problematized.

It should be noted that feeling the general atmosphere of the village and moods of the producers contribute a lot to comprehend the prevailing position of them. It is also significant in terms of understanding the different and diversified ways of adopting, operating and resisting to the hegemonic forms as the thesis assumes that hegemonic processes and operations are not totally and systematically absorbed by the people who are subordinated to these processes because the practice of the subordinated that might bear hegemonic, non-hegemonic and counter- hegemonic elements is an underhanded process that entails a kind of methodology including *subjectivities* that “allows us to ask sharp questions about the cultural shaping of subjectivities within a world of wildly unequal power relations, and about the complexities of personal subjectivities within such a world” (Ortner, 2005: 46).

In addition to this, I also want to share some details of my field research process. At the beginning of the field research, it was very difficult to decide which village I was going to study. I demanded help from the officers and agricultural engineers who have been working in Manisa Provincial Directorate of Food, Agriculture and Livestock. I also made interviews with many agricultural engineers to get general information about agricultural relations of Manisa, what have changed in recent years and what their predictions about the future of agriculture in Manisa and its petty commodity producers. I got some statistical information about the agricultural production of Manisa but I could not benefit from the data because it based on efficiency ratio and it was product-based only. Thus, state registers did not seem to be convenient for a producer-based or a village based analysis.

With the guidance of the people in Manisa Provincial Directorate of Food, Agriculture and Livestock, I met with mukhtars of a few villages. Then I decided to visit Hamzabeyli village which seem to be convenient for my study because of the reasons previously mentioned. Firstly, I tried to learn about the history of the village in order to understand the settlement process of petty commodity production and I tried to understand that process within the framework of economic and social development of Turkey. In parallel with that aim, I tried to talk to the oldest people of the village as well as the mukhtar. Then I tried to understand the prevailing class differentiation, the structure of land ownership and the patterns of use of family labour as well as foreign labour by means of talking to the producers from different ranks. I strived a lot to talk to *dayıbaşı*⁷ to learn more about the patterns of use of labour; however, I could not manage to make her tell about the issues in detail although I met her 3 times.

Then I tried to understand how they interpret their own situation, how they feel, what their expectations are, and how they make sense of inequalities in order to comprehend their contemporary class experience. This part of the study was very difficult because they were talking about the deteriorating conditions in terms of

⁷ The person arranging the labourers who will work in the field within and around the village. He or she is the mediator between the owner of the land and the labourers.

agricultural production for hours while they kept silent when I asked about their feelings, expectations, or their experience of unequal relationships. When I realized that my questions did not work, I just casually talk about the issues I tried to learn about their ideas. Then they felt more comfortable and we could catch lively dialogues. To give an example, while we were talking about the shopping malls I shared my experience, and told that when I entered into a luxurious store just to look at the models of the products I was annoyed of the glances of the sales person. Then, the man to whom I was talking, Murat, told about his experience in Didim in a nightclub where he was not let into because of his appearance. I understood that when I felt comfortable, they did too.

Most of the interviews took place in the coffeehouse of the village. As a result of this, most of the interviewees were male peasants. It was difficult to meet with female peasants especially who were working in a factory or in farmland because they arrived at the village at 6 pm when the last vehicle departed from the village to the town. I came to the village and returned to Manisa and then to Menemen everyday during my visits. I wasted approximately 5 hours in a day with journey. Some of the peasants offered me to stay with their houses and I stayed for 2 nights for the women working at days. However, I could not stay longer in order not to disturb them. I can say that I had more difficulty to communicate with women peasants maybe because they were more timid in terms of telling about themselves.

I will also always remember with humour that at the beginning of my visit, they hardly believed that I was just a student from M.E.T.U by supposing that I was a police and then an agent of the government. When I asked them why they supposed me a police, they told me that a murder took place in the village two years ago and the police still came sometimes to get information. In spite of their suspect, they never refrained from helping me. Although the village was conservative in terms of public behaviors of women (women never appeared around the coffeehouse, for example), they got accustomed to my sitting in the coffeehouse for hours, and they even offered me to smoke cigarette in the coffeehouse during the interview when they learn that I was a smoker.

When we talked about where they came from, they discovered that my family was also a migrant from Salonika where most of the peasants came from. Then they acted in a warmer way and they said that I resemble to them. When I was talking to a 70 years old peasant, Şeref, about the migration process from Salonika to Anatolia, I also learnt about my ancestors as well, and to be honest at those moments I forgot about my purpose of visit there and my thesis. I really enjoyed to be that village and to talk to the people there.

1.3 Outline of Chapters

The thesis consists of four chapters. First chapter includes the theoretical framework that offers an evaluation in terms of theoretical bases of agrarian studies by focusing on contemporary interrogations and tries to define the place of the thesis within the relevant literature. It also includes an evaluation in terms of the methodological standpoint of the thesis as well as the significant points of the field research.

Second chapter comprises of the leading arguments of contemporary agrarian studies by pointing out the prominent focus of debates as well as its repercussions in the relevant literature in Turkey. In this chapter, the relation between the theoretical and methodological points of the classical and contemporary agrarian studies is also traced.

Third chapter includes an analysis of the prevailing class differentiation of PCP'ers in Hamzabeyli village where the field research was conducted by focusing the resistance dynamics of PCP'ers in parallel with the objective of the thesis. The analysis of class differentiation and resistance dynamics are based on the tendencies of proletarianization, commodification of land and labour basing on the use of land, labour and means of production.

The main focus of the fourth chapter is the analysis of contemporary class experience of peasantry on the basis of subjective experiences of PCP'ers in Hamzabeyli village. It deals with PCP's subjective experiences of unequal social relations on the basis of

class confrontations which comprises of the confrontations of values, feelings, expectations as well as images.

Finally, fifth chapter offers an overall evaluation and concluding remarks of the study.

CHAPTER 2

CONTEMPORARY AGRARIAN QUESTION AND ITS REPERCUSSIONS IN TURKEY

The agrarian question that focuses on how pre-capitalist production relations survive, resist and integrate into capitalist production relations has been widely debated predominantly within Marxist literature in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Does it make sense to speak of peasants, or have they, in the early years of this century, become a ‘historical anachronism, unable to survive the dynamics of the capitalist development of agriculture’ on a world-scale? (Veltmeyer cited in Akram-Lodhi and Kay, 2010:179). The attempts to resolve the agrarian question and produce satisfactory explanations of the change in agricultural relations by classical peasant studies resulted in the reevaluation of the agrarian question within the scope of contemporary debates in the late 20th century. Circling around the question above, peasant studies during the 20th century have welcomed new interrogations or problematic in search of the contemporary relevance of petty commodity producing to capital accumulation as well as how to locate small-scale petty commodity production within contemporary capitalism and have contributed to the classical survey of the agrarian question of 19th century improved by Marx, Kautsky and Lenin by means of new approaches and interpretations.

2.1 A New Phase of Agrarian question in the Neoliberal Era?

It can be said that the debates around the agrarian question blazed out again in 1970’s by focusing on late capitalist or so called Third World countries whose pre-capitalist agricultural relations have been integrated into capitalist relations in those period. Those debates went hand in hand with the debates of development or underdevelopment. The effort to understand the problems and prospects of economic and social development of poorer countries in which ‘the peasant is a very essential factor of the population, production and political power’ (Berstein & Byres, 2001: 2)

became an important constituent of the studies. It can be said that the relation between different markets, labour regimes, the role of the state in agricultural production relations, circulation of products as well as the scale and scope of the capital has changed a lot upon 1970's within the context of rising penetration of capitalist relations into agricultural relations. The studies that attempt to comprehend and explain these changes are marked by the analyses basing on "globalization"⁸. Rising levels of commercialization as well as circulation of capital in neoliberal era shifted the concern from national to global level and the analyses were marked by "globalization", "commercialization", "commodity chains", "agri-food relations" and "transnational corporations" The predominant tendency of contemporary studies is in the direction of the rising inner differentiation of agricultural petty producers and the rising hegemony of capitalist relations in agricultural field. In that sense, it can be said that petty producers lose their analytic and phenomenological importance.

The classical issues of peasant studies such as production, commodification, capital accumulation and proletarianization begin to be reevaluated and reconfigured within the framework of globalization in the late 20th and early 21st century. While capitalist relations have integrated into agricultural production relations on a world-scale, great diversity of the ways of integration as well as the survival of petty commodity producing lead the scholars to reevaluate the relation between capitalist development and petty commodity producing within the framework of internationalized capitalist accumulation. So one of the interrogations of the late 20th century peasant studies is the contemporary role and extent of the agriculture in creating surplus for capital accumulation around which contemporary scholars conduct discussions from different perspectives. Also the class differentiation, restructuring labour processes in agricultural relations, the commodification process of petty commodity producing peasant labour in neoliberal era is also the issues argued by following subsequently the analyses of proletarianization which is the constituent of classical peasant studies.

⁸ "The state forms, economic systems and labour regimes that subordinated peasants had become incorporated into global circuits of production, trade, and finance as historically unprecedented processes of concentration and centralization of capital on a world-scale took place. These phenomena have become generally known as 'globalization'" (Akram-Lodhi and Kay, 2010: 177, 178).

This problematic explores the micro political economy issues affecting the structural transformation of petty commodity producing peasant labour into its commodified form, labour power, through both the restructuring of rural labour processes, shifts in the technical coefficients of production, and processes of peasant class differentiation, processes that were highlighted by Kautsky and Lenin in the classical exposition” (Akram-Lodhi & Kay, 2010: 256).

In addition to this, politics of peasantry that was previously elaborated in depth by classical peasant studies from Engels, Kautsky and Lenin in terms of class alliances is reevaluated in the late 20th and the early 21st century within the framework of internationalized capital as well as penetration of capitalist relations into agriculture on the basis of social policies or ‘calling the state back in’ to agricultural relations besides new social movements from Asia, Africa, America and Europe challenging against prevailing subordination of small peasants under the impetus of internationalized capital accumulation.

Within that context, certain different approaches in terms of comprehending and explaining the contemporary agrarian question frames the route of the contemporary peasant studies. First of all, Terence Byres deals with contemporary agrarian question by focusing on class forces by following in Brenner’s wake by keeping the search of transition problematic and he attracts attention to “many context-specific ‘paths’ of agrarian transition have been attempted within the context of both capitalist and post-capitalist modes of production” (Akram-Lodhi & Kay, 2010: 258). Byres concentrates on class differentiation, which is a basic constituent of the classical peasant studies, as an important “determiner” of the class struggle within the context of its role in the transition of agrarian structures. As a result of the comparative historical analyses Byres underlines that “differentiation of the peasantry is central to transformation: it is not an outcome but a determining variable, a *causa causans* rather than a *causa causata*. Differentiation of the peasantry feeds into and interacts with the landlord class and class struggle, these three being critical to the eventual outcome.” (Byres, 2009: 33).

Bill Warren also shares the notions of Byres in terms of the transition of agrarian structures by means of a different approach. He attracts attention to the rising rates of wage labour around the world by relating commodification of labour power with capitalist surplus accumulation within the framework of the analysis of imperialism. As a result, he underlines the rising diffusion of capitalist relations into agricultural structures. So “the emergence of agrarian capital and rural capitalism is, as our term for this perspective makes clear, path-dependent and hence inevitable” (Akram-Lodhi and Kay, 2010: 266).

Both Byres and Warren indicate the same path of the capitalist development in the context of transition problem and keep adopting an approach that supposes a kind of relevance or relation between agricultural relations and capital accumulation or capitalist development. On the other hand, Henry Bernstein challenges such an approach that tries to make relevance or a kind of relationship between agricultural relations and capitalist development in an age of internationalized capital. It is a considerable challenge to the classical and ongoing peasant studies in the sense that their analyses overwhelmingly bases on such a relationship between agricultural relations and capital accumulation, which is characterized in the transition problematic.

According to Bernstein, no longer necessary that capital reorganize agricultural production, a corollary of which is that agrarian transition is no longer a necessary precondition of the development of capitalism. Rather, transnational capital requires the technical capacity to ever more efficiently allocate resources on a global scale so as to enhance the surplus value generated within production as well as the ability to develop and control markets so as to realize that surplus value which is created (Akram-Lodhi & Kay, 2010: 264).

Within the transition problematic, according to Bernstein, it can be said that whether agrarian capital develops in a country or not does not matter anymore because the capital does not need agricultural production in order to accumulate surplus on national as well as global level. With the internationalization of capital, rising rates

of commodification and commercialization in the neoliberal era, and diffusion of capitalist relations into agrarian structures as well as the disintegration of colonial rules, problematizing petty commodity producers, for example, on the basis of certain characteristic features attributed to peasantry such as solidarity, egalitarianism, kinship, subsistence, resistance as well as social and moral virtues is labeled by Bernstein as “peasant essentialism” (Bernstein & Byres, 2001: 6). The standpoints that attempt to problematize small peasantry or petty commodity producers can be said to be excluded from the scope of peasant studies by Bernstein because they are excluded from the agenda of capital or the capitalist development in the neoliberal era according to Bernstein. So that kind of studies and approaches are defined as essentialist in methodology and populist in ideology (Bernstein & Byres, 2001: 7).

Farshad Araghi also bases his studies on the globalized era of the world capitalism in the way of reconfiguring the peasant studies. Just like Bernstein, he emphasizes the rising diffusion of capitalist relations into non-capitalist and non-commoditized fields of the world including agricultural structures by conducting his analysis basing on the relationship between globalization and depeasantization from a world-historical perspective. He explains the global depeasantization by means of “enclosure food regime” characterized by a structure of forced underconsumption for the surplus populations of the world’s hyperurbanized cities, which expose millions of agrarian petty producers in the South (Araghi, 2009: 112, 113). What is specific in terms of Araghi’s analyses is that he criticizes both the followers of the “disappearance thesis” and the “permanence thesis” methodologically in terms of engaging with essentialism, evolutionism, and determinism.⁹ The critical distinction between the classical peasant studies and “post-war” or contemporary peasant studies, which is addressed to Byres, can be seen an important contribution in terms of the reevaluation of the peasant studies. He remarks that the original peasant question was rooted in the question of how to conduct socialist revolutions in a society the

⁹ For further information see Farshad A. Araghi (1995) *Global Depeasantization, 1945-1990*. The Sociological Quarterly, Volume 36, Number 2, pp: 337-36.

majority of which consists of peasants while “post-war peasant question” puts forward a developmentalist problematic on the basis of persistence of “backwardness” or non capitalist agrarian relations in Third World countries (Araghi, 2009: 118).

Unlike Bernstein, Araghi keeps recognizing the relevance between the agrarian relations and capital accumulation. Araghi does not regard global depeasantization as a completed process or a self-completing process leading the death of peasantry (Araghi, 2009: 138). On the other hand, Bernstein and Araghi share a similar standpoint in terms of the relevance of agriculture as a matter of global reserve army of labour as Bernstein underlines the issue of “agrarian question of labour” rather than being the issue of “agrarian question of capital”. Agrarian question of labour bases on fragmentation of labour including lose of a stable wage, stability of livelihoods and economic security that grounds popular struggles over land (Bernstein, 2009: 250-251). Thus, it can be said that the rural politics becomes foreground in the analyses of Bernstein and Araghi. Araghi also points out the politics of the agrarian question by stating that the process is not completed or self-completing by referring the social movements of the era in the sense that social classes do not simply end or die but they live and are transformed through social struggles (Araghi, 2009: 138). So the transitions problematic of the classical agrarian question is not valid for the contemporary agrarian question to the extent that the focus shifts to agrarian question of labour which is characterized by the resisting against devalorization and fragmentation of labour. Philip McMichael also characterizes the contemporary agrarian question with the rising emphasis on the politics of the agrarian question. It is ultimately more about the political history of capitalism than its trajectories of transition (McMichael, 2009: 288-89). McMichael points out a methodological default which is the reduction of agrarian question into a question of accumulation by attracting attention to the distinction between the historical conditions of capital accumulation and theoretical conditions of accumulation. The confusion between the two results in such a comprehension that peasants are external to the accumulation process or the conditions they live and

participate. By indicating the importance of the politics, he focuses on contemporary peasant mobilization that seeks to go beyond the restrictions and subordination of global capitalism, concentrating on the example of Via Campesina¹⁰ in 21st century, by introducing the conceptualization of “food sovereignty” politics combining politics of citizenship and revaluation of agrarian relationship (McMichael, 2009: 290). The agrarian question turns to be a question of food in the analysis of McMichael that characterizes class struggle constituting the contemporary character of subordination and the domination of global capital. What is specific in the analysis of McMichael is that his remarks about the methodology of agrarian studies in terms of dealing with non-capitalist relations as pre-capitalist resulting in a determinist understanding of social relations that are shaped on the basis of how capital forms agrarian relations in the direction of capitalist development. He rather proposes an alternative way basing on the perspective of agrarians subject to these processes. Contemporary peasant movements comprise of subsistence producers, *kulaks*, landless peasants and contract farmers and others in all their heterogeneity (McMichael, 2009: 289).

So is it possible to mention about a new phase of agrarian question in the neoliberal era within the framework of the hot topics of the foremost contemporary agrarian studies? Taking into consideration of one of the basic interrogations of classical agrarian question, the “transition problem”, the basis of which is founded by Karl Marx himself, it can be said that the so called problem originates from “historical and theoretical account of the primitive accumulation that produced the first agrarian capitalism and subsequently industrial capitalism, in England, as well as class basis and dynamics of capitalist farming, which is later known as agrarian question” (Bernstein, 2009: 241). So the original attempts to theorize the transition problematic bear the characteristics of the contradictory relationship between feudalism and capitalism which lived through fundamental changes in favor of the latter. Although

¹⁰ For further information Borras, S.M., Jr. (2008). La Vía Campesina and its global campaign for agrarian reform. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 8(2/3), 258–89; María Elena Martínez-Torres & Peter M. Rosset, (2010). La Vía Campesina: the Birth and Evolution of a Transnational Social Movement, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37:1, 149-175.

the transition problem had been argued and reconfigured for almost a century dated from Marx within different perspectives¹¹, the debates and studies on the characteristics of capital in the neoliberal era can be said to have removed the transition question from the contemporary agrarian question together with the analyses of the hegemony of the capitalist relations. The problem of transition from feudal into capitalist relations which requires the development of productive forces of capitalism brings out a strong emphasis on the process of capitalist development as well as the sources of “backwardness” in the studies analyzing late capitalist countries¹² within the classical agrarian question. Also the analyses on the sources of “backwardness” either in search of capitalist development or of the socialist revolution by means of the development of capitalist forces paved the way for a national scope in terms of the level of analysis. On the other hand, it can be said that contemporary agrarian question becomes distant from the focus of capitalist development or lack of it within a historical context that characterized by the diffusion of capitalist relations via the resolution of colonies, disintegration of the Soviet Bloc and the globalization of the capital on the basis of the consolidation of the international finance capital, with an exception of Keynesian period. Such a shift in the focus of analysis was accompanied by the shift in the level of analysis from national to global scope. Although the problem of the development of capitalist forces in agrarian relations is still valid for most parts of the world, the concern of the contemporary agrarian question shifts towards labour issue. The conditions and prospects of the agrarian labour that global capital does not essentially need any more for the accumulation of surplus in neoliberal era turn to be the basic focuses of the contemporary agrarian question. To the extent that the position of petty

¹¹ Kautsky, Lenin, and the participants of the Brenner Debate such as Robert Brenner, Christopher Hill, Rodney Hilton, Morice Dobb, and Paul Sweezy can be counted as the contributors of the transition debate since Marx. For further information: Dobb, M. (1964). *Studies in the development of capitalism*. London: Routledge; Hilton, R.H. (1990). *Class conflict and the crisis of feudalism* (revised edition). London: Verso; Aston, T.H. & Philpin, C.H.E. (eds.). (1987). *The Brenner debate: agrarian class structure and economic development in preindustrial Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Banaji, J. (1976). Summary of selected parts of Kautsky's *The Agrarian Question*. *Economy & Society*, Vol. 5 Issue 1, pp. 2- 48.

¹² For further information, see B. N. Ghosh (2004) *Dependency Theory Revisited*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

commodity producers loses its relevance to or moves away from the needs of capital or capitalist development, conditions and prospects of petty commodity producers become closer to the position of working classes or the politics of labour in general. Thus, it can be said that the politics come much more to the foreground.

Another basic interrogation of classical agrarian question is the dissolution and decomposition of peasantry in the directions of capitalist relations by means of class differentiation. As Lenin puts forward that ““the old peasantry [was] not only ‘differentiating,’ it [was] being completely dissolved, it [was] ceasing to exist, it [was] being ousted by absolutely new types of rural inhabitants. . . a class of commodity producers in agriculture and a class of agricultural wage-workers” (Araghi, 1995: 340 quoted from Lenin, [1899] 1960) in the context of the development of national market. It can be said that there is a common tendency among the studies of the agrarian question which presuppose an essential path and a rational outcome of the social process in non-capitalist relations that has a causal relationship with the development of capitalist relations basing on the assumption of non-capitalist relations as “pre”-capitalist. So a dichotomic relationship between the capitalist and non-capitalist relations can be seen in the analyses of classical agrarian question basing on class differentiation and subsequently resolution of peasantry which brings out a new dichotomic relation between capitalist farmers and agricultural wage workers in the countryside. On the other hand, although “class differentiation” keeps its place in the contemporary agrarian question as a basic interrogation, the historical context of the 21st century leads to new kind of approaches to or the reevaluation of the topic. In spite of the rising diffusion of the capitalist relations into agrarian relations including the non-capitalist formations in the late 20th and the early 21st century, there is still a problem of proletarianization of peasants although the numbers of the agricultural petty commodity producers decrease in number all around the world¹³. In the framework of such an historical conjuncture, “class differentiation” becomes distant from the basis of a dichotomic

¹³ For the statistical data, see Farshad A. Araghi, (1995). Global Depeasantization, 1945-1990 The Sociological Quarterly, Volume 36, Number 2, pages 337-36

assumption that assumes class differentiation as a constituent of transition process that essentially result in the proletarianization of peasantry. On the other hand, it can be said that contemporary agrarian question develop a tendency towards handling “class differentiation” as an ensemble of differences resisting against the global needs and movements of capital, which enables a critic of peasant-worker dichotomy of the classical agrarian question by attracting attention to the political field the ground of which is seen as “laboring classes” constituted on the ensemble of differences capitalizing on the overcoming the dichotomy of peasant-worker. In that sense, class struggle that take place between capitalist and “pre”-capitalist forces in the classical agrarian question turns out to be within the capitalist relations in contemporary debates. Thus, it can be said that class differentiation in the direction of disappearance of peasantry in classical agrarian question turns towards the focus of “laboring classes” in search of the politics of the collective labour with the emphasis on the global reserve army of labour in the 21st century. All in all, contemporary agrarian question can be said to represent a kind of distance from the capitalist accumulation problematic of the classical agrarian question and heads for a contribution to politics of labour.

Contemporary agrarian question also welcomes the studies that expand to post-modernism and push the distance paved by contemporary studies from classical agrarian question into a rupture from it (Ploeg, 2008; Long, 2008). What is specific in terms of these studies is that they explicitly conduct a methodological and epistemological debate which is a shortcoming in terms of agrarian studies. As it is previously mentioned, contemporary studies have an attempt to overcome the dichotomic comprehensions and conceptualization of the classical agrarian studies such as peasant-worker, developed-underdeveloped, capitalist-pre-capitalist or modern-pre-modern together with the rising diffusion of the capitalist relations. It can be said that such kind of an effort is made by “post-modern peasant studies” with a strong challenge both to modernist and Marxist writers. Ploeg criticizes the available literature as it separates the world into two parts and then applies different theories and different concepts to each part (i.e. to the developed centre and the

underdeveloped periphery) (Ploeg, 2008: 20). In that sense, Ploeg criticizes the studies that see peasants as hindrance to development by referring the studies of Byres.

Alongside the already well-known peasants, modernization processes created agricultural entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial farming in the agricultural sectors of the developing world just as they did elsewhere. The theoretical implication of this was that classical dualism (peasants versus capitalist farmers) suddenly became inadequate for reflecting theoretically on the situation in the countryside. There are no longer just two delineations that define the peasantry (namely, peasant versus proletarian and peasant versus capitalist farmer) (Ploeg, 2008: 21).

Another important contribution of post-modern peasant studies can be seen in their explicitly problematizing the relation between the structure and the agency. Peasant studies can be said to be weak in terms of the problem of *agency*, which evidently is an (unintended) consequence of their epistemological stance resulting in configuration of peasants as ‘passive victims’ (Ploeg, 2008: 21). Different from the classical and the successor agrarian studies, post modern agrarian studies handle agency as “attributing to the individual actor the capacity to process social experience and to devise ways of coping with life” (Ploeg, 2008: 22-23 quoted from Long & Long, 1992:). In that sense, they challenge not only the dichotomies of the objects of inquiries (such as peasant-worker etc. as it is previously mentioned) but also the dichotomies within the method of inquiry such as the dichotomy of agency and the structure. So they challenge the universality of the social “reality” by attributing agency to the individual actor. Within that framework Ploeg puts forward the conceptualization of “repeasantization” by focusing on the features of peasantry such as coproduction, moral economy, survival (pursuit of livelihood) with the emphasis of striving for the autonomy. Ploeg characterizes peasantry with resistance that neither simply connotes to demonstrations or active mobilizations nor to the everyday practices of resistance in the sense of ‘weapons of the weak’ of Scott (1985). Resistance is encountered in a wide range of heterogeneous and increasingly interlinked *practices* through which the peasantry constitutes itself as *distinctively*

different (Ploeg, 2008: 265). In that sense, “class differentiation” of classical the agrarian studies and its successors turns to be the differences among peasants within that framework.

Capitalizing on such a methodological standpoint, Ploeg argues that “peasant mode of farming”, which is exclusively different from the *mode of production*, brings out a “peasant principle” that refers to certain features of peasantry grasped in a historical context such as moral economy, reciprocal relations, subsistence as well as a mode of livelihood is the way to understand the contemporary position of peasantry in the 21st century. Ploeg handles the peasant principle normatively by stating that the ‘peasant principle’ is an emancipatory notion (Ploeg, 2008: 273). “For Ploeg, the peasant principle must be considered as the capacity of the peasant condition to project itself into the future, by defending its values -material but also ethical and moral -, to defend a social project” (Sabourin, 2008). The peasant principle also feeds into peasant resistance both in the sense of the resilience of the peasantry and *bodily* struggles. “In short, the peasant principle is about facing and surmounting difficulties in order to construct the conditions that allow for agency” (Ploeg, 2008: 274). So it can be inferred that Ploeg handles the relation between peasants and the global capitalist relations or movement (that he calls as *Empire*) in the sense that the features of the natural flow of peasants’ lives are already a manifestation of the resistance to the conditions and relations that subordinate them as he puts forward that “namely, that by simply being there, these peasantries remind us constantly that the countryside, agriculture and the processing of food are not necessarily to be ordered as part of Empire. The peasantry presents, in this respect, a materialized and often highly visible critique of today’s world and how it is organized” (Ploeg, 2008: xvi).

In terms of the problematic of resistance and agency in the agrarian question, Scott’s *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (1985) can be said to have a considerable effect on agrarian studies by substituting “covert, informal and often individual acts through which, reinforced by a popular culture of resistance” (Walker, 2008: 462) for the *rebellion* or *revolution* notions of the classical agrarian

studies in terms of class struggle. It can be said that Eric Wolf's (1966) analysis that departs from the *peasant* as the unit of analysis in making his relation to wider social relations has been rediscovered since 1980's within that context. Within the framework of such a philosophical climate Indian subaltern studies can be said to contribute to the prevailing literature capitalizing on Antonio Gramsci, James Scott and Ranajit Guha. In that sense, everyday forms of peasant protest¹⁴ against domination becomes a significant part of their analyses in terms of peasants' attempts to cope with changing forms of material and ideological life that shapes and modifies their forms of exercise of domination (Chatterjee, 2000: 21). Within the context of everyday forms of peasant protest relative autonomy or autonomous desires of peasants against the subordination of capitalist relations and its hegemonic culture occupies an important place in theorizing the agency in agrarian relations capitalizing on Guha's analyses on India (Ardold, 2000: 34).

To sum up, it can be said that the methodology of classical agrarian studies and its successors are criticized for determinism and universality that can be traced in the use of class differentiation as an *explanan* resulting in the resolution of peasantry in that way or another. In that sense, class differentiation can be said to feed into an essentialist standpoint that presuppose peasants as something else (such as proletarians, semi-proletarians etc.) in a capitalist society. On the other hand, post-modern agrarian studies share an essentialist standpoint in a different way by handling resistance to subordinating relations and conditions of capitalist relations as an inherent character of peasantry. Bernstein and Byres defines that standpoint as "peasant essentialism" including the notions of subsistence, solidarities, and reciprocities, egalitarianism of the (village) community, kinship, and harmony with nature and so on. They criticize "celebrating 'resistance' to urban industrial civilization or its discontents or advocating a more humane, and effective programme of development that frees the productive energies, and social and moral virtues, of

¹⁴ See Kathy Le Mons Walker, (2008) *From Covert to Overt: Everyday Peasant Politics in China and the Implications for Transnational Agrarian Movements*, Journal of Agrarian Change, Vol. 8 Nos 2 and 3, April and July 2008, pp. 462–488.

peasantry” by rendering it as neo-populism, which ironically make reference to Chayanov’s conceptualization (Bernstein & Byres, 2001: 6, 7).

Ever so, the post-modern expansions to contemporary agrarian studies can be said to contribute to the relevant literature in terms of conducting methodological and epistemological interrogations besides the analyses of contemporary agrarian relations. Questioning the dichotomic assumptions of the prevailing literature opens the door for analyses including differences, heterogeneities and specificities as well as discourse and experience on methodological level, which might contribute to better understanding the complex picture of agrarian relations as well as peasantry on global level. In that sense, being sensitive to reflecting the multidimensional, multilevel and multi-actor nature of peasant realities (Ploeg, 2008: 23) might conduce to overcome the shortcomings of universality that seeks a universal path to explain the adventure of peasantry in capitalism, “uni-linear determinism that assumes the peasantry to be a straightforward *derivative* of its structural context” (Ploeg, 2008: 261) as well as rationality that assumes a rational cause and effect relationship between the movement and motives of capitalist relations and peasantry¹⁵. In the final analysis, regarding the post-modernist expansions of agrarian studies¹⁶ that call for discourse, experience, agency and positionality in terms of methodology as contemporary “praise of peasantry” would be unfair (Özüğurlu, 2011: 66).

2.2 The Repercussions in Turkey

The agrarian debate in Turkey can be said to have faded after 1980’s in parallel with the waning concern about peasants in terms of the political agendas within the

¹⁵ For a similar approach that criticizes the classical agrarian studies and its successors methodologically via focusing on family farm enterprises analytically, see Glavanis, Kathy R, (1983) The sociology of agrarian relations in the Middle East : The Persistence of Household Production, London: Sage.

¹⁶ It can be said that rural sociology finds its broader meaning within the discourse of modernity and has not vigorously adopted the ‘expansions’ to post-modernist discourse yet (Ecevit et. al, 2009: 42).

context of dazzling effects of urban change that absorb much of the academic and political concern.¹⁷ While agrarian studies before 1980's focused the problem of mode of production, production relations as well as the development of capitalist forces in Turkey, small peasantry had a phenomenological and analytical importance in the analyses of Marxist economy politics. Such kind of analysis before 1980 is characterized by *Boratav-Erdost* debate. The main concern was on the problem of discovering the predominant production relations which is *feudal* or *capitalist* and its role in the class relations as well as deciding the political strategy of the *revolution* in the agrarian debate of Turkey in parallel with the academic and political debates on national bourgeoisie around the topic of agrarian question around the world in 1970's, the examples of which can be seen in the debates of Latin America and India. "For the different interpretations of the nature of Turkish agriculture, hence of the forms of production and class relations existing in rural areas, were closely associated with different conceptualizations of the appropriate political strategy for the left" (Seddon & Margulies, 1984: 2). It can be said that that tendency was in parallel both with the classical Marxist approach to agriculture and peasantry which can be best seen in the analyses of Lenin and Kautsky, and the fact that more than half of the population lived in countryside by dealing with agricultural activity. Korkut Boratav's argument that had a political implication in favour of *socialist revolution* represented by Turkish Workers' Party based on the assumption that "small producers within the relations of exploitation of Turkish agriculture are subject to the primitive mechanisms of capitalist exploitation... petty commodity production is fundamentally subjected to capitalist relations through the market" (Seddon & Margulies, 1984: 2). On the other hand, Muzaffer Erdost's argument that had a political implication in favour of *National Democratic Revolution* represented by groups around the journal of *Aydınlık* based on the assumption that feudal relations were predominant in Turkish agriculture and the predominant mode of production in Turkey was *pre-capitalist* (Seddon & Margulies, 1984: 3). What is important in terms of the debate of the period is that the analyses of Boratav put

¹⁷ That assumption is supported by a survey on the basis of bibliographic data base conducted by Metin Özügürlü. See, Metin Özügürlü (2011). *Küçük Köylülüğe Sermaye Kapanı*. Ankara: Nota Bene, pp. 20-22.

forward the conceptual framework within a Marxist point of view that become very crucial in the analysis of the agricultural structure of Turkey in following years by means of the analyses of how and by whom surplus is extracted from small peasants, the distinction between sharecropping and ‘produce rent’ as well as the different forms of feudal rent (Seddon & Margulies, 1984: 22) outcome of which he emphasized the role of the merchant capital in understanding the agricultural relations of Turkey¹⁸. What is specific for the analyses of Boratav is that he did not ignore petty commodity producers as an analytical category and handled it as the unit of analysis, although he concentrated on the problem of development of capitalist forces in the last instance with special emphasis on merchant capital. On the other hand, his approach is later criticized for the lack of a satisfactory argument on the analytical importance of the merchant capital in Turkey:

Although the merchant-usurer relationship is an important issue in terms the change problematic in agricultural debates of Turkey, it is not handled by critically problematizing its prevalence and significance as well as its role on agricultural relations...although a theoretical argumentation is crucial in terms of how much it is valid to attribute a special status/power (seizing surplus value by itself and independently) for the countries that have the features of transition period such as Turkey, that issue is not argued enough in the literature of Turkey (Ecevit et. al., 2009: 46)

It can be said that the concern on agricultural relations of Turkey waned in 1980’s as it is previously mentioned and it revived in 1990’s in a way that it became very distant from the focuses and argumentations of a decade before, and the concern was concentrated on agricultural policies on the basis of the effects of the Turkey’s adaptation process to European Union on the agricultural relations of Turkey. ‘Rural development’ and ‘agricultural policies’ can be said to become the most popular topics while the problematization of rural relations on the basis of analytic and

¹⁸ For further information, see Korkut Boratav, (2005) 1980’li Yıllarda Türkiye’de Sosyal Sınıflar ve Bölüşüm. Ankara: İmge; Korkut Boratav, (2004) Tarımsal Yapılar ve Kapitalizm. Ankara: İmge.

phenomenological categories lost its importance (Özüğurlu, 2011: 33).¹⁹ The studies focusing on rural development cannot go beyond a kind of uni-linear progress understanding that handles the obstacles of capitalist development without problematizing capitalist transformation by assuming it pre-given, and concentrates on the improvement of prevailing relations and maintaining their continuance (Ecevit et. al., 2009: 43). Also the dynamics of market relations became much to the foreground together with the analyses concentrating on these topics, which later yielded to the analyses of “globalization” that marked the agrarian studies in the neoliberal era. In that sense, petty producers with their specific features are disgraced as an analytical category on the basis of the unit of analysis, and the problematic of agricultural structure lost its place in the agrarian question.

In the early years of 21st century the methodological standpoint can be said to shift from petty producers as the unit of analyses as well as the agricultural structures to the movements of global capital as an analytical category together with the rising popularity of the topic of “globalization” in Turkey in parallel with the trend around the world. So the change in agrarian relations of Turkey is explained as the consequences of the movements of global capital. On the other hand, it is difficult to say that there is a remarkable argument around the conceptualization of “globalization”. It would not be wrong to say that the problematic of the classical agrarian question such as the problem of proletarianization, commoditization, and dispossession are resolved with the “magic wand” of the term, *globalization*. When the concern shifts towards globalization, the analytical interest also shifts towards *Trans-National Corporations* (TNC’s) as the bearer or executive of the movements or needs of the global capital. In that context, while the penetration of TNC’s into agricultural structures brings food-based analyses into foreground, it paradoxically causes agricultural structure analysis to have a secondary role (Özüğurlu, 2011: 15). In the studies that concentrated on rural development and agricultural policies in

¹⁹ Among a great number of studies including master and doctorate thesis on rural development and agricultural policies, for further information see the study of Gökhan Günaydın, (2010) *Tarım ve Kısallıkta Dönüşüm*, Ankara, Tan; Oğuz Oyan, *From Agricultural Policies to an Agriculture without Policies in The Ravages of Neo-liberalism: Economy, Society and Gender in Turkey*, (2002), Nova Science.

1990's, the level of analysis was national and the role of the state in the execution of policies had an important place whereas the studies of the neoliberal period that focus on the movements of the global capital have a global level of analysis. However, what is common between the two contradictory standpoints is that former one makes use of the state intervention or its executive role in the agricultural policies as *explanan* while the latter uses the withdrawal of the state from the agrarian field as *explanan* without conducting a methodological argumentation in terms of the analytical significance of the *explanans* they apply.

Among the leading representatives of the studies basing on the conceptualization of globalization as the characteristic feature of neo-liberalism, the analyses of Zülküf Aydın, Zafer Yenel and Çağlar Keyder have an influential place in the contemporary agrarian studies in Turkey. Yenel argues that “one of the main characteristics of the world economy in the past several decades has been acquisitions by multinational food corporations of existing firms operating in established markets, and mergers among large multinational food firms” (Yenel, 1999: 23). Aydın also supports that argument by declaring that the abandonment of the nationalist project that underlined state policies in industry and agriculture between 1930 and the late 1970s as well as the impoverishment of the rural masses and to the abandonment of agriculture by small- and medium-sized households as a consequence of that process via indicating the consolidation of transnational agribusiness firms in cooperation with transnational institutions and mechanisms such as IMF, the WB, NAFTA, the EU and GATT (Aydın, 2010: 149). Keyder also reinforces that standpoint by discussing that “together with the integration of Turkish economy with the world economy since 1980's, the role of the state in the regulation of national market weakened and agricultural production on national/regional/local level was integrated with the global agriculture/industry complex” (Keyder & Yenel, 2013: 173). The internationalization of agricultural market is another constituent of that standpoint basing on rising commodification of agricultural inputs, liberalization of capital regime, commercialization of inputs such as seed, fertilizer and pesticides. In that sense, it can be said that main concern of the agricultural debates shifts from production and

petty commodity producer family enterprise towards circulation of commodities in the framework of global regime of food and agriculture and transnational or international corporations. In that respect, while small family enterprises of undeveloped countries are seen as passive participants of the results of so called global transformations, firm-based analyses come into foreground (Özüğurlu, 2011: 18). That standpoint is in parallel with the contemporary approaches and tendencies in agrarian studies around the world in the sense that agricultural relations and structures lost its relevance or importance in terms of the development of capitalist relations or capital accumulation, which was expressed very vigorously by Bernstein as it was previously mentioned in 2.1.

On the other hand, although the standpoint explained above seem to considerably differs from the classical analyses of production relations and the problematic of agrarian structures by shifting the unit of analysis from small peasantry to the global circuits of capital via the conceptualization of globalization and other counterpart concepts, it does not represent a rapture from the classical agrarian studies on methodological level as the “classical path” of the rural change from inner differentiation towards resolution and dissolution of peasantry is followed in a different way via movements of “empowered” global capital. So the outcome of the methodological standpoint of the both is that small peasantry is something to be essentially and necessarily turn into something else either by means of depeasantization or proletarianization or semi-proletarianization and so on. In that sense the differences and specificities of peasantry become trivial analytically via the general path in the direction of proletarianization in the last instance, which means that global capital has a homogenizing power. Thus, such a standpoint leads to the perception of a homogenous society and social relations to the extent that the differences and specificities are disregarded. The tendency to present a homogenous view of these processes fails in perceiving the “heterogeneity of values, interpretations, interests, relations, and models of society and morality that inevitably surrounds issues of power” (power of global capitalism) in the process of everyday life (Long, 2008: 76). The importance of the need to analyze the multiplicity and

complexity of the social relations being sensitive to differences is expressed by Ecevit and his friends by attracting attention to the deficiency of the studies that analyze various ways of differentiation and sophisticated social relations as well as differences in rural relations by indicating the lack of class analysis in agrarian studies:

Analysis of social classes is not widely used as one of the basic analytical instruments of rural sociology in Turkey. Marxist class analysis is mostly practiced within the context of theoretical debates. The deficiency in class analysis also limits the analysis of rural relations and ways of differentiation. Versatile and sophisticated social changes and differences in rural relations, the maintenance of prevailing relations as well as the ways of dissolution of those cannot be included into the analysis. (Ecevit et al., 2009: 44)

In that sense, it can be said that there is a common tendency in the direction of resolution of peasantry via the conceptualizations of proletarianization, semi-proletarianization or depeasantization on the basis of globalization or the global movements of the capital without analyzing how this process occurs. That is to say, the analyses produce Marxist deductions such as proletarianization, semi-proletarianization, commoditization or dispossession without using Marxist class analysis²⁰, which make these studies methodologically problematic and complicate to understand the change in rural relations. The studies basing on the resolution dynamics of peasantry focus on the proliferation of non-agricultural sources of income, pattern of contractfarming, commoditization of land as well as rising burden of debt of petty producers within the framework globalizing capital. Keyder and Yenal emphasize the rising importance of proliferation of non-agricultural sources of income by means of increasing activities of tourism and construction sector in Southern and Western coastal lines of Turkey such as Antalya and Dikili (Keyder & Yenal, 2013: 71, 72). Also the contractfarming analyses can be said to base on the

²⁰ It can be also seen the studies that come to “Marxist conclusions” such as proletarianization and resolution of peasantry by using the neoclassical conceptual framework rather than Marxist conceptualization such as population and labour force statistics in neoclassical sense. See Nevzat Evrim Önal,(2012) *Anadolu Tarımının 150 Yıllık Öyküsü*, İstanbul, Yazılama.

resolution dynamics of small peasantry in the direction of the tendency towards the proletarianization and their prevailing position as “worker on his own land” or “agricultural pieceworker” via the emphasis on rising debt burden of petty producers and their inability to accumulate capital (Ulukan, 2009: 257, 258). Commoditization of land is handled on the basis of rising activities of tourism and construction sector which is specific to Western and Southern parts of Turkey (Keyder & Yenal, 2013: 84, 89). A similar tendency is put forward in terms of the region around Bafra in the context of resolution of tobacco production and the effect of construction sector on it (Keskin & Yaman, 2013: 485). The issue of migration from village to the cities should be added to the general tendency of the analyses focusing on the resolution dynamics within the framework of the operations of the global capital the executive of which is seen as TNC’s (Keskin & Yaman, 2013: 496; Öztürk, 2014: 170).

On the other hand, Ecevit and his friends develop a critical approach to the conceptualization of globalization in terms of adopting the characteristics of underdeveloped countries such as the survival of petty commodity production, informal sector, commoditization of domestic female labour, devalorization of labour as *a priory* (Ecevit et. al, 2009: 56). Within that framework it is underlined that an analysis of accumulation without taking into account these issues weakens the relationship between the economy and the politics. Ecevit and his friends attract attention to the constrains of the conceptualization of “transnationalization” or “globalization” in the sense that it focuses on a one-sided power relation between the global character of capital and multi-national state system rather than handling it as a contradictory relationship (Ecevit et. al, 2009: 55).

A similar point is emphasized on the basis of methodological evaluation. In terms of the analyses focusing on “global capitalism” as an analytical category, it can also be said that they “contribute to the success of the project by depicting the global economy as (composed of) sites of capitalist dominance, rather than considering the alternative possibility of depicting “economic discourse as hegemonized while rendering the social world as economically differentiate and complex” (Long, 2008: 73 quoted from Gibson-Graham, 1996). Thus, in terms of the studies of agricultural

relations basing on the analyses of “global capitalism” or “globalization”, it might be meaningful to think about its role as a discourse that constitutes our understanding of the contemporary agrarian relations “by offering representations of “reality (often taken for granted) and what we consider to be the significant...” (Long, 2008: 75). Also Justin Rosenberg indicates the methodological shortcoming of the conceptualization:

In the logical structure of their argumentation, what presents itself initially as the explanandum – globalization as the developing outcome of some historical process – is progressively transformed into the explanans: it is globalization which now explains the changing character of the modern world – and even generates ‘retrospective discoveries’ about past epochs in which it must presumed not to have existed. (Rosenberg, 2000:3)

Finally, another significant critic about the conceptualization of globalization is the emphasis on “backward²¹” relations of capitalism on both national and international level and state’s keeping its position in that sense. To the extent that capitalism keeps “backward” class relations²², its inner contradictions can be said to be preserved and it has reflections on class struggle (Ecevit et al, 2009: 57) In that sense, there is a necessity for the analyses basing on family unit in terms of “subsistence” and commoditized features of family labour as well as the differentiations on the grounds of the village, sources of income, seasonal and permanent works and gender. Thus, the need for the analyses basing on the family unit of petty commodity producers taking the various kinds of differentiations in agricultural relations as well as the

²¹ The term of ‘backward’ is handled as the relations that include both the relations “predating capitalism” and the features which do not correspond to the ‘ideal’ features of capitalism that survive in national and international capitalist relations and provide the reproduction of the contradictions of the system (Ecevit et. al, 2009: 41). It should be noted that their way of handling the term is different from the way of dependency school in the sense that they do not apply to the conceptualization of ‘pre-capitalist’ and a developmentalist standpoint.

²² For an analysis problematizing what Ecevit and his friends call as “backward” in the name of “dependency relationships” on capitalist labour processes on the basis of seasonal agricultural workers, see Sidar Çınar, (2014) *Öteki Proletarya De-proletarşasyon ve Mevsimlik Tarım İşçileri*, Ankara, Nota Bene.

relationship constituted between the general social relations and agricultural relations. The study of Özuğurlu (2011) can be said to contribute to the satisfaction of the need mentioned above. He handles the structural transformation of small peasantry focusing on the resistance dynamics and capacity of it by revealing the multiple differences and class differentiations in agricultural relations capitalizing on his field research. In that sense, he problematizes the characteristic features of agricultural structure of Turkey that Ecevit and his friends call as “backward” class relations of “backward” capitalist relations on the basis of product pattern, production process, forward-backward relations of production, ways of land use and property relations as well as family labour and ways of labour use. It is significant in terms of focusing on small peasantry without applying to “peasantist” approaches and the methodological arguments of the study can be seen as a remarkable contribution to the relevant literature in Turkey, which can be summarized as the necessity to analyze the object of the study by problematizing its basic characteristics²³ (Özuğurlu, 2011: 11).

2.3 Concluding Remarks

While the agrarian question reviewed in 1970’s focused on late capitalist or so called Third World countries whose pre-capitalist agricultural relations have been integrated into capitalist relations, the classical interrogations of the literature such as production, commodification, capital accumulation and proletarianization begin to be reevaluated and reconfigured within the framework of globalization in the late 20th and early 21st century. The contemporary role and extent of the agriculture in creating surplus for capital accumulation around which contemporary scholars conduct discussions from different perspectives gather around the question whether it make sense to speak of peasants in 21st century.

²³ This issue is explained in the *Introduction* part.

Within the framework these debates, it can be said that there is a strong need for methodological evaluations and argumentations²⁴ in terms of the different approaches in the agrarian studies in Turkey, which would help better understand the change in agrarian relations and make clear the standpoints of analyses for the provision of a more qualitative ground for a sophisticated agrarian debate²⁵ as well as the strong need for more studies focusing on small peasantry which is sensitive to the heterogeneous features, differences and differentiations in agrarian relations of Turkey. This thesis attaches importance to further proliferation of the agrarian studies and the understanding of the change in agrarian relations and contemporary experience of small peasantry by means of including and benefiting from the rooted and sophisticated reservoir of political economy besides the cultural analysis on the basis of the subjective experiences of peasants, which can be seen as a deficiency of the corpus of agrarian studies.

²⁴ For a critical evaluation of the conceptualization of food and agriculture sociology, see Atakan Buke, (2008), *Globalization, Transnationalization and Imperialism: Evaluation of Sociology of Agriculture and Food in the Case of Turkey*, METU Master Thesis of Sociology Department.

²⁵ It can be said that Turkey lacks a noteworthy debate between different approaches of contemporary agrarian studies. On the other hand, that tendency is in parallel with the relevant world literature in the neoliberal period. "It is would be interesting to note that there is not a noteworthy debate between the groups of traditional journals and the ones that focus on global food regime" (Özüğurlu, 2011: 18).

CHAPTER 3

CLASS DIFFERENTIATION AND RESISTANCE DYNAMICS OF PETTY COMMODITY PRODUCTION IN HAMZABEYLİ VILLAGE

This chapter focuses on the class differentiation in the village on the basis of resistance dynamics of petty commodity production. In accordance with that aim, history of the village is explained on the basis of the dynamics that is relevant to the settlement of petty production and petty commodity production successively. Petty commodity history of the village is significant in order to understand the change in class relations through time as well the prevailing class differentiation in the village. In that sense, the specificities of the village is evaluated within the framework of settlement of PCP and then the resistance of PCP. The prevailing class differentiation of the village is evaluated within the framework of commodification of land and labour, the tendency of proletarianization and family labour composition with regard to the change from cotton to corn as well as the characteristic feature of each type of PCP'er on the basis of its way of resisting. Also the commodification of land and its relevance to resistance of PCP is separately evaluated in terms of the general tendency of the village. In addition to this, subsistence production is assessed within the framework of changing habits of consumption. Finally, cultural aspects of agricultural production are elaborated within the framework of everyday life in the village. The issues that will be analyzed are expected to provide necessary ground to analyze the resistance dynamics of PCP on the basis of class differentiation and the socio-cultural climate of the village.

3.1 History of the Village/Background of Petty Production

Hamzabeyli was a Greek village up to the population exchange between Greece and Turkey in 1922-23. Although the village in which subsistence production was predominant had a few Greek big land owners, Turkish state seized their lands. The current inhabitants of the village came from predominantly Salonika as a result of the

population exchange. When they came to the village, Turkish state gave them the right of occupancy with 10 decares land. In Salonika they got on well with stockbreeding. So they came to Hamzabeyli by selling their animals in Salonika. So the number of animals in Salonika (their economic welfare) and the number of family members who had emigrated (population) can be accepted among the early dynamics of differentiation between peasantry. When the immigrant peasants came to the village, they came across with Native Mustafa and Native Halil who were Muslim-Turkish brothers. They share the same class position with immigrant peasants. In the region there were powerful *beys* whose roots went to Ottoman period who had a considerable political power as a result of their help to revolutionary *eşkıyas* during the Dependence War. Although the village was not directly dominated by a *Bey*, Yasin *Bey* from neighboring village registered a considerable amount of common land such as meadows. As peasants got on well with stockbreeding and subsistence production approximately until 1950's, there was abundance of land. The lands of Yasin *Bey* in Hamzabeyli are still kept by his ancestors. The lands of *beys* were only divided by means of heritage. Small peasant could not expand their land via sharecropping, they rather had chance to buy new lands by means of division via heritage among small peasants. Petty production in Hamzabeyli village was settled by immigrant small peasants' expanding their lands in time by means of buying and selling lands among small peasants rather than between *beys* and small peasants. Between the time when immigrant peasants came from Salonika and 1950's, non-capitalist relations were predominant in the village and the dynamics of the settlement of petty production were the lack of a feudal power in the village, economic welfare of peasants in Salonika and the number of family members when they settled in the village (population advantage) and then population movements within the family unit.

It can be said that the settlement of petty production in Hamzabeyli village took place between 1930's and 1950's with the dynamics explained above. It can be said that what makes petty production to survive (up to now) when it is integrated into capitalist dynamics in 1950's, its capacity of adaptability to capitalist relations in the

form of petty commodity production (PCP). So the dynamics that settled petty production until 1950's in the village make a suitable ground for the settlement of PCP. As the village integrates into capitalist relations, class dynamics were triggered on the basis of the use of land and labour. Together with the integration with capitalist market relations, the ground for class differentiation in peasantry was constituted by means of changing product composition, use of land and labour. The journey of peasants in Hamzabeyli village from petty production to PCP on the basis of changing product composition, use of land and labour is shown in the table below. The variables in the table focus on the settlement of petty production and PCP on the basis of changing product composition, use of land and labour as well as type of production and the process of integration into capitalist relations. However, class differentiation between petty producers in time is not purposely included in the table. This issue will be elaborated later.

Migrant peasants were adopted land during 1920's by the state as a part of nation construction policies. National economy was heavily depended on agricultural production and political legitimacy was heavily depended on peasants' consent. On the other hand, main objective of the Turkish state is to establish industrialization via founding a series of state enterprises for providing essential materials for the country. Thus, low wheat prices enable cheap labour power for industry so that surplus value is transferred to industry. So it can be said that the state had a policy of settling petty production in an environment of scarcity of capital for industrialization because petty producers (especially wheat producers in this period) was one of the basic social stratus from which surplus value/source can be transferred to industrialization in 1930's (Boratav, 2010: 371). In that sense, Boratav emphasizes that wheat producers contributed to the capital accumulation of Turkey together with urban worker class and urban middle classes in 1930's (Boratav, 2010: 373). In such a national conjuncture petty producers in Hamzabeyli produced wheat and they sold their product remaining from their own consumption to merchants coming from cities. While the village had advantages such as being close to railroads, İzmir harbor and city centers as well as having fertile soil, petty producers suffered from less

productive means of production, and small and limited farmland. Even so it can be said that petty producers in Hamzabeyli contributed to surplus flow to industry in this period. Within the framework of these conditions, peasants in Hamzabeyli predominantly used their own land for basically subsistence production and simple commodity production with low capacity and dealt with stockbreeding during the years between 1930's and 1950's. What is specific for this period is the settlement of petty production by means of right of occupancy (ten each) in 1930's and titles documented in the second half of 1950's. The basic dynamic for the change in landownership can be said to be population movements within family unit and heritage. Production which mostly bore subsistence character was completely carried out by domestic labour. On the other hand, as Turkey's integration into capitalist relations and the need for agricultural production in Turkey where capital accumulation is sparse, development of petty production and its integration into market relations is an important issue for industrialization, construction of national economy as well as social construction of nation. Thus, the dynamics of class differentiation in peasantry between 1930's and 1950' which are the economic welfare of peasants in Salonika, population movements within the family unit and heritage were diversified with the increasing integration of market relations. While Democrat Party's populist policies transferred a great deal of source to peasants, access to new means of productions accelerated the class differentiation dynamics with the use of tractors. Hamzabeyli village began to use tractors and produce cotton in 1950's. Petty producers in Hamzabeyli that began to produce cotton caught an advantage compared to wheat production because cotton was an export product and it as supported by the government as it contributed to balance of trade (Boratav, 2010: 369). In addition to this, big agricultural producers and *ağas* that producing cotton had an influence on the political power (Boratav, 2010: 372). Petty production in Hamzabeyli settled down as peasants in Hamzabeyli who become wheat and cotton producers successively integrated into capitalist relations by producing the necessary products in the right time for capitalist development of the country. While petty producers transferred surplus value to industry which was sparse and weak and merchants because of this weakness, petty commodity production settled down at the

same time. In such a conjuncture, first tractors came from outside the village to cultivate the fields in Hamzabeyli in this period. Petty producers began to buy tractors after 1960's and plenty of tractors in the village are seen after 1965-1970's. There are approximately 300 tractors in the village now. From then on, means of production becomes a stronger dynamic of class differentiation in the village. Thanks to high growth levels achieved by ISP, populist policies continued in 1960's. While petty commodity production was supported with subsidies, loans, support buying and prize arrangements in 1960's, what was specific in Hamzabeyli about integration in capitalist market relations is the construction of Salihli Barrage in the same period that expanded farmland in the village. Another specific element in Hamzabeyli's integration into market relations is the construction of irrigation canals. Thus, rising property of means of production (tractors) and rising potential of agriculture together with expanding farmlands and irrigation canals resulted in Hamzabeyli village's dynamic/positive integration in capitalist relations. With the rising potential of agriculture in Hamzabeyli, the village producing cotton and rise was integrating in the national economy that was integrating in the world economy via ISP by achieving a balance between cheap raw material for industry and petty commodity producers between 1960 and 1970. Another title documentation activity followed this period in early 1970's. Between 1960 and 1980 Hamzabeyli village welcomed agricultural wage workers from Balıkesir and Uşak for cotton production. The number of seasonal workers coming from outside the village got 2000 in the village that had 200 households. Especially female domestic labour became unproductive except for small PCP'ers that could not hire wage labour. Moreover, the village gained municipality as a result of the population census when seasonal workers dwelt in the village. This period can be accepted as the liveliest times of village life. The keeper of the coffeehouse in the village points out this situation by stating that he was buying oralet²⁶ in 5 kg pockets in the past while he is buying 750 gr. pockets now.

²⁶ A kind of granulated beverage.

It can be said that populist policies enabled a fragile balance between contradictory classes as well as class fractions in Turkey where hegemony had not yet constructed among capital fractions, and political legitimacy was not strong enough to eliminate some of social classes and base on another²⁷. In such a political conjuncture, petty producers in Hamzabeyli village can be said to get the chance to survive by integrating in capitalist relations and being petty commodity producers. Turkey came face to face with reorganization of the accumulation regime after 1980 Coup and the agenda dating back to 24 January Decisions showed that populist policies would be thoroughly eliminated. Plans for disabling agricultural credit cooperatives, abandoning support purchases, and privatization of state's regulatory agencies in agriculture indicated to the end of populism in Turkey or a balance between social classes in other words²⁸. Thus, predictions made in the direction of a rapid resolution of petty commodity production in Turkey were reevaluated in 1990's because of the application of the so called agenda. Structural problems of Turkey that stemmed from weak capital accumulation and Turkey's dependency on global capitalist powers resulted in problems of application of the agenda. So in such a fragile conjuncture, application of the agenda for the reorganization of accumulation regime in Turkey could not be a linear process but rather up-and-down. For example, Turkey was highly affected by the Europe's money crisis and 5 April Decisions in 1994 make the situation worse²⁹. However, high inflation levels in 1994 enabled petty commodity producers in Hamzabeyli village got high prices for their products (even a record in their history). It should be noted that the position of PCP'ers in Hamzabeyli village seems to be contradictory with the indicators of terms of trade

²⁷ Populism in Turkey has been on the agenda since 1946 and experienced its apprenticeship between the period of 1950 and 1960. The populism of the period before 1960's that based on peasants included the economic policies in favour of working class by means of the Constitution of 1961. In that sense, it can be said that the populism in Turkey was applied with all its components between 1962 and 1976 (Boratav, 2010: 385).

²⁸ In that sense, Boratav underlines that populist policies collapsed as a result of the economic crisis that burst out since 1977 because the inevitable part of populist policies was the maintenance of economic policies (Boratav, 2010: 385).

²⁹ For further information, see Korkut Boratav, (2010) *Emperyalizm, Sosyalizm ve Türkiye*, İstanbul: Yordam, pp. 439

against agriculture (TİTH) which were in the trend of decrease³⁰. Another reason for the problems of application of the agenda was the inconsistent political power that lacked political hegemony. The policies that transferred the surplus value created in agriculture to capitalist classes would achieve the expected results in 2000's. Thus, petty commodity producers in Hamzabeyli kept their prevailing position up to 2000's. They even benefited from the economic crisis in late 1990's and it can be said that the village began to change both socially and culturally between 1980's and 1990's. While income of the PCP'ers in Hamzabeyli rose in parallel to the rising levels of inflation in these years, their consumption needs increased by getting highly commoditized in parallel to the flattered consumption culture in the country. Their consumption habits and daily life of the village began to change. Washing machines and televisions began to enter into the houses while cars began to enter into the village. Possibilities of the cities get closer to the village. The modernization of the village life also loaded new expenses to peasants by commoditizing many elements in social and cultural life of the village, which resulted in weakening the resistance of petty commodity production after 2000's. On the other hand, it can be said that the village's changing social life that became livelier also supported the resistance of PCP versus social and cultural pulling effect of cities. However, social development of the village in 1990's fell behind the development of cities in following years. When the agenda mentioned above gave its results in 2000's, PCP'ers in Hamzabeyli village gave up producing cotton in time as a result of rising input and fuel prices as well as decreasing value of the product. Cities increased their social and cultural pulling effect while the village whose petty commodity producers struggled to survive in 2000's could not keep its social liveliness. The modernization of the village in 1990's could not contribute to the resistance of PCP in 2000's. However, PCP'ers developed a good number of resistance strategies. Changing the product from cotton to basically corn, transforming unproductive female labour to productive labour (either as seasonal wage labourers or agricultural wage labourers), changing use of means of productions such as selling their tractors in cash and purchasing more developed ones with payments by installments, transferring social aids into

³⁰ Ibid, 439

commodities such as selling the coal they took as social aid, enrollment of different members of the same family into agricultural credit cooperatives can be counted among basic resistance strategies. Many PCP'ers, especially middle PCP'ers, began to cultivate more and more land via hiring land to survive.

In that sense, it can be said for all PCP'ers that after they turn from cotton which is a labor-intense product from corn which is not so, their family labour composition keeps its prevailing position although there are some differences in the use of family labour. What is implied by 'keeping its position' is that productive labour power mostly resists being productive while unproductive labour power keeps being unproductive. What is specific for that resistance is its effect on class differentiation within PCP'ers after turning from cotton to corn in 2000's.

Small PCP'ers who produced cotton before 2000's use family labour in the household production. They are able to save surplus family labour when they turn from cotton to corn. As corn is not a labour-intense product, the productive surplus labour power turn to be productive wage laborer. It can be said that there is no other chance for small PCP'ers to use surplus labour as productive wage laborer to survive. The resistance of PCP depends on the resistance of productive surplus labour in being productive. Middle PCP'ers were using foreign labour (agricultural wage laborer) when they were producing cotton as the scale of the land necessitates so and female family labour was not included in the household production. When they turn from cotton to corn, they give up hiring foreign labour. Unproductive female family labour mostly remains being unproductive. The resistance of family labour composition of middle PCP'ers restrains the tendency of proletarianization while the resistance of family labour composition of small PCP'ers results in the empowerment of the tendency of proletarianization. In other words, if the unproductive family labour of middle PCP'ers turns to be productive family labour, class position of middle PCP'ers get closer to small PCP'ers. Family labour composition of big PCP'ers does not change before and after cotton production thanks to the big landownership, developing means of production or dealing with commercial activity.

Differentiating features for this type of PCP is based on whether the surplus family labour of big PCP'ers deals with commercial activity or not.

Within that context, it can be said that the integration of petty commodity production into capitalist relations turns out to be passive/negative integration³¹. As the resistance dynamics of PCP'ers became stronger, class differentiation among PCP'ers in the village multiplied and diversified. On the other hand, it can be alleged that those resistance strategies are destined to destroy PCP. For example, PCP'ers who hired land and produced more than their own land fell in a debt spiral because the product's value was low while they increased their inputs whose value was high. Another example can be given for the credit system. They saved the day by means of paying debt with debt. Their almost everything was bonded/mortgaged. Taking this situation into account, a superficial prediction put forwards that PCP would disintegrate. However, this study claims that resistance strategies of PCP make it survive in passive/negative integration periods. Also class differentiation diversifying with these strategies helps reveal new forms of PCP that has the capacity to survive in neoliberal period. The relation between resistance strategies and class differentiation in the village will be evaluated in following parts within the framework of PCP's structure and changing features of the village.

3.2 Prevailing Class Differentiation in the Village and the Resistance of PCP

Main source of income of Hamzabeyli village was agricultural production and it has always been so. When the rearrangement of agricultural relations has shown its effects in the village in 2000's, the resistance dynamics of PCP get stronger in Hamzabeyli. PCP'ers differ in terms of use of land, labour and means of production and it leads to fortification of class differentiation dynamics of PCP in the village. It can be said that the village consists of four main class positions which are *surplus population household*, *small PCP'ers*, *middle PCP'ers* and *big PCP'ers*. The prevailing class differentiation of the village is evaluated within the framework of commodification of land and labour, the tendency of proletarianization and family

³¹ It means that petty commodity production does not contribute to capital accumulation.

labour composition with regard to the change from cotton to corn as well as the characteristic feature of each type of PCP'er on the basis of its way of resisting

3.2 .1 Surplus Population Household³²

It consists of the PCP'ers who are separated from agricultural production and they are no longer PCP'ers. They still have the ownership of averagely less than 50 decares land. It can be said that this type of household does not have a tendency towards commodification of land. Although they do not get on well with agricultural production, they still live in the village and do not sell their land because the value of land does not worth to sell. Main income of the household changes from agricultural production to informal sector. Various non-agricultural incomes consists almost all of the income of the household. The children of the household are employed in non-agricultural sectors and they do not live in the village. It is strongly possible that this type of household will thoroughly separate from the village. It stands for a type of peasantry which is separated from agricultural production. As the children of the household have already been employed and settled down in cities, the persistence of surplus population household in the village is hardly possible in next generation. Also commodification of their lands can be possible in coming generations. The opinion of surplus population households about the future or destiny of PCP is that it is almost destroyed. It is better to point out that each different class position within PCP equalizes PCP with itself. Thus, when peasants talk about PCP or the change in their village, their comments can be evaluated as clues of the character of class differentiation.

3.2.2 Small PCP'ers

a) Small PCP'ers Resisting via Non-agricultural Wage Labour

It consists of PCP'ers who have the ownership of averagely 50 decares land. Main resistance strategy of this type of PCP'ers is the commodification of labour. The

³² Metin Özüğurlu puts forward the similar features of surplus population household basing on his field research including 10 cities and 24 villages. For further information, see Metin Özüğurlu, (2011) *Küçük Köylülüğe Sermaye Kapanı*, Ankara: Nota Bene, pp. 94,95.

source of income of this household is a mixture of wage and agricultural production. Middle and old aged members of the family are busy with agricultural production while male young members are employed in non-agricultural sectors and female young members are either agricultural wage laborer or seasonal wage laborer in Salsa Tomato Factory in the village. When they were producing cotton before 2000's, their all the family members were participating in the agricultural production. It can be said that men have a tendency towards avoiding being agricultural wage laborer and prefer being non-agricultural wage laborer in Manisa. Most of the male members of this type do not work as agricultural wage laborer even in this type of PCP that commoditize family labour. They rather work in subcontractors of factories in Manisa. This type lives in the village. However, male family members whose labour commoditized come and go between city (Manisa) and the village (Hamzabeyli). Also this physical shuttling between city and the village is accompanied by shuttling between subcontracting in the city and domestic labour (agricultural production) in the village. This type is suitable for the conceptualization of "peasant-based workers" in the literature.³³ Also male members who are wage laborers in Manisa help agricultural production of the household. A route between field of agriculture and subcontracting characterizes this type of PCP. So it can be seen that this type of PCP'ers experiences a cultural gap by squeezing between being a farmer and a worker as well as being a peasant or a citizen. However, it can be said that being a farmer overweighs in terms of their identity, which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4.1. When small PCP'ers turn the product from cotton to corn to resist, they have the chance to get surplus labour. What differs this kind of PCP from the one resisting via hiring land (just below) is using this surplus labour as wage laborer.

³³ That conceptualization is emphasized by Özügürlü within the context of its being the most common and widespread category of the village if it is defined on the basis of non-agricultural wage labour rather than the type of proletarian family. For further comments about the conceptualization, see Metin Özügürlü, (2011) *Küçük Köylülüğe Sermaye Kapanı*, Ankara: Nota Bene, pp. 96-97.

b) Small PCP'ers Resisting via Hiring Land

This type of PCP is characterized by hiring land and producing much more than the land they have the ownership. There are small PCP'ers who cultivate four or five times more than the land they own. The sole source of income of the household is agricultural production. So diversification of household income is quite weak. PCP'ers who hire land and produce more than the capacity of their own land fall in a debt spiral because the product's value is low while they increase their inputs whose value is high. It can be said that they highly use the credit system. They save the day by means of paying debt with debt. Also the commodification of labour power and land is weaker compared to other small PCP'ers. If they sell their land, the value of it does not meet their debt. They cannot commoditize family labour that deals with agricultural production because they take risk for cultivating more land. In other words, they are destined to petty commodity production. Children of the family either have education or participate in household production. When small PCP'ers turn the product from cotton to corn to resist, they have the chance to get surplus labour. This type of PCP'ers uses that surplus labour in expanding the scale of agricultural production. Only female members of the family work as seasonal wage laborer in Salsa in some of the small PCP'ers. They also work as agricultural wage laborer in the village. As they do not have another chance, they plan the future of family household in the direction of descending from father to son. On the other hand, their opinion about the future of PCP is that it will be certainly destroyed and our children will be wage labourers in factories.

In addition to this, it can be said that all the women of small PCP'ers have a waxing tendency to liberalize when the resistance dynamics of PCP diversifies in 2000's. When they participated in household cotton production before 2000's, they never had a right to the income. However, when they become wage laborers (agricultural or non-agricultural), they have a right to the money they earn. Thus, it can be inferred that there is a parallel relation between the rising resistance dynamics of PCP and the liberation of women of small PCP'ers.

3.2.3 Middle PCP'ers

The average land ownership of this type is 100-200 decares. It is characterized by intense agricultural production by hiring land and producing much more than the land they have the ownership. The sole source of income of the household is agricultural production. Thus, diversification of household income is quite weak. They are also in a debt spiral. However, it has the advantage of the land size which is bigger than small PCP'ers such as giving their land as a pledge for more credits as well as proliferating product diversification. Male children participate household production. Female members of the household either work as seasonal wage laborer or they are employed as unproductive domestic labour (mostly the second one). When they were producing cotton before 2000, female members of the family did not participate in household production as well. Unlike small PCP'ers who save surplus labour by turning from cotton to corn to resist, middle PCP'ers resist by not hiring wage laborer for cotton production as corn is not a labor-intensive product like cotton.³⁴ Thus, it can be said that there is not much difference in terms of women's position in participating in household production as well as the position of the family labour composition, and the tendency of proletarianization of this type is weak. Labour composition of household has the capacity to keep itself. Their opinion about the future of PCP is that it will go on in this way.

3.2.4 Big PCP'ers³⁵

a) Big PCP'ers Resisting via Absolute Agricultural Production

The average land ownership of this type is over 300 decares. Although male family members of the household participate in agricultural production, they are not included in an intensive labor process. Children of the household are generally graduated from notable universities. They are interested in household production but

³⁴ Similar features are put forward by Özüğurlu on the basis of his conceptualization of 'new petty commodity producer' capitalizing on his field research (Özüğurlu, 2011: 101).

³⁵ Some of the features of big PCP'ers explained here in terms of use of family labour are presented by Özüğurlu on the basis of his conceptualization of 'traditional and new capitalist farmer' (Özüğurlu, 2011: 101).

they do not directly participate into it. Big PCP'ers resisting via absolute agricultural production neither hire land nor do sharecropping. The tendency of proletarianization is quite weak. This type of PCP'ers do not have a significant tendency towards proletarianization and dispossession (though they begin to sell small amounts of land) while it does not have a tendency of capital accumulation as well. This type tries to keep its prevailing position by neither accumulating capital nor commoditizing domestic labour power and its means of production which are technological machines that almost all of the middle and small PCP'ers do not have. It resists by developing means of production (latest machines) and via product diversification with the advantage of big land ownership. As the land they own is over 300 decares and productive capacity is high, they take considerable amounts of credits from banks. However, they are also in a debt spiral. Opinion of this type of PCP'ers about the future of PCP is that it is going to be destroyed if the circumstances do not change. Big PCP'ers resisting via absolute agricultural production resist by developing their means of production and product diversification in 2000's unlike small PCP'ers who save surplus labour by turning from cotton to corn to resist and middle PCP'ers who resist by not hiring wage laborer for cotton production as corn is not a labor-intense product like cotton. Thus, it can be said that there is not much difference in terms of family labour composition of the household and the tendency of proletarianization in this type is weak. When they decrease the scale of cotton production, they use their productive capacity for the products generating more value by means of production via machines such as tomato and corn.

b) Big PCP'ers Resisting via Commercial Activity

The average land ownership of this type is over 300 decares. The differentiating and characteristic feature of this type lies in its commercial activities besides intense agricultural production. It is the only type within all PCP'ers that is able to increase its land ownership and accumulate capital. It deals with commercial activity on the basis of its agricultural production. The capital accumulated by commercial activity is invested in agricultural production. It can be said that there is a kind of slow

motion agricultural capital accumulation. Although male family members of the household participate in agricultural production, they are not included in an intensive labor process. Big PCP'ers resisting via commercial activity purchase the corn produced by small and middle PCP'ers and they sell it to factories and other merchants. They deal with usury. Thus, it can be said that they hold a part of the surplus created by small and middle PCP'ers. In this sense, big PCP'ers resisting via commercial activity seem to have contradictory class position against small and middle PCP'ers and even they do not seem to be PCP'ers any more at first sight. However, it should be noted that this type of PCP'ers hold a part of the surplus by means of credits taken from banks. They do not have the necessary capital of their own for now and they are able to hold the surplus by its mediatory position between small or middle PCP'ers and capitalist classes. Thus, it can be said that big PCP'ers resisting via commercial activity bear the character of contradictory class position. They do not have the control over rate of interests or they do not use the surplus they hold in commercial activity but agricultural production. So it can be argued that the basic contradiction is not between this kind of PCP'ers and small or middle PCP'ers but rather capitalist classes and PCP'ers. The contradictory class position of big PCP'ers resisting via commercial activity is better to be considered within the changing character of PCP. They systematically increase their land ownership in five years. Their social and cultural relations with the village are quite strong. They usually pass their spare time in the coffeehouse and financially help social facilities of the village such as necessities of school, wedding saloon and mosque. The opinion of this type of PCP'ers about the future of PCP is that small and middle PCP'ers will be destroyed and big PCP'ers who deal with commercial activity like themselves will survive.³⁶

³⁶ Nükhet Sirman indicates similar features in terms of class differentiation on the basis of 'large farmers' in a village of Söke in 1980's. For further information, see Nükhet Sirman, (1988) Peasants and Family Farms: The Position of Households in Cotton Production in a Village of Western Turkey, unpublished Phd Thesis, University of London.

3.3 Commodification of Land and the Resistance of PCP

It can be said that there is a tendency of concretion of land in the village. On the other hand, there is a tendency of division of land by means of heritage. Thus, two contradictory tendencies which have almost the same power neutralize each other in long period. It means that each tendency do not achieve its own natural outcome which is either dispossession of PCP'ers and commodification of land (as prevailing PCP'ers do not have the capacity to do so) or division of big landownership. Two contradictory tendencies about the commodification of land should be evaluated within the framework of the problem of agricultural capital accumulation.

PCP'ers resist commodification of land and dispossession by means of commoditizing family labour power or hiring land (increasing productive capacity) or developing means of production. Their ways of resistance empower class differentiation within PCP'ers. If the relation between class differentiation and commodification of land is problematized, it can be said that surplus labour household and small PCP'ers do not have a tendency towards commoditizing land. Both of them do not generally sell their land as it is not valuable. Middle PCP'ers sell some of their land times to times but they might again purchase another small piece of land in time. On the other hand, small and middle PCP'ers do not have the capacity to valorize the land they have or to commoditize land in other words. Thus, they are neither dispossessed nor do they commoditize the land they have. Class differentiation within big PCP'ers triggered by the commercial activity reveals different outcomes in terms of the commodification of land. Big PCP'ers resisting by means of commercial activity increase their landownership while big PCP'ers resisting by means of absolute agricultural production keep its prevailing landownership. It can be said that big PCP'ers resisting via absolute agricultural production are not able to commoditize or valorize their lands which are over 300 decares in spite of developed means of production. What is specific for big PCP'ers resisting via commercial activity is that they have the tendency towards valorizing the land they have or to commoditize land in other words. Thus, agricultural capital accumulation seems to be achieved by only this type of PCP'ers. However, the

capital accumulated by this type of PCP'ers cannot be thought as absolute capital accumulation and it does not result in dispossession of other PCP'ers and total commodification of land. In that sense, it might be significant to remind that much of the capital accumulated by big PCP'ers resisting via commercial activity is seized by finance capital via the interest mechanisms as the dependency of that type of PCP'ers on credit system of banks is previously mentioned. Thus, the relation between that type of PCP'ers and small or middle PCP'ers does not refer to the basic class contradiction between the ones created surplus and the ones hold that surplus. As this issue is explained previously, they are able to grasp some the surplus by means of its mediatory role between capitalist classes and PCP'ers. This mediatory role stems from the capacity of capitalist classes of Turkey which is not strong enough to valorize land, labour and means of production. Thus, it can be said that PCP'ers resist within circumstances in which capitalist classes of Turkey that absorbs much of the agricultural surplus but do not increase that surplus via commoditizing land and dispossessing PCP'ers. In that sense, big PCP'ers have a tendency to congregate land by benefitting from the insufficient capacity of capitalist classes by means of playing a mediatory role. Within the framework of these circumstances, PCP'ers seem to keep resisting against commodification of land and dispossession.

It can be said that PCP'ers begin to sell some of their land after 2000's in the village when the resistance dynamics get stronger. From then on, selling land is on the agenda of PCP'ers in certain periods. If the tendency of selling land becomes the only focus, it will be misleading in the sense that the dispossession of PCP'ers seems to be an inevitable outcome. However, PCP'ers purchase land according to the capacity of the household following a better year. They do not give up increasing their landownership and they are apt to planning their salvation on the basis of land. As one of the old peasants states that "money is wasted but not the land; the order of the factory is broken but not the land³⁷". They rely on land as another small PCP'er states that land remains the same but the people and buildings change on it. Thus, it

³⁷ "Para erir ama toprak erimez; fabrikanın çarkı dağılır ama toprak dağılmaz"

can be said that PCP'ers have the will to resist to the end against dispossession and dissolution because their hope lies in land and they take many risks against dispossession.

3.4 Subsistence Production within the Framework of Changing Habits of Consumption

As it is previously, subsistence production was the basic type of production in Hamzabeyli village up to 1950's. Following the market relations developed in the village after 1950's, it can be said that both subsistence production and simple commodity production have played a vital role for the peasants. When Salihli Barrage and irrigation canals were constructed in 1960's resulting in the rising capacity of agriculture, Hamzabeyli village vigorously integrated into capitalist relations together with rising ownership of tractors within the framework of import-substitution (IS) policies. With the domination of capitalist relations, subsistence production played secondary in the village. On the other hand, it can be said that subsistence production continues up to 1990's to some extent. When the income of PCP'ers considerably increased in parallel to the rising levels of inflation in 1990's, they began to purchase their consumption needs some of which they were producing themselves before. It also should be thought in parallel to the flattered consumption culture in the country in 1990's as well as the inclusion of lower classes into consumption³⁸. Subsistence production has become less and less important with the changing consumption habits in the village. Peasants now meet their kitchen needs from the bazaar in the neighbor village, Çobanisa. It can be said that peasants begin to purchase basic materials of subsistence production such as milk and meat products as well as basic kitchen needs especially after the expenses of stockbreeding has become very high in 2000's. Peasants states that they had better purchase rather than carrying out subsistence production because it becomes cheaper when it is bought. Thus, it can be said that subsistence production is almost vanished in Hamzabeyli

³⁸ For further information, see Elif Tuğba Doğan, 2004, *1990'lı Yıllarda Türkiye'de Çalışma Yaşamı ve Tüketim*, unpublished Master Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi.

village now. Of course, the geographical position of Hamzabeyli village which is close to city center and commercial centers has significant effects on subsistence production. It should be noted that product composition of the village does not seem to affect subsistence production. The fact that the village almost totally produced cotton which is an industrial product for 50 years might make a negative effect on subsistence production. When they turn from cotton to corn in 2000's, consumption habits are commoditized anymore and the corn is not a basic material for Aegean kitchen as well.

Another element in terms of the elimination of subsistence production can be said to be socio-cultural. Men and women humorously emphasize that women of the village turn to be "*ladies*" and "*socialites*" any more. They do not want to make yoghurt, cheese or bread. They state that they become clean people and they do not want to feed nasty chickens any more. A middle aged peasant complains from brides by stating that in the past they produce what they eat but now there is Kipa³⁹, and so why brides do themselves!

While PCP survives by means of its resistance dynamics, traditional peasantry experiences certain changes in the village. The relation between peasants and agricultural production, producers and the village as well as the changing everyday life in the village give an idea about the prevailing peasantry within socio-cultural framework. First of all, it can be said that one of the basic judgments which is peasants' working like an ant and consume like a sparrow seem to be changed. They still work very hard but their consumption habits can be said to change a lot. Apart from the commodification of kitchen needs that are previously mentioned, LCD-TV's can be seen in the houses of small and middle PCP'ers as well as I-Phones in the hands of the children of these families. A middle aged peasant states that he never have a dinner in a restaurant with his wife but now young couples can go out. Peasants in Hamzabeyli emphasize that they become "*socialites*" about the consumption needs of them. One of the middle aged women states that they cannot want something new to wear from their husbands or their father-in-law and they

³⁹ Kipa is a big store which is very widespread in Aegean region.

never buy themselves before approximately 20 years ago. Families are now going to the city to meet their needs. Young women of the village state that it was a dream to go to the city in the past. It can be said that old peasants were careful about producing or preparing their own food in the past. Young women and brides are dispraised if they purchase food such as cheese, bread, chicken or egg. It refers to lack of manners and lack of ability. However, peasants now mostly purchase milk products, meat products as well as egg. Many peasants buy bread from the bakery and cannot pay the fee, so the bakery in the village has a bulgy bill book.

It can be said that aliment regimes are formed as a result of a historical process comprising regional necessities, geographical resources and discoveries of certain techniques. So tastes are originated as a result of such an historical and complicated process. On the other hand, capitalism is specific in terms of standardization of aliment regimes and tastes consequently. Commodification of foods imposes the consumers a standard taste. It might be said that the relation between the practice of preparing a food and the taste is related with each other especially in terms of traditional foods. The “commoditized” new tastes mean the abolition of the rituals of preparing traditional and “non-commoditized” foods to the extent that the new taste is adopted and becomes dominant. It can also be said that the “commoditized” new tastes, in a way products, constitute a “new aliment culture” in favour of the specific features of the commoditized product that differentiate it from the traditional one. Those features can be said to be stemming from the capitalist production techniques. To give an example, capitalist automatized production techniques develop a “hygienic” and “untouched” food culture. So hand labour specific to traditional production technique becomes a source of disgust and unpleasantness according to that “new aliment culture”. All in all, along with the changing taste, hegemonic aliment culture has a tendency to abolish traditional production rituals and the relationships behind those rituals.

The ideas of a small PCP'er who works in tomato sauce factory in the entrance of the village apart from his agricultural production is significant in terms of changing

consumption habits of the village. He compares and contrasts hand-made tomato sauce of peasants and the sauce the factory he works produces. He states that “I think it is healthier than homemade... You know, ladies squeeze them by hand and then they wait under the sun for a while... They say that it is salty! Okay, that is salty, too. Also, salt is harmful”⁴⁰. What is significant here is that he is much far away from the traditional taste and practice of peasants in terms of tomato sauce which is one of the basic foods of Aegean kitchen. Preparing tomato sauce is a ritual in the village that is conducted by women collectively. It is a practice that necessitates a collective production process and a kind of division of labour. Thus, his favoring for the commoditized version of the food and his legitimizing it by nourishing from the “hegemonic ailment culture” worth mentioning.

3.5 Culture of Agricultural Production within the Framework of Everyday Life in the Village

It can be said that as the basic source of income is agricultural production on the basis of household, there is a direct relationship between peasants and the land. This relationship goes beyond its commodity value. No matter they complain from being farmer, they do not give up their expectations from land. Producers who are fed and prospered by the land as well as suffer from problems of the land still remember the reward of the land at the end of intense labour process and various problems. As an interesting aspect of their relationship with land, it can be noted that PCP’ers are not annoyed when a PCP’er purchase a piece of land while they are angry when companies or wealthy urban middle class purchase land to deal with agricultural production. They complain from the people who purchase land but do not know what the agricultural production is. They give importance to the knowledge and experience of agriculture. However, the latest and coming generations who only suffer from the problems of production and debts might not feel the same loyalty to the land as their fathers and mothers do feel. On the other hand, boys of PCP’ers still grow up on the top of tractors. There is an oral tradition in the village that enables

⁴⁰ “Sağlıklı mı bence çok sağlıklı evlerde yapılanlardan.. hani bayanlar ellerinde sıkıyo, dışarıda güneşin altında bekliyo... e neymiş tuzluymuş! Tamam bu da tuzlu, zaten tuz zarar.”

young people know about the previous position of the village, the products they produce, the methods they use in the past as well as the periods they prosper. They have the information of production process and they have the experience of production. The experience that is transferred from generation to generation is an important element supporting the resistance of PCP⁴¹. That resistance dynamic is challenged by two dynamics that differ according to class differentiation. These are increasing level of education and an increase in the number of non-agricultural laborers. Children of middle and small PCP'ers who have higher education separate from the village and agricultural production although they have the knowledge and ability which is necessary for the production. Also the middle aged women of the village complain from their traditional lifestyle and they want their children (especially daughters) to rescue themselves from the village by having a job by means of education. They express their desire for a more elegant lifestyle by stating that "best dress of you is a *shalvar*⁴² and a pullover here". It also should be noted that the number of the children who have higher education has been increasing for 10 years. The number of the young people who become wage laborers in the city has increased since 2000. Mostly small PCP'ers export family labour power as a part of resistance strategy. However, it can be said that labour power exported from the household does not totally separate from the village and agricultural production. For example, most of them keep living in the village and help household production when possible. Also middle PCP'ers can be said to resist against commoditizing labour power. For example, one of the sons of the family is suitable to be wage laborer while the other sons deal with agricultural production; however, family labour power of middle PCP'ers generally resists against this. One of the middle PCP'er states that their children do not want to work under command of anybody else and they cannot work in factories like a race horse. Thus, it can be said that family labour power of middle and big PCP'ers still has the possibility to keep the independence of labour power while family labour power of small PCP'ers hardly resist against dependency. Finally, it can be said that PCP'ers cling to the culture of

⁴¹ This issue will be handled in detail in Chapter 4.1.

⁴² It is a traditional cloth like trousers.

production although they suffer from serious problems about the survival of PCP. This situation is best expressed by peasants stating that “my hands are full of food while I am hungry”⁴³. Although they are hungry while they are producing much, they do not give up producing. They seem to go on taking risks for the survival of PCP as they still pin hope on the land: “I prefer wasting my labour instead of my hopes”⁴⁴.

Within that context, the mood of peasants which can be characterized as exhausted but resilient can be felt when a certain period of time is wasted in the village, especially in the coffeehouse. Within a framework that both the city and the village have an economic pushing effect, the young members of small PCP’ers come and go between the two opposite effects. While Hamzabeyli village has almost totally lost its social pulling effect, the number of young peasants who come to the coffeehouse at night hardly finds 10. So the coffeehouse’s being desolate and lifeless indicates weak social attraction of the village as the coffeehouse is the only social center, especially at night after the daily works has finished. This issue is emphasized by a peasant who states that 20 people gather in a table in the coffeehouse and everybody competes with each other to pay for tea in the past but now everybody takes his own cup of tea and goes aside. As the village has lost its social attraction, young brides do not want to live in the village any more. One of the young PCP’ers who is not married complains about the young women in the village for their wish to live in the city. Thus, the change in everyday life of the village is closely related with the village’s losing its social liveliness for various reasons.

Another significant change in the everyday life of the village that has also an effect on resistance dynamics is about stockbreeding. As it is previously mentioned, most of the PCP’ers in Hamzabeyli gave up stockbreeding as a result of rising expenses in 2000’s. One of the middle aged peasants states that their animals were passing by the coffeehouse for hours in the past. Women were dealing with stockbreeding and they

⁴³ “Elim hamur, karnım aç.”

⁴⁴ “Emeğim kalacağına umudum kalsın.”

were able to arrange a budget at the disposal of themselves. The change in the use of female labour power together with the decrease in the stockbreeding in the village has an effect on class differentiation as well. Women of small PCP'ers who dealt with stockbreeding go on their labour process by dealing with household agricultural production or being agricultural wage laborer. Women of middle PCP'ers who dealt with stockbreeding turn to be unproductive domestic labour. The first one empowers the resistance dynamics via wage labour or productive domestic labour while the second one leads women of middle PCP'ers to be alienated from labour culture.

What is also significant in terms of the everyday life of the village is that peasants have lost their culture of solidarity compared to previous years. Peasants harvest their products successively in the past. A few families unite and help one of them in the harvest period and this ritual repeats for other families as well. Thus, co-op farming disappears as a result of the resistance strategies of PCP'ers. Legal regulations also contribute the elimination of co-op farming as they prohibit means of productions such as tractors which are not registered to the farmer cooperatives to be used in another producer's land. There are heavy penalties for this. These legislations not only support the destruction of co-op farming but also obstruct the valorization of means of production of big PCP'ers who do not have the capacity on their own to valorize them. Many big PCP'ers do not check their means of productions into the cooperative to get rid of burden of tax. On the other hand, they do not hire them to other producers as they are not registered. Thus, those producers neither help other producers nor accumulate capital by means of benefitting the capacity of means of productions via hiring them to other producers. Therefore, the elimination of co-op farming cannot be evaluated as the commodification of means of productions as well as family labour power used in co-op farming.

As a final point it can be noted in terms of the socio-cultural atmosphere of the village that political tendencies of peasants do not seem to change much. It is closely related with populist policies. Peasants in the coffeehouse talk about the

government's policies every day⁴⁵. They always expect the state to improve the circumstances of PCP'ers. On the other hand, it should be noted that peasants do not consent to and pleased with populist policies no matter what they are. It can be said that they consent to the populist policies improving their agricultural production. However, the focus of populist policies changes from agricultural production to income since 2000's. Elimination of state subsidies and implementation of direct support system in Turkey is a clear indicator of the change. AKP tries to replace social aids instead of support for agricultural production. It can be said that PCP'ers do not pleased with the populist policies which do not ground on agricultural production. Many PCP'ers use these social aids to support agricultural production. For example, they sell the coal they take as social aid. They complain from the government for feeding unproductive strata of the society and destroy the productive ones. They often complain that they are destroyed while producing by stating that *"the more we produce, the more we are ruined."* They state that this government favors for the undermost (via social aids) and the uppermost strata (via interest income) while it destroys the ones who produce. Thus, they have a great respect to agricultural production and labour. They want to see the same respect from the politicians. One of the small PCP'ers even states that he is pleased when he hears something about petty producers from a politician even if he knows he is telling lie. Thus, it can be said that its peasants' consent in Hamzabeyli, as a petty commodity producing village, is closely relate with valorization of agricultural production as well as agricultural labour power.

3.6 Concluding Remarks

It can be said that the dynamics of the lack of a feudal power in the village, economic welfare of peasants in Salonika and the number of family members when they settled in the village (population advantage) and then population movements within the family unit reveals the specificity of the village in terms of the settlement of petty production. These dynamics can be said to be significant in terms of the settlement of petty commodity production in the village after 1960's and then the increasing

⁴⁵ This issue will be opened in 4.2.6.

resistance dynamics after 2000's. Another specificity of the village in terms of the integration of capitalist relations is its being wheat producing village and then cotton which are closely related with the capital accumulation processes of Turkey. Within that context, diversification of class differentiation in the village after 2000's cannot be evaluated independently from the previous dynamics of petty commodity production.

Capitalizing on the prevailing ways of resistance of PCP'ers on the basis of prevailing class differentiation in the village, it can be concluded that these ways that ranges from commoditizing labour or exporting labour power from the family and elimination of subsistence production to engaging in commercial activity should be evaluated as a part and parcel of contemporary characteristics of PCP that adopts itself to the changing conditions rather than as constituents of the dissolution process of it.

It can be also argued that PCP should be evaluated within the framework of socio-cultural climate of the village and the practice of everyday life that are constituted and reconstituted in time in relation to the characteristics of PCP. Thus, it can be concluded that the comprehension of the change in the practice of everyday life of the village as well as the habits and attitudes of peasants embedded in the social relations of the village is a significant part and parcel of the understanding the change in agricultural relations.

Finally, it should be noted that dynamics of settlement and resistance of petty commodity production and the character of prevailing agricultural relations as well as the change in the socio-cultural climate in the village within the context of everyday life experience can be understood through focusing petty commodity producers as an analytic category in order to understand the contemporary features of agricultural relations.

CHAPTER 4

CLASS EXPERIENCE OF PEASANTRY

The prevailing class differentiation of the village is evaluated within the framework of commodification of land and labour, the tendency of proletarianization and family labour composition on the basis of resistance dynamics of petty commodity production in Chapter 3. In parallel with the aim of the thesis to include class confrontations which means the confrontations of feelings, values, expectations, images while establishing the relation of small peasants and the general social relations, this chapter tries to benefit from a kind of methodology including *subjective* aspects taking place in the realm of everyday life. Within that context, the analyses in this chapter trace the clues of contemporary experience and of PCP'ers and their contemporary image as peasants.

In parallel with the aim of comprehending the subjective aspects of everyday life experiences on the basis of class confrontations that bear both subordinating features and peasants' defenses against these features, the study tries to let the voices of petty commodity producers be heard by the reader. In that sense, the expressions of peasants are thought part and parcel of such an analysis, and the chapter lets them speak.

It might be meaningful to remind that the thesis does not retain from the conceptualization of peasant or peasantry as the experience of class differences on the basis of the class confrontations that is previously conceptualized cannot be comprehended and analyzed without the conceptualization of peasant/peasantry as it comprises the social, personal, akin, communal relations that surround PCP'ers life.

Within that context, this chapter seeks for the source of the characteristics of peasant labour within the framework the characteristics of capitalist labour process in general; peasants' experience of unequal or hierarchical social relations on the basis of body, language, and space as well as the specific features of peasants' defenses against these relations.

4.1 The Character of Peasant Labour

The analyses of proletarianization in agricultural relations are mostly based on commodification of land and labour as well as expropriation as previously mentioned in Chapter 1. The issue is analyzed within the framework of a series of structural changes after 1980's that have complicated the survival conditions of small producers. While such kind of analysis paves the way for understanding the change in agricultural relations, it should be supported with the subjective experiences and attitudes of peasants in order to comprehend how structural changes are experienced by them.

In the relevant literature peasants are often characterized by self-exploitation. In that sense, Kautsky states that peasants work like an ant and consume like a sparrow. This process can be said to result in devalorization of peasant labour. It can be said that these evaluations are incontestable. On the other hand, this feature of labour can be said to be valid for other forms of labour in different scales. So it might not belong to the character of peasant labour. It might be meaningful to look for the character of peasant labour in the artisan character of peasant labour and the fact that the realm of production and reproduction interlace with each other, which resulted in its resistance against capitalist notion of time and capitalist division of labour. In order to understand the specificity of peasant labour, it should be better to evaluate it within the framework of the specificity of capitalist labour process in general.

In 21st century of Turkey it can be said that labour bears more and more an artificial, unskilled and floating character especially in neoliberal era. It can be deduced that the extent and intensity of alienation to labour rises. In that sense, rising alienation to labour reinforces the violence of attacks on the self of labouring classes by means of having an erosive effect on a sustainable sense of 'self'. In such a context, the question of 'who needs me?' in the sense of the character of labour is under intense attack in modern capitalism (Sennet, 2011: 154). As E.P. Thompson states that "even the workers who is continually jobless or who find a job times to times or wanders from a job to another or who is the most unskilled in 19th century try to define themselves with certain qualities such as bricklayer, blacksmith or farmer" (Sennett,

2011: 127). On the other hand, certain forms of labour can be said to be resisting against those attacks. Within that framework, it can be said that peasants have a stronger sense of self which means that they know who they are, what they are doing and what they want. In this part, the sources of the character of peasant labour will be traced.

4.1.1 Artisan Character of Peasant Labor

It can be said that there is a kind of master-apprentice relationship in terms of peasant labour process. Masters of 'peasant apprentices' are mostly their fathers, grandfathers or close relatives. Young peasant apprentices who are mostly boys of the family enter into the learning process at a very early age. They are taken to the farmland when they come to the school age and they learn how to use a tractor when their legs reach to the pedals of the tractor. They are equipped with the experience of how the work goes on thoroughly in a long time period. When they grow to maturity they take over the control of the production or they separate from the family enterprise to set up their own work capitalizing on the experience they get from the family. In that sense, it reminds the separation of an apprentice from his master's guidance and setting up his own work. Thus, farming experience is conveyed from generation to generation. That process constitutes strong ties to farming and peasantry which contributes to the resistance of petty commodity production against negative circumstances that complicate the survival of small peasants. Such kinds of ties are closely related with making sense of their existence by basing on the experience of previous generations (for example on fathers and grandfathers). So it can be thought that peasant labour bears a traditionalist character. Ibrahim who is 20 years old wants to stay at the village and become engaged with farming although his father wants him to go out of the village because of the worsening conditions of peasantry:

Is that not possible? I told him to rent a 500-600 acre field and farm it. However, he told me to have a profession and save yourself, maybe we can open a shop in future. But since I was little, about 5 years old, I have been on the top of the tractor. We do every kind of work with my father, I am

always beside him. I mean, my father tells me to do some work; I do them on my own. He tells me “do that”, then I do. For example, when my father goes somewhere, he recommends me to use pesticides for our vineyard, then I do, or he wants me to plow, I do it too. I am eager to work in the field but we earn too little. It is hard to work for someone else but my father does not want me to stay in this village. (İbrahim)⁴⁶

In that sense, it can be said that the relationship between father and son is a master-apprentice relation at the same time. As boys integrate in the production process at very early ages, they comprehend farming process thoroughly as a part of their life. The reason why this learning process is a part of apprentices' lives lies under the specific feature of peasantry which is the unity of the fields of production and reproduction. That is to say, their houses, their farmlands and their cow houses interlace with each other. So the time for rest or leisure and the time for work interlace with each other. That specificity of peasantry enables a specific kind of way of life in which junior peasants grow up with farming practice. Their childhood memories are full of experiences of farming. Muharrem remembers his childhood and states that:

People here make their children, who are 6 or 7 years old, them get on the tractor in order to make them work in the field. It is just interest, a child at those ages does not want to go to school, but prefers and loves driving tractor and do that work (Muharrem)⁴⁷

Murat also remembers his childhood and he underlines that he willingly deals with farming and he does not regret:

⁴⁶ Olmaz mı ya tutalım dedim 500-600 dönüm bi yer işleyelim beraber. Git kendini kurtar dedi bi meslek edin belki ilerde bi dükkân açarız dedi. Ben istiyodum benim yani ufaklığımndan beri 5 yaşımdan beri motorun üstündeyim. Her şeyi biz yapıyoruz mesela ovaya gidiyoruz babamın hep yanıdayım yani babam onu yap bunu yap hani babam olmadan da yapıyodum ben arıyodu beni olum bu olacak tamam. Mesela babam bi yere gidiyo git diyo bağa zehir atılacak tamam diyom yapıyom. Bağ sürülecek gidip sürüyom tarla sürcek yapıyom. İstiyom ama kazanç yok. Elin işinde çalışmak çok zor ama babam istemiyo köyde durmamı.

⁴⁷ Çocukların ufaklığında okulu bitmeden altı yedi yaşında traktöre bindirirler ovada iş yapsın. Merak yani e o yaşta çocuk okumayı düşünmüyo traktör kullanmayı seviyo o işi yapıyo.

My uncle has a son. We studied at the same school. Now, he works in Vestel for 1200 TL. I mean, I do not think that I am a loser because I did it voluntarily. If I had studied my lesson at that time, I would have done. I was clever as well, but why did I want to do this work? Because, I was coming quickly from the bus to the farm, I loved that job, it was a pleasurable job. For example, sometimes, we were going to the field which we farmed together with Uncle Haşim for plowing with my uncle's son. I liked it, it was pleasurable. (Murat)⁴⁸

Thus, it can be deduced that the learning process based on a master-apprentice relationship maintained for generations constitutes a significant element of the traditional character of peasant labour. So peasantry seems to be a lifelong learning process that begins from childhood. Such kind of ties constitutes a different kind of dependence on peasantry. It becomes a matter of a way of life. Also Mustafa states that “you should deal with the work you know and you feel happy ... There is a proverb here saying that ‘as the twig is bent, so grows the tree’. We are inclined to such things here”.⁴⁹

As it is previously mentioned, they talk about their ‘peace’, ‘happiness’, ‘will’, ‘love’, ‘care’ and ‘inclination’ about peasantry. To the extent that peasantry becomes a personal experience rather than an economic means of subsistence by means of master-apprentice relationship between father and son, and dealing with farming at young ages as a part of their childhood, it can be mentioned about, basing on their way of narration, an emotional tie binding them to peasantry. For example, the relationship between the tractor and children goes much beyond to the role of the tractor as a means of production to the extent that it becomes an important part of childhood experiences and memories.

⁴⁸ Var amcamın oğlu aynı okulu okuduk şimdi Vestel’de 1200e çalışıyo. Yani ben kaybettim diye bişey düşünmüyom ben bunu isteyerek yaptım. O zaman çalışsaydım yapardım kafam çalışıyodu benim niye bu işi yapmak istiyodum. Otobüsten koşarak geliyodum çiftliğe gideyim diye seviyodum zevkli işti mesela o zaman haşim amcamlarla beraber işlediğimiz yerler vardı ara sürmeye gidiyoduk amca oğluyulan beraber. Seviyodum zevk alıyodum.

⁴⁹ Bildiğin işi huzurlu olduğun işi mutlu olduğun işi yapcan... Atasözü var ağaç yaşken eğilir, biz burda bu konularda eğildik.

Another significant element in terms of the constitution and preservation of such traditional ties to peasantry is oral tradition of agricultural production. The labor process in the village forms a kind of memory in terms of peasantry. Oral tradition can be seen as a vehicle in the constitution of that memory which transmits experiences of older farmers to younger ones from generation to generation. For example, young peasants know about which crops their fathers and grandfathers produced in the past, how they produced and how the circumstances were at that time. They know how much land their grandfathers handed down to their fathers and how much land they inherited from their fathers besides that how much land they are planning to hand down to their sons. The expression of Emre is meaningful in terms of those traditional ties:

My grandfather handed down 60 for my father, my father made it 160. If God bestowed, I will increase it to 200. If we cannot increase it, at least, it should remain the same but decrease. (Emre)⁵⁰

So farming is a process that expands to a few generations. Such kind of traditional ties transferred from generation to generation constitutes strong ties to peasantry and farming. It becomes a matter of protecting family inheritance by going beyond the matter of subsistence. Ahmet talks about the ties bounding them to the land and farming:

(selling out) you cannot do that because it is my mother's and father's fields... It causes gossip. If I sell my land in order to set up a business, my close relatives would say that "he sold it because of his debt", even if it is not the fact. They would say "he damaged the order, he sold his father's and mother's fields in order to save himself. (Ahmet)⁵¹

It can be said that such kind of traditional ties binding them to their land as well as their village constitute a strong identity in terms of peasantry. So being a farmer

⁵⁰ Dedem babama 60 bırakmış, babam 160 yapmış. Allah nasip ederse, 200.. çoğaltmak, çoğaltmasak da yerinde saysın en azından. Eksilmesin.

⁵¹ (Satıp gitme) onu yapamazsın işte babamın tarlası annemin tarlası.. Dedikodusu var. İş kurmak için ben bi tarla satsam hadi ya dıcek yakın akrabam dıcek borcundan sattı belki hiç alakası yok. İşte düzeni bozdu.. Kendini kurtarmak için işte babasının tarlasını yedi, annesinin tarlasını yedi.

becomes an occupational identity. On the other hand, labour bears more artificial, unskilled and floating character today. It becomes harder and harder to define oneself with a definite occupation. So peasantry can be said to be clear in terms of who they are. Murat defines himself as a farmer and asserts his will not to deal with another occupation:

You know, we are the son of village. We cannot finish all the work suddenly like closing factory. Because, a farm means capital stock, such as tractor and tools. Consider the full day law that has been enacted for pharmacies and doctors. Will they leave their job and sell *simit*? All in all, he is a doctor... So, they have to do that job. Similarly, when we decide to leave our land, what to do with numerous tools? We love village life, for example, I cannot live in Manisa... I quickly get bored. We are not used to that life; we grew on the field by touching the land. (Murat)⁵²

He compares the position of doctors and peasants and he implies that if people do not expect doctors to do something else, they should not expect it for farmers as well. In that sense, he underlines the specific merits of farming which are the accumulations of experience and skill. Peasants' insistence on skill is worth paying attention as this tendency can be seen in other peasants' expressions. Halil states that:

If I do this job, I won't work in construction sector so that the construction worker can get what he deserves. It is the same for tradesmen. A *cigkofte* saloon opened in Manisa and it was followed by many others. I was born as a farmer's son and will die as a farmer. My son will either get education and have a good job or do this job like me; he cannot work in a factory. An officer's son will either get education or work in a factory. However, my son will work there as a qualified personnel. But, I will do this work. In any case, if I won't do this job, why would I stay here? I have 160 decares field, I consume what I produce, then. I mean, why would I sell it? I

⁵² Biz şimdi köy çocuğuyuz hani şey yapamayız kapıyı kapattın da yapamazsın yani bi fabrikadaki gibi yapamazsın çiftçilik demek yani baya bi öz sermaye traktörün malzemen. E şimdi eczaneler doktorlar tam gün yasaşı çıktı adam bırakcak mı napcak simit mi satcak? Sonuçta doktor sonuçta o işi yapcak. Şimdi biz çiftçiliği bırakıyoz desen dünya takım taklavat satsan napcan? Biz köy hayatını seviyoruz mesela ben Manisa'da yapamam... Sıkılırım biz alışkın değiliz öyle biz toprakta büyüdük toprağa elliye elliye.

won't, because my father left it to me and I will leave it to my children. It is the way here. (Halil)⁵³

In Halil's expressions, the importance he gives to skill and traditional character of peasant labour can be seen. He gives two options to his son for his future. His son should either sustain the farming activity of the family by becoming a farmer or has education and has a job according to his education. It can be seen that in both cases he insists on a skilled labour for the future of his son. He does not want his son to work in factory as an unskilled labourer. Another significant point is traditional character of peasant labour that is mentioned before. He asserts his desire to manage the circulation in farming from father to son. It can be said that the inheritance of land from father to son is a kind of inheritance of skill from father to son.

Also Mesude who works in the tomato sauce factory in the entrance of the village talks about her will to be a skilled labourer.

I would like to have a status. I am sorry about it. Of course, I am not mentioning about a status like a prime minister or president of republic but like "the labourer x" as the head of a work. I would like to be a head of whatever I work at. I would even be a dustman but as a qualified labourer. I might be a labourer, it is not matter, but only qualified. But, I will, I attended to open university to achieve this. I want to be either an expert labour or an engineer, maybe in our factory. For example, I realized that I can do the same thing as an engineer. Of course, there are many things I will learn but I will, because I want it. I do not fly high but I want to be more qualified than a contact labourer. When people ask for a person who knows this work, I would like to be the one people point at. (Mesude)⁵⁴

⁵³ Ben bu işi yapıyosam gitmicem inşaata inşaattaki hakkını alsın. Esnafılıkta da aynı. Manisa'ya bi çiğ köfteci açıldı her yer çiğköfteci. Ben çiftçi çocuğu doğmuşum ben çiftçi ölcem. Benim oğlumda ya okucak bişey olcak ya da gelecek bu işi yapcak, fabrikada çalışamaz. Fabrikada memurun çocuğu okursa okucak okumazsa gitcek orda çalışacak veya okursa da benim çocuğum vasıflı olarak gitcek çalışacak. Ben bu işi yapcam. Zaten bu işi yapmadıktan sonra ben niye duruyum yüz altmış dönüm yerim var benim, çıkardığımı yerim çıkardığımı yerim yani ben niye alıyım benim babam çalışmış bana bırakmış bende yarın çocuğuma bırakayım diye. Burada bu var.

⁵⁴ Ben kendim mevki sahibi olmak isterdim. Üzüldüğüm nokta o. çok böyle başbakan cumhurbaşkanı gibi değil de hani şu işin başında bulunan x işçi, başında olan ben olmak isterdim ne olursa olsun çöpçü bile olurum vasıflı işçi olmak isterdim. ille de vasıflı olmak isterdim. İşçi olayım sorun yok ama vasıflı. Olcam da onun için zaten açık öğretime yazıldım ya usta olmak istiyom mühendis olmak

So it can be said that the skill specific to farming, traditional ties binding them to the land and inclination to farming at young ages through a kind of master-apprentice relationship constitute the meaning of farming for peasants. As it is previously stated, farming together with these features goes beyond being a solely economic means of survival but a process that peasants make sense of their existence, their labour and their struggle to survive.

Finally, it can be said that besides the artisan character of peasant labour, peasants have a close relationship with artisanship. Most of the high-school graduates are graduated from vocational high-schools. Also some of the peasants perform their vocation such as barber and shoemaker besides being a farmer. It might be related with the similar character of labour in artisanship and farming most significant feature of which is their relatively autonomous position of labor that enables artisans and peasants to control and conduct the production process as well as the control of time in terms of regulating their lives. That tendency becomes clearer when it is focused on peasants' experiences of factory work and their attitudes towards being wage labourer that is concretized in factory work for them.

4.1.2 Working in Factory or Farming?

In order to understand the specificity of peasant labour, it should be better to evaluate it within the framework of the specificity of capitalist labour process in general. Although working as wage labourer is a strong option for peasants in Hamzabeyli as the village is very close to the city center, it can be said that there is a tendency of resistance against working as wage labourer. The source of that tendency might be searched in peasants' control over time, production process, division of labour as well as the unity of production and reproduction field all of which characterize the village life as a whole. If these elements are compared to the forms specific to wage labour basing on the experiences and attitudes of peasants, it might be possible to understand resources of their avoiding from being wage labourer.

istiyom fabrikamızda mesela. Mesela analiz ettim mühendisin yaptığı şeyleri ben de yaparım pekâlâ. ha öğrencim çok şey var belki ama olsun öğrencem yapcam istiyom yani. Çok yükseklerde gözüm yok ama taşeron işçiden vasıflı işçi olmak istiyom. Bu işi bilen kişi kim dediklerinde beni göstermelerini isterim

Firstly, it can be said that one of the characteristic features of capitalism is its conducting time, especially by dividing it as work time and leisure time. In that way, it can be understood that time for production and time for reproduction is separated from each other. That separation mostly connotes to a spatial separation as well such as factory and house. These features can be said to be concretized in wage labour process, especially in factory system. What is significant in terms of such character of capitalism is that labourers lose much of their control on their labour. As a result of the features specific to capitalist labour process such as dividing time as 'work' and 'leisure' and division between the fields of production and reproduction, the labourer can be said to be alienated from his own labour power. On the other hand, the distance between work and leisure, production and reproduction in terms of time as well as the space of production and reproduction in peasantry can be said to be less than wage work. For example, peasants might postpone the time when they fertilize their land for a few hours or a few days while wage labourers cannot postpone the work they have to do. Wage labourers cannot take a rest apart from break hours while peasants can have a cup of tea in the coffeehouse in the village whenever they want. The village is both a field of production and reproduction for peasants while the 'workplace' is limited to the field of production for wage labourers. Thus, it can be argued that peasant labour bears a less alienated character.

It can be said that negative attitudes towards being wage labour are common among peasants. The sources of that attitude might be found in their wage labour experiences as well as the images related with wage labour. Basing on peasants' experiences it can be said that peasant work discipline contradicts with wage work discipline. Halil who is a shoemaker besides being a farmer tells his experience in a shoe factory:

(in a shoe atelier) we do not depend on clock. It is about how much you have done. If you want, you can go home in the mornings and do not come back and sleep there. It is up to you. I do not work in a job which you show your fingerprint in the entrance or clock off in the exit, like in a factory... Once, they invited us to a factory in Istanbul, when I entered the door, they wanted me to wear a blue shirt on which it is

written ‘*Bozyaka*’ (name of the firm). I said that I won’t wear it, I could quit for it but I agreed to wear at the end... While we were working, the bell rang. How can I know why the bell rings, I did not experienced before. “Hey, hey! Leave your work!” they shouted at me. I asked why I should leave. They said it was time to break. I said “hey okay, I wore the shirt but my breaks are not your concern”. After that, they told their bosses ‘their mind is different, let them do whatever they like’ as we produced quite a lot. They told us that we can undress our shirts, also if we want our trousers! In addition, they asked us to be salaried labourers; I did not accept, of course. I said ‘no, thanks! I don’t buy it!’ (Halil)⁵⁵

The ring for break, the entrance card and the uniform are all foreign to him. The routine of the factory work contradicts with the routine of farming in which peasants can decide when, how and what to do during production process. Halil loses his control over his labour while he is working in the factory. He normally works in a small shoe workshop in certain periods of the year in weekly wages. Although he is a wage labourer in the workshop, he does not lose his control over his labour thanks to the fact that the relatively autonomous work discipline of the artisanship is predominant in the workshop. Although peasants are subordinated to capitalism and exploited by dominant classes, their work discipline bears a relatively autonomous character. Halil insists on his work discipline against the work discipline of the factory and he manages to work in his own discipline thanks to his artisanship which is his talent in shoemaking. Thus, it can be deduced that the work disciplines of peasantry and artisanship bear a similar character in terms of the peasant’s or artisan’s having control over his labour, which constitutes a significant resistance

⁵⁵ (Ayakkabı atölyesinde) bizim saatle alakamız yok adet hesabı istersen sabah git hiç gelme yat orda o senin elinde. Bi fabrika gibi işte git gel parmak bas kartını bas aman o oldu bu oldu... Öyle bi işte çalışmam. Çağırdılar bizi İstanbul’daki fabrikaya renklendirici, daha kapıdan girdim bana dediler gömlek giy fabrikanın standartlarında dedim sen ne diyon ya verdiler mavi Bozyaka yazıyo ben dedim giymem ha kaçırım ona göre abim giy iyi tamam giydik. E çalışıyoz dırrr zil çalıyo ne bileyim ben zilden milden böyle şey görmemişiz. Geldiler hoop hop yav dediler zil çalıyo bıraksana. Neyi bırakcam abi dedim ben, ya dedi mola var, ne molası dedim ya böyle dedi burda. Aaa ama dedim gömleği giydik benim molama karışma dedim. Ben elli basıyom bak burda sonra sahiplerine söyledi bunlar böyle böyle kafa bunların bu şekilde bunları rahat bırakalım bu adet çıkıyo aman dedi bırak istedikleri gibi yapınlar sonra geldi dedi gömleklere de atın abim diyo pantolonları da atın isterseniz. Bi de demezler mi siz bırakın şeyi sizi aylıkçı yapalım yaaa dedim hayvan terli...

against factory work. As it is previously mentioned, peasants are inclined to artisanal works and the sources of that tendency might be traced in the similar character of peasant and artisan work disciplines. On the other hand, it is better to note that factory work is a strong option for the peasants in Hamzabeyli village as the village is close to the city center where industrial institutions are abundant. In spite of the abundance of factory work options, it cannot be said that it constitutes a center of attraction for peasants. For example, Halil is offered a permanent position in the factory and he rejects working in the factory permanently as he knows that he must be subjected to the rules of the factory in that case.

Another dimension of the control over labour is valid in terms of time discipline of the production process. Fragmented character of factory work highly contradicts with the holistic and linear character of peasant production. Peasants have the experience of the production process from seed to the crop. While different time periods of the production process follow one another (such as fertilization, applying pesticides, plowing, etc.), peasants become a part of each process. They comprehend the production process as a whole and they have the ability to control it. On the other hand, factory work confines the labourers to a definite time period of the whole production process, which should be thought in parallel with the problem of alienation, again. Labourers do not have the experience of the whole process and control over it. The experience of Mustafa is significant in terms of that experience:

I worked for Vestel. We said to them ‘if you are going to give us a consistent job, we can start to work, but if you are going to fire us after 1 or 2 days, we do not would not even start to work’. Human Resorces said that ‘we do not fire people gregariously but Vestel city might do’. So I answered him; ‘I do not care about Vestel City; both of them are ‘Vestel’ to me’. He kept telling that the two is different departments. It is okay, I went there for three days but then they said ‘you are going to come at nights’, I said okay. I went there at night by motorcycle and after we finished the work, masters left and beginners were sent to another section, there were great pressure and oppression on us perpetually. The foreman took me and sent another section later, he did the same thing again and again; next day, again he did the same thing finally he wanted me to use the palette by watching woman who is

using it and to do like them. But you have to see the scene! The palette was moving just in front of me. I said to him “Okay, you say do that and do that again. It is okay but please do not try me. It is enough. Let me do the work so that I can learn it.” However he said ‘If I want you to do something you have to’. I replied him ‘who do you think you are?’ I enter from an edge of the factory and exit from the other. Can you guess how he answered? He said ‘your friends are working at harder sections, so if you want to work here go and work with them or you are going to be fired’. That was very offended, so I quit the job. I said ‘Clean out this factory and see how I produce a fridge by myself from one edge of the factory to the other’. I said that a man should not be tested like this. He just gave another job before I got used to the job I was trying to learn, and I was obliged to do that job. For example, while I was producing telephone, he asked me to produce lighter. Salaried labourers are just so terrible! Only companies’ and bosses’ income is important. But, you put effort there actually. Some people work wistfully and some others do cunning, so the foreman is also under responsibility. But, there are works that I can do and I cannot do. (Mustafa)⁵⁶

Mustafa could not be adapted to the work discipline of the factory and he develops a resistance against it by basing on peasant work discipline. His resistance against the fragmented character of factory work is concretized in his words while he is arguing with the foreman “Clean out this factory and see how I produce a fridge by myself from one edge of the factory to the other!” His assertion that he can produce a

⁵⁶ Ben Vestel’de çalıştım bize kalıcı iş verebilecekseniz biz gelelim 1-2 gün sonra çıkarırsanız biz hiç başlamayalım dedik. İnsan hakları orda biz toplu çıkış yapmıyoz dedi, Vestel City yapıyo dedi ben dedim city mity bilmem sonuçta Vestel. Onun bölümü ayrı benim bölümün ayrı diyo. E tamam 1 gün 2 gün 3. gün dediler gece gelcen tamam. Motosikletle gittim gece biz işi bitirdik ustalar ayrıldı biz acemiler öbür bölüme, sürekli bi baskı üzerimizde ezme olayı var. Ordan alıyo beni oraya koyuyo ordan aldı öbür tarafa koydu ertesi gün gene aynı şekil en son paletin başına getirdi beni yanda dedi bayanlar var bayanların yaptığı gibi yapcan, palet geçiyo ama habire önümden. Abi dedim tamam öyle diyon böyle diyon tamam, insan denenir mi bi gün iki gün bi yerde bırak şu işi öğreneyim onu ondan sonra işte diyo yap diyosam yapcan sen kimsin, dedim bende kimsin. Yapcan diyo yapmıyom hadi yaptır. Tamam da 1 hafta içerisinde fabrikanın o ucundan girdim bu ucundan çıktım. Bana ne dedi biliyon mu senin tanıdığım varmış dedi senle bir girenler daha ağır yerdeler. Ya dedi onların yanına ya da başka fabrikaya. Öyle diyince benim zoruma gitti yapmıyom dedim bıraktım kaçtım. İstiyosan gel yaptır. Boşalt dedim fabrikayı 1 hafta oluyodu ben çalışalı o baştan geliyon bu başa tek başıma buz dolabı çıkarayım dedim. İnsan dedim böyle mi denenir 1 hafta içinde bahsettiğim fabrika belki 20 dekar araziye kurulu. Bu işe alışmadan o işe veriyo o işe alışmadan bu işe veriyo yapamadığım taktide yapcaksın. Ben bu telefonu üretiyom misal gel diyo çakmağı üret. Aylıklı çalışanların benim gözümde kötü yani sadece şirketlerin, patronların kazancı bakılır. Senin emeğin oraya harcağıdın belli bişeyler olur. Bazı insanlar isteyerek çalışır bazı insanlar hinayet yapar. O da sorumluluk altında benim de işte yapabileceğim bi iş var yapamayacağım iş var.

refrigerator by himself connotes to the work discipline of the peasant production. It is just like producing a crop by conducting the production process from beginning to the end. He is irritated by the fragmented production process of the factory which he cannot control and conduct. The production process becomes incomprehensible for him. Thus, as a result of these features of the factory work it can be said that factory work becomes an 'illegible' process for him that has neither a beginning nor an end while peasant production is a "legible" process bearing a linear feature that begins and ends cyclically.

Apart from peasants' factory experiences, it can be said that certain images with regard to wage work accompany and support their experiences and negative attitudes towards wage work. One of the basic understandings lying under their negative attitude can be said to be the notion of 'working under the command of somebody else' (*elin işinde çalışmak, el kapısında çalışmak*), which connotes to the control and domination of 'somebody else'. What is difficult for peasants is that they have to be subjected to the domination of somebody else's. As it previously mentioned, peasant labour bears a relatively autonomous character in terms of the control and conduct of the production process no matter how they are integrated into capitalist relations. To the extent that the 'autonomy' bears a traditional character, avoidance from a dependent labour discipline can be said to be settled down into the mentality of peasants. Muharrem talks about the reasons of their inability to adapt factory work:

People here cannot work in factory system; they cannot be patient because we have been accustomed to a definite order for a long time... We do our own jobs. When we have done good job, we have a break for a few days. But if you work in a factory, you cannot do it. You just have holiday from Sunday to Sunday but it is not valid for all factories. (Muharrem)⁵⁷

Thus, it can be said that traditional and autonomous characters of peasant labour interlace with each other. "Being accustomed to a definite order" refers the

⁵⁷ Fabrika sisteminde burdaki insan çalışamaz o sabrı gösteremez hiçbiri çünkü burda uzun zamandır belli bi düzene alışkınız biz kendi işimizi yaparız işimizi oturttuk mu arada birkaç gün kendimize tatil fırsatı yaratırız ama fabrikaya girip çalışmaya başladığı zaman yapamazsın ancak pazardan pazara o da her fabrika için geçerli değil.

traditional character of peasant labour while “being self-employed” (kendi işini yapma) connotes to the autonomous character of it. Also what is specific in terms of his expressions explaining the reasons of their avoidance from factory work is that he compares two different work disciplines by stating that “factory system” and a “definite order” in the village for a long time. The words of system and order connote to a set up structure comprising of definite rules, relationships and disciplines. While the first one is constituted under the domination of capitalist work discipline, the second one is constituted by a series of social, economic and cultural elements predating capitalist relations. Thus, it can be said that there is an essential contradiction between the system of the factory and the order of the village according to the mentality of peasants. The notion Muharrem expresses can be said to be shared by many other peasants. Some of the similar expressions are “we cannot take directions about how to do a work” (Yasin), “our people cannot participate in chain of command” (Ahmet), “our sons don’t want to work, of course, like a race horse from 8 to 12” (Ekrem), “for example, İsmail cannot work in the factory I am working at because he is hurt when a younger man comes and commands him” (Ethem), “it is like smoking cigarette, I cannot quit for example; I am 28 years old and I haven’t ever worked under the command of somebody, and I cannot do it after that time. It hurts me” (Mustafa).⁵⁸

It can be also said that peasants try to keep the autonomous character of their labour in their wage work experiences. In that sense, there are many personal narratives about their wage work experiences. Besides Halil who works in a shoe factory temporarily and Mustafa who works in Vestel for a weak, Mehmet talks about his experience bearing the similar features:

I work as it is my own work. The boss came and said a lot of things, I did not care. Eventually, I could not stand and I

⁵⁸ “Biz şimdi emir alamayız o iş böyle olacak diye” (Yasin), “Bizim insanımız emir komuta zincirine girmiyor” (Ahmet), “Çalışmak istemez tabi 8-12 yarış atı gibi çalışmaz bizim çocuklar”(Ekrem) “Alalım İsmail’i bizim oraya bence yapamaz niye çünkü yeri gelecek ondan ufak adam ona emir onun zoruna gider.”(Ethem), “Sigara gibi bişey ben bırakamam mesela ben 28 yaşındayım bu yaşa kadar hiç emir altına girmemişim bu saatten sonra bi yere gidip çalışmak bana koyar.” (Mustafa).

cleared off. I quitted many jobs like that. I left my jobs almost 3-4 times like that. (Mehmet)⁵⁹

As it is previously mentioned, peasants underline the importance of the skill specific to farming. In the comparison between peasants and workers it can be seen that the features of farming entailing a difficult labour process and skilled labour becomes a source of superiority over wage labour in the factory. Halil compares and contrasts the position of peasants and workers upon his relationship with his friend who works as a wage labourer in a factory:

Working in a factory is really different than my work in terms of ability and knowledge, and it is also different physically and visually. A man working in a factory communicates only with his headsman or laborers, but we are in connection to a lot of people such as bosses and engineers because you are in many places, you come across many things and learn from them. In fact, agriculture is also a difficult job. Growing a plant is like looking after a baby. For example, we cultivated cotton, but it was ruined and we needed time. People working in a factory have restricted lives. I can see my future better than the factory laborer. The educated people work in trivial jobs. For example, we visited our friends, who started to work in a factory; we thought that we can talk until 2 or 3 am. But they quickly became sleepy as their bus will depart to the factory at 6 am. Then, we asked for going to Çanakkale, they said ‘we can go next Sunday but not that Sunday because they had to work on that day’. I mean that a labourer in factory cannot even participate in a funeral when necessary. Also you cannot produce an idea in the band system of factory but shoemakers like me can create styles, it develops the brain. (Halil)⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Kendi işim gibi gibi yapıyodum ben, adam geliyo bişeyler söylüyo takmıyom ben söylüyo söylüyo en sonunda burana kadar geliyo başlarım senin işine diyom alıyom ceketini kaçıyom. Öyle bırakmışlığım çoktur, 3 4 yerden bıraktım öyle ben.

⁶⁰ Fabrika benim durumumdan çok farklı ya hem beceri olarak hem bilgi olarak hayat bakımından maddi olarak görseliği olarak fabrikadaki adam gider fabrikada en fazla ustabaşısıyla çalışan arkadaşınla, muhatap olur, e biz çok fazla kişiyle muhatap olursun patronunla mühendisiylen çok yerde bulunduğun için çok şeyle haşır neşir olman çok şey kapıyosun. Çiftçilik de zahmetli meslektir aslında. Bi bitkiyi bakmak bi bebek büyötmek gibi. Terzinin söküğü dikilir mesela pamuk ekimi yaptık bozuldu zaman gerekti. Fabrikada çalışan insanın hayatı çok dar. Bi fabrikada çalışan elli metre ötesini görebilir ben on sene ötesini görebilirim. Okuyanlar hep teorik adam şu olmuş bu olmuş hammallık yapıyo. En basitinden oturmaya gittik fabrikaya girmiş çalışmaya saat biz gece 2’ye 3’e kadar otururuz ama onlar sabah altıda servis kalkcak başladılar uyuklamaya dedik en iyisi biz kalkalım yavaş yavaş kaçalım başladı dedim senin gözler yaşarmaya. Arkadaşlarla dedik

He sees himself superior to his friend in some respects. First of all, he supposes himself more qualified than his wage labourer friend. He adopts farming and shoemaking while he degrades wage work in the factory in terms of realizing human capacity. For example, farming entails a skilled labour just like growing up a baby while shoemaking is a creative labour process the labourer can make up new models. On the other hand, wage labourer in the factory is just passively subjected to the band system rolling by him. Then he defines his friend's life as restricted in a way that he cannot even attend a funeral of his relatives because of his work. He feels himself more autonomous than his friend when he is planning to go a trip as he himself decide when to go by arranging his work while the leisure time of his friend is arranged by the work discipline of the factory. Also Yasin expresses a similar tendency about the subjection of workers to the discipline of the factory when he witnesses in his short-term experience in a factory:

Excuse me but sometimes employers can be bastards. In my previous job, a labourer, Memet, was warned because he went to WC... Sometimes, people have something to do outside. If I am not mistaken, his wife had a trouble which could be sorted out in half an hour. This is a real faithlessness; if you treat a labourer like that...⁶¹

So it can be said that images of wage labourers that peasants adopt overlap the experiences of their factory work or their relationships with wage labourers. All in all, although peasants are exploited by dominant classes either when they are farmers or they become wage labourer, they have autonomous desires lying under their subordination. Their negative attitudes towards wage labour, their avoidance from being a wage labourer, and their short-term wage labour experiences indicate their autonomous desires lying under their subordination. Thompson underlines a similar point to constitute quite a different view of rural society from the perspective of the

Çanakkale'ye gidelim, bu pazar değil de öbür pazar gidelim diyo. Bizim o hafta mesai olmuyo diyo o zaman gidelim diyo, bu yani adamların köyde cenazesi olsa gelemecek. Fabrikada bant sisteminde bi fikir üretemezsin ama bizim ayakkabı işinde model yaratırsın. Beyin gelişiyö.

⁶¹ İşverenlerde de yavaşaklık var çok affedersin bizim orda Memet abi diye bi arkadaş vardı adam lavaboya gitti diye uyarı almıştı yani bu.. Bi de bazı çarşıda bi işi oluyo orda gördüklerim benim valla hanımının bi sıkıntısı vardı herhalde yarım saatlik karta basmamış diye bu kadar da hainlik olmaz ya artık sen bi işçine öyle davranırsan...

subordinate classes in terms of eighteenth-century rural society in England. He states that:

Whatever this hegemony may have been, it did not envelop the lives of the poor and did not prevent them from defending their own modes of work and leisure, and forming their own rituals, their own satisfactions and view of life. Hegemony did not, in his view, constitute a rigid, automatic and all-determining structure of domination. It merely 'offered the bare architecture of a structure of relations of domination and subordination' within which 'many different scenes could be set and different dramas enacted' (Thompson, 1978: 163).

So it can be said that although the way of life, thoughts, and values as well as the conditions of farming are shaped under the hegemony of dominant classes, peasants do not absorb the hegemonic forms thoroughly. "There are always non-hegemonic or counter hegemonic values at work to resist, restrict and qualify the operations of hegemonic order" (Williams, 1977; 112-13). Thus, their inability in terms of adapting to hegemonic forms as well as the 'way' they integrate might reveal the subjectivity of their subordination.

It might be meaningful to mention about a different tendency towards wage labour as well. Ethem who works in the tomato sauce factory just in the entrance of the village is in favour of wage labour compared to farming. He compares and contrasts the two:

It is better to work in a factory, agriculture exhausts people fast. I mean, people grow old quickly. I go to the factory at 8 and exit 5 o'clock. Your responsibility is defined. Nobody annoys you or pushes you. He comes and tells me to do that work. I agree and he goes. I mean, it is comfortable. This factory is like a benefactor for our village. (If they provide people more employment opportunities, will more people come here?) No, will not. The capacity of this village is limited. Our people are not accustomed to factory work. How to say... I mean, people cannot stand to work. Our people are not used to working. We are looking for two employees now, but we cannot find them in this village. People do not apply for...I asked many young people to make them labourer in the factory, but some said they work as agricultural labourer and earned more money. Can't you not, you do not have

social insurance. Yes, you earn, but you do not have insurance. They cannot think about it. If old people thought about it, people in the village would be retired now. There is no retired person here. (Ethem)⁶²

The expressions of Ethem indicate to a different kind of mentality which prioritizes retirement and social insurance compared to other peasants. He also affirms the work and time discipline of the factory. He even defines the factory he works as a golden opportunity for the village. He is angry with other peasants for their avoidance of that opportunity. He accuses them of not being hardworking enough to work in the factory. On the other hand, it is indisputable that farming is a more labour-intensive process compared to wage labour in the factory, and actually that is why he himself states that farming is very tiresome. Thus, as it is stated above there must be other kinds of reasons or motivations under the avoidance attitude of the peasants. The question here is what the sources of the two different tendencies in terms of wage labour are. It might be understood from the expressions of Murat who is a close friend of Ethem: “they are landless, he even doesn’t know how to drive a tractor” As it is previously mentioned, traditional character of peasant labour basing on a master-apprentice relationship that maintains for generations is an important constituent of the character of peasant labour and peasants’ attitudes and values. Ethem is a landless peasant, which is an extraordinary position especially for Aegean peasants. So he is distant from the traditional ties binding him to farming and land and he develops a different attitude towards wage labour.

4.2 Hidden Injuries of Peasants

Hidden injuries of class refer to the class confrontations that people experience personally in their everyday life and live through class differences as particular men

⁶² Fabrikada çalışmak daha iyi, çiftçilik insanı çok çabuk yıpratıyor. Yani çabuk çöküyo insan. Ben fabrikaya 8’de gidiyorum 5’te çıkıyorum. Yaptığın iş belli. Sıkan yok, gelip hadi diyen yok. Adam geliyo bu iş olacak diyo, tamam diyom gidiyo başımdan. Yani rahat. Bizim köy için velinimet yani bu fabrika. (daha fazla iş imkanı açsalar gelen olur mu?) Olmaz, köyün kapasitesi belli. Alışkanlık yok, nasıl diyeyim. Katlanamıyorlar. Bizim milletimiz zaten çalışmaya alışkın değil. İki tane eleman arıyoruz şuanda köyden bulamıyoruz. Gelmiyo millet... İstiyom yani ben kaç tane gence sordum, gelin alayım, aldırayım, yok benim bağım var, yok ben yövmiyeye gidiyom daha fazla para alıyom. Yav kardeşim sigortan yok. Tamam alıyon da sigortan yok. İşte bunu düşünemiyorlar. Eskiler zaten düşünseymiş bunu şuanda herkes emekli olurmuş köyde. Bir tane doğru dürüst emekli yok bizim köyde.

and women. To the extent that “class is a factor that conditions the most intimate levels of their personal lives”, hidden injuries engage in “daily realities of inequality” (Howard & Wajeman, 1978). Unequal relations in the field of everyday life are experienced on the basis of the confrontations with the values of the dominant culture. Sennett uses the term in order to understand the American working class upon how they define themselves and how they feel when they experience class confrontations on the basis of ability as a source of legitimacy in terms of unequal relations and power as well as loss of dignity by tracing certain defenses that they develop as hidden in their everyday life. He deals with class together with certain values, feelings and personal experiences on the basis of cultural resources. In that part, peasants’ experience of unequal relations on the basis of class confrontations will be dealt. It is better to seek the hidden injuries of peasants in the realm of representations developed from outside and upside nested in hegemonic culture as it is previously mentioned that hierarchical (from bottom to top) constitution of social relations takes place in the context of “inside” and “outside” for peasants.

4.2.1 So who is the poor; who is the wealthy?

Peasants are able to make sense of their existence conditions by means of associating these conditions with the ones exterior to themselves. A hierarchical insight of the society in which they are positioned in a layer can be possible with their experience outside of their village and even their town. It can be said that hierarchical (from bottom to top) constitution of social relations takes place within the context of “inside” and “outside” for peasants. The ocularcentric character of social relations in the sense of being the subject and the object of the *look* (Erdoğan, 2007: 52) take the form of a relationship between the insider and the outsider. The ocularcentric character of social relations connote to a kind of relationship in which inferior-superior relationships can be constituted by means of the *look*. The features of the object of the *look* are turned to be the constituents of a hierarchical relationship by the subject of the *look*. In that sense, peasants become the object of the *look* when they leave the village while they are the subject of the *look* in the village. So long as they wander around the network sprawling from the village to the town, social

relations bear 'village character' no matter they are in the village, borough or town. Whenever they get out of this network, they begin to get a hierarchical insight of society. Contrary to town life, class difference does not reveal itself by appealing to the *look* in village life although it does not mean that there is no class difference among peasants. However, an outsider, or foreigner, cannot easily distinguish a wealthy peasant from the poor one. Wealth and poorness bear a less ocularcentric character in the village compared to town and it rather necessitates a kind of relationship inside the community. This horizontal character of social relations of the village can be thought in relation with the fact that class experience mostly do not happen in a naked form of poorness and wealth. On the other hand, it can be said that an insight of self as well as class requires more than knowledge of wealth and poorness such as some kind of feeling experienced with confrontations. So class experience of peasants should be thought together with peasant image and in a village where everyone is peasant, peasants cannot experience their image which opens the door to the experience of hierarchical social relations. İsmail talks about the character of social differences in the village:

Our lives are not much different from each other. There is no difference between rich and poor people. Both laboring and rich people may have I-phone 5. I mean, when you try, you cannot differentiate the rich ones easily. Their dressing style or life style is not different from the poor one's. In fact, there are not very rich people having luxuries here. The rich people who live here drink even their teas alone in a hidden part of a tea shop so that nobody can notice them and want to sit near them. You cannot talk to them in a society. Look, who is coming is rich. He does not sit here. He drinks tea lonely there. They wander *barefoot*, masquerade as poor by wearing ragged pants. The rich with *barefoot*... They masquerade as different. They complain more than you, because they think that if you know their wealth, you offer to barrow something. (İsmail)⁶³

⁶³ Bizim buradaki yaşamların çok farkı yok. Zenginle fakir arasında fark yok. Bi bakıyosun çalışanda da iphone 5 var, normal zenginde de i-phone 5 var. Geldiğin zaman şu çok zengin diyemezsin yani, ayıramazsın bizi. Giyim tarzında yaşam tarzında öyle bir fark yok. Yani bizim burada öyle zengin yok zaten. Yatları katları lüks otomobilleri olan insan yok yani. Buranın zenginleri tek başına alıyo çayını gidip ocağın arkasında tek başına içer. Yanına kimse gelmesin diye. Onların yanında toplumda öyle oturup çay içemezsin. Bak şimdi şu gelen zengin. Oturmaz şimdi buraya. Gidecek şimdi yalnız başına

It can be said that social differences hide behind the appearance, which diminishes the violence of class confrontations in the village and prevents the constitution of hierarchical social relations in the village to an extent. In that sense, appearance becomes a significant constituent of that horizontal character. So the horizontal insight of society is constituted due to the fact that the differences cannot be noticed by the *look*. Such a tendency towards the experience of the difference between the wealthy and the poor is shared by most of the peasants that are interviewed. Ahmet also thinks that the difference between the wealthy and the poor is vanishing:

In my opinion, (the differences between poor and rich people) are less recognizable rather than before. Well... It is the fact that the poor and rich people's lives are not different. I think so. They have similar lives. Even in relationships, now, being poor or rich is not matter. There are not poor people but middle class, I can say. There is no discrimination now; you can *see* the same clothes on rich kids and poor kids. Nobody wants their children to stay behind others. (Ahmet)⁶⁴

In that sense, 'seeing' similar clothes on all of the peasants supports peasants' insight of a horizontal society. Thus, appearance becomes a significant constituent of such kind of a comprehension. While appearance differentiates people from one another in the city life, that function of appearance becomes inoperative in the village life. Emre puts forward that there are differences in terms of property and then he adds that there is no difference in terms of way of life by giving reference to appearance. Then he underlines the different function of appearance in the village and the city by comparing the two:

(Is there any wealthy here?) Yes, of course. There are the people who have a factory or plow three thousand decars land. There are the people who have 15-20 decars land and

çay içecek. Yalınayak gezer, fakir *gösteriyo*, yırtık pantollarla *geziyo*. Yalınayak zengin. Farklı gösteriyorlar kendilerini. Zengin olduğunu anlarsın, ondan ödünç istersin diye senden fazla ağlaşıyo artık.”

⁶⁴ (zengin fakir arasındaki fark) bence kalkıyo gibi kimse kimseden aşağı kalmıyo. Ha şöyle bişey var valla zenginle fakirin arasındaki yaşantının hiçbir farkı yok. yok gibi görüyorum ben. Onun gibi o da yaşıyo. Gidiyolar yani. şimdi arkadaş durumları öyle yani zenginlen fakir şeyi olmuyo. Kalktı kalktı, aç *geziyo* onu alacak. Fakirlik değil de orta tabaka geldi desem yeri. Şimdi ayrımcılık kalktı zengin çocuğunda aynısını *görüyo sun*. Kimse istemez arkadaşlarının yanında geri kalsın.

work another job, as well. In terms of life style all people are the same in our village. I mean, nobody does such things. Now, people are wearing different things in Manisa. 'Different'... in the sense that there are clothes for different strata of society, it differentiates everyone. (Mustafa)⁶⁵

Also the expressions of Mustafa are in parallel with Emre in terms of the difference between the wealthy and the poor on the basis of appearance:

They wear what others wear. I mean, wealthy and poor people do not differ. There are no such things anymore. Maybe, they would have more money. It may be. You know, the people who have factory are wealthy. They have money and even land. I mean, they have everything. (Emre)⁶⁶

In that context, wealth is closely related with the way of life. For example, both the wealthy and the poor peasant work in their lands by using their labour power. They go the same coffeehouse and drink the same tea. Tosun points out this issue by talking about wealthy peasants in the village:

Erdođdu and Yılmaz Families, for example, are really wealthy. But, you can see their sons on the top of the tractor, or you can see them while they are fertilizing and sowing pesticides. They are not different from you, they are just wealthy. That is to say, they have money. (Tosun)⁶⁷

Also Murat emphasizes the lack of difference between the wealthy and the poor in terms of way of life in the village:

No, there are no such things... The richest person is the poorest person in this village. Now, the person who works for

⁶⁵ (köyde zengin var mı) var tabi, fabrikası olan 3 bin dönüm yer işleyen de var, 15-20 dönüm yeri olup dışarıda çalışan da var. Yaşam olarak bizim köyde herkes aynı, bizim köyde öyle şey olmaz. Kimse de yapmaz yani. (Manisa'da) şimdi insanların üzerine giydiği şeyler artık değişik. Değişik derken yani her kesime göre kıyafet var, herkesi ayırıyor.

⁶⁶ Onun giydiğini o da giyiyor. Valla zenginler fakirin arasında hiçbir fark yok. Yok yani kalktı. Ha belki onun cebindeki para fazladır. O var. fabrikacılar zengin onlar yani. parası da var toprağı da var her şeyi var yani.

⁶⁷ Erdođdular, Yılmazlar mesela aşırı zengin ama şimdi git oğulları traktör tepesindedir, tarlada gübre atıyorlardır, zehir atıyorlardır; onların senden bi farkı yok yani sadece zenginler paraları var yani.

800 TL has the same life with the person who has one thousand decares land. (Murat)⁶⁸

He also compares and contrasts the difference between the wealthy of the city and of the village. This time “way of life” comes to the foreground in terms of using their labour power:

There are many differences between the wealthy of city and the wealthy here. My schoolfellows take people off Mecca to pilgrimage, I cannot count their cars. He just talks on the phone! I go into the mud for a long time; my heart may stop until I start the water engine up.. Well, it is my machine but he earns money by using people. I produce, grow up, and look after my crops myself. (Murat)⁶⁹

The fact that both the wealthy and the poor peasant use their labour power in their lands is a significant element which equalizes the relationship between the two. The difference in the use of labour between the wealthy of the city and the wealthy of the village plays an important role in the constitution of an antagonistic relationship between peasants and the wealthy of the city rather than among the wealthy peasants in the village. A similar comparison between the wealthy of the city and himself is made by Mustafa in terms of appearance. He states that “both the wealthy and the poor man wear trousers... they are just pretentious!” Although the trousers of the wealthy and the poor are the same as a piece of cloth, what makes the trousers of the wealthy different is his show-off which connotes to a different way of life compared to the life in the village. Also the expressions of Ibrahim indicate a different kind of culture in terms of the way of life in the village:

There is not much difference in terms of life style in this village. All people live in the same degree; there are not many differences between rich and poor people. All people live by *looking* at each other not to attract attention with their

⁶⁸ Yok kalmadı... En zengini en fakiri bu köyün. şimdi 800 milyona çalışanla 1000 dönüm yeri olan aynı hayatı yaşıyo.

⁶⁹ Şehrin zenginiyle buranın zengini arasında çok fark var. Benim okul arkadaşlarım hacca götürüp getiriyolar, arabalarının sayısını bilmiyom. Adam sadece telefonla konuşuyo ya bu işi yapıyo. Ben çamurun içine giriyom on saat bi su motorunu aldıcam diye kalbim durcak e bu benim malım o insanın üzerinden para kazaniyo. Kendim ürettiyom büyütüyom bakıyom.

money. The poor goes to the city to wander, and so does the rich. While the inferior one goes to Kemeraltı, the other goes to Alsancak. (İbrahim)⁷⁰

It can be said that showing the wealth is not a preferable and approvable thing in the village as Muhittin previously points out the same issue by calling the wealthy as “*the wealthy with barefoot*”. He underlines a difference in terms of the ways of life of wealthy and poor peasants by stating that the first one goes to Kemeraltı where cheap products, especially clothes, are sold while the second one goes to Alsancak which is a more touristic place and more expensive products are sold in. What is significant here is that the experience of the difference between the wealthy and the poor peasant in terms of way of life takes place out of the village. On the other hand, he states that people live by “*looking at each other*” in the village and that is why there is not much difference in appearance or in the way of life. The difference between “*looking at each other*” in the village and “*looking at each other*” in the city lies in the fact that the second one constitutes the experience of hierarchical social relations on the basis of appearance while the first one results in the constitution of horizontal relations via peasants’ arranging their way of life or appearance according to the others or to the ‘*average*’. It might be thought that increasing facilities in terms of the availability of consumption goods since 1980’s might contribute to the experience of such horizontal relations by providing the circumstances that enable both the wealth and the poor to have I-phone 5 as Muhittin states so. Boratav underlines a similar point in terms of the ‘restriction of pretentious manners’ in villages on the basis of increasing availability of consumption goods by capitalizing on the studies conducted by Nükhet Sirman and Mehmet C. Ecevit (Boratav, 2005: 140).

It can be also said that such horizontal relations in the village is closely related with peasants’ sense of ‘community’. The notion of community cannot be immediately assigned a single determinate value based on a determinate social institution

⁷⁰ Köy içinde çok büyük farklılık yok yaşantı olarak herkes aynı şeyde yaşıyo en zenginle en fakir arasında pek bi fark yok herkes *birbirine bakarak* yaşadığı için *göze* batmamak açısından bizim paramız var diye. Zengini de şehre gidiyo gezip tozmak için fakiri de, aşağıdaki, Kemeraltı’na giderken öbürü Alsancak’a gidiyo.

(Chatterjee, 2000: 14). It can be said that the sense of community in the village that not only bases on common interests but also mutual bonds of kinship aggravates the constitution of antagonistic relationships at micro level in the village. However, it does not refer to, with Chatterjee's words, "a populist idealization of the peasantry as an egalitarian and harmonious community, free from internal dissension and struggle" (Chatterjee, 2000: 17). Village community bearing limited class confrontations triggers a *sense* of 'shelter' for peasants. Subjective experiences of peasants on the basis of class confrontations by which they experience hierarchical social relations outside the village lead peasants not to feel as a part of the 'larger society'. So felt disintegrated, they push themselves to their village. Village community or community relations in the village, provides the feeling of being a part of the society via making sense of their positions. Being integrated into community (at micro level) is a way of being integrated into society (at macro level).

4.2.2 Subordinated 'Skins'

First of all, it can be said that the image of peasant is something that is printed on body just like poverty⁷¹. So the representations developed from "outside" and "upside" are printed on the body of peasants. It is such subordination that economic differences become trivial. These representations are experienced by peasants outside from their village or community and expose them to the hierarchical social relations. Murat, a middle-aged peasant in Hamzabeyli tells his experience in Didim and it is quite striking for how peasants experience the representations imprinted on their body:

They did not let us enter into Medusa in Didim. We, as two friends, went there. We have money and maybe we would purchase Medusa, who knows? It is entertainment center and they do not let enter without women as far as we heard and experienced before. So we even arranged women in order to get inside. In front of Medusa there was a large field. We were standing in front of the door, 3 young people came with

⁷¹ For a detailed analysis about the relationship between body of the poor and poverty on the basis of the constitution of domination, see Necmi Erdoğan (ed.), (2002) *Yoksulluk Halleri*, İstanbul: İletişim, pp. 61-65

women friends. I thought that it was time to enter. We were getting inside one by one, so we lined up. I was third and I think Doğan was behind me. There were an urban boy and a woman between us. Damn we did so, the first entered, the second entered and when I entered I was pulled back. Two people behind me entered but Doğan was pulled back like me. I said what is happening, we have even women friends. The people who entered turned and said we were together with them. However, the bodyguard ignored them and told them to go to inside. They told us we could not enter. We asked why? They said no again. We lost because of our appearance. They must not have realized that we had already arranged other people to get inside together with them. In fact, you can understand easily who is urban or peasant there. We are peasants, sure we are dark skinned... innocent peasants... (Murat)⁷²

To the extent that peasantry which is loaded with certain images is imprinted on body, it becomes an ocularcentric phenomenon which opens the door of the experience of hierarchical social relations. As it is underlined before Murat's experience of hierarchical social relations take place within the context of 'inside' and 'outside'. Images imprinted on his body such as non-urban, inferior, vulgar that connote to the fact that he is not appropriate for 'this place' and he does not belong to 'this place' makes him an outsider. So he is not accepted to the night club. Murat and his friend's attempt to be invisible and undistinguishable as a peasant by means of arranging two civic men between the two are shot down by the bodyguard on the door. So being visible and distinguishable becomes a source of injury for them by

⁷² Bizi şeye sokmadılar Medusa'ya sokmadılar. Didim'de. İki arkadaş çıktık gittik para desen belki Medusa'yı satın alcaz, paramız var. Damsızlığı bırak onu da bulduk bayan da var yanımızda. Şimdi onun önü böyle bir iki dönüm boş arazi daha önceden başımıza geldiğinden olayı biliyoz duyduğumuza göre de oraya bayansız girilmiyo eğlence merkezi. Kapının önünde duruyoz şimdi 3 tane genç geldi yanında bayanlarda var ya dedim girelim bayanlarla beraber tam denk geldi, hepimizi de böyle sırayla alıyo, hepimiz böyle sırayla dizildik. Ben üçüncü sırada mıydım ne yalan söyliyim Doğan bi geride. Aramızda bi şehirli çocuk var, bi bayan var, şey yaptık anasını satayım biri girdi ikincisi girdi tam ben girdim beni çekti kıyıya; arkamdaki girdi, doğan geldi doğanı çekti kıyıya... İkimizi... Noluyoz dedim bayan da var, çocuklar döndü abi dedi onlar bizle, siz geçin içeri diyo. Bizi çekti kıyıya siz dedi giremezsiniz, neden, giremezsiniz. Soruyoz sebep, giremezsiniz, tipten kaybetmiştik. Ya görme imkânı hiç yok, gerçi şehirli çocuğuyan bizim köylü çocuğu o durumda hemen karpuz gibi belli oluyo... Köy çocuğuyuz yanık tenliyiz tabi... Masum köylüler...

means of bodyguard's eye distinguishing their body on which certain images imprinted.

Peasants experience peasant image which is imprinted on body in different ways. Mustafa tells a similar experience as well:

We went to Istanbul for visiting our soldier friends. We were about 15 people. They asked if we were soldier. We said "no" for sure! They said how they should know if we were soldiers or not because our skin is sunburned. Oh sure, we are sunburned because we are farmers! (Mustafa)⁷³

Just like Murat's experience in a nightclub in Didim, Mustafa and his peasant friends are distinguished among a series of men as an appropriate appearance for being "soldier". Mustafa is annoyed of being supposed as a soldier because "being a soldier" connotes to an extraordinary case in which young men become subordinate being under the command of somebody else, and they become an outsider in the place they go for a limited time period. His natural appearance is judged as abnormal in that sense because he is not a soldier. Moreover, just like Murat and his friend they are distinguished among other people, and being visible and distinguishable becomes a source of injury for them as well. Thus, once again class experience of peasantry takes place within the realm of ocularcentric hierarchical social relations in the context of coming from 'outside' or belonging to 'inside'.

İsmet tells about his experience which is another example of ocularcentric hierarchical social relations focusing on peasant body in the context of coming from 'outside' or belonging to 'inside':

We went to Istanbul where I did not know anybody. My uncle's wife showed us around, there was a mosque which was called Sultan Ahmet, I think. They were feeding doves while I was trying to catch them. They told me not to do because it was a shame but I was too little to know. My aim was taking one of them to my village. While I was playing, my eye was injured because of dove's wing and then my

⁷³ İstanbul'a gittik asker ziyaretinde siz mi asker siniz diyo, 15 kişi falan varız ama yok dedik ya! Ne bileyim böyle yanmışınız falan dedi, çiftçilik yapıyoruz ondan yandık bea!"

uncle's wife took me hospital. We left my mother and aunt behind, near the mosque. My uncle's wife told them not to move anywhere or they would be lost. While my mother and my aunt and her little girl were sitting near the mosque, people supposed them beggars and gave money. You know, other beggars said 'here is ours' and then my aunt and others fled from there and sat in somewhere like coffee shop. My aunt phoned us and told what happened. Oh, she was really hurt... (İsmet)⁷⁴

Another dimension of body in terms of peasants' class injuries is a physical intervention to peasant body. Class confrontations taking place within the realm of the body of the subordinated can take the form of a physical violence against his body. Halil tells the experience of an immigrant peasant:

While you were coming, you must see the farm of Jewish man who bought an air-conditioner for his dog's house but not for laborer's cottage. Sorry but don't you bother such a boss like that? The labourer even asked for an air conditioner for his cottage. When he also asked for planting corns like other peasants, the boss made him run around the field 15 times as a punishment (Halil)⁷⁵

Peasants in the village are highly annoyed by witnessing the destruction of a peasant's self-respect and by the fact that he is not worthy as much as an animal. It seems parallel to Erdoğan's point about the fact that the poor defines the value granted to them by the wealthy with animal images (Erdoğan, 2002: 64). It can also be said that symbolic violence of the dominant on the subordinated take the form of a

⁷⁴ İstanbul'a gittik hiç kimseyi tanıımıyom yenge bizi gezdirdi cami varmış Sultan Ahmet mi ne. Onlar yem atıyo ben güvercin yakalamaya çalışıyom oğlum yapma ayıp diyo daha küçüğüz alcım bi tane köye götürcem. benim güvercin kanadından çöp girdi gözüme yengem bindirdi taksiye annemleri bıraktık caminin yanında annemle tezyem oturmuş caminin yanında teyzemin de kızı vardı küçük dilenci sanmışlar bunları teyzem dedi kıpırdamayın kaybolursunuz biz tekrar buraya gelcez falan teyzemi dilenci sanmışlar teyzemin yanında çocuk da var adamın biri para atmış teyzeme falan öbür dilenciler burası bizim mekan falan. Teyzemler sonra kaçmış ordan kafe gibi biyere oturmuşlar teyzem bizi arıyo dilenci sandılar bizi diyo. Gücüne gitmiş kadının ya...

⁷⁵ Gelirken görmüşündür Yahudi çiftlik almıştı adam şey yapmış köpeğinin kulübesine klima var kendi çalışanın kaldığı yerde klima yok. Şimdi sen böyle patronun af edersin çıkmaz mısın tepesine. Hatta demiş ya abi köpeğin kulübesine koymuşsun klima bizim eve de koysan. Bi de şoförü (bir tür tarım işçiliği) demiş ki bizde bu köylüler gibi yapalım mısırı ona ceza olarak şu beş dönüm arazinin etrafında on beş tur attırmiş.

physical violence (by making him run over the field) when being a foreigner in the village is added to class injuries of the peasant.

4.2.3 *To speak or not to speak?*

Another dimension of the injuries peasants have is language which can be thought as a part of body. Language might be a means by which unequal and hierarchical relations are experienced by the subordinated as subjective experiences of *inferior* representations on the basis of class confrontations. When Rıdvan takes his mother to hospital, he exposed to a symbolic violence of medical language of the doctor. He says that:

I asked the doctor what her illness is. He said something, you know, we are peasants. Last year my mother got sick and I took her to hospital; they checked up but did not say anything about. How they name stomachache, something like “gastrology”, whatever shit it is! She had an ache in her stomach, I do not know its name, in fact I did not understand what the doctor said, he said bla bla and gone. I asked what.. what’s matter? He did the same... hey man where are you living? Are you Turkish, Kurdish or Armenian? Who are you? Can’t you name it in Turkish? I said ‘look, I do not understand’. I told him ‘supposed that you know Kurdish and I know Turkish, when I tell you something in Turkish, will you understand it?’ Then we argued. People should be fair. You are working for me, well; I am working for you as well. We should reach a compromise. (Rıdvan)⁷⁶

Richard Sennett says that a badge of ability seems the perfect tool to legitimize power. The ability of the doctor to speak in medical terms connoting the knowledge that the doctor has while the peasant needs is a source of subordination. He cannot get what he needs besides being scolded and degraded. Language of the doctor

⁷⁶ E dedim doktor bey dedim rahatsızlığı bişey söyledi şimdi ama biz şimdi köylü takımımız geçen sene annem biraz rahatsızlandı, götürdüm devlet hastanesine, bakıldı çıktı, daha hiç bişey söylemiyo, valla şimdi o gün için gaza ne diyolar onların dilinde, gastroloji mi öyle bi bok. Gaz varmış midesinde ben adını bilmiyom şimdi, bi de anlamadım da yani bıdı bıdı bıdı yaptı defoldu gitti. Ne dedim yani sorun ne? e gene aynı şekil... Yav kardeşim sen nerde yaşıyon Türk müsün Kürt müsün Ermeni misin nesin sen, bunun bi Türkçesi yok mu? Dedim ben anlamıyom bak. Dedi ben izah etmek zorunda mıyım?. ben senin dilinden anlamak zorunda değilim ki. Ben şimdi Türkçe biliyom sen Kürtçe. Anlatayım sen bana ne dicen. Bunu söyleyince doktorla kötü olduk. İnsanda vicdan olacak. Sen benim için ordasın. E tamam ben de senin için de bi ortak yol bulmak lazım.

makes him feel inadequate being in need of the doctor and worthless who do not deserve what he demand, an explanation he can understand. In the beginning he is angry with the doctor but then he hesitates by doing so because it can be said that cultural capital is a source of dignity for them. “He accepts as legitimate what he believes is undignified in itself, and in accepting the power of educated people he feels more inadequate, vulnerable, and undignified” (Sennet & Cobb, 1977: 78). Validating the self through distinctive personal merit is not a matter of spontaneous desire (Sennett, 1977: 153) which entails to discuss hegemonic culture. In that sense, Yasin is both angry and ambivalent about his right to be angry (Sennet & Cobb, 1977: 79).

As an important feature of the language of peasants’ defense against class injuries it can be said that they might borrow from the language of the powerful or the wealthy while they can apply to the language of village life example of which is given below. Murat who is not accepted to the night club in Didim states that he has money if they ask for (maybe we could purchase Medusa, we have money) at the beginning of the conversation before he reveals his injuries. He applies to money as if he were a wealthy peasant although he is not because he knows that money is the power. He says that:

In fact, you can understand easily who the urbanite is and who the peasant is. We are peasants; sure, we are dark skinned... ‘Innocent peasants’... If I provoked Doğan, he would buy everything there. But he said barkeepers most probably have gone, if they were there, we would do. (Murat)⁷⁷

So he borrows the language of the wealthy to diminish the violence of his injuries by saying that he has money maybe enough to purchase the night club. However, the language he borrows from the wealthy seems foreign to himself, his own language, to the extent that what he borrows does not belong to him. On the other hand,

⁷⁷ Gerçi şehirli çocuğuyulan bizim köylü çocuğu o durumda hemen karpuz gibi belli oluyo. Köy çocuğuyuz yanık tenliyiz tabi.. masum köylüler.. Doğan’ı biraz gaza getirsem ordaki şeyi satın alabilir ama orda barmenler yok olmuştur artık orda olsa satın alırız dedi şey.

Muhittin who changes his appearance via piercing, shorts, t-shirts, flip flop and tattoo and can be accepted to the night club borrows another kind of discourse that belong to dominant ideology:

Our village is such underdeveloped that... But of course not all of them... There are progressive people as well. People who come from Manisa engage in agriculture here, they find such things normal. Let people do what they want. They can have goatee, wear earrings if they want, it's none of your business! (Muhittin)⁷⁸

The point here is not to decide whether village life is backward or not but the tendency of Muhittin to degrade his fellow peasants in the village who look like himself. So he applies a discourse which cannot belong to his own language but must be borrowed from dominant ideology that humiliate himself by producing representations about peasants from “above” and “outside” such as “backward” and ‘innocent peasants’ by humiliating peasants and himself. However, no matter how much they talk in a ‘borrowed discourse’ it does not mean that they are totally absorbed by dominant ideology (Erdoğan, 2007: 84 quoted from Bourdieu, 1984: 461). To the extent that the language they borrow does not suit to their mouth, they are not totally absorbed by dominant ideology. In that sense, they still bear the possibility to challenge what they borrow. Thus, it can be said that besides the fact that peasants are integrated into the hegemonic language, “the cultural apparatus of signs and meanings - the language, in the broadest sense - available to a peasant consciousness, far from being narrow and inflexible, is capable of a vast range of transformations to enable it to understand, and to act within, varying contexts, both of subordination and of resistance” (Chatterjee, 2000: 15) at the same time.

4.2.4 Holding Injuries under Wraps

It can be said that there is a tendency of peasants to hide their class injuries as a defense to diminish the violence of the effect of injuries. Erdoğan underlines the same tendency in terms of urban poor as well. Such an attempt of hiding can take

⁷⁸ Bizim köy o kadar geri ki ha tabi hepsi bir değil var köyde ileri giden adamlar da var. Manisa'dan geliyo adam burda çiftçilik yapıyo o adamlar her şeyi normal karşılıyo normal.. ya bırak insanları istediği gibi ister top sakal yapar ister küpe takar, sana ne ya!

place in various ways. For example, trivializing the social status which means the violence of cultural capital on peasants just like the doctor experience of Murat is a way of hiding injuries. A similar tendency can be seen in Ahmet's attitude towards the agricultural engineer who is responsible from his village. He calls him "imbecile" who had education in vain for years. He states that he does not know anything about agriculture because his knowledge is just theoretical but the real one is the practical experience. So he says that 'he speaks, speaks, and goes... but I do the thing I want'. It can be said that it is almost impossible for an agricultural engineer not to understand about agriculture. However, what is specific is that he is degraded by means of trivializing engineer's professional knowledge and cultural capital because of his pedant and boastful manners wounding some of the peasants.

A similar tendency can be seen in terms of trivialization of the value of wealth. Tekin tells about the splendor of wealth he witnessed when he had been in İstanbul:

I was in Istanbul one week ago. We wandered and joined Bosphorus tour. After the weather got dark, there was a wedding at Cırağan Palace; our guide said that that palace has made of 30 tons gold. In Cırağan Palace, there was a woman, almost 100 meters between us. That woman wore such clothes that... In fact the woman was worth to see, she looked like a million. She was exactly socialite. We watched them from afar. Also we learnt that royal rooms worth €40.000, it is almost 90 Billion Turkish Liras, the guide said. Well, the only place that you can see them in is E-5 highway, their car glasses are filmed so that nobody can see who is in it. But I have a pickup, 13 people fit into it. I challenged Istanbul traffic; I have a few people sit baggage because all people did not fit inside of the pickup. They have glasses that look like tractor lights and weathercocks in their hands, sure, how the people of Istanbul can know us, they just consider us as mad... Manisa... It was really nice, I mean, you should just live, fuck the wealth! (Tekin)⁷⁹

⁷⁹ Ben bir hafta önce İstanbul'daydım düğüne gittik gezdik baya boğaz turu oldu hava da karardı Cırağan sarayında düğün vardı mikrofonda rehber konuşuyo işte diyo burası bilmem kaçınıc Mecidi'nde yapılmış 30 ton Osmanlı altınla yapılmış. Cırağan sarayında bi kadın var tabi düğün ya aşağı yukarı aramız yüz metre abi kadın öyle bi kıyafet giymiş ki kadın da kadın ha bi gör abi gelin mi gelin sülün mü sülün. Tam sosyete onları karşıdan böyle izledik hatta kraliyet dairesi kırk bin euro muş. Yani doksan milyara tekabül ediyo onu söyledi rehber. İşte öyle öyle onlarla artık sosyeteyle artık aynı sokaktan caddeden geçersin E-5' ten, onun arabanın camı filmlidir yani göremesin içinde kim olduğunu ben gittiğimde böyle pikapla gidiyom 13 kişi sığar yani İstanbul trafğine meydan

It can be seen, at the beginning of his talk, a kind of emulation for the lives of wealthy people. The act of watching across the sea that separates the wealthy and them, and the distance between the two connotes to a symbolic distance between two classes. Again experience of hierarchical relations takes place in the realm of “outside” and “inside”. Peasants and other people in the ship know that they can never get inside the Çırağan Palace and they can only look from a distance. Such a *look* reproduces the hierarchical relationships based on ocularcentricity. On the other hand, Tekin begins to tell his adventure in İstanbul, and what is specific here is that he narrates his experience, uses a narration, in a kind reminding *Yeşilçam* films. He romanticizes his experience and makes it more valuable with an amusing and lively narration while the distant wealth of Çırağan becomes trivialized.

Also the language of peasants which is specific to them has a role in hiding injuries by means of trivializing the source of injury. Such kind of a role can be seen in Tosun’s experience in a store in Çeşme:

We went to a store, I really liked a couple of slipper; I did not see even its price. I attended to buy it. It was a really big store. Salesman said that t-shirt is 20 TL and slippers are 80. I surprised and said ‘Are you crazy, my brother, do you think that I am purchasing land from Horozköy?’ He said ‘here is a store of high-society, so if you can’ I asked him for discount, I really liked those slippers, but he refused. He said if you want to bargain, you should go to bazaar. I did not buy anything (Tosun)⁸⁰

It can be said that many people act according to the place where they are. For example, many people do not say something about the high prices in an expensive

okudum arabanın içi almadığı için kasaya attım arka tarafa. Traktör farı gibi gözlükler ellerinde rüzgar gülleri var ya dönüyo ellerinde onlardan va e tabi İstanbul insanı nerden görcek 45 gelmiş buraya deliler gelmiş.. Manisa... Çok güzeldi yani hayatı kendi çapında yaşamaya bakcan yemişim zenginliği!

⁸⁰ Gittik işte baktım çok hoşuma gitti bi tane fiyatına miyatına bakmadık aldık terliği güzel böyle büyük bi mağaza tişört 20 milyon dayı demez mi terliklere 80 milyon dedim sen kafayı mı yedin be Horozköy’den arsa mı satın alıyom abim dedim, bura sosyetik mekan dedi istersen. Adama diyom hadi bi indirim yap alcem çok hoşuma gitti terlikler ama olmaz abim diyo burası pazar mı diyo pazarlık yapcaz diyo bıraktım tişörtü mişörtü almadım.

shop and do not try to make a bargain. Even a kind of bashfulness dominates the self of the poor while looking around the shop. Tosun's objection to the high prize with reference to the language belonging to village life 'Are you crazy, my brother, do you think that I am purchasing land from Horozköy?' and trying to bargain is a kind of challenge to the image of shop as well as the codes organizing the manners of customers according to that image which constitute the injury in that case. By doing so, he challenges the customer image and forces the shopkeeper to speak in his own language as a defense against the injury.

Another means of peasants' hiding injuries as a defense is imagination. As it is previously mentioned, body through which they experience hierarchical social relations becomes the realm of subordination as it is seen in the experiences of Murat who is not accepted to the night club because of his appearance, Mustafa who is supposed a soldier and Muhittin who changes his appearance in order to enter into the night club. It can be said that symbolic violence on their bodies turns to physical violence such as 'throwing a punch' (yumruk çekme) against the superordinate and 'shoving down the dominant's throat' (ümük sıkma) in imaginary level. Ahmet tells about his experience while working in a restaurant in Manisa:

Some people, nouveau-rich, come here and command me to bring *raki* by saying 'waiter, look here!' or something like that. Annoying treatments... Silly man! All right, you are rich but it does not mean that you can ignore my dignity. I punch you and you clear off. I do not like such people (Ahmet)⁸¹

A similar reaction comes from Tekin about the experience of a migrant peasant in the farm just in the entrance of the village:

⁸¹ Kimi geliyo öküz sonradan görmüş rakı getirin bana getiriyon, baksana garson, bi bakar mısınız var. böyle hareketler falan... Köpek senin paran varsa benim de orda itibarım var. Çekerim sana bi yumruk alırsın ceketini gidersin. Hani öyle insanları sevmiyom.

Now don't you kill such a boss? You must see the Arab, he can strangle three Jewish as bulky as me. You know, bosses may be really bastard! (Tekin)⁸²

Neither Ahmet throws a punch to the nouveau-rich nor does the migrant peasant shove down his boss' throat in reality. However, they try to recover their ruined self-respect by means of their imagination. Thus, imaginations of peasants help peasants hide their injuries as a source of defense against those injuries, which shows once again class experience is a matter of personal experience.

Peasants also appeal to emulate the attributes of the superordinate in order to hide their injuries. As Arnold states that "Peasants participated in their own subordination by subscribing to hegemonic values, by accepting, admiring, and even seeking to emulate many of the attributes of the superordinate classes" (Arnold, 2000: 29). It is previously said that beneath the class injuries lies the sense of self-respect and its being ruined as a result of class confrontations. Especially the ones experienced in emotional relations leading to the break of self-respect, in a sense, 'emotional injuries' (gönül yaraları) is very significant in order to understand the extent of the violence of injuries. Tosun, a young peasant, emulates the attributes of a wealthy boy to hide his injuries he experiences in the emotional relationship with his girl friend from the city:

For example rich people are educated; they are wandering with girls and living well. We are not like them, you find a girl's phone number and chat with her and then she asks what is your business, your answer is farmer. Girls say "I will be educated, so break up with you". Okay, no matter you can but how to tell that if a girl marries, she cannot go any school. When she gets married, she must work in farm. When you confess you are farmer, everything changes even her way of talking... Girls think that people say "you found a farmer although you are educated". I have a lot of friends who has talked with 3 girls at the same time. I said "man, how can you manage 3 people at the same time?" He said 'one for each day'. You know, snob man, girls never see it. When I meet a

⁸² Şimdi sen böyle patronun af edersin çıkmaz mısın tepesine. Arap'ı da görçen benim gibi üç tane sıkır Yahudi'nin boğazını atar böyle ümüğünü sıkır. Patronların da çok yavaşlığı var!

girl, I have to lie to her; they ask you whether you go to school. I say 'yes' and then they ask 'which school?' I say here or there. They want to come to my school, how can you accept, you are not attending a school, it hurts you (Tosun)⁸³

He knows that he would be injured when he says that he is a peasant. So he tells lie and emulates the attributes of a wealthy boy living in the city to cope with this injury. However, he is annoyed of telling lie to the girl he loves. He has to speak like a boy living in the city and attending the school, he behaves according to that character and he acts as someone else. Actually Tosun emulates his friend he annoyed in his school years who is a wealthy child having the ability to conduct three girl at the same time. So he feels uncomfortable about emulating a boy he does not approve. He has to live a 'double life' and he is injured once again by means of this division as a result of telling a lie while escaping from the injury that would occur when he does not tell a lie. So he becomes problematic with his self-respect while trying to earn the respect of his lover. Class injury and 'heart injury'⁸⁴ (*gönül yarası*) interlace with each other which indicates the fact that 'class is a factor that conditions the most intimate levels of their personal lives' (Howard & Wajeman, 1978).

The experience Muhittin who changes his appearance from bottom to top when he is going to holiday in Didim where Murat is not let into the same night club, is another kind of emulating the attributes of the superordinate:

Hey, I just have mustache but not earrings or, you know, not tattoos on my arm... For example, nobody can wear something which is put in between your toes. Well, people can wear sandals in Çobanisa as well as short by showing

⁸³ Mesela zengin insanlar nasıl insanlar, zengin insan okumuş insan kızlarla oraya gidiyo buraya gidiyo hayatını yaşıyo. Bizim durumumuz öyle değil kızın numarasını buluyon, konuşuyon konuşuyon, e kız sen nariyon diyo çiftçilik. ya kız diyo işte ben okucam ayrılcam diyo e tamam sen oku biz bişey mi diyo. Diyemiyosun ki bizim köy yerinde evlendi mi okul mokul göndermez yani adam. Evlendi mi çiftliğe. Çiftçilik yapıyom diyince her şeyi deęişıyo konuşmaları bile deęişıyo. Okudun okudun aman bi çiftçi mi buldun dicker herkes onu düşünüyö. Benim çok arkadaşım var okulda 3 tane kızla aynı anda konuştuğunu biliyom. Diyom oğlum içinü nasıl aynı anda e diyo bi gün onla bi gün onla.. Zengin bebese kızlar da bunu anlayamıyo yani. Ben gidiyom bi kızla tanışiyom e yalan söylemek zorunda kalıyom. Okuyon mu diyo okuyom diyom nerde okuyon diyo burda diyom e okuluna gelmek istiyom diyo nasıl getircen okumuyon ki, insanın zoruna gidiyo.

⁸⁴ As an analogy substituted for *heartbreak*.

their tattoos on arms and earrings, nobody criticizes you. Our village is such underdeveloped that... Of course, not all of them, there are progressive as well. People who come from Manisa engage in agriculture here, they find such things normal. I wear that length short; people ask why I wear it... For example, when I go to Didim, Medusa Bar, with a woman I arranged, I have goatee, piercing on my ear. I went like this almost 50 times. We cannot do it here but if we go there, we can. Before I went there, I made my beard goatee, wore my piercing on my ear, did tattoo on my arm, wore short, you know, so that I could satisfy a desire... Let people do what they want. They can have goatee, wear earrings if they want, who cares? (Muhittin)⁸⁵

The experiences of Murat and Muhittin should be evaluated together because they are the different parts of the same problematic. Muhittin knows about the experience of his friend, Murat, and he prefers to change his appearance from bottom to top to get rid of the image reflecting his peasantry, folksiness, foreignness and 'inferiority' imprinted on his body. To the extent that he reflects the images such as being modern and civic, he had the chance to be accepted to the 'inside'. Hierarchical social relations experienced through 'ocularcentricity' on the basis of peasants' body can be said to result in class injuries directly by putting him aside/outside as in the experience of Murat. Murat did not change his image imprinted on his body and experienced a harsh confrontation reminding him that he is not appropriate for this place. On the other hand, Muhittin changed his image by changing his body. What is significant here is that he really emulates the hegemonic attributes that imposed on him in order to be accepted to city life. So he squeezed in between the judgments of his fellow peasants in the village about the image he masquerades such as womanish, snob, etc. and not being accepted to the night club just like Murat. So the experience

⁸⁵ Yav kardeşim bıyık bıraktım alt tarafı ya küpe takmadım, dövme yapmadım koluma yani.. Mesela bizim burda ayağının arasına giren şeyden giyemezsin. Yani bak şimdi ama Çobanisa'da (kasaba) sandaleti giyersin, şortunu da giyersin dövmele açık kolunda küpeler kulağında kimse sana senin küpen var adam mısın sen demez. Bizim köy o kadar geri ki ha tabi hepsi bir değil var köyde ileri giden adamlar da var. Manisa'dan geliyo adam burda çiftçilik yapıyo o adamlar herşeyi normal karşılıyo normal.. ben bu kadar şort giyiyom ya bu kadar.. bu ne diyo bana.. ben mesela Didim'e gidiyom Medusa bara gidiyom mesela şey de (kadın) bulduk gittik. Top sakal burda, askılı şey, kulağında piercing gittim yani bi de elli kere gittim yani. ha burda yapamazsın giderken yaptım. Giderkene sakallarımı kestim top sakal bıraktım, piercing aldım taktım kulağıma, koluma dövme yaptırdım altına şort giydim hani hevesimi alayım diye yani.. ya bırak insanları istediği gibi ister top sakal yapar ister küpe takar, sana ne ya...

of trying to be accepted to city life via the emulation of the attributes of the superordinate without being excluded from the village life takes place on the basis of the dichotomy of ‘appearance’ and ‘essence’ in a sense. So masquerade or acting as if somebody is something going beyond a modern-traditional confrontation while class confrontations become the confrontations of images. He tries to make room for himself in the city life by emulating hegemonic attributes and get ‘inside’ via images. What is specific for the experience of Muhittin is that to the extent that he speaks with hegemonic language (Our village is such underdeveloped that ... Let people do what they want. They can have goatee, wear earrings if they want, it’s none of your business!), he accepts the codes of hegemonic language that prioritize appearance. In that sense, masquerade or mimic turns to be realized as desire. So he becomes integrated into the hegemonic discourse that assumes him as unacceptable and inferior.

Various kinds of class injuries indicating a class-vector as a common denominator are experienced by peasants with different reflexes and different forms. What is specific for class analysis is not whether there is a smooth overlapping between classes and cultural representations but the fact that it is class organizing the strategies of separation in cultural realm (Erdoğan, 2012).

4.2.5 Hierarchy of Space

To the extent that social relations are imprinted on spatial structures and social distance becomes materialized in spatial distance, space becomes an area that power imposes itself and apply a symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1999: 126 quoted from Erdoğan, 2007). Erdoğan indicates the same point by underlying the overlapping character of social topography and spatial topography (Erdoğan, 2007: 54-55). As it is previously explained, social relations of village bear a horizontal character as class differences does not much appeal to the *look*. Village life limits the constitution of hierarchical social relations. Where peasants experience hierarchical social relations on the basis of class experience is the urban space. When peasants are asked about whether they want to live in the city, they complain about apartment life by giving reference to their desire to situate themselves horizontal. Mesude tells about this

issue like that: ‘Actually I want to live in the city but there are separate buildings here at least. We can more easily see people. People know each other in our village’.⁸⁶

This sense of Mesude reminds the sense of Mert who lives in a *gecekondu* among high apartments. He states that:

Sometimes I curse and wish these all buildings broke down. Then, they may be equal to us. Why? I ask why God made us like that. God made everybody rich but we are not. More or less, I want God to give us a *gecekondu*. I do not want anything else... Oh, I also want my daughter and sons to go to school and also a shanty to live in, I do not want anything else (in Erdoğan, 2007: 56)⁸⁷

Mert smoothes or equalizes the hierarchical topography while Mesude protects the horizontal space. The defense against class injuries is concretized in the desire of social relations that are not hierarchical while that desire is defined in relation to space. Although Mert who comes from absolute poverty and Mesude who is a peasant do not have the same socio-economic conditions, they share the same sense in terms of the experience of hierarchical social relations. So it can be said that the sense they have and the tendency to define that sense by means of spatial terms might indicate a common feature of urban lower classes and peasants.

Erdoğan indicates that “the space comes up in an asymmetrical, vertical and hierarchical way and a kind of *look* constitutes and concretizes such kind of a space. Thus, asymmetrical power and unequal relationships of social formation are concretized in the topography of the city (Erdoğan, 2007: 55). In that sense, ocularcentricity bases itself on the sharpening of spatial disintegration as well as increasing perceptibility of symbolic distance (Erdoğan, 2007: 53). Mesude complains about the showy manners of her friend living Manisa:

⁸⁶ Şehirde de oturmak insan istiyö ama ya hiç olmazsa burda binlar tek. Hani insanları görüş alanımız daha yüksek. köyümüzde yani insan birbirini biliyo.

⁸⁷ Bir anda böyle isyan ediyorum yani, diyorum, keşke şu binalar şöyle dümdüz olsa, onlar da bizim durumumuza gelirler. Niye diyorum, Allah bizi böyle yapmış. Herkesi zengin yapıyor, dostunu fakiri yapıyor. İyi kötü bize de bir gecekondu şey etse. Hiçbir şey istemem, ha kızlarım bir okusa, oğlan okusa... bir de ufak böyle, iş görse, gecekondu olsa, başka bir şeyde, yükseklerde gözüm yok yani

(talking about the acquaintances living in town) They want to be superior to us, more comfortable than peasantry. Because of that, they adopt different *personalities*... Their *characteristics* are changing. They assume social characteristics. There is no difference between our lives and theirs, both are the same family lives. We drink and eat the same thing, doing the same thing, what's difference? Sociology... If you have money, you join social activities; here our disadvantage is just road fee. They tell you where they *shop* in the city but you do not know. They bought or not, it is not matter but it is clear that their aim is to be superior to you. Imagine that, they say 'if it is not bought from that store we do not wear it' or 'if not from there we do not eat it' because they are living in the city. But you actually know their financial situation and inner world. They say 'when evening falls, we go to the *park* to eat ice cream'. As we do not have ice cream here... But you know, their aim is to be superior to you. In order to go there, you need money in your pocket. When we go there, we will eat not just ice cream but meat, honey and pastry. They treat like it is a privilege and deceive young people. So what is the point? The show-off stemming from living in the city. (Mesude)⁸⁸

It can be said that symbolic distance between the people living in the city and the peasants living in the village is constituted by means of the 'showy' glances of the people living in the city. In that case, source of the *look* is not the cloth 'they' wear or the park 'they' eat ice cream but the *place* where 'they' purchase and eat. The *shop* and the *park* become the images in the service of the people living in the city in terms of setting a hierarchical relationship with peasants in the village. Thus, the *look* can be directly headed for to its object within the hierarchical topography of the city (as in the experience of Murat who is not accepted to the night club because of his

⁸⁸ (şehirde yaşayan tanıdıkları hakkında) Bize göre artı pozisyon olmak istiyö köylölüğe göre, daha böyle rahat, farklı kişiliklere bürünüyolar böyle... *Karakterleri deęişiyö . sosyal kişiliklere bürünüyolar. Hiç bi farklılık yok ordaki de aile hayatı aynı hayat. aynı şeyleri yiyip içiyöruz aynı şeyleri yapıyöruz deęişen ne? deęişen ne.. sosyoloji... o da cebinde para varsa sosyal faaliyetlere katılırsın bizim işte tek eksiğimiz yol parası. İşte ben şehirde oturyöm şu dükkândan şunu aldım senin bilmediğın yerleri geliyö burda sana anlatıyö alıp almadığın sen bilmiyön ama noluyö sana bi üstünlük saęlamak istiyölar yani. Atıyöm işte dükkândan olmazsa giymeyiz o dükkândan olmazsa yemeyiz halbuki onun iç dünyasını biliyön maddi durumunu da biliyön ama işte şehirde oturyöm ben. Akşam oldumu parka gideriz dondurma yemeğe tabi bizim burda yok o sana karşı işte *üstünlük* oluyö ama oraya gitmek içinde para lazım cebine hah ama biz de gideriz bi dondurma deęil af edersin yanına köfte eklemek de yerim bal börek de yerim ona şey yapıyö işte ayrıcalıkmiş gibi yapıyö bu sefer gençlerin gözünü boyuyölar ama noluyö ben şehirde oturyöm o *hava* oluyö.*

appearance) while it can be the bearer of that hierarchical topography by means of images (as in the experience of Mesude who is annoyed of the showy glances of his urbanized friend). Living in the city, together with its images, becomes a way of constituting superiority on the peasants living in the village. Also another significant point in Mesude's talk is that symbolic distance between her and her friend becomes a matter of character. She says that 'they adopt different *personalities*... Their *characteristics* are changing' and the source of symbolic distance or superiority of the urbanized one is concretized in her character. To the extent that symbolic distance between the two becomes a matter of superiority of the urbanized one and to the extent that constitution of superiority becomes a matter of character, it connotes to an attack against the character of peasant.

4.2.6 Moral Weapons of Peasants

Peasants emphasize the importance of moral values, positive characteristic features as well as happiness and peace when they are talking about the difference between the wealthy and the poor. The wealth or wealthy people are defined with the lack of these features although they have money. Erdoğan indicates a similar tendency for urban poor-subalterns by stating that "poor-subalterns portray themselves as equipped with moral-humane values against the rich. In that sense, virtue plays a key role in the self-constitution of poor-subaltern subject and it becomes a weapon keeping him alive against material poverty and moral pain" (Erdoğan, 2007: 49). Mesude who is exposed to the showy glances of her urban friend develops defenses against that attack by competing with her friend. She sorts a series of things she does or eats and she prioritizes moral values that her friend lacks:

When we go to the city, we will eat not just ice cream but meat honey and pastry. Right, we are peasants but we go to the sea as well. (Her husband: We go out for dinner as well, we do not deprive of anything). Right, we go out once in a week but have its revenge. Something that you do every day on your own is not valuable. It also contributes to the communication in family. But, in my opinion, there is no communication in families living in cities; all family members are living different lives. If 3 couple divorce in our village, almost 100 couple divorce in the city because there is

no communication in their families but we are not like that. For example, we allow time for ourselves more than them because we are together even while we are working. For example, I go to farmland to hoe with my husband until the evening falls; we can share everything together. But it is not like that in the city, men go outside on evenings and maybe come back home at 12.00 am (Mesude)⁸⁹

She compares and contrasts family relations in the village and in the city by giving reference to moral values. It can be said that Mesude has difficulty in competing with her urbanized friend because of material constrains and she changes the subject towards moral values she has and her friend lacks. The dichotomy of village and city is reconstituted by her in a way that city as a place of absences which is poor in terms of moral values and village as a place wealthy of morality. That picture is just visa versa of her urbanized friend portrays.

As it is previously mentioned, hierarchical social relations are constituted on the basis of ocularcentricity within the social topography of the city. Thus, it can be said that the two important element of hierarchical social relations which are the *look* and *hierarchical space* are by-passed by Mesude as moral values does not appeal to the *look* and does not belong to a *space*. While the *look* and *space* represent the 'appearance', moral values stand for the 'essence'. So the superiority of the appearance over the essence in social relations of the city is reversed to the superiority of the essence over the appearance. The conversation of two peasants below underlying family values of the poor against the wealthy is significant:

The wealth does not have peace but does the poor. They may not return to their home with peace. For example, a wealthy man has 3 daughters and wants a son but it does not realize

⁸⁹ Gideriz bi dondurma değil af edersin yanına köfte eklemek de yerim bal börek de... Biz denize de gidiyoruz köylüyüz ama (Kocası: ben eşimi yemeğe de görürüyüm, hangi şeyden eksik kalıyorsunuz ki). Ha nolur haftada bir gidersin acısını çıkarırsın. Her gün yaptığın, yalnız yaptığın şeyin hiçbir kıymeti yok. Hem aile içi paylaşımı arttırıyor. Ama şehirde paylaşım yok bence aile paylaşımı yok herkes birbirinden ayrı hayat yaşıyor kopuk aile çok. bizim köyde boşanan 3 kişiye şehirde belki 100 kişi oran.. Çünkü neden aile içi paylaşım yok birbirleriyle oturup şeyler paylaşmıyorlar ki ama biz öyle miyiz mesela daha çok paylaşım var birbirimize daha çok zaman ayırıyoruz çünkü çalışırken bile beraberisin ovaya gidiyorsun mesela çapa yapıyorsun akşama kadar eşinle beraber her şeyi paylaşabilirsin ama şehirde öyle mi adam akşam gidiyor belki gece 12 de geliyo.

while a poor man has a son. We cannot know it... the poor man's wife may be very beautiful whereas the wealthy man's is not well-mannered. (Rıza)⁹⁰

Ayten also underlines similar points:

In my opinion, rich people do not have piece in their family. I think, they talk to each other only about financial matters. There is no man-wife or parent-child relation. They ask 'what do you want, son? Which brand of phone you want to buy? Let's buy it'. They make their child happy but only once. But another time another need comes. They do not have emotional family relations, it is just material things, I think. (Her husband: I work in Directorate of National Education and I am in social people. But they are more inferior to me, in more inferior situation.) For example, I do not want to be rich... Happiness and peace in family... What would I do with 10 cars and houses? I just want my children. If I cannot have dinner with my husband when evening falls, what to do with money. What to do with money if my husband goes to night clubs or drinking houses when he is rich, is that wealth? Soullessness... No, I do not want wealth like that. My wealth is my family, my two children. At least, we will be together for dinner. This is my happiness ...There are always problems in their homes... In my opinion, they are unhappy, yes, unhappy families... Their husbands do not respect them... (Ayten)⁹¹

It can be said that family is a hegemonic institution in society that is loaded with various moral values. Family is such an institution in society that it is difficult to challenge it. Wealthy people are excluded from that institution by Ayten, which can

⁹⁰ Onda huzur yok, fakirde huzur var. Huzurlu evine gidemeyebilir. Mesela zengindir 3 tane kızı vardır oğlan ister yoktur, ama fakirinde vardır. Bunları bilemezsin ki.. Fakirin hanımı çok güzeldir eve gider güler, zenginin hanım yaramazdır gir ağlar çık ağlar ne işim var cenaze evinde der.

⁹¹ Bana göre zenginlerin aile ortamı yok. Sadece onlar maddi konularda birbirleriyle konuşuyorlar bana göre. Karı koca ilişkisi yok, annenin babanın çocuğuyla ilişkisi yok. Neden ne istiyon oğlum, ne marka telefon istiyon oğlum., hadi gel alalım. Ne oluyo o çocuğu mutlu ediyö ama o çocuk o günlük mutlu. Başka bir gün başka bir ihtiyacı çıkıyor mesela. Onların duygusal olarak aile hayatı yok, sadece maddiyat bence. '(kocası) ben de milli eğitimde çalışıyorum, sosyal insanların içindeyim fakat onlar benden daha aşağılık konumda daha aşağılık durumda...' Zengin olmak istemezdim mesela... Aile içi huzur mutluluk... Napayım 10 tane arabam evim olmuş. Ben çocuklarımı isterim. Akşam olup akşam sofrasına eşimlen oturamadıktan sonra napayım parayı pulu. Eşim zengin olmuş arkadaşlarıyla pavyonlarda meyhanelerde arkadaşlarıyla içmiş, ben burada kendi başıma yalnız kalmışım, zenginlik bu mu? Ruhsuzluk... istemem öyle zenginlik. Benim zenginliğim ailem eşim 2 çocuğum. Akşam sofrasında hiç olmazsa birleşiriz. Benim mutluluğum odur.. evde hep problem vardır yani... bana göre onlar mutsuzlar yani. Mutsuz aile onlar işte. Onların kocaları eşlerini saymıyo..."

be seen as a serious attack towards the wealthy having a prestigious position of in society. Thus, she uses the hegemonic concept of family institution as a weapon against the wealthy within that content. She equips herself with family values and completes her 'deficiencies' she feels when she is exposed to the *look* of her urbanized friend while she creates 'deficiencies' in her friend's life that seem superior by making holes in. It reminds 'hit and run' tactic that she does not totally challenge to the wealth but only making holes in her friend's life whenever she finds an opportunity. In that way she feels better. It is can be seen as a kind of defense against class injuries. In that sense, "we need to recognize the moral dimension of social life, not only in itself and as a basis of social order, but as a source of resistance to the existing order." (Sayer, 2005: 97).

It can be said that the images of the wealthy including lack of moral values, lack of family order as well as lack of peace in life base on their experiences and witnesses in the their village or neighboring villages. For example, Ayten shows a house by indicating from the window while she is mentioning that the wealthy deprives of family order and peace, and she states that the people living in that house do not have a happy and peaceful family life. She adds that the husband of the woman living in that house does not come to home but drinks in pubs. Then she concludes that what to do with such a wealth! Also Ahmet underlines the same issue by giving reference to a friend of him:

I am wealthy as well as him but in terms of my heart. There are good and bad ones among the wealthy. I always say that if somebody has a lot of properties, he must be certainly engaged in undeserved gain. I mean, he may be wealthy but he may not be a proper man. God gives us health and happiness, I always say. I mean, there is a wealthy acquaintance of us who has a disabled child. It may be... For example, he is wealthy but he is not happy at his home or he deceives his wife, or he is wealthy but mean, and never aid to a bridge building. Showing off and splendor, wealthy without working, wealth because of his father... It is their matter. Because the people who become wealthy gradually know where they come from, they hesitate to spend money. But

people should recognize the difficulties of life conditions.
(Ahmet)⁹²

It is better to note that lack of family peace, lack of health or having a disabled child, being mean and lack of moral values base on his experiences or witnesses. For example, as he said so he knows a wealthy person from the neighboring village. While he is mentioning that wealthy men deceive their wives, he implies a peasant in the village as the same family is mentioned by other peasants as well without pronouncing the related name. Likewise, showing off and being wealthy without working as a result of inheritance as images of the wealth base on an acquaintance, a peasant from neighbor village, who is inherited considerable amount of land from his father. While it cannot be said that all the images of the wealthy base on experiences and witnesses of peasants, they play a certain role in those images. Besides this, another significant point in Ahmet's expressions is that the negative images of the wealthy are attributed to the ones who become wealthy without working as a result of inheritance (*sonradan görme*). That tendency is parallel to the notion of wealth of the urban poor in the way that:

...wealth in most instances is not a bad thing itself but it is attributed as bad because of the behavioral patterns, ways of life and ways of operation that it produces. In that sense, the distinction between "legitimate" and "illegitimate" wealth overlaps with the distinction of "good" and "bad" wealthy. So it can be said that undeserved gain and a kind of wealth turning to be a symbolic capital which is pretentious, humiliating the subordinated and oppressive practices are interrelated with each other (Erdoğan, 2007: 50).

Thus, it can be inferred that wealth is not simply a matter of money but a matter of character at the same time. The utterances of Ayten just below are significant in terms of that feature:

⁹² Bende onun kadar zenginim diyom mesela gönlü zengin misal... İyisi de var kötüsü de var az ama çok laf yalansız çok mal haramsız olmaz diyom yani zengindir ama insan değildir yani. Allah sağlık huzur versin ben hep derim yani adam zengin var tanıdıklarımız çocuğu sakat özürülü yani öyle var mesela zengin ama evinde huzuru yok alıyo dost hayatı yaşıyo zengin mesela ama pinti bi köprüye para vermez. Gösteriş şaşaha çalışmadan zengin olan babası zengin olan.. onların şeyi. Kademeli olarak gelenlerde nasıl bu hale geldiğini bildiği için zaten parayı harcamaya çekiniyo. Öyle de olmaz ya insan bi hayat şartlarını zorluğunu görecek yani.

Sometimes, I talk to my friends about what if we were rich? What we would do? But not in terms of wealth, in terms of *materiality*... We became more *high-fed* by treating like 'we have as well'. We became unsatisfied... (Ayten)⁹³

When she talks about her dreams, she shies away from being wealthy. She feels she becomes spoiled and bad-tempered because she dreams about wealth. So she feels obliged to make an explanation '*not in terms of wealth but in terms of materiality*'. She wants to have better economic conditions but she does not want to have the characteristic features of the wealthy such as spoiled and bad-tempered according to her. It means that wealth is more than '*materiality*' or good economic conditions but rather referring to a kind of character connoting to corrosion in that sense.

The expressions of Mesude in terms of the dreams of her and her friends also indicate that certain kind of way of life specific to the wealth is associated with a kind of character:

People say they will buy villas, yachts, Mercedes cars etc. Mine is really different from others, I want to buy a farm, have cows and chickens according to my *character*. I choose natural life while they have maids, servants cleaning their houses. But I choose the romantic one. When you buy a farm, animals will need care, so you will work. I do not give up working. I will have horses, for example, I will ride horses. Oh sure, I do not want to take all responsibility of the farm but I like it. They are more depressive people compared to me, so they admire a kind of life on TVs. For example, they wear short skirts and eat outside, go to special places, they go to coiffeur every day, every month. There are the times that we do not comb our hair daily. They admire these things. There are the things which are beautiful materially but they do not be satisfied, they want more. Materiality is nice but they are always unhappy... Always more, more and much more... (Mesude)⁹⁴

⁹³ Çok paramız olsa naparız konuşuyoz bazen arkadaşlarla zenginlik yönünden değil de ekonomik yönden maddiyat olarak mesela... Biraz daha şımarık olduk biz işte beni de var olmuş gibi. Bizde de bi tatminsizlik oldu.

⁹⁴ Herkes diyo ki ben yat alırım yazlık alırım Mercedes araba alırı bilmemne. benim ki onlardan çok farklı kendi *karakterime* göre ben çiftlik alıyom ineklerim olsun tavuklarım olsun işte ben doğal yaşamı seçiyom onlar evlerine hizmetçi tutuyo gündelikçi geliyo gidiyo ama ben daha böyle romantik şey. Gene böyle çiftlik aldığında bile bişeyler yapcaksın o hayvanlara bakılacak gene çalışmaktan

She compares a way of life including Mercedes, yacht, villa, flat, maid, miniskirts as well as chauffeur to a way of life including farm, kitchens, horses, and a natural life at all. She associates the first one with unhappiness while she refers the second one as romantic. The way of life attributed to the wealth is associated a kind of dissatisfied character. To the extent that she relates the way of life of the wealth to a kind of deficiency in certain moral values or feelings such as happiness, she can shelter into a strong castle of *immaterial* features that cannot be easily challenged. Also Rıza mentions a similar point in terms of the fact that wealth is beyond a matter of economic status but also a matter of a way of life which peasants attribute negative features rather than being against the wealth itself as it is previously mentioned:

There is no significant change here in terms of materiality. But in the city, there are both rich and poor people. Economic differences exist everywhere, in even South Africa. Is there any place that has not economic differences? If all people were equal, the order of the earth is broken. There are the people have money by both working and stealing. A comfortable life by working hard is different, but *wealth is a different thing*. (Rıza)⁹⁵

Rıza states that ‘wealth is a different thing’ and the ‘thing’ here opens to certain features as well as a certain way of life as other peasants point out. These features are also concretized in the words of many peasants about wealth such as ‘the wealth spoils men’. Thus, features such as ‘problematic family life’, ‘apathy’, ‘indifference’, ‘inferiority’, ‘corrosion’ and ‘show off’ are the images of wealth in peasants’ world. To the extent that wealth is thought together with a kind of character or a series of

vazgeçmiyom ben. Atlarım oluyo mesela at bincem. Ha öyle şeylerim vat mesela bütün çiftliğin sorumluluğunu almasam da ben öyle şey seviyom istiyom yani. Onlar bana göre daha hayattan yılgin onlar böyle daha televizyondakilere özeniyolar işte. Mesela mini eteklerle yemeğe gitcekler şoför kapıyı açcak yemeklere gitcekler özel yerlere gitcekler öyle kuaföre gitcekler her ay her gün, ha biz yeri geliyo saçımızı taramıyoz günlük onlar öyle şeylere özeniyö... Maddi olarak güzel olanlar var tatmin olamıyolar daha fazla istiyolar... Maddiyat çok güzel ama mutsuzlar hep daha çok daha çok daha çok...”

⁹⁵ Buralarda parasal anlamda pek bir değişiklik yok. Ama şehirde zengini de var fakiri de var. Ekonomik farklılık her yerde var. Güney Afrika’da bile var. Ekonomik farklılığın olmadığı yer var mı? Herkes eşit olursa o zaman dünyada düzen olmaz. Çalışarak olan da var, çalarak olan da var. Çok çalışmak, rahat yaşam o ayırdır ama *zenginlik farklı bir şey*.

images, peasants are able to equip themselves with superior character features or images against superior social and economic conditions of the wealthy. The dichotomy of 'they' and 'we' that is constituted by the repertory of the wealthy is reconstituted again by peasants by turning the hierarchical relationship upside down via moral values. It can be seen as one of the basic sources of peasants' defenses against class injuries.

4.2.7 Furious Peasants

Another source of peasants' defense against class injuries can be said to be 'anger'. That kind of defense is dealt before in the experience of Yasin who is both angry with the doctor he argues and is ambivalent about his right to be angry. Basing on the general atmosphere of the coffeehouse in the village where political issues are publically talked the most, a similar tendency can be seen in peasants' way of evaluating their contemporary position and searching for the one or ones that are responsible for the poor conditions. When they begin to evaluate their contemporary position in order to understand why their economic position deteriorates and who is responsible for this, it is interesting that their narration follows a sequence. Their conversation begins with their anger towards AKP government and then the direction of anger changes to urban consumers. AKP's accession to power constitutes a turning point in terms of their understanding of what is going on. Although neoliberal policies targeting agricultural relations date back to AKP government and even the changes in that field applied in basically 1990's, they initiate their 'story' with AKP government that gets the power in the beginning of 2000's. It can be said that initiating the 'story' with AKP makes the process more legible for them. As Sennett points out, "the cliché of 'critical moment' enables us to understand the change not as a spontaneous outburst or a complex and insensible process but as legible and clear" (Sennett, 1977: 78). When peasants talk about AKP policies, they tell about the rising prices of fuel, fertilizers, pesticides and so on as well as falling prices of corn for hours. They make annual, five-year and ten-year mathematical calculations but they get lost in numbers. Language of the numbers does not enable them to develop a kind of defense:

Since they came to the government, we have been going back each passing year. They are our enemies... Enemies...They ruined all farmers... (Ahmet)⁹⁶

It is better to note that peasants state that majority of the village has voted for the right parties for generations. Before the last local election, AKP was the first party in the village. However, it left its place to MHP after the last selection. It can be said that political issues are almost always the hot topic in the village coffeehouse. There is an ongoing argument between peasants who support the AKP government and who oppose it. However, when the issue comes to the agricultural policies of the government there is a consensus, with the reluctant consent of the supporters of the government, among peasants in terms of AKP's intention to conduct destructive policies against small peasantry. They implicitly or explicitly curse the government by stating that they turn to be unfair. In that sense, Rıza is just one of the peasants among others that is angry with the President:

Tayyip... Tayyip... that's man just ruined us since he came!
(Rıza)⁹⁷

Thus, AKP's accession to power constitutes a turning point, the 'critical moment', for peasants' understanding of their destiny. When they go on talking and discussing with each other about their situation, they become unsatisfied with their explanations about the terrible agricultural policies of the government. Then the focus of the talk slips towards urban consumers. Some of them are angry with the urban consumers because they could not afford what the product deserves and cause export products to come into the country, which means that peasants cannot sell their products. The dialogue between Mehmet and Nazif is significant in terms of the anger they headed for urban consumers:

⁹⁶ Bunlar başımıza geldiğinden beri her geçen yıl bir çentik geriye gidiyoruz. Bunlar bize düşman.. düşman.. bitirdi çiftçiyi bitirdi.

⁹⁷ Tayyip... Tayyip... O Tayyip yok mu! O geldiğinden beri mahvetti bizi! (Rıza)

M: Cherries are exactly 10 Turkish Liras, who can eat the cherries which are 10 TL, is that reasonable? We became like Europe...

N: You know, cherries which are collected for 1 TL at a loss. I have cherries in my garden but I did not collect them, man, one person collects 40-45 kg cherries and I give 45 TL to the laborer at the end of the day. Why should I do that? There is such a reasoning here.

M: Don't talk like that, my brother... There is no balance, official people will eat that.

N: They will buy, my brother, they will buy cherries which are 1 TL; I say that we are Turkish people, we deserve the cheapest!

M: Why I cannot eat the cherries which are 10 TL?

N: I cannot wear the trousers which are 50 TL, my trousers is 10-20 TL... Then, they will eat the cherries which are 1 TL!⁹⁸

The significance of that dialogue lies in the fact that Nazif asserts his autonomy on his own product in spite of dominating policies (Why should I do that?), and he does not harvest his product while he is able to take the control of the narration as well. He gives up using the word 'they' (they ruin us, they are enemy of us, they will abolish small peasantry and so on) and begin to talk with the word 'I' and 'we' (why shall I do this?) and (we feed Turkey). However, it can be said that his anger is canalized horizontally to the urban consumers who are mostly officers in the examples peasants give. That is to say, peasants' anger headed for AKP government

⁹⁸ M: Kiraz on lira kiraz, on lira kirazı kim yiyebilir, hangi mantık mı bu? Avrupa gibi olduk...

N: Abicim bi liraya toplanan kirazlar var ya zarar şuan amelelik parası. Bende de var ben toplamadım abi, bi kişi topluyo 40 kilo 45 kilo topluyo akşam üzeri 45 lira yövmiyesi, bütün gün ona toplatcem ben alcağım parayı ona vercem, niye yapayım ben bunu? Burda böyle bir mantık var.

M: Abi öyle deme... Denge yok memur insanlar yicek bunu?

N: Alcak abi 1 liralıklardan alcak, diyom ya biz türk milleti her şeyin en adisine layıkız!

M: Niye ben on liralığı yiyemeyim?

N: Ben elli liralık pantolon giyemem benim pantolonum 10 lira 20 lira.. o da 1 liralık kiraz yicek!

makes them passive and leaves no room for thinking and trying something else but only an absolute pessimism although a kind of anger against government would be expected to be a more political reaction in terms of class struggle. However, only when they begin to talk about urban consumers they are able to speak by legitimizing their position such as “why shall I do this?” and “they will eat cherries 1 lira in cost as I do not wear trousers 50 liras in cost”. Another peasant states that “we produce food, we feed Turkey, is that wrong?” in terms of this issue. Although their anger is canalized horizontally which means that it targets to another subordinated class, they begin to defend themselves and become active agents in a sense by means of their attempt to create a narration with their own words caring about their position/role in society and taking attention to its significance. It is also significant that the word ‘enemy’ that peasants use when they talk about AKP does not give a feeling of rage but such a rage makes itself felt when they talk about urban consumers. It also might be a matter of distance. The symbolic distance between peasants and the government is much more than the distance between urban consumers and peasants. First one bears an abstract and invisible character while second one is more concrete and visible. The distance constituted by hierarchical social relations is overlapped by spatial distance. It can be said that such a distance aggravates the possibility of peasants’ defenses.

Also it had better to indicate that the directions of peasants’ anger that they target (towards government, urban consumers or merchants as in the example) might be interlaced with each other:

He works for 800 TL and he buys a car. He should not buy it, my brother. If he does, he cannot fuel it. Well, I don’t say that poor people should die... I do not criticize it, but he cannot buy, fuel it or pay its taxes. Do rich people always win? My sister works in a factory for 12 hours along 30 days. Her boss pays 1100 TL minimum wage to the bank and delivers the rest of the money by hand. Why he can steal but I cannot? They steal my taxes. Look, this man gets grapes which worth 5 or 6 trillion for a day and earns cash but he steals. Then, it can be banned. The government gives him export bonus, why? It gives because he steals. But the system is wrong. I try to explain it to people but they did not get it. They say

‘Tayyip has built highways’. I do not mind his highways, ‘he built highways, hospitals...’ He should give me my money, I can go to hospital. He should give the money I deserved. Farmers need to buy diesel, fertilizer, pesticide. If you market them expensive, people should buy our products expensively. Consumers will eat that chicken. If they cannot buy, they won’t eat. (Mehmet)⁹⁹

Mehmet is angry with the urban consumer because of his consumption over his economic capacity, and he also angry with the merchant who evade tax and has undeserved gain, and he is angry with the government because of its support for the ones who have undeserved gain such as merchants as well as the support for roads rather than producers. So he tries to make sense of the negative conditions of peasantry in search of the responsible of the situation as well as solutions. It can be said that anger of peasants includes certain significant clues about their class experience that bears both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic features.

4.2.8 ‘Art of Making Do with’ in Peasants’ Lives

First of all, it can be said that ‘art of making do with’ is not only related with strategies of making out besides that it is not limited with direct-indirect relations with the power or confrontation moments. It is valid for hidden injuries of class. That is to say, the tactics and psychological mechanisms developed to protect oneself against wounds of self are a kind of relationship developed with ‘the dominant social order’ (*yerin yasası*) by escaping without leaving it (Erdoğan, 2007: 82). So the defenses of peasants explained above to protect themselves against wounds of self constitutes a major part of ‘art of making do with’ in peasants’ lives. Besides coping with cultural patterns and moral values, a pattern of ‘art of making do with’ can be said to process in the economic realm. A kind of ‘art of making do with’ can be seen

⁹⁹“Adam 800 milyona çalışıyo araba alıyo almıcan kardeşim benzinini koyamıcan. E garip ölsün mü ben onu demiyom alsın adam ama alamazsın ama benzinini koyamazsın vergisini veremezsin. Hep bu zengin mi kazancak. Benim ablam özürlü ablam fabrikada çalışıyo 30 gün 12 saat 1100 milyon asgari ücreti bankaya yatırıyo geri kalanı elinden veriyo. Niye çalabiliyo ben çalamıyom. Benim vergimi o kesıyo. Yav bu adam günde beş trilyon altı trilyonluk üzüm alıyo nakit para kantarda, böylesi çalıyo. Ona çaldırma o zaman. Ona ihracat pirimi veriyo devlet neden çalıyo diye veriyo işte sistem burda yanlış ben bunlara anlatıyom anlamıyo. Yol yaptı tayyip o yol yaptı onun yolunu bilmem neyini.. Yol yaptı hastane yaptı.. Bana versin paramı ben giderim hastaneye. Hakkımı versin ben para kazanayım. Çiftçi mazotu alcak gübreyi alcak ilacı alcak pahalandırıyosan malımı alırken de pahalı alcak tüketici de bu tavuğu yiecek alamıyosa almıcağ abi”

in strategies of making out. That kind bears a more practical feature such as tactics focusing on saving the day. According to De Certeau:

... a tactic is, on the other hand, a calculus which cannot count on a 'proper' (a spatial or institutional localization), nor thus on a borderline distinguishing the other as a visible totality. The place of a tactic belongs to the other. A tactic insinuates itself into the other's place, fragmentarily without taking it over on its entirety, without being able to keep it at a distance. It has at its disposal no base where it can capitalize on its advantages, prepare its expansions, and secure independence with respect to circumstances". (De Certeau, 1988: xix).

"What distinguishes them (tactic and strategy) concerns the types of operations and the role of spaces: the strategies are able to produce, tabulate, and impose these spaces, when those operations take place, whereas tactics can only use, manipulate, and divert these spaces." (De Certeau, 1988: 30).

Within that context, the issue of tactic and strategy in terms of peasants' lives can be thought within the framework of the relation between agricultural cooperatives and peasants. The role of agricultural cooperatives in bearing the strategy of the government is very crucial in terms of the application of agricultural policies imposed on peasants. They have also played an important role in the implementation of neoliberal policies after 1980's by means of codes, regulations, registration, taxes, penalties, and so on. In that sense, it can be argued that they symbolize the strategy of the government in terms of agricultural policies and they are also the executives of that strategy. On the other hand, peasants develop certain kinds of tactics to feed off the prevailing conditions that restrict them by means of manipulating and getting around. Legal regulations restrict the use of state subsidies with certain requirements. For example, young, disabled and woman peasants as well as the peasants dealing with 'good agriculture' or organic agriculture can get the subsidies. The size of farmland and the type of product are important in terms of getting the subsidies. On the other hand, it can be said that peasants develop tactics to get around these restrictions by manipulating the cooperatives. For example, they make their mothers who do not deal with agriculture seem to be the owner of the farmland so that they

can get the subsidies given to woman peasants. Old peasants arrange a medical report in regard to being disabled if they have an ‘appropriate’ ailment more or less so that they get the subsidies given to disabled peasants. They also do not register their own product, the right product, but the one the state gives subsidies. Another restriction of the legislations is that the state does not give subsidies to the peasants who get more than two times before. However, peasants can also cope with it by rearranging the land title in the name of another family member.

In addition to this, legal regulations restrict the use of tractors in the way that peasants must register their tractors to cooperatives (so they must be a registered farmer) in order to hire their tractors for another peasant’s use. Besides this, the legislation accepts ‘help’ as a commercial activity no matter the peasant does not hire and get money in return for lending his tractor. Thus, legal regulations also contribute the elimination of co-op farming as they prohibit means of productions such as tractors which are not registered to the farmer cooperatives to be used in another peasant’s land. There are heavy penalties for this. However, many peasants round around that restriction by not registering their tractors to the cooperatives. So they can use the tractor of their neighbors or relatives without applying to money relationship completely in the name of solidarity or by means of a mutual reciprocity (such as labour power or sort something out in return for the use of tractor). In a similar way, they can hire their tractors and evade tax as well. Thus, with De Certeau’s words, they are *poaching* in a sense and “they circulate, come and go, overflow and drift over an imposed terrain” (De Certeau, 1988: 34). Peasants’ tactic to cope with their debt can be seen as a kind of ‘circulation’ and ‘come and go’. It can be said that most of the peasants in the village sell their tractors in cash and purchase a new tractor on credit. In that way, they can pay their debt and do not lack for tractor. So they make do with the debt in a sense because they cannot get rid of the debt entirely as they are indebted to tractor credit. They also deviate the original or predetermined aim of using tractor.

There are different examples of ‘deviating from its aim’ for the benefit of themselves by developing certain kinds of ‘modes of use’. Deviated modes of use can be

developed by peasants for various reasons such as gaining prestige in the village and fulfill their desires. To make it clear, peasants deviate the ‘original’ or predetermined aim of using a tractor not only to make out with debt but also to be prestigious in the village and fulfill their desire to have a spectacular tractor. In order to understand these reasons, it is better to explain more about the psychological atmosphere of the peasants. The “issue of tractor” is a sensitive topic for peasants. They continually talk about they have tractors and its private apparatuses.¹⁰⁰When one of the peasants purchases a new model of tractor in the village, everybody in the coffeehouse talks about this issue. It can be said that it spreads like a whisper and wanders around the village by beginning to spread from the coffeehouse to the whole village. To be the subject of such a topic is a kind of source of prestige for peasants. In addition to this, village square witness spectacular tractors come and go on the top of which its owners sit down puffing his cigarette with swagger. That is to say, having a good tractor is closely related with the image of peasants in the village. It is a source of prestige and an object of desire. Muhittin talks about this issue in that way:

When somebody passes by the coffeehouse with a tool (a piece of tractor), another one buys the same tool. Even its color is exactly the same. The name of the brand, *Mercan*, is written on it. He sticks that brand. They don’t prefer the brand of *Başaran* as *Mercan* is a better brand. Farmers are in bad conditions... While they are crying, somebody comes with his new tractor to the coffeehouse. Then he says ‘Poor people should die, this motor is really great’. Others think that ‘If you can buy, I can do, too’. Although they are in debt, they think about selling their tractor and taking loan from a bank for 13 years. (Muhittin)¹⁰¹

Thus, it can be said that peasants apply to the same tactic of selling their tractors in cash and purchasing a new one on credit in order to gain prestige and fulfill their

¹⁰⁰ E takım taklavatımız var Allah’a şükür... E takım taklavat var şimdi bizde...

¹⁰¹ Kahvenin önünden biri takımla geçsin aletle geçsin gider aynısını alır. Rengi dahi, aynı olur, aynı ayar. *Mercan* yazılır. Markası. O markayı yapıştırır, *Başaran* olmaz, *mercan*ınki daha iyi ya. Çiftçinin durumu çok bozuk adam ağlıyo ağlıyo bi geliyo biri traktörle kahveye, aldın mı aldın, garibanlar gebersin diyo motor on numara motor. sen alırsın ben neden alamam. Gidiyo akşama ona kaç para verdin diyo yav sen borçlu adamsın satırım ötekini diyo bankadan da kredi çekerim on üç sene ödemeli

desire rather than paying the debt for this time. Thus, peasants deviate the ‘original’ or predetermined aim of using tractor or deviate the ‘rationality’ of the use of tractor with such kind of motivations. Sources of motivations as well as types of tactics vary in kind. However, what is significant in terms of peasants’ tactics is that they manage to be plural in solutions and creative within the realm of the official or legal borders without crossing the borders imposed on them by means of law that they have to live inside (De Certeau, 1988: 30).

Finally, it might be necessary to note that some cultural codes of the village have a restricting effect on peasants’ developing tactics, on the other hand. Becoming needy or dependent (*muhtaç düşme*) is an important source of anxiety in the village. Peasants do not talk about social aids that they get in AKP period. When the issue is asked directly, they mostly reply that “there are people taking social aid in the village” although they might have taken it get as well. They also complain about social aid policy of AKP as it does not support the ones who produce but the ones who only consumes. They accuse the peasants who get coal aid and then sell them. For example, Halil praises of his friend, Ekrem, because he does not accept disabled salary for his disabled sister:

H: Look, that man does not get the salary for disabled people... If he wanted, he would, his sister is disabled but he does not. People in need may benefit from it instead of me, he says.

E: My sister is disabled and working in a factory and getting 1100 TL for working 12 hours 30 days.¹⁰²

So why they develop a kind of reaction against manipulation and utilization social aids while they also manipulate and utilize state subsidies? The answer might lie in the notion that ‘taking aid’ is an indication of a kind of ‘inferiority’, ‘dependency’ and ‘helplessness’. On the other hand, their tactics manipulating and utilizing

¹⁰²H: Bak bu adam özürlü maaşı almıyo ha.. İstese alır, ablası özürlü ama almıyo... Daha ihtiyacı olanlar alsın diyo...

E: Benim ablam özürlü ablam fabrikada çalışıyo 30 gün 12 saat 1100 milyon.

cooperatives connote to a kind of ‘cunning’ and ‘ability’. Thus, it can be said that peasants taking aid are the objects of the operation while the peasants developing tactics to make out with restraining conditions are the subjects of the operation.

Another interesting point about developing tactics to manipulate and benefit from the restricted conditions is their rage against the Kurds in the East of Turkey because of their illegal use of electricity. Ekrem states that:

They set an electricity meter in my field. When I do not pay it for a month, they quit the electricity of both my field and home. It is free of charge in the East! We always pay their taxes... Is that fair? (Ekrem)¹⁰³

Kurds develop tactics to cope with difficult life conditions just like the peasants in Manisa who develop tactics for the same reasons. In spite of the same motivation lying under their tactics, peasants in the village constitute an antagonistic relationship between the two types of art of making do with. In that sense, peasants are integrated into a kind of nationalist discourse which they are engaged in eclectically rather than a systematic usage of the discourse. Thus, the direction of their angry search for the responsible of the bad conditions is once again canalized horizontally. In that way, they lose their critical position against government.

All in all, it can be concluded that the way of analysis should move away from rationalist patterns of thought in order to realize the daily resistance of peasants on the basis of certain tactics, manipulations, and ‘escaping without leaving’ as peasants deviate the ‘rationality’ of the usages and deactivate the methods focusing on the ‘original/undeviated’ usages in that sense.

4.3 Concluding Remarks

The analyses of proletarianization, as a part and parcel of the analyses of the change in agricultural relations, are mostly based on commodification of land and labour as well as expropriation. However, it might be meaningful to look for the character of peasant labour which is closely related with the artisan character of peasant labour

¹⁰³ Benim tarlama sayaç takıyo, bi ay ödemeyince kesiyö hem tarlayı hem evi... Doğuda bedava kullanıyolar... Bizden çıkıyo hep bunların faturası.. Olcak iş mi?

and the fact that the realm of production and reproduction interlace with each other, which resulted in its resistance against capitalist notion of time and capitalist division of labour in order to better comprehend the ongoing processes in agricultural relations. In that sense, the kind of relations developed with these features might reveal the specificities of the resistance tendencies of PCP'ers, which should be evaluated within the framework of the specificity of capitalist labour process in general. Within that context, character of peasant labour can be traced in the subjective experiences of PCP'ers as wage labourers as well as the images with regard to wage labour or wage labourers.

In that sense, the analysis of subjective experiences of peasants is significant as class is handled as “a factor that conditions the most intimate levels of their personal lives” (Howard & Wajeman, 1978). So it can be said that “daily realities of inequality” in the fields of everyday life are experienced on the basis of class confrontations which means the confrontations of values, feelings, expectations, and images as well. It is argued that peasants confront with the representations of the hegemonic culture that are developed from ‘upside’ and ‘outside’ on the basis of the body, language and space that become the realm of peasants’ subordination. In that sense, the analysis of both the hidden injuries of peasants experienced through these confrontations and peasants’ defenses against these injuries might reveal the specificities of class experience of peasants on the basis of the specificities of peasants’ subordination.

Such a perspective plays a significant role in comprehending peasants as a living force and active agents contradictorily bearing counter-hegemonic, non-hegemonic and hegemonic features at the same time on the basis of the tactics developed to manipulate, to utilize, to bypass the operations that cause their subordination. Thus, such a standpoint might contribute to realizing the agent in the making of social formation or social change when it does not reveal itself openly from a perspective that analyzes social agent on the basis of movements, strikes or occupations.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

The thesis attempted to understand the change in agricultural relations by analyzing the class-based resistance dynamics of petty commodity producers and subjective aspects of everyday life experiences. Basing on the assumption that hegemonic processes and operations are not totally and systematically absorbed by the people who are subordinated to these processes because the practice of the subordinated that might bear hegemonic, non-hegemonic and counter- hegemonic elements is an underhanded process that entails a kind of methodology including *subjective* aspects taking place in the realm of everyday life, the thesis included class confrontations which means the confrontations of feelings, values, expectations, images while establishing the relation of small peasants and the general social relations. Within that context, the thesis traced the clues of contemporary experience and of PCP'ers and their contemporary image as peasants.

In such an age that “the end of peasantry” is declared, the thesis tried to search what is going on at the side of peasants in Turkey where the majority of agricultural production is humped by petty commodity producers. The prevailing conditions of petty commodity producers in Turkey were analyzed within the framework of a series of structural changes after 1980's that have aggravated the survival conditions of small producers. While such kind of analyses contributed to understanding the changes in agricultural relations as well as the prevailing conditions of PCP'ers, the thesis supported the analyses based on political economy with the subjective experiences and attitudes of peasants in order to comprehend how structural changes are experienced by them.

As the analytic focus of the studies has shifted from petty commodity producers to the global movements of capital, the thesis elaborated on the conceptualization of ‘globalization’ as majority of the contemporary studies are marked by the term although it is difficult to say that there is a remarkable argument around that

conceptualization. To the extent that globalization which is an outcome of the historical process is used as explanan in order to explain the change in agricultural relations and the analytical focus of the studies has shifted towards TNC's as the executive of the global capital, it might have the risk to be an 'empty signifier', which leads to presuming prevailing relations as given without problematizing them and assumption of a one-sided relationship consequently. Within that context, the thesis developed a critical evaluation of the contemporary agrarian literature.

In that sense, the thesis was sensitive to the argumentation of methodological points throughout the study as much as possible. Within that context, an evaluation of the contemporary agrarian studies was given by being sensitive to expressing correlations between the world literature and the literature in Turkey as well as correlations between the interrogations of classical agrarian studies and of the contemporary ones. In that sense, the shifts in terms of the focus of the studies as well as methodological standpoints were tried to be elaborated in the thesis. While the problematics of the leading analyses were argued, the conceptual framework of these studies was also problematized. The thesis was especially sensitive towards the conceptualizations that are commonly and popularly used in the analyses of agrarian studies with different perspectives. In that sense, these conceptualizations were not randomly used but rather were problematized within the framework of methodological argumentation as much as possible.

In addition to this, the thesis gave importance to the field research as a part of methodology of the study rather than standing for verification or a concrete example of the theoretical analysis. Field research provided new perspectives to be developed and contributed the framework of theoretical analysis. In parallel with the aim of the thesis to understand the subjective aspects of everyday life experiences on the basis of class confrontations, the study let the voices of petty commodity producers be heard by the reader in order to challenge the general acceptance about peasants' being like a 'potato sack'. Such a perspective is significant in terms of understanding class struggle when that struggle does not take place as active mobilizations and open clashes. While 'the end of peasantry' is popularly debated, what peasants think about

their own future and how they evaluate the changes in their lives was handled as a crucial part of comprehending the change in agricultural relations. One of the advantages of the field research can be said to be feeling and comprehending the general mood of the peasants who were interviewed which helped better understand the issue of resistance in parallel with the main focus of the thesis. Basing on the interviews and overall impression of the researcher about the village and the peasants, the thesis found out that they cling to land with their nails by using whatever tactic or solutions they find via economic tactics, moral values, traditional ties, anger and obstinacy or hiding their injuries.

The field research in Hamzabeyli village put forwards that petty commodity producers resist in various ways that ranges from resisting via hiring land, commoditizing family labour, dealing with commercial activity to resisting via changing the product pattern. These various ways of resisting towards dissolution proliferates class differentiation by originating a dynamic process in agricultural relations. Within that context, it can be said that petty commodity production is rich in class dynamics in the sense that class is handled as a process and a relation. Within the framework of these dynamics, it can be also stated that the tendency of proletarianization as well as the tendency of dispossession is weak in the village. Thus, the thesis put forwards that resistance dynamics of PCP'ers enhance their capacity of adaptability to changing conditions in the sense that it is a dynamic process that produces and reproduces petty commodity production.

Within that context, the thesis focused on the character of peasant labour on the basis of a kind of master-apprentice relationship within the family as well as its specific work discipline that are marked by the unity of the field of production and reproduction, which blurs the conceptualizations specific to capitalist work discipline to the extent that means of production such as track becomes a source of prestige and a crucial part of childhood memories or land stands for more than a means to produce crops but a legacy from earlier generations that must be kept and conveyed to coming generations. In that sense, the thesis included such kind of features of peasant

labour into the analysis in order to understand class-based resistance dynamics of PCP'ers.

The thesis found out that peasants have a stronger sense of self in terms of specific from of their labour, which can be evaluated within the framework of resistance dynamics of petty commodity production. Capitalizing on wage work experiences of peasants as well as the images regarding wage labour, the thesis found out the source of that character of peasant labour in peasants' control over time, production process, division of labour and low levels of alienation as well as the unity of production and reproduction field all of which characterize the village life as a whole. There is a kind of resistance to the capitalist work discipline. One of the signs of that resistance is their inconsistency with the discipline of wage work when they experience being wage labourer by stating that they are not accustomed to such an order. They find such an order unbearable and unjust. Another sign of that resistance is the image they have regarding being wage labourer which connote to 'working under the command of somebody else'¹⁰⁴. In that sense, the thesis argued that peasants' tendency of proletarianization can be better understood by including that these tendencies into account. Within that context, the thesis tried to overcome the dichotomy of peasant-worker basing on the subjective experiences of peasants as wage labourers as well as the images regarding wage labour in order to deeply comprehend the character of labour in general.

The thesis also tried to understand how peasants experience 'peasant images' as a crucial part of making of class on the basis of class confrontations in order to comprehend the contemporary class experience of them. "Class matters to us not only because of differences in material wealth and economic security, but also because it affects our access to things, relationships, experiences and practices which we have reason to value, and hence our chances of living a fulfilling life" (Sayer, 2005: 1). In that sense, the thesis handled class not as a mere matter of economic category but also a matter of personal experience of unequal social relations and differences.

¹⁰⁴ "El kapısında çalışmak", "Elin işinde çalışmak"

To the extent that peasant images are constituted from upside and outside which lead to hidden injuries of peasants, peasants can be said to develop certain tactics and ways of coping with these subordinating images, which can be seen as a part and parcel of their resistance against dissolution. Within such a perspective, resistance dynamics of PCP'ers seems much more diversified and richer to the extent that it includes different experience of subordination as well as different tactics to cope with it. Within that context, peasants' perception of the wealthy is an important feature that enables to understand how the subordinating images some of which bases on personal experience are constituted. The thesis claimed that the similarity between the way of life of the poor and the wealthy decreases the violence of the experience of hierarchical relations. As stated by one of the peasants, somebody coming from outside of the village cannot understand who is wealthy and who is poor while they are sitting in the coffeehouse. Both the wealthy and the poor families work in their lands, wear similar kinds of clothes, and men of the village from different ranks pass time in the same coffeehouse. Basing on such kind of features expressed by peasants, the thesis argued that the class-based differences in the village has a less ocularcentric character and peasants define the relations in the village as horizontal by situating themselves in these horizontal relations. However, it does not mean that the relations in the village are safe from class differentiation and hierarchical relations. The analyses rather attempted to include how peasants experience class differences and how they evaluate these experiences.

Besides peasants' experience of class differences and hierarchical social relations in the village, the thesis focused their experience of these differences outside of the village. The study argued that peasants more openly experience hierarchical social relations in city life where unequal relations bear a more ocularcentric character. Within the context of peasants' experience of unequal or hierarchical social relations, the thesis emphasized the ocularcentric character of that relationship which connotes to a kind of relationship in which inferior-superior relationships can be constituted by means of the '*look*'. The thesis argued that contemporary class experience of peasants is characterized by peasants' being object of the '*look*' when they become

distant from their village or network of the relations around their community. In that sense, the issue of being object of the *look* also becomes a matter of being inside or outside (of the village). The thesis traced the class experience of peasants in the realm of representations developed from outside and upside nested in hegemonic culture as hierarchical (from bottom to top) construction of social relations that takes place in the context of ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ for peasants. In a village where everyone is peasant, peasants cannot experience their image which opens the door to the experience of hierarchical social relations. What is specific in terms of comprehending peasants’ experience of unequal or hierarchical social relations on the basis of class confrontations is the character of social relations of the village community which is not convenient for the constitution of hierarchical relations via class confrontations. It rather creates a notion of a horizontal kind of relations the sources of which might be traced in cultural formation of the social relations of the village in which differences cannot be noticed by the “*look*” and are not welcomed to be so. Within that framework, the thesis argued that the body of peasants becomes an area of their subordination via the experience of the subordinating representations in such a way that their sunburned skin causes them to be excluded from city life or to be inferior to urban people. Likewise, the way peasants speak becomes an area of their subordination that reproduces negative images as well as humiliating, excluding and degrading representations regarding peasants. In a similar way, space becomes a vehicle of peasants’ subordination. What is significant here is not the food eaten or the clothes bought but the place (city) where these are eaten and bought. Thus, urban space becomes a source of superiority over peasants.

On the other hand, the thesis puts emphasis on different ways of resisting to these subordinating experiences and images as well as certain tactics that range from hiding their injuries, using their moral values as a weapon, and mocking and trivializing the subordinating features to defending themselves against the injuries. Peasants develop against these subordinating representations by means of either the power of imagination that invalidate these representations or using tactics to bypass subordinating relations. The thesis argued that peasants resist against these

representations either by adopting the hegemonic language of the wealth via certain tactics or using non-hegemonic language as spoiling the order of the hegemonic one. Imagining to beat the snob and wealthy men, imagining to purchase the nightclub that he could not accepted, hiding his being farmer from his girlfriend, insisting to speak with the vocabulary of peasants in a fashionable store, accusing the wealthy of not having moral values and happiness that the poor have are seen within the framework of their resistance against the subordinating representations. In that sense, the thesis assumes that the contradictory relationship between hegemonic and non-hegemonic elements can be seen as a part and parcel of the making of class experience and class struggle.

In that sense, the thesis attached importance to peasants' *art of making do with* in terms of comprehending and analyzing the resistance dynamics of PCP'ers. Such a standpoint should be thought in parallel with the aim of the thesis asserting that hegemonic operations and processes are not totally absorbed by peasants as passive objects but they develop certain tactics to cope with subordinating relations. While it is valid for their tactics to keep themselves against class injuries, a kind of 'art of making do with' can be seen in tactics of making out. The thesis argued that the diversity of peasants' tactics to avoid, to operate, to manipulate or to turn the subordinating implementations that complicate the survival of PCP'ers into their own benefit indicate a dynamic process that still goes on in terms of petty commodity production. What is significant in terms of peasants' tactics is that they manage to be plural in solutions and creative within the realm of the official or legal borders without crossing the borders imposed on them by means of resisting rather than revolting against.

Finally, while the thesis used Marxist conceptual framework and way of analysis, it benefited from non-Marxist approaches and methodologies especially when understanding and analyzing the subjective experiences of peasants who are 'foster children' of Marxism, as the phrase goes. In that sense, the thesis attached importance to post-modern expansions to contemporary agrarian studies in terms of its contribution to questioning the dichotomic assumptions of the prevailing literature

that opening the door for analyses including differences, heterogeneities and specificities as well as discourse and experience on methodological level. It was also supposed that expansions of post-modern agrarian studies should be included to modernist studies for a critical contribution to modernist analyses in order to better understand the complex picture of agrarian relations as well as peasantry on global level.

REFERENCES

- Akram-Lodhi A. H. & Cristóbal K. (2010) Surveying the agrarian question (part 1): unearthing foundations, exploring diversity, *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37:1, 177-202.
- Araghi, F. A. (2009). The invisible hand and the visible food: peasants, dispossession and globalization. In: A. Haroon Akram-Lodhi & Cristóbal Kay, (ed), 2009. *Peasants and Globalization: Political Economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question* (pp. 111-147). New York: Routledge.
- Araghi, F. A. (1995). Global Depeasantization, 1945-1990 *The Sociological Quarterly*, Volume 36, Number 2, pages 337-36.
- Arnold, D. (2000). Gramsci and Peasant Subalternity in India. In: Chaturvedi, Vinayak (ed.). *Mapping Subaltern Studies and the Postcolonial* (pp. 24-49). London: Verso.
- Aston, T.H. & Philpin, C.H.E. (eds.). (1987). *The Brenner debate: agrarian class structure and economic development in preindustrial Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aydın, Z. (2010). Neo-Liberal Transformation of Turkish Agriculture. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 149–187.
- Banaji, J. (1976). Summary of selected parts of Kautsky's *The Agrarian Question*. *Economy & Society*, Vol. 5 Issue 1, pp. 2- 48.
- Berstein H. and Byres T.J., (2001) From Peasant Studies to Agrarian Change, *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol 1. No 1, January 2001, pp.1.56.
- Bernstein, H. (2009). Agrarian questions from transition to globalization. In: A. Haroon Akram-Lodhi & Cristóbal Kay, (ed), 2009. *Peasants and Globalization: Political Economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question* (pp. 239-261). New York: Routledge.

- Borras, S.M., Jr. (2008). La Vı'a Campesina and its global campaign for agrarian reform. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 8(2/3), 258–89.
- Boratav, K. (2004). *Tarımsal Yapılar ve Kapitalizm*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Boratav, K. (2005). *1980'li Yıllarda Türkiye'de Sosyal Sınıflar ve Bölüşüm*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Boratav, K. (2010). *Emperyalizm, Sosyalizm ve Türkiye*. İstanbul: Yordam.
- Bourdieu, P. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Routledge, Londra.
- Büke, A. (2008). *Globalization, Transnationalization and Imperialism: Evaluation of Sociology of Agriculture and Food in the Case of Turkey*, METU Master Thesis of Sociology Department.
- Byres, T.J. (2009). The landlord class, peasant differentiation, class struggle and the transition to capitalism. In: A.H. Akram-Lodhi and C. Kay, (eds.), *Peasants and globalization: political economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question* (pp. 57–82). London: Routledge.
- Chatterjee, P. (2000). The Nation and Its Peasants. In: Chaturvedi, Vinayak (ed.). *Mapping Subaltern Studies and the Postcolonial* (pp. 8-23). London: Verso.
- Çınar, S. (2014). *Öteki Proletarya De-proletarşasyon ve Mevsimlik Tarım İşçileri*. Ankara: Nota Bene.
- De Certeau, M. (1988). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dobb, M. (1964). *Studies in the development of capitalism*. London: Routledge.
- Doğan, E. T. (2004). *1990'lı Yıllarda Türkiye'de Çalışma Yaşamı ve Tüketim*, unpublished Master Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi.

Ecevit, M.C., Karkıner, N & Buke, A. Köy Sosyolojisinin Daraltılmış Kapsamından, Tarım-Gıda-Köylülük İlişkilerine Yönelik Bazı Değerlendirmeler. Mülkiye, 2009. Cilt XXXIII. Sayı: 262.

Erdoğan, N. (2007). Yok-Sanma: Yoksulluk-Maduniyet ve “Fark Yaraları”. In N. Erdoğan (ed.), Yoksulluk Halleri: Türkiye’de Kent Yoksulluğunun Toplumsal Görünümleri (pp. 47-96). İstanbul: İletişim.

Erdoğan, N. (2014, August 27). *SINIF KARSILASMALARI (4): 'Beyaz adamlar' ve 'Apaçiler'*, from Muhalefet web sitesi: <http://muhalefet.org/yazi-%E2%80%98beyaz-adamlar-ve-%E2%80%98apaciler-necmi-erdogan-0-3229.aspx>

Ghosh, B. N. (2004). *Dependency Theory Revisited*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Glavanis, Kathy R, (1983) The sociology of agrarian relations in the Middle East: The Persistence of Household Production. London: Sage.

Günaydın, G. (2010) *Tarım ve Kısallıkta Dönüşüm: Politika Transferi Süreci / AB ve Türkiye*. Ankara: Tan.

Hilton, R.H. (1990). Class conflict and the crisis of feudalism (revised edition). London: Verso

Hobsbawm, E. (1992). The Crisis of Today’s Ideologies. *New Left Review*, Issue 192, 55-64.

Howard, B. & Wajeman, J. (1978). “The Hidden Injuries of Class”, by Richard Sennett and Jonathan Cobb, *Sociological Review*; Feb78, Vol. 26 Issue 1, p. 164-166.

- Kathy Le Mons Walker, (2008) From Covert to Overt: Everyday Peasant Politics in China and the Implications for Transnational Agrarian Movements, *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 8 No. 2 and 3, pp. 462–488.
- Keskin, N. E. & Yaman, M. (2013). *Türkiye’de Tütün: Reji’den TEKEL’e TEKEL’den Bugüne*. Ankara: Nota Bene.
- Keyder, Ç. & Yenal, Z. (2013). *Bildiğimiz Tarımın Sonu: Küresel İktidar ve Köylülük*. İstanbul: İletişim
- Lenin, V.I. 1964. The development of capitalism in Russia. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Long, N. (2008). Resistance, Agency, and Counterwork: A Theoretical Positioning. In: Wright, W. & Middendorf, G. (eds.). *The Fight Over Food* (pp. 69-92). Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Long, N. and Long, A. (1992) *Battlefields of Knowledge: The Interlocking of Theory and Practice in Social Research and Development*. London: Routledge.
- Martínez-Torres M. E. & Rosset, P. M. (2010). La Vía Campesina: the Birth and Evolution of a Transnational Social Movement, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37:1, 149-175.
- McMichael, P. (2009). Food sovereignty, social reproduction and the agrarian question. In: A. Haroon Akram-Lodhi & Cristóbal Kay, (ed), 2009. Peasants and Globalization: Political Economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question (pp. 288-312). New York: Routledge.
- Mitchell, J. P. A fourth critic of the Enlightenment: Michel de Certeau and the ethnography of subjectivity *Social Anthropology* (2007) 15, 1 89–106.
- Ortner, S. B. (2005). Subjectivity and cultural critique, *Anthropological Theory* 5 (1), pp. 31–52.
- Oyan, O. (2002). From Agricultural Policies to an Agriculture without Policies. In: Balkan, N & Savran, S. (ed.). *The Ravages of Neo-liberalism: Economy, Society and Gender in Turkey* (p. 55-71). New York: Nova Science.

- Önal, N. E. (2012). *Anadolu Tarımının 150 Yıllık Öyküsü*, İstanbul, Yazılama.
- Ploeg J.D. Van der. (2008) *The New Peasantries: Struggles for Autonomy and Sustainability in an Era of Empire and Globalization*. Padstow: Earthscan.
- Rosenberg, J. (2000). *The Follies of Globalisation Theory*. London, New York: Verso.
- Saborin, Eric. (2014, August 27). “Facing the empire of agro-food industry: the peasant principle”, from Rural Development: Challenges and Interlinkages web site, <http://www.jandouwevanderploeg.com/EN/the-new-peasantries/reviews/by-eric-sabourin-in-la-revue-du-mauss/>
- Sayer, A. (2005). *The Moral Significance of Class*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, J. C. (1985) *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Seddon, D & Margulies, R. (1984). The politics of the agrarian question in Turkey: review of a debate. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 11 (3): 28-59.
- Sennet, R. & Cobb, J. (1977). *The Hidden Injuries of Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sennett, R. (2011). *Karakter Aşınması*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı.
- Sirman, N. (1988). *Peasants and Family Farms: The Position of Households in Cotton Production in a Village of Western Turkey*, unpublished Phd Thesis, University of London.
- Swartz, D. (1997). *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Sweezy, P. et al. (1978). *The transition from feudalism to capitalism*. London: Verso
- Thompson, E. P. (1978). Eighteenth-Century English Society: Class Struggle without Class?, *Social History*, Vol. 3, Issue 2, p. 133-165.
- Thompson, E. P. (1966). *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Random House.
- Ulukan, U. (2009). *Türkiye Tarımında Yapısal Dönüşüm ve Sözleşmeli Çiftçilik: Bursa Örneği*. İstanbul: SAV.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wolf, E. (1966). *Peasants*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.
- Wood, E. Meiksins. (2000). *Democracy against Capitalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yenal, Z. (1999). Food TNC's, Intellectual Property Investments and Post-Fordist Food Consumption: The Case of Unilever and Nestle in Turkey. *International Journal of the Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, Vol. 8: 21-34.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INFORMATION ABOUT THE INTERVIEWEES

Name	Age	Education	Type of PCP'er	Wage Work Experience	Place of Residence (Village or City)
İbrahim	20	VHS	Small PCP	No	Village
Muharrem	29	PS	Small PCP	No	Village
Murat	31	VHS	Big PCP	No	City
Emre	27	VHS	Middle PCP	No	City
Ahmet	51	PS	Middle PCP	No	Village
Halil	35	VHS	Middle PCP	TNA	Village
Mesude	38	SC	Small PCP	SNA	Village
Mustafa	38	PS	Small PCP	TNA	Village
Yasin	30	PS	Small PCP	TNA	Village
Ahmet	40	PS	Small PCP	No	Village
Ekrem	47	PS	Middle PCP	No	Village
Ethem	31	VHS	Small PCP	PNA	Village
Mehmet	33	VHS	Small PCP	TNA	Village
İsmail	45	PS	Middle PCP	No	Village
Tosun	17	SC	Small PCP	TNA	Village
İsmet	19	SC	Small PCP	TNA	Village
Rıdvan	40	PS	Middle PCP	No	Village
Muhittin	32	PS	Small PCP	No	Village
Tekin	35	VHS	Small PCP	TNA	Village
Rıza	47	PS	Middle PCP	No	Village
Ayten	42	PS	Small PCP	AWL	Village
Sebahat	45	PS	Small PCP	AWL	Village
Yılmaz	51	PS	Big PCP	No	Village
Eşref	49	PS	Big PCP	No	Village
Şermin	29	SC	Small PCP	AWL	Village
Aynur	38	PS	Small PCP	SNA	Village
Şeref	70	-----	Middle PCP	No	Village

VHS: Vocational High School

PS: Primary School

SC: Secondary School

SNA: Seasonal Non-Agricultural Wage Labourer

TNA: Temporary Non-Agricultural Wage Labourer

PNA: Permanent Non-Agricultural Wage Labourer

AWL: Agricultural Wage Labourer

APPENDIX B

TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Bu tez Türkiye'nin batısında bir köyde yapılan alan çalışmasına dayanarak küçük meta üreticilerinin sınıfsal direniş dinamikleri ve gündelik hayatın öznel karakterini analiz ederek tarımsal ilişkilerdeki deęişimi anlamayı hedeflemektedir. Küçük köylülük ile genel toplumsal ilişkiler arasındaki ilişkiyi Türkiye'deki küçük meta üreticilerinin mevcut sınıf deneyimi çerçevesinde kurarken; duygular, değerler, beklentiler ve temsillerde gömülü olan küçük köylülüğün sınıf karşılaşmalarını kapsamaya çalışmaktadır. Ayrıca köylülerin 'köylü temsillerini' nasıl deneyimledikleri de sınıf oluşumunun önemli bir parçası olarak direniş dinamikleri temelinde anlaşılmaya çalışılmaktadır. Direniş dinamiklerini anlamak amacıyla aile içerisindeki usta-çırak ilişkisi temelinde köylü emeğinin karakteri ile üretim ve yeniden üretimin iç içe geçmesi ile şekillenen küçük meta üretiminin özgün iş disiplinine odaklanılmaktadır. Böyle bir analizin 'hegemonik', 'hegemonik olmayan' ve 'karşı hegemonik' unsurlar barındıran köylülerin baskılanmasının özgünlüklerini anlamaya yardımcı olacağı iddia edilmektedir. Bu bağlamda, küçük meta üreticilerinin çözülme yönündeki basınçlara karşı çok yönlü sınıfsal farklılaşma ve kültürel çeşitlenme örüntüleri ile sınıf karşılaşmalarına dayanan gündelik hayat deneyimleri içerisindeki temsiller yoluyla direndiği iddia edilmektedir.

Tarımsal tartışmalar küçük köylülüğün önemini gittikçe kaybederek marjinalleştiğinin ilanı ile neoliberal dönemi karşılarken tarımsal ilişkileri ele alan çalışmaların odağı küçük köylülükten küresel kapitalizmin hareketlerine kaymıştır. Tarım çalışmaları açısından öyle bir döneme gelmiştir ki önde gelen entelektüellerden Eric Hobsbawm köylülüğün ilk defa bu dönemde Üçüncü Dünya ülkelerinde bile azınlık haline geldiğini ifade ederken, tarımsal çalışmaların önde gelen isimlerinden Henry Bernstein bu kanıyı küçük köylülüğü ve onun direniş unsurlarını inceleyen çalışmaları popülist olmakla suçlayarak desteklemiştir. Neoliberal dönemdeki Türkiye'deki tarımsal çalışmalar da bu genel atmosferden azade olmamıştır. 1980'lerden sonra tarım çalışmalarına olan ilgi ciddi ölçüde

azalırken, bu ilgi 1990’larda Avrupa Birliği üyelik süreci tartışmalarının etkisi altında tarımsal uyum politikalarına kaymıştır. Öte yandan Türkiye’deki çağdaş tarım çalışmalarının ‘küreselleşme’, ‘ticarileşme’, ‘meta zincirleri’, ‘tarım-gıda ilişkileri’ ve ‘ulusaşırı şirketler’ temelinde yapılan analizlerin damgasını vurmuştur. Bu doğrultuda köylülerin ‘kendi toprağında proletere’, ‘tarım işçisine’ ya da ‘köy ayaklı işçiye’ dönüştüğü ya da ‘sınıfsal farklılaşma ile çözülüyor olduğu’ gibi çıkarımlar genel eğilimin çözülme dinamiklerinin vurgulanması yönünde olduğu iddia edilmektedir. Bu durumda köylüler, belirli ilişkilerin öncülüğünde *zorunlu* olarak ya da *özünde* başka bir şeye dönüşmesi gereken bir *şey* olarak ele alınmış olmaktadır.

Literatürdeki küçük meta üretiminin ve köylülüğün çözülmesine odaklanan genel eğilimin aksine bu tez tarımsal ilişkilerdeki değişimi küçük meta üreticilerinin sınıfsal farklılaşması ve gündelik hayatın öznel deneyimleri çerçevesinde direniş dinamikleri temelinde incelemektedir. Bu bağlamda küçük meta üreticilerinin sınıfsal farklılaşmasının çeşitlenerek arttığı iddia edilmektedir. Ayrıca üretim ilişkileri temelindeki sınıfsal farklılaşmanın analizine ek olarak küçük meta üreticilerinin öznelliklerini dahil eden başka bir inceleme boyutunun eklenmesi gerektiği düşünülmüştür. Bu sebeple ‘küçük köylülük’ kavramsallaştırmasının bu öznelliklerin incelenmesinde kullanılabileceği ifade edilmiştir. Küçük köylülüğün öznelliklerinin analize dahil edilmesinin bir takım direniş dinamiklerini açığa çıkaracağı iddia edilmektedir. Buna paralel olarak küçük meta üreticilerinin emek ve zaman kullanımı, üretim sürecinin deneyim şekli gibi konularda görece özerkliğini koruma yönünde güçlü bir eğiliminin olduğu ortaya konulmaktadır. Bu noktada tez, direniş unsurlarına bu unsurları evrenselleştirmeden ve ‘köycü’ bir yaklaşıma başvurmadan odaklanmaktadır.

Küçük köylülük Türkiye tarımsal ilişkilerinin en köklü ve en yaygın unsurunu oluşturduğundan (Özuğurlu, 2011: 15) bu tez, analiz birimi olarak küçük meta üreticilerine odaklanmaktadır ve uzun tarihsel seyri içinde küçük köylülüğün özgün karakterinin direnme ve uyum sağlama kapasitesi olduğundan (Özuğurlu, 2011: 11) direniş dinamiklerine odaklanılmaktadır. Öte yandan küçük köylülüğün ve Türkiye tarımsal ilişkilerinin özgün unsurlarını anlamak için sadece küçük köylülüğe

odaklanmanın yetersiz olduđu, konunun nasıl ele alındığının da önem taşıdığı düşünölmektedir. Bu yüzden de küçük köylölüğün direniş dinamiklerine Türkiye tarımsal ilişkilerinin özgönlükleri ve küçük köylölüğün öznellikleri çerçevesinde odaklanılmaktadır. Böylelikle köylöler öznelliklerinin, tahakkümün içim ve boyutunu belirlemesi bağlamında toplumsal değışimin aktif özneleri olurlar. Öte yandan bu çerçevede bir analizdir direniş sadece politik eylemlilik çerçevesinde ele alan bir yaklaşım ile gerçekleştirilemeyeceğı ifade edilmektedir. Bu noktada mevcut çalışmaların köylölüğü yapısal değışikliklere maruz kalan neoliberal politikaların edilgen nesnelere olarak ele aldığı düşünölmektedir. Bu yaklaşımın aksine bu tez, direniş dinamiklerinin fark edilebilmesi için köylölerin gündelik hayatına, sınıf karşılaşmalarının özne deneyimlerine, geleneksel deđerleri ve kültürel desenlerine odaklanmaktadır. Böyle bir yaklaşımın önemi sınıfı bir ilişki ve süreç olarak kavrayarak sınıf bilincinin ve politik eylemliliğın yokluğunda sınıfsal oluşumları fark edebilmekte yatmaktadır. Bu yüzden bu tez, küçük köylölüğe odaklanmakla yetinmemiş onların deneyimlerini de analize dahil etmiştir. Bu deneyimi dahil ederken de küçük köylölüğün öznelliklerine odaklanılmıştır. Böyle bir anlayışın çözüme ya da devamlılık sorunsalını daha iyi kavrayabileceğı ve neden farklı yerlerde farklı süreçlerin yaşandığına dair de bir cevap üretebileceğı düşünölmektedir.

Öte yandan klasik sosyoloji köyü ve kırsal ilişkileri, genel toplumsal ilişkilerle bağlantısını kurmadan sorunlaştırmakta ve köyü homojen bir birim olarak ele almaktadır. Sonuç olarak da homojenleştirdiğı özellikleri evrenselleştirmektedir. Bu bağlamda ‘evrensel’ analiz yöntemini kullandığı ve özgönlükleri evrenselleştirdiğı için de ‘köycü’ olduğı iddia edilmektedir. Kırsal sosyoloji çalışmaları, kırdaki gözlenen değışimin kırsal toplumun tamamında bir dönüşüme neden olup olmamasını kuramsal olarak sorunsallaştırmaktan ziyade, kırdaki gözlenen değışikliklerin sonuçlarına odaklanmıştır (Ecevit, Kırkıner & Búke, 2009: 42).

Tarihselci yaklaşım ise köyü ve kırsal ilişkileri genel toplumsal ilişkilerle bağlantısını kurarak sorunsallaştırmaktadır. Hatta genel toplumsal ilişkilerden başlayarak köye ve kırsal ilişkilere gelmektedir ve bu yaklaşım da küçük köylölüğün

bir olgu ve analitik bir kategori olarak öneminin küçümsenmesine sebep olmaktadır. Tarihselci yaklaşım, dünya görüşünün yapısalcı olmayan birikiminden yararlanamamış ve ekonomi politiğin kavram hazinesiyle sınırlı kalmıştır (Özügürlü, 2011: 71). Neoliberal dönemde çoğalan küreselleşme, ticarileşme, sermaye döngüsü temelli analizler bu çalışmada bu çerçevede içerisinde ele alınmaktadır.

Tezin literatüre katkısı ise küçük köylülük ile genel toplumsal ilişkiler arasındaki bağlantının ekonomi politik analizi göz ardı etmeden kültürel alan temelinde kurulmaya çalışılmasıdır. Bu amaçla tez; yöntemsel olarak söylem, deneyim ve özneye başvururken küçük köylülüğü hem bir oldu hem de analitik bir kategori olarak ele almaktadır. Bu bağlamda sınıf karşılaşmaları temelinde yapılan analizleri, köylülüğün saklı yaralarını ve sınıf deneyimini, gündelik hayat pratiklerini, taktiklerini, köylü ve işçi temsillerini ve ‘idare etme sanatını’ analize dahil etmektedir. Bu kavramsallaştırmaların bazıları tarım literatürü dışındaki çalışmalardan küçük köylülüğün mevcut durumunun anlaşılabilmesine katkı sağlaması ve ilgili literatüre kültürel analiz boyutundan katkı yapmak amacıyla benimsenmiştir.

Türkiye’nin tarımsal üretimini hala küçük meta üreticilerinin sırtındadır ve bu tez ‘köylülüğün sonunun’ ilan edildiği bir dönemde Türkiye köylülerinin cephesinde ne olup bittiğini incelemeye çalışmaktadır. Türkiye’deki küçük meta üreticilerinin mevcut koşulları onların yaşam koşullarını zorlaştıran 1980’den sonra uygulamaya konulan bir dizi yapısal değişiklik çerçevesinde incelenmektedir. Bu tür analizler tarımsal ilişkilerdeki değişimi ve küçük meta üreticilerinin mevcut koşullarını anlamaya katkı sağlamaktadır; ancak bu tez ekonomi politik analizlere dayanan bu çalışmaları küçük köylülerin öznel deneyim ve tutumlarını analize dâhil ederek desteklemeye ve yapısal değişikliklerin onlar tarafından nasıl deneyimlendiğini kavramaya çalışmaktadır.

Mevcut çalışmalardaki analitik ilgi küçük meta üreticilerinden sermayenin küresel hareketlerine kaymasıyla birlikte çağdaş pek çok çalışma ‘küreselleşme’ kavramsallaştırmasının damgasını taşımaktadır. Yaygın kullanımına rağmen

kavramsallaştırma üzerinde kayda değer bir tartışmanın eksikliği göz önüne alınarak ‘küreselleşme’ kavramsallaştırmasına tarım çalışmaları çerçevesinde eleştirel bir değerlendirme yapılmaktadır. Küreselleşme tarihsel bir sürecin sonucu olmakla birlikte kavramsallaştırmanın tarımsal ilişkilerdeki değişimin açıklayıcısı olarak kullanıldığı, mevcut çalışmaların analitik ilgisinin küresel kapitalizmin yürütücüsü olarak görülen ‘ulusaşırı şirketlere’ kaydığı ve bunun küreselleşme kavramsallaştırmasının mevcut ilişkileri verili kabul edip onları sorunsallaştıramayan bir ‘boş gösterene’ dönüşmesi tehlikesini yarattığı iddia edilmektedir. Bu çerçevede tez, çağdaş tarım literatürünün eleştirel bir değerlendirmesini yapmaktadır.

Bu bağlamda çalışma boyunca mümkün olduğu kadar metodolojik noktaların tartışılması konusunda hassas davranılmaktadır. Çağdaş tarım çalışmalarının değerlendirmesi, dünya literatürü ve Türkiye’deki ilgili literatür ile klasik ve çağdaş tarım sorgulamaları arasındaki bağlantılar kurularak yapılmaktadır. Bu bağlamda çalışmaların odak noktaları arasındaki değişimler ve metodolojik duruşlar tartışılmaya çalışılmaktadır. Literatürün önce gelen çalışmaları değerlendirilirken bu çalışmaların kavramsal çerçevesi de sorunlaştırılmaktadır. Bu noktada tez, yaygın olarak kullanılan ve popüler kavramsallaştırmalar konusunda duyarlıdır ve bu kavramsallaştırmaları rastgele kullanmak yerine metodolojik olarak sorunlaştırmaya çalışmaktadır.

Açıklanan sorunsal çerçevesinde Manisa’nın Hamzabeyli köyünde bir alan çalışması gerçekleştirilmiştir. Manisa ilinin seçilmesinin sebebi, tarımsal ve tarım dışı üretim ilişkilerinin gelişmiş olması ve tarihsel olarak bir ticaret merkezi olan İzmir’e yakın olmasıdır. Ayrıca Ege Bölgesi tarımsal küçük meta üreticiliğinin direnişi açısından önemli bir bölgedir. Hamzabeyli köyünün seçilmesinin sebebi ise köyün temel geçim kaynağının hala küçük üreticilik temelinde tarımsal faaliyet olmasıdır. Kent merkezine 20 dakikalık uzaklıktadır. Sınıfsal farklılaşma açısından zengindir. Alan çalışması sınıfsal farklılaşmanın zenginliğinin ortaya çıkarılması amacıyla her birinin iç farklılaşmaları dikkate alınarak büyük, küçük ve orta küçük meta üreticileri ile tarımsal üretimle bağlantısı kopan fazlalık nüfustan teşkil eden hane tipinin yanı sıra bir fabrikada ücretli işçilik yapan küçük üreticiler ve tarımsal işçilik yapan küçük

üreticileri kapsamaktadır. İlişkilerin çeşitliliğini derinleştirmek amacıyla alan çalışmasında cinsiyet ve yaş unsurlarında hassas davranılmaya çalışılmış kadın, genç ve yaşlı köylüler de kapsamaya çalışılmıştır. Hem birebir mülakatlardan hem de grup görüşmelerinden yararlanılmıştır ve görüşmeler kayıt altına alınmıştır. Köyün küçük üreticilik geçmişinin öğrenilmesi amacıyla öncelikle köyün tarihçesi araştırılmıştır ve bunun için köyün yaşlıları ile ve muhtarla görüşülmüştür. Köyün tarihsel gelişimi Türkiye'nin ekonomik ve toplumsal gelişimi ile paralel olarak değerlendirilmeye çalışılmıştır. Sonra köydeki mevcut sınıfsal farklılaşma, mülkiyet yapısı ve hane emeği ile yabancı emek kullanımının biçimlerini kavramaya dönük olarak farklı tabakalardan küçük üreticilerle görüşülmüştür. Daha sonra da köylülerin kendi durumlarını nasıl yorumladıklarının, nasıl hissettiklerinin, beklentilerinin neler olduğunun ve yaşadıkları eşitsiz ilişkilerin kendileri tarafından nasıl yorumlandığının anlaşılabilmesi amacıyla yine farklı tabakalardan ve yaş gruplarından kadın ve erkeklerle görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Ancak görüşmeler genellikle köyün kahvehanesinde yapıldığından kadınlarla görüşebilmek daha zor olmuştur. Öte yandan köyün genel atmosferinin ve köylülerin genel ruh halinin alan çalışması yoluyla hissedilebilmesi tezin amacıyla paralel olarak köylülerin öznelliklerinin anlaşılabilmesine katkı sağlamıştır.

Tez alan çalışmasına çalışmanın metodolojisinin bir parçası olarak önem vermektedir; alan çalışmasını teorik analizin somut bir örnekleme ya da sağlaması olarak görmemektedir. Alan çalışmasının teorik analiz çerçevesini geliştirecek ve ona katkı sağlayacak yeni bakış açıları sağladığı düşünülmektedir. Tezin sınıf karşılaşmalarına dayanan gündelik hayat deneyiminin öznel unsurlarını anlama amacıyla paralel olarak yapılan çalışmada küçük meta üreticilerinin kendi seslerinin duyulması köylülerin 'patates çuvalı' olduğu genel kabulüne bir eleştiri olarak sağlanmaya çalışılmaktadır. Böyle bir bakış açısı, sınıf mücadelesini açık bir eylemlilik şeklinde cereyan etmediği zamanlarda da anlayabilmek açısından önemsenmektedir. 'Köylülüğün sonu' konusu popüler olarak tartışılırken, köylülerin kendi gelecekleri hakkında ne düşündükleri ve kendi hayatlarındaki değişimi nasıl yorumladıkları tarımsal değişimin kavranması açısından çok önemli bir unsur olarak

ele alınmaktadır. Bu noktada alan çalışmasının bir avantajı da çalışmanın odağındaki direniş unsurlarını kavramaya yardımcı olması bakımından görüşme yapılan köylülerin hissiyatları ve genel ruh halini anlayabilmektir.

Hamzabeyli köyünde yapılan alan çalışması küçük meta üreticilerinin icar, haneden emek ihraç etme, ticari faaliyette bulunma, ürün desenini deęiştirme gibi çeşitli yollarla küçük meta üretimini çözüme yönündeki basınçlara karşı direndiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Çözölmeye karşı direnmenin çeşitli yollarının, tarımsal ilişkilerde dinamik bir süreci yaratarak sınıfsal farklılaşmayı geliştirdiğı sonucuna varılmıştır. Bu bağlamda sınıf, bir ilişki ve süreç olarak ele alındığı ölçüde küçük meta üretiminin sınıf dinamikleri açısından zengin olduğu söylenmektedir. Bu dinamikler çerçevesinde köydeki proleterleşme ve mülksüzleşme eğilimlerinin zayıf olduğuna işaret edilmektedir. Küçük meta üretimini yeniden üreten bir süreç olarak küçük meta üreticilerinin direniş dinamiklerinin onların deęişen koşullara uyum sağlama kapasitesini arttırdığı iddia edilmektedir.

Bu bağlamda tez aile içerisindeki usta-çırak ilişkisi temelinde köylü emeğinin karakteri ile üretim ve yeniden üretimin iç içe geçmesi ile şekillenen küçük meta üretiminin özgün iş disiplinine odaklanmaktadır. Üretim ve yeniden üretim iç içe geçtiğı ölçüde kapitalist iş disiplinine özgü kavramsallaştırmaların sorunlu hale geldiğı ifade edilmiştir. Traktör bir prestij kaynağı ya da çocukluk hatıralarının önemli bir parçası olduğu ölçüde, toprak sadece ürün yetiştirmenin bir aracı deęil de önceki kuşaklardan kalan ve muhafaza edilip sonraki kuşaklara aktarılması gereken bir miras olduğu ölçüde üretim araçları kavramsallaştırması küçük meta üretiminin özgünlüğü içerisinde yeniden sorunsallaştırılması gereken bir hal aldığı ifade edilmektedir. Köylü emeğine dair bu tür unsurlar küçük meta üreticilerinin sınıfsal direniş dinamiklerini anlamak açısından analiz edilmektedir.

Köylülerin özel bir emek türüne karşı oldukça duyarlı oldukları, köylü veya çiftçi kimliğinin güçlü olduğu ve bunların küçük meta üreticilerinin direnişine önemli ölçüde katkısı olduğu ortaya konmaktadır. Bu doğrultuda köylü emeğinin görece özerk kalma eğilimi olduğu iddia edilmektedir. Köylülerin ücretli emek

deneyimlerinin yanı sıra ücretli emeğe dair temsillerine dayanarak bu eğilimin kaynağının köylülerin zaman, üretim süreci ve işbölümü üzerindeki denetiminin yanı sıra kendi emeğine yabancılaşmanın daha az olması ve üretim ile yeniden üretimin iç içe geçmesi olduğu ileri sürülmektedir. Bu çerçevede kapitalist iş disiplinine karşı direndikleri iddia edilmektedir. Bu direnişin işaretlerinden biri olarak köylülerin ücretli işçi olarak çalıştıklarında bu disipline uyum sağlayamamaları böyle bir sisteme alışkın olmadıklarını ifade ederek aktardıkları deneyimler sonucunda ortaya konulmaktadır. Böyle bir sistemi katlanılmaz ve adaletsiz bulduklarını ifade etmişlerdir. Direnişin bir diğer işareti olarak da ücretli işçiliğe dair köylülerin ifade ettiği ‘el işinde çalışmak’, ‘el kapısında çalışmak’ ve ‘yarış atı gibi çalışmak’ gibi olumsuz temsillerde yattığı ortaya konulmaktadır. Köylülerin proleterleşme eğilimlerinin bu gibi unsurların da hesaba katılarak analiz edilmesinin söz konusu eğilimin anlaşılmasında faydası olacağı iddia edilmektedir. Bu bağlamda tez, işçi-köylü ikiliğini köylülerin öznel ücretli işçilik deneyimleri ve ücretli işçiliğe dair temsiller temelinde aşmaya çalışmaktadır.

Ayrıca sınıf karşılaşmaları temelinde sınıf oluşumunun önemli bir unsuru olarak köylülerin ‘köylü temsillerini’ nasıl deneyimledikleri anlaşılmaya çalışılmaktadır. Bu bağlamda sınıf sadece ekonomik farklılıklar meselesi değil eşitsiz toplumsal ilişkilerin ve farkların öznel deneyimi olarak da ele alınmaktadır. ‘Yukarıdan’ ve ‘dışarıdan’ oluşturulan köylü temsilleri köylülerin dünyasında saklı yaralar açarken, köylüler de olumsuz temsillerle başa çıkabilmek için çeşitli taktikler geliştirmektedirler. Bu bağlamda bu temsiller ve karşısında geliştirilen taktikler köylülerin çözülmeye karşı direnişinin bir parçası olarak ele alınmaktadır. Bu çerçevede köylülerin ‘zengin’ algısı, bir kısmı öznel deneyimlere dayanan olumsuz temsillerin nasıl oluştuğunu anlamak açısından önemsenmektedir. Bu tez köydeki zengin ve yoksul hayatlarının birbirine benzerliğinin hiyerarşik-eşitsiz ilişkilerin deneyimini azalttığını iddia etmektedir. Görüşmeci köylülerden birinin de dediği gibi dışarıdan gelen bir kimse kahvede oturan köylülerden kimin zengin kimin yoksul olduğunu anlayamamaktadır. Zengin haneler de yoksul haneler de toprağında çalışmakta, benzer tür kıyafetler giymekte ve köyün farklı refah kesimlerinden gelen

erkekleri aynı kahvehane de oturmaktadır. Köylülerin köydeki ilişkileri yatay bir düzlemde tanımladığı buna benzer unsurlara dayanarak sınıfsal farklılıkların daha az göz merkezli bir karakter taşıdığı ortaya konulmaktadır. Fakat bu tespit, köydeki ilişkilerin sınıfsal farklardan ve hiyerarşik ilişkilerden azade olduğu anlamına gelmemektedir. Daha ziyade köylülerin sınıfsal farkları nasıl deneyimledikleri ve bu deneyimleri nasıl yorumladıklarının analize dâhil edilmesi amacını taşımaktadır.

Köylülerin sınıfsal farkları ve hiyerarşik toplumsal ilişkileri köy dışında nasıl deneyimledikleri de analiz edilmektedir. Köylülerin hiyerarşik toplumsal ilişkileri, eşitsiz ilişkilerin daha göz merkezli bir karakter taşıdığı kent hayatında daha açık bir şekilde deneyimledikleri iddia edilmektedir. Köylülerin çağdaş sınıf deneyiminin köyden ve köyün ilişki ağından uzaklaştıklarında ‘*bakışın nesnesi*’ olmalarıyla şekillendiği tartışılmaktadır. Toplumsal ilişkilerin hiyerarşik oluşumu köylüler açısından ‘içerde olma’ ve ‘dışarıda kalma’ bağlamında gerçekleştiği için köylülerin sınıf deneyimi, hegemonik kültür içinden köylülere ‘dışarıdan’ ve ‘yukarıdan’ geliştirilen temsiller üzerinden incelenmektedir. Herkesin köylü olduğu bir yerde köylüler, hiyerarşik ve eşitsiz ilişkilere kapı açan ‘köylü temsillerini’ deneyimlememektedir. Köylülerin sınıf karşılaşmaları temelinde eşitsiz ve hiyerarşik ilişkileri deneyimlemesi bakımından önemli olan nokta köyün toplumsal ilişkilerinin sınıf karşılaşmaları yoluyla hiyerarşik ilişkilerin kurulmasına uygun olmayan karakterinde yatmaktadır. Farkların ‘*bakış*’ yoluyla fark edilmesinin zor olduğu ve hoş da karşılanmadığı köyün toplumsal ilişkilerinin kültürel oluşumu temelinde anlaşılabilir bir ‘yatay toplumsal ilişkiler algısının’ varlığı ortaya konulmaktadır.

Bu çerçevede köylülerin yanık tenlerinin onların kent hayatından dışlanmalarına ya da kentli insanlar tarafından aşağı görülmelerine sebep olması bağlamında köylülerin bedenlerinin, aşağılayıcı temsillerin deneyimlenmesi yoluyla bir tahakküm alanına döndüğü ortaya konulmaktadır. Benzer bir şekilde köylülerin konuşma tarzlarının da köylülere dair geliştirilen aşağılayıcı, dışlayıcı ve değersizleştirici temsillerin yeniden üretildiği bir tahakküm alanına dönüştüğü ifade edilmektedir. Yine benzer bir şekilde mekan da tahakkümün bir alanına dönüşebilmektedir. Buradaki önemli nokta, kentli olanın köylü olana üstünlük kurmasının bir aracı olan şey yenilen yemek veya satın

alınan kıyafet değil, yemeğin *nerede* yenildiği veya kıyafetin *nereden* satın alındığıdır. Böylece kent mekanının, köylüler üzerinde kurulan üstünlüğün bir kaynağı olduğu ortaya konulmaktadır.

Öte yandan bu tez, tahakküm edici temsillerin deneyimine karşı direnmenin çeşitli yolları ve yaraların saklanması, ahlaki değerlerin silah olarak kullanılmasına ve bu unsurlarla dalga geçerek önemsizleştirilmesine kadar çeşitlilik gösteren kendilerini korumanın bir takım taktikleri üzerinde de durmaktadır. Köylüler tahakküm edici temsillere karşı hayal etmenin gücünü kullanarak ya da bu temsilleri *atlatmak* için bir takım taktikler kullanabilmektedirler. Köylüler bu temsillere karşı direnirken zenginlerin hegemonik dilini de sahiplenebilmektedir, hegemonik dilin 'kurallarını' bozabilir ya da hegemonik olmayan bir dil de kullanabilmektedir. Zengin ve züppe adamı dövmeyi hayal etmek, çiftçi olduğunu kız arkadaşından saklamak, sosyetik bir mağazada köylü *ağzıyla* konuşmakta ısrar etmek, zenginleri yoksulların sahip olduğu ahlaki değerlere sahip olmamakla suçlamak ve mutsuzlukla nitelenmek tahakküm edici temsillere karşı direnmenin çerçevesinde değerlendirilmektedir. Bu bağlamda hegemonik ve hegemonik olmayan unsurların çelişkili ilişkisi sınıf deneyiminin oluşması ve sınıf mücadelesinin ayrılmaz bir parçası olarak ele alınmaktadır.

Gizli yaralar kavramsallaştırmasıyla sınıf karşılaşmaları temelinde eşitsizliğin gündelik gerçekliklerinin deneyimi analiz edilmektedir. Bu kavramsallaştırma Amerikan işçi sınıfının, sınıf karşılaşmaları temelinde kendilerini nasıl tanımladıklarını ve nasıl hissettiklerini sınıf deneyiminin bir parçası olarak inceleyen ve bu eşitsiz ilişkilere karşı gündelik hayat içerisinde ne gibi savunmalar geliştirdiklerini araştıran Richard Sennett'den alınmıştır. Bu bağlamda *gizli yaralar* köylülerin gündelik hayatta sınıf karşılaşmaları temelinde deneyimledikleri eşitsiz ilişkiler çerçevesinde kullanılmaktadır. Ayrıca köylülerin eşitsiz ilişkilere karşı geliştirdikleri bir takım dirençleri incelemek için köylülerin ahlaki değerleri, duyguları ve bu duyguları nasıl yorumladıkları eşitsiz ilişkilerin kişisel deneyimleri bağlamında analiz edilmektedir.

Küçük köylülüğün yaşayan bir güç olarak ele alınması amacına paralel olarak, köylülerin gündelik hayattaki direniş pratiklerini inceleyebilmek için ‘idare etme sanatı’ kavramsallaştırması kullanılmaktadır. Michael De Certeau’dan ödünç alınan ‘idare etme sanatı’, madun kesimlerin egemen olanın alan ve kurallarını kendi faydasına kullanması anlamında ‘terk etmeden kaçma’ eyleyişine tekabül etmektedir. Bu kavramsallaştırmaya, köylülerin yaşam koşullarını zorlaştıran politikaların uygulayıcısı olan tarım kredi kooperatifleri ile olan ilişkilerini incelemek ve olumsuz uygulamaları atlatmak ya da kendi lehlerine çevirmek amacıyla kullandıkları taktikleri ortaya koyabilmek çerçevesinde başvurulmaktadır. Sonuç olarak köylülerin yapısal deęişikliklerin edilgen nesnelere olmadıkları, küçük meta üreticilerinin hükümetin tahakküm edici uygulamalarına karşı çeşitli taktikler geliştirerek direndikleri vurgulanmaktadır. Bu gündelik hayatta, hissiyat ve değerler dünyasında cereyan eden taktiklerin incelenmesi sonucunda, hegemonik süreçlerin farklı kullanımlarının olabileceği gösterilmeye çalışılmaktadır.

Bu çerçevede tez, ‘idare etme sanatı’ kavramsallaştırmasını küçük meta üreticilerinin direniş dinamiklerini anlamak ve analiz etmek amacıyla kullanılmaktadır. Bu kullanım, tezin hegemonik uygulamaların ve süreçlerin köylüler tarafından edilgen bir biçimde massedilmediği, daha ziyade bu hegemonik ilişkilerle başa çıkabilmek için çeşitli taktikler geliştirdikleri iddiasıyla paralel ele alınmaktadır. ‘İdare etme sanatı’ sınıf karşılaşmaları temelinde oluşan *gizli yaralar* için geçerli olmakla birlikte geçinme taktikleri açısından da söz konusudur. Küçük meta üreticilerinin hayatlarını zorlaştıran tahakküm edici uygulamalarla başa çıkabilmek, bunlardan sakınabilmek, amacından saptırarak kullanmak ya da kendi lehine çevirmek için geliştirdikleri çeşitli taktikler, küçük meta üretimi bakımından hala dinamik bir sürecin işareti olarak yorumlanmaktadır. Bu taktikler açısından belirtilmesi gereken nokta, küçük meta üreticilerinin yasal sınırları aşmadan, isyan etmeden direnerek, çoğulcu ve yaratıcı çözümler geliştirmeleridir.

Son olarak, tezde Marksist kavramsal çerçeve ve analiz yöntemi kullanılmakla birlikte, özellikle Marksizm’in, deyim yerindeyse, üvey evladı olan köylülerin öznel deneyimlerinin anlaşılması ve incelenmesi bakımından Marksist olmayan

yaklaşımlardan da faydalanılmıştır. Bu bakımdan çağdaş tarım çalışmalarına yapılan post-modern açılımlar farklılıkların, heterojenliğin, özgünlüklerin, söylem ve deneyimlerin incelemeye dahil edilmesi bağlamında önemsenmiştir. Bu açılımların modernist çalışmalara dahil edilebilmesi, tarımsal ilişkilerin ve köylülüğün küresel düzeydeki karmaşık resmini daha iyi anlayabilmek açısından modernist analiz yönetimine eleştirel bir katkı sağlayabileceği düşünülmüştür.

APPENDIX C

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enformatik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Akmeraner
Adı : Yeşim
Bölümü : Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : Class-based Resistance Dynamics of Petty Commodity Producers: Subjective Aspects of Everyday Life in a Western Village of Turkey

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: