

TOWARDS AN APPRAISAL OF THE ACADEMIC LITERATURE ON
DETERMINANTS OF CHILD LABOUR IN TURKEY

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

BY

BURCU SAĞLAM

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL POLICY

SEPTEMBER 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha ALTUNIŐIK
Director

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

Assist. Prof. Dr. F.Umut BEŐPINAR
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

Assist. Prof. Dr. İpek EREN VURAL
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. F. Umut BeŐpinar (METU,SOC) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. İpek Eren Vural (METU,ADM) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Asuman Gökssel (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 : Burcu Sađlam

Signature :

ABSTRACT

TOWARDS AN APPRAISAL OF THE ACADEMIC LITERATURE ON DETERMINANTS OF CHILD LABOUR IN TURKEY

Sağlam, Burcu

M. S., Social Policy

Supervisor : Assist. Prof. Dr. İpek Eren Vural

September 2014, 133 pages

This thesis has two interrelated aims. First, it aims to assess the mainstream theoretical approaches that account for the causes of increasing significance of child labour. Secondly, it aims to locate the evolution of child within its political economic context of capitalist development and crisis in Turkey especially since the 1980s. The thesis argues that changing dynamics of capitalist development especially since the 1970s, (such as the internationalisation of capital, the growing dominance of money form of capital, the concomitant prevalence of finance dominated capitalism), and the manifestations of these trends in neoliberal policy frameworks as well as the resultant intensification in the commodification of labour should be reintegrated into the analyses of child labour to understand the structural interrelationships between poverty, urbanisation, migration, and technological developments as factors perpetuating child labour.

Keywords: child labour, capitalism, neoliberalism, financialization, political economy

ÖZ

TÜRKİYE’DE ÇOCUK İŞÇİLİĞİNİN BELİRLEYENLERİNE İLİŞKİN AKADEMİK LİTERATÜR ÜZERİNE BİR DEĞERLENDİRME

Sağlam, Burcu

Yüksek Lisans, Sosyal Politika

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. İpek Eren Vural

Şubat 2014, 133 sayfa

Bu tezin birbiriyle bağlantılı iki amacı bulunmaktadır. İlk olarak, çocuk işçiliğinin artan öneminin sebeplerine ilişkin olarak literatürde yer alan hakim söylemin bir değerlendirmesinin yapılması hedeflenmiştir. İkinci amaç ise Türkiye’de çocuk işçiliğinin gelişim sürecinin, kapitalist gelişmenin siyasal iktisadı ve Türkiye’de özellikle 1980’lerden bu yana yaşanan krizler bağlamında ele alınmasıdır. Tezin temel argümanı şudur ki çocuk işçiliğini sürekli kılan yoksulluk, kentleşme, göç ve teknolojik gelişme arasındaki yapısal bağlantıların kavranabilmesi için kapitalizmin özellikle 1970’lerden bu yana değişen dinamiklerinin (sermayenin uluslararasılaşması, parasal sermayenin artmakta olan egemenliği, finansal sermayeye dayalı kapitalizm vb.) ve bu eğilimlerin neoliberal siyasal çerçevedeki yansımalarının yanı sıra bu süreçlerin bir sonucu olarak emeğin metalaşmasındaki derinleşmenin analize eklenmesi gerekmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: çocuk işçiliği, kapitalizm, neoliberalizm, finansallaşma, siyasal iktisat

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. İpek Eren Vural for her generous guidance, support and encouragement throughout all the stages of this study.

I would also like to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut Beşpınar and Assist. Prof. Dr. Asuman Göksel for their valuable comments and suggestions.

I am also grateful to my dear friends and colleagues for their genuine support throughout this thesis. I would also like to thank my instructors and friends in the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) at University of Sussex for providing me with inspiration and strenght through our fruitful discussions.

My highest indebtedness is to my family that this study would not have been completed without their love, support and guidance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. REVIEW OF EXISTING APPROACHES ON THE DETERMINANTS OF CHILD LABOUR IN TURKEY.....	5
2.1. Mainstream Approaches on the Determinants of Child Labour in Turkey.....	5
2.1.1. Rights- Based Approaches to Child Labour: Lack of Rights/Access to Rights.....	6
2.1.2. Changing Conception of Work and Child Labour.....	9
2.1.3. Migration, Urbanization, Poverty and Urban Poverty.....	12
2.2. Critical Assessment of The Mainstream Discourse on the Determinants of Child Labour in Turkey.....	22

3. THE GLOBAL CONJUNCTURE OF THE RISE OF NEOLIBERALISM, FINANCIALISATION AND THE NEOLIBERAL TRANSFORMATION OF SOCIAL POLICY.....	29
3.1. The Global Conjencture of the Rise of Neoliberalism and Financialisation.....	30
3.1.1. The Global Conjencture: Crisis of Fordism and the Collapse of Bretton Woods.....	30
3.1.2. The Relationship Between Neoliberalism and Financialization.....	31
3.1.3. Impact of Financialization on Labour.....	33
3.2.The Neoliberal Transformation of Social Policy.....	35
4. CHILD LABOUR IN TURKEY AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF THE RISE OF NEOLIBERALISM, FINANCIALISATION AND THE NEOLIBERAL TRANSFORMATION OF SOCIAL POLICY.....	41
4.1.The Turkish Experience of Neoliberalism and Financial Liberalization.....	44
4.1.1. 1980-89:Early Phase of Encounter with Neoliberalism.....	45
4.1.2. 1989-2000: “Premature Financialization”.....	49
4.1.3.2000 Onwards: The Growth Model Based on Short-Term Capital Inflows.....	51
4.2.NEOLIBERALISM AND SOCIAL POLICY IN TURKEY.....	57
4.2.1.Retreat of State from Public Provision of Social Services....	58
4.2.2.Recommodification of Labour.....	64
4.3. AGRICULTURAL DISSOLUTION, MIGRATION, URBAN POVERTY AND INEQUALITIES.....	67
4.3.1. From Agricultural Dissolution to Urban Poverty.....	68

4.3.2. Urban Poverty and Inequalities Against the Background of Neoliberalism and Financialization.....	74
4.4. NEOLIBERAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE DEFINITION, PREVALANCE AND THE SCOPE OF CHILD LABOUR IN TURKEY.....	81
4.4.1 Neoliberal Transformation of the Definition of Child and Child Labour in Turkey.....	82
4.4.2 The Trends of Child Employment Rates Under the Neoliberal Restructuring of Labour Market.....	85
4.4.3 The Convergence of the Branches of Economic Activity Performed by Children.....	90
5. CONCLUSION.....	99
REFERENCES.....	103
APPENDICES.....	121
A. Turkish Summary.....	121
B. Tez Fotokopisi İzin Formu.....	133

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There is a growing interest in the phenomenon of child labour at the global level particularly since the 1990s. This tendency is understandable given the fact that there are around 168 million child labourers in the world, almost half of which are working in the “worst forms of child labour” (ILO 2013). In Turkey, 5,9 per cent of the children aged between 6-17 were employed in 2012, which reveals an increase by three thousand compared to the results in 2006 (TURKSTAT 2013). The increasing trend in the incidence of child labour despite the attempts to eliminate it through various policies and programmes forms the basis of rising number of studies on child labour in Turkey.

This thesis has two interrelated aims. First, it aims to assess the mainstream theoretical approaches that account for the causes of increasing significance of child labour. Secondly, it aims to locate the evolution of child labour within its political economic context of capitalist development and crisis in Turkey especially since the 1980s.

Concomitant with these two aims the thesis has two main arguments. First, it argues that while mainstream theoretical approaches provide highly valuable empirical data on factors that they depict as determinants/aggravators of child labour, (such as poverty cum migration, cum technological developments, cum urbanisation), these factors are taken as given and are not further problematised. Hence, the general tendency in the mainstream literature is to treat these factors as independent variables in their own right. This tendency, the thesis argues, in turn fails to reveal the underlying mechanisms in the spread of child labour. The

solutions developed by the mainstream approach to tackle child labour therefore remain *ad hoc*, incremental and partial.

Secondly, the chapter argues that understanding the underlying mechanisms that facilitate the spread of child labour requires a holistic political economy approach that locates evolution of child labour within its context of capitalist development and crises both globally and in Turkey since the 1980s. In that context the thesis argues that changing dynamics of capitalist development especially since the 1970s, (such as the internationalisation of capital, the growing dominance of money form of capital, and the concomittant prevalence of finance dominated capitalism), and the manifestations of these trends in neoliberal policy frameworks as well as the resultant intensification in the commodification of labour should be reintegrated into the analyses of child labour to understand the structural interrelationships between poverty, urbanisation, migration, and technological developments as the factors perpetuating child labour.

The second and third chapters of the thesis are devoted to the further eloboration of the arguments mentioned above.

The second chapter provides an assessment of the theoretical perspectives that account for the growing significance of child labour both in the global and Turkish contexts. It develops a categorisation between a) the mainstream approaches that dominate the literature and b) critical approaches that challange the motives and implications of mainstream approaches' analyses. Within the mainstream approaches the chapter analyses i) the rights-based approaches associating child labour to the lack of rights and lack of access to rights; ii) the transformation in the conceptualization of childhood, work organization and child labour; and iii) the perspectives referring to migration, urbanization, poverty and urban poverty as the most significant causes of child labour in Turkey. Despite providing valuable empirical data on the rising significance of child labour as one of the most prioritized issues to be addressed globally, the mainstream approaches on child

labour draw an incomplete picture of child labour in that they reduce child labour to a matter of definition and measurement. Also, these approaches take the contextual dynamics leading to child labour as given, without analysing the multidimensional interlinkages between these factors. Secondly, the chapter reviews the critical approaches which locates the determinants of child labour in Turkey in a broader framework shaped with the capitalist mode of production, commodification of labour (more specifically, child labour) and the dynamics of accumulation in capitalist development.

The third chapter is based on a historical periodization starting from the crisis of Fordism in the 1970s and the resultant introduction of free-floating exchange rates and the deepening financialization underpinned by the rise of neoliberalism, which in turn led to the deepening of vulnerability of the masses to crises and poverty. The restructuring of state's role in social reproduction is addressed as the main aggravator of the social reproduction of poverty through recommodification of social services and labour.

On the basis of the historical analysis made in the third chapter, the fourth chapter aims to draw a holistic picture of the current situation and reproduction of child labour in Turkey. For that purpose, the relationship between neoliberalism and financialization, the dynamics of migration and urbanization, the circumstances producing and reproducing the inequalities, and "uneven development" (Smith, 2008) are included in the analysis. More specifically, the chapter illustrates that the growth model based on financial capital inflows perpetuated the suppression of real wages, unemployment and poverty. Through this line of argument, it is aimed to show that the variables analysed as independent from each other in the mainstream discourse are indeed closely related to each other and that they pave the ground for the production and reproduction of child labour in Turkey, specifically in the urban areas. The neoliberal transformation of the definition of child and child labour, the rates of children engaged in an economic activity under the conditions of the restructuring of the labour market, and the convergence of the branches of

economic activity performed by children are illustrated. Throughout these discussions, the spatial dimensions in the trends of child labour and the convergence of gender roles in the reproduction of child labour are analysed. Besides, the legislative framework is figured out as a factor reproducing child labour through asymmetrical power relations. As such, the chapter aims to locate the current situation of child labour in Turkey within its underlying context of the neoliberal regulatory framework.

The thesis ends with a concluding chapter.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF EXISTING APPROACHES ON THE DETERMINANTS OF CHILD LABOUR IN TURKEY

This chapter aims to assess the available literature on causes of child labour, both in Turkey and abroad. For that purpose, the chapter categorises the available literature on the causes and prevalence of child labour into two groups: a) the mainstream approach that dominates the literature b) a burgeoning critical approach that aims to identify the implications, and outcomes of the analysis developed by mainstream approaches.

First group under the existing literature on child labour is the mainstream discourse that has been shaped along the capitalist production process and neoliberalism while the second group is the critical discourse that identifies and criticizes the main motives of the mainstream discourse and attempts to present alternative policy routes within the context of this critique. The mainstream discourse is conveyed through the rights-based approaches associating child labour to the lack of rights and lack of access to rights; the transformation in the conceptualization of childhood, work organization and child labour; and the perspectives referring to migration, urbanization, poverty and urban poverty as the most significant causes of child labour in Turkey. The critical approach is illustrated through an emphasis on the political economy perspective which is adopted by a relatively smaller number of studies in the literature. In this regard, the determinants of child labour in Turkey are located in a broader context of the capitalist mode of production, commodification of labour (more specifically, child labour) and the dynamics of capital accumulation in the capitalist development.

The chapter argues that the mainstream approach provides highly valuable data on what they depict as the causes/aggravators of child labour, such as poverty cum migration cum urbanisation cum technological developments. However, the mainstream approach's tendency to take these factors as isolated independent variables without problematising their sources not only results in masking the relationship between these factors and capitalist development but also results in the development of only partial, *ad hoc* and incremental solutions to tackle child labour.

2.1.MAINSTREAM APPROACHES ON THE DETERMINANTS OF CHILD LABOUR IN TURKEY

2.1.1. Rights- based Approaches to Child Labour: Lack of rights/Access to Rights

The rights based approach to child labour is shaped with International Labour Organization (ILO)'s discourse which considers child labour as a matter of human rights. This approach associates the prevalence of child labour with the lack of access to rights. Relying upon some statistical data on child labour as a way to assess the size of the problem, it is estimated that there are around 168 million child labourers in the world, half of which are involved in the "worst forms of child labour" (ILO 2013). This is mainly associated with the discrepancies in their access to educational facilities as both the reason and result of child labour. Article 1 of the ILO Minimum Age Convention dated 1973 and no. 138 states that "Each Member for which this Convention is in force undertakes to pursue a national policy designed to ensure the effective abolition of child labour and to raise progressively the minimum age for admission to employment or work to a level consistent with the fullest physical and mental development of young persons"¹. Moreover, the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention of ILO, dated 1999 and no. 182, sets a number of immediate action for prohibition and elimination of the worst

¹http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:C138

forms of child labour, such as slavery, forced and illegal labour of children as well as the activities that are regarded as harmful for health, security and “morals” of the children² (emphasis added).

Related to ILO’s framework, which is on the normative side of the literature on child labour, the concept of children’s rights is utilized as an analytical tool to illustrate the determinants of child labour. By definition, largely emerging from the United Nation Convention on the Rights of Children (UNCRC) (Ben-Arieh 2006: 4; White et.al. 2010: 390- 391; Uyan- Semerci et. al. 2012: 1; Müderrisoglu et.al. 2013: 24), this approach seeks to identify the transformations in children’s needs, values and perceptions (Sabates-Wheeler and Roelen 2011 cited in Roelen and Camfield 2012: 1) by taking their own discourses into consideration within the framework of the socio-economic context shaping their experiences (Ridge 2004 cited in Uyan- Semerci et. al. 2012: 20; Müderrisoglu 2013: 7) paving the ground for children’s employment. In this regard, Arat (2002) looks at the phenomenon of child labour through the lens of children’s rights; she argues that many children, and particularly the working children, are deprived of the rights attributed to children by the UNCRC. She takes child labour as an “issue” and associates children’s rights with the denial of parents’ right to employment and decent jobs. It is argued that this denial of adults’ employment rights lead to the violation of childrens’ rights in the form of child labour.

As an extension of the lack of access to rights which limits the opportunities of children, there are discussions on child labour within the context of the Capability Approach, which is introduced by Amartya Sen as a moral framework constituted with the combinations of freedom and functionings (beings and doings) that a persons is able to achieve within the given circumstances of livelihood (Alkire 2013). In this sense, Ballet, Bhukuth and Radja (2005) argue that the emergence of child labour is related with a lack of freedom of choice and even the light works

² http://www.ilo.org/public/turkish/region/eurpro/ankara/about/ilo_cisc.htm

“cannot be considered as a choice that they have made” (Ballet et. al. 2005:8). The findings of Altıntaş (2003) support this argument; the children do want to participate to the education system, they are not willing to pursue the situation that they are surviving in, but they are in a passive position making them obliged to work.

As another approach associated with the determinative role of lack of freedom of choice and the passive position of children vis-a-vis being obliged to work, Bakırcı (2002) refers to “exploitative societal power relations” between different actors involved in the production and labour processes as major determinants of child labour. It is argued that children are expected to obey the “will of men” and this analysis is adopted to child labour by stating that child workers are more likely to act in accordance with the power relations in the work place, which is managed by the employer. Citing from Köksal and Lordoğlu (1993), Bakırcı (2002) argues that this power dynamic leads to the submissiveness of children, shown as among the reasons for employers’ preference for employing child workers. Lack of unionization and right to strike as well as the potential for easy dismissal of children in times of economic downturn are pronounced as other reasons why the employers prefer child labour. The childrens’ submissiveness is argued to be reflecting also in the provision of social security that the employers motivated to decrease the labour costs prefer child labour to avoid paying the premiums.

The child’s rights discourse also makes an emphasis on the determinants of child labour from the legal aspect through pointing at the gaps and weaknesses in the implementation of relevant legislation. The contradiction between the sophisticated nature of legal regulations and the meagerness on the side of practical enforcement of those regulations is argued to reproduce child labour. Also, it is pointed out that the legislative framework is not free from inner contradictions, meaning that different pieces of legislation may lead to different practices in terms of children’s involvement in the labour market. One of such studies is Bakırcı (2002) which

refers to Turkish Constitution , the labour legislation and a number of other acts and regulations with a perspective of protection of child workers from the harmful effects of hazardous and heavy works. It is argued that although the Constitution provides that “no person will be obliged to do such works which are unsuitable for their age or capacity”, the labour legislation contains contradictory provisions in relation to minimum age. It is underlined that regardless of the legal provisions, children are fulfilling a whole bunch of work even before the minimum age for work, due to the power relations prevalent in the society and between the political will and the children.

2.1.2. Changing Conception of Work and Child Labour

The second pillar of the mainstream discourse on the sources of child labour in Turkey is composed of a number of discourses on the interrelatedness between changing meaning of childhood and child labour. This approach analyzes the concept of childhood with a perception of childhood as embedded in the historical, social and cultural contexts. It is argued that, today, particularly in the western world, childhood is identified with innocence and dependency, and this approach is considered as resulting in the necessity to keep children distant from the burden and responsibility of work (Bulutay 1995). Along the same axis with the discourses on the definitions of child labour, Ennew, Myers and Plateu (2003) integrate the notion of childhood into social structure through arguing that “child labour is a social construction”. According to this approach, social construction of childhood is based on a number of observable physical factors creating dependency (p. 31). This kind of a conception generates the notion of childhood which, according to Ballet, Bhukuth and Radja (2005), “is not universally accepted and concepts of childhood and adulthood depend on societies.” (p. 5). “[...] according to Punch (2001) within a country all the children do not have the same childhood whether they are issued from a wealthier or poorer milieu.” (p. 5). Similar, but a more critical approach is the one analysing the perception of childhood as connected to

capitalist and patriarchal structures (Akbas and Atasü-Topçuoğlu 2009). According to this perspective, in the pre-capitalist era the children were exploited in agricultural work as free labourers while with the advent of capitalism children have become alienated to their labour, to the production process and to themselves. Bulutay (1995), citing from Becker (1981), makes an economic analysis that mechanization in the agricultural production –which is identified with development- has led to the population movements from rural to urban areas, changing the nature and forms of child labour. However, Bulutay (1995) also argues that capitalist transformation has affected also the social codes and perceptions, so adopting merely an economic perspective carries the risk of missing the historical, cultural, social and even emotional transformations latent in the broader context and it is not providing sufficient input to understand the inner dynamics of the child labour in itself.

Attributing several meanings to childhood and child labour is closely associated with the perspectives on the changing nature of work. One of those perspectives is the one trying to show that there are different conceptualizations on the work organization and the position in which the children are located as actors in the work organization and production process. In this regard, Erder (2010), challenging the reasons of the transformation of child labour, makes a value-laden analysis on the reasons for child's work through accounting for the reasons for opposing child labour. The answer of the question why child labour is opposed can be found in the changing nature of labour market and the transformations in the meaning of child's work. The fact that work has surpassed the boundaries of home and it has extended towards producing and working for the market rather than subsistence production are regarded as being parallel to the transformation of children's identification from apprentices to "workers" (emp. added). In this regard, it is argued that children in Turkey are no longer the skills-building apprentices but they are in the process of becoming workers for wage returns. With integrating the dimension of space into her analysis, Erder (2010) argues that child labour is related with the segmented

nature of labour market in the urban areas and the informal sector in these areas is characterized with the dynamics of competition. In this regard, informally decreasing the minimum age for work and early entrances to labour market are seen as facilitating to hold a permanent place in the market through learning the conditions of competition from the early ages. It is referred as a relatively new approach that being involved in the agricultural production and at home-based production activities are considered as work and employment (pp. 40-41). This is seen as a perceptual transformation that points at a change in the standpoint about child labour. In other words, with the changing conceptualization about childhood, child labour and work in general, child's work that was previously not considered as child labour started to be seen as something to combat, alleviate and, at the last instance, to eliminate.

Within the context of the changing conception of the nature and organization of work, there are a number of perspectives on the association between technological development and child labour. Technological development, characterized by the gradual transition from agriculture to industry, is argued to affect the frequency and prevalence of child labour. In this sense, it is argued that the capital-intensive nature of industrial production decreases the demand for labour, so the number of children working in the industrial enterprises are lower than the children working in agricultural sector (see Gülçubuk 2012; Erder 2010). This is in line with Dayioğlu's (2005) analysis that in Turkey, with the process of migration from rural to urban areas since 1960s, the proportion of family-run agricultural enterprises decreased and this led to a decline in the proportion of children working as unpaid family workers (Dayioğlu 2005: 202). Opposing to these analysis, Bulutay (1995) argues that technological development indirectly has a triggering effect on child labour through increasing adult unemployment due to the reduction in demand for labour/manpower and, in turn, child labour has been utilized as a strategy to cope with household unemployment and poverty.

2.1.3. Migration, Urbanization, Poverty and Urban poverty

In the mainstream approach, the socio-economic transformation that Turkey has gone through since 1950s -characterized with poverty, immigration and “deficiencies in the urban sub-structure”- is shown as the leading cause of child labour (Acar 2010, emp. added). Although there is not a detailed conceptual or empirical discussion on the background conditions reproducing child labour in Turkey, work is defined as a dynamic concept whose scope and value have changed with the transformation in the socio-economic conditions (Ertürk 2009). Ertürk (2009) argues that Turkey is going through a transformation period which is characterized with increasing poverty and informality that results in the utilization of child labour as a survival strategy in the households sustaining their livelihoods through subsistence production. On the basis of this background situation, she concludes that under these circumstances the households are utilizing child labour as a means to complement, substitute, even replace the adult labour for household survival (p. 734). This is attributed to the changes in the socio-economic conditions by arguing that in the era of deepening poverty and informality, families are face to face with the necessity to involve child labour in the process of maintaining household livelihoods. Hence, according to this approach, child labour becomes a means for the overall household survival, and particularly for child’s survival as long as the family income is unable to provide the family with necessary material resources (Ballet et. al2005). A child has to work for survival “as long as the family income is unable to ensure his living” (Ballet et. al2005). Parents “have to” send their children to work as either the agents contributing to the family budget by earning additional income or as the sole breadwinner within a particular household.

As regards child labour in the urban areas in Turkey, it is quite common to refer to the unplanned mass migration, including the forced migration or internal displacement, from the eastern and southeastern part of Turkey due to political conflict and violence. The broader context is illustrated as “the implementation of

economic development model in the 1950s and the rapid urbanization due to mass migration from rural to urban areas as a result of this economic model (Yılmaz and Dülgerler 2011:130). The migration process is argued to result in “enormous problems such as unemployment, slummification and insufficient incomes in a new” place for settlement (Yılmaz and Dülgerler 2011:130). It is concluded that all these circumstances have led to the appearance of new districts at the outskirts of the cities, which have been formed and filled by the “new poor”. The “new poor” is defined as those who are unemployed or working in temporary jobs without social security with a lack of decent housing. The issue of working children is analysed within this context that “new poverty” and unemployment led to a situation that children had to become a part of the labour force for contributing to the family income, an idea evidenced by the fact that almost all the children give the money they earn to their families (Acar et. al. 2006, Duyan 2005 and Polat 2009 cited in Yılmaz and Dülgerler 2011).

As argued by Atauz (1990 cited in Dayioğlu 2005), the number of people to share the resources in the urban areas rapidly increased but the amount of the resources did not change in a considerable way to compensate for the needs of the growing urban population. It is concluded that the population movement dramatically affected the distribution of the resources in the urban areas. From an economic point of view, rapid increase in urban population due to flows of migration from rural areas necessitated the creation of new jobs in the urban areas. Here, the emphasis is on the industrial sector since this sector was targeted in the planned era as the pioneer of economic development, and industrial development in the urban areas led to the discussions on job creation (Arat 1975; Tümertekin 1967, in Eraydın 2006). As Tekeli (1997 cited in Eraydın 2006) states, the rapidly-increasing population in the urban areas attempts to survive in the places they arrived, and finding a regular job is the major channel for survival. However, the difficulties in finding a job in cities resulted in the lack of job opportunities that the new-comers could work only in marginal sectors (pp. 36-37). Utilization of child

labour, which is argued to be a natural extension of the dynamics of work and production in rural areas, is regarded as being transformed with the population movements towards the urban area. More specifically, it is illustrated that children in rural areas were involved in the household-based agricultural work due to the nature of organization of work in rural areas (Dayıođlu 2005) while the children of migrant families in urban areas firstly become the members of “unstructured communities of recent migrants” (Bakırcı 2002: 57, emp. added) and then these children in the urban areas have become the contributors to the family income at the expense of educational enrolment (e.g. see Bastaymaz 1990; Koksall and Lordođlu 1993; Erturk 1994; Karabulut 1996; Dikmen 1998 and MoLSS 2000 cited in in Bakırcı 2002).

Approaches explaining child labour in Turkey through migration and rapid urbanisation also emphasise the forced migration or internal displacement in Turkey which intensified in 1990s. The displaced population migrated to and concentrated in several places grouped under three main categories: the districts and cities within the conflict area, urban part of the conflict-affected cities or to the slum areas of big and metropolitan cities having no direct connection with the conflict area, as temporary and transitory residences (Adaman and Keyder 2005). The groups of people migrated to the third category of areas, namely, the slum areas of the big and metropolitan cities, have constituted the poorest and most vulnerable segments of the urban society (Adaman and Keyder 2005; Erdođan 2007). Hence, displaced masses arrived into the new dynamics of life in urban areas and, as stated by Ersoy (2009) “At this stage, forced migration becomes an urban problem with unemployment and absolute poverty (p. 7). This situation is regarded as limiting their livelihood options with spatial concentration of poverty and deprivation, referred to as “slummification” (Adaman and Keyder 2005; Kaygalak 2001). In these parts of the cities, unemployment becomes a major and vital problem for the Internally Displaced People (IDPs). It is often stated about IDPs in Turkey that they are coming from rural parts of the country and they lack

the necessary professional skills for finding decent jobs in urban area, and IDPs have come to cities without means to do some investment for establishing a job, even for conducting petty trade. (Kaygalak 2001: 146- 148). The displaced masses are referred as becoming the tenants without any support mechanisms and as the sources of cheap labour (Göç-Der 2001, Işık ve Pınarcıoğlu 2001, Başak Culture and Arts Foundation 2004, Ayata and Yüksekler 2005 and Kirişçi 2005 cited in Adaman and Keyder 2005). They are illustrated as constituting the working poor in the urban areas who are destitute and unable to meet even their basic needs. As Bakırcı (2002) argues, the newly-arrived families in the urban centres became detached from their social ties and networks, and they remained unable to find a job except for the insecure and precarious jobs in the informal sector (Bakırcı 2002), resulting in high levels of unemployment, low levels of wages and a great imbalance in income distribution.

Socio-economic profiles of the internally displaced households are analysed as the determinants of child labour in the urban area. It was found through Ersoy's (2009) study on IDPs conducted in 2003 that most of the respondents were illiterate, majority of them were only elementary school graduates and the average household size was twelve. Furthermore, majority of those households did not have regular jobs and/or income, and half of them were found as not having social security (Ersoy 2009). Women tend to stay away from labour market due to traditional cultural barriers, illiteracy and lack of institutional and social support for child care. They were mainly involved in domestic work such as cleaning, child care, or piecework in their own houses. Men start to work as construction workers and street vendors with no regular income. Child labour started to be utilized as a survival strategy, particularly in cases where the father was died, kidnapped or "disappeared" in the conflict period or in the process of internal displacement. Altıntaş (2003) puts primary emphasis on poverty, more specifically, "new poverty" as the most outstanding cause of child labour in urban areas. Altıntaş defines "new poverty" as a form of poverty characterised with the deepening of

economic hardships and social exclusion at the urban areas due to high levels of unemployment, unregistered work and insecurity created by the dissolution of social safety nets and lack of access to employment opportunities. Besides, not only the poverty *per se* but also the changing perception of poverty in the society is argued to result in the utilization of child labour through triggering the motivation to consume. It is argued that working for consumption has become more common than before. These views are also regarded as pointing at the linkage between social transformation and child labour, and analysing the phenomenon of working for consumption together with the working for building skills (Erder 2010). High numbers of children per household, lack of decent housing and disruption of social networks are referred as adding to the disadvantaged position of those people. Limited access to educational facilities, crowded classrooms, discrepancies in the provision of skills-building opportunities are all seen as deepening the vulnerability of the IDPs. The activities are pursuing are the evidences of their relatively disadvantaged position in the urban area that they are either involved in waged labour at the expense of school enrolment or they are forced to shoulder the burden of domestic chores and the responsibility to look after the children or the elderly in the family (Adaman and Keyder 2005).

As an alternative example of the analyses on the interrelatedness between household income and child poverty, Edmonds (2004) draws attention to the fact that an improvement in the economic status of the family, defined as an increase in the family income, does not necessarily lead to a decrease in the incidence of child labour. It is illustrated that for the poorest segment of the society it is generally the case that the increases in income levels are not reaching a level sufficient to prevent child labour. At this point, it is argued that the results of globalisation and economic growth shall not be ignored. The fact that income levels and child labour rates are not always positively correlated is leading to the conclusion that economic growth is not enough for decreasing child labour, as opposed to the mainstream discourse on globalisation.

Along the same line of argument, in their study aiming at figuring out the determinants of child labour in urban Turkey, Dayıođlu and Assaad (2006) puts special emphasis on low levels of household income as one of the root causes of child labour. On the basis of data from urban Turkey she concludes that children from “poorer families are under a greater risk of being employed” (Dayıođlu and Assaad 2006: 24). In this study, child labour is illustrated as a common phenomena in the developing countries including Turkey and not only the rural but also the urban areas are referred as being the spaces where child labour is highly prevalent in the form of various practices such as street vending, apprenticeship and working in the small, medium and large sized establishments and in the service sector workplaces. A higher number of children are reported as working in the family establishments, which is regarded as being one of the most prevalent forms of unpaid family work (Dayıođlu and Assaad 2006: 3). Through a quantitative analysis, Dayıođlu and Assaad (2006) argues that “withdrawing the children from labour market leads to a significant amount of decrease in the household income, so resulting in an increase in the proportion of households at the lower income levels through increasing the number of households living below the poverty line”, which has been determined as the half of the median income (Dayıođlu and Assaad 2006) .

Dayıođlu (2006) conclude that “the livelihoods of the majority of households in Turkey depend on their labour earnings, and the economic standing of the household is important in determining the employment status of the child”. With reference to different measurements of poverty, she argues that the incidence of “child labour is higher among households that are asset poor as opposed to being income poor” (Dayıođlu 2006:940-953). The difference between the responses obtained on the basis of wealth and income indicators is explained as that the households can benefit from their accumulated wealth in transitional hardships before sending their children to work. This is consistent with Basu and Van’s

(1998) standpoint that parents are altruistic towards their children and adopt other tools and measures before letting their children to be involved in the labour market. Paradoxially, existence of a household enterprise and larger amounts of land owned by a household are estimated to increase the incidence of child labour although it is a means of contributing to the household wealth, which is called as “the wealth paradox” by Bhalotra and Heady (2003). Also, with reference to the “luxury axiom” of Basu and Van (1998) children of poor urban backgrounds are estimated to be more likely to work and less likely to be enrolled in school (Dayioğlu 2005). This is supported by Arat (2002) that the parents in fact do care about their children but poverty results in a situation that parents rely upon their children’s material contribution to household budget instead of the “luxury” to send their children to school.

Locating the decision to be made between sending the child to school or work in a broader context, Dayioğlu (2005) argues that there have been improvements in the child labour and schooling in Turkey from the beginning of 1990s in spite of the downturns in the economic structure characterised by shrinking of the economy between 1994-1999. This “unfavourable” economic conjuncture is regarded as having negative implications on the household well-being. She argues that the material well-being of the family has multidimensional effects on household’s decision to send the child to school or to work. In fact, discrepancies in the material conditions may not lead only to the situation that the families require child’s material contribution to the household budget, but also to the circumstance that the household budget is simply not sufficient to afford the costs of schooling which are varying from the expenses for educational materials, transportation and others costs. Müderrisoğlu (2005) also emphasizes this point that the families with very limited resources are in a disadvantaged position due to the high cost of additional expenses they need to make for sending their children to school. This is linked with the high prevalence of school drop outs, even at the very beginning of primary school, in spite of the extension of compulsory schooling to eight years. The

students are dropping out in order to work with the aim of contributing to the family budget (Adaman and Keyder 2005). The importance of material conditions in parents' decision on whether to send their child to work or school is reflected in Arat's argument (2002):

From the perspective of impoverished parents, sending children to school is seen as nothing but a waste of time and money. In addition to its opportunity cost (the time the child could use to earn money instead of spending his/her time at school), keeping a child in school imposes an extra financial burden on parents (even if schools were available and properly equipped). While "modest" school fees actually constitute large sums for the poor, in many countries "free" education means only the absence of tuition and fees; the cost of uniforms, books, and supplies still has to be absorbed by the family (Arat 2002 cited in Adaman and Keyder 2005: 188).

Although not related to poverty situation of the household in a direct way, there are other determinants referred in the literature which have indirect implications on the relationship between child labour and poverty. Within this framework, it is argued that characteristics of the children, parents, household and the community are providing data and input on the material conditions of the household and shaping the probability of a child's being involved in schooling or work.

First of all, in Dayioğlu (2005), parental education is referred as one of the factors effecting the amount of parents' earnings (Dayioğlu 2005). It is estimated that an additional year of parental schooling leads to a decrease in the children's employment by about 0.5-0.7 percentage points (Dayioğlu 2006). In this regard, lower earnings of parents are associated with their lower levels of education and this is linked to the high share of child labour in the overall household budget. Also, father's sector of employment is utilized as an indicator of his level of earnings, which, in turn, argued to play a role in the decision to send the child to work (Dayioğlu 2008).

Age is another determinant for the incidence of child labour. A child's age is affects his/her likelihood to be involved in employment (Dayioğlu 2006). The

association between child's age and probability of employment is established in a way that "as the child grows older, the risk that s/he will be employed rises through a decreasing rate." (p. 950).

Gender is among the most pronounced determinants of child labour. In her study, Dayioğlu (2008) points at the gender dimension of child labour in relation to that of mothers. She assesses the factors that determine the employment of children with the aim of figuring out the association between children's employment and that of their mothers, in a simultaneous way (p. 95). As regards the root causes of the linkage between child's and mother's employment, she cites from White (1993) that female children and their mothers are "working side by side" in Turkey in family establishments. Also, there are home-based work practices such as daily cleaning in return for a wage in which case the mothers are taking their daughters to work together with them in homes or offices. Furthermore, from the socio-cultural, even patriarchal point of view, it is argued that there are cases that the "sons would rather work than see their mothers [and sisters] employed" which is seen as an indicator of the household's attitude towards women's labour force participation and this is argued to explain the prevalence of child labour in time since the male children are found to be more inclined to send their children to work than their future wives. While female children from poor households and male children from rural households are observed not to be at a higher risk of being employed, male children in the urban area living in poor households are estimated to be twice as likely to be employed compared to their counterparts from non-poor urban households (Dayioğlu 2008), in parallel to the findings of Dayioğlu (2006) as for the older children. Also from a gender perspective, female children are found as less likely to participate not only to market-oriented work but also to school, which is explained by their higher propensity to be engaged in domestic chores (Kağıtçıbaşı 1994 cited in Bakırcı 2002).

Family size is also pronounced as effecting the incidence of child labour, which is indeed closely associated with poverty situation. Crowded households are estimated as increasing the probability of children's employment simply through the pressure it imposes on the material resources shared within the household (Dayıođlu 2006: 950). Various dimensions of this relationship is analysed with reference to the material value that rural parents associate with having a high number of children due to the children's financial contribution to family budget (Kađıtıbaşı 1994 cited in Bakırcı 2002). Yılmaz (2005) argue that child labour is an indispensable part of the lives of the urban poor that a high number of children who are able to work means the availability of the labour force for sustaining the livelihoods of these poor segments of urban population. From the other side, in the longer term, high number of children constitutes one of the main factors of social exclusion through imposing a limitation on the chances for social integration and upward social mobility (in Adaman and Keyder 2005) As regards schooling of these children, high levels of maternal illiteracy and language barriers are given as some of the factors hindering the social integration of these people, limiting the schooling prospects of their children and increasing the probability of child labour (Yükseker cited in Adaman and Keyder 2005)

Residential region is referred as affecting the likelihood of children's employment in Turkey; low levels of development of the regions are considered as being linked to a higher incidence of child labour. This is explained by the existence of sources of employment explained by relatively larger share of agriculture and predominance of industrial establishments in some regions (Dayıođlu 2006). Rural as opposed to urban residency is also considered as affecting the potential wages of both the children and their parents while the number of children is an indicator of the inter-household resource allocation and share of each and every child. These factors are associated with the educational level of the parents which, in turn, determine the opportunity cost of parental time and time allocation of children within a neoclassical model. The increase in rates of child poverty in urban areas is

argued to result in a substantial increase in the proportion of children working in these areas as well as in the rates of school drop outs. It is argued that the work and schooling outcomes of children have become even more negatively correlated over 1994-1999. It is considered as consistent with the stronger correlation between the poverty status of the household and child labour in urban areas (Dayıoğlu, 2005).

Bora's (2002) expressions are illuminating for seeing the survival strategies adapted by the households at a micro level; especially women's changing position and roles are analysed by establishing a relationship between their reflexes, reactions and behavior against poverty. Women play the primary role in seeking for and finding some ways to make a living in the urban space and adapting those strategies to changing conditions by establishing various networks. However, it should be stressed that the networks in the urban space have also undergone rapid transformations and poverty reduction/alleviation strategies are also changing in order to comply with this transformation. When the traditional networks are not functioning as effectively as it was before, the common and accustomed strategies remain insufficient, and households seek for new ways for survival. Various mechanisms come into practice in the urban space; first and foremost, child labour becomes a part of the survival strategy especially in the absence, illness, unemployment or imprisonment of the parents, which is generally the father. Children may sometimes be the sole "breadwinner" in the family. Children present a readily available resource whose labour can supplement or be substituted for adult labour [...] and can be exchanged [...] within or outside the formal market." (Ertürk 2009: 734).

2.2.CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE MAINSTREAM DISCOURSE ON THE DETERMINANTS OF CHILD LABOUR IN TURKEY

As illustrated in the previous section of this Chapter, majority of the studies referred within the context of the mainstream discourse attribute a negative connotation to child labour, which is reflected in the rights-based approaches, the

discourse on different conceptualizations of childhood and child labour as well as the approach pointing at migration, urbanization and poverty as the main reasons of child labour. The studies illustrated under the mainstream discourse on child labour in Turkey are important due to their result-oriented approach and in that they attempt to determine the size and characteristics of child labour in order to initiate effective policies towards combating and eliminating child labour in the global scale. Still the mainstream approaches lack a holistic approach since they analyse determinants of child labour as detached from the structural transformations particularly in the developing countries where there is a high prevalence of child labour. These factors referred as the reasons of child labour are taken as independent variables, masking the interdependencies between these factors. This leads to a theoretical preoccupation that child labour is seen as a problem to combat and eliminate, without delving into the structural causes producing and reproducing the commodification process of child's labour power. The increasing emphasis on the *results* of child labour comes at the expense of a comprehensive and in-depth analysis of the broader context producing and reproducing the *reasons* of child labour. An analysis made without referring to political, ideological and economic processes and mechanisms of a particular period of time, and the class, capitalist mode of production, uneven development and international division of labour are disregarded by the mainstream approach (Yücesan- Özdemir and Özdemir 2010).

While the right-based approaches see children's lack of rights (human rights, or children's rights) as the source of child labour, or as a factor causing child labour, they remain hesitant to contextualize the sources of such lack of rights. They are predominantly normative in the sense that instead of attempting to investigate the root causes of child labour, they try to create a global platform for opposing child labour due to its hazardous implications on the health, morals and educational prospects of children. This moral emphasis of these approaches mask the complex structural dynamics paving the ground for child labour, which are indeed the original factors to address rather than combating the phenomenon of child labour in

its own right. A lack of contextual perspective is also valid for the approaches referring to the exploitative power relations in a society. This discourse does not challenge the roots of those exploitative power relations but takes them as given. Similarly, the discourse “complaining” from the discrepancies in the practical enforcement of the labour legislation does not locate this issue within a framework of political economy which is indeed necessary to comprehend the labour relations and the relative position of labour vis-a-vis capital.

Majority of the studies in the rights-based pillar of mainstream discourse is illustrating the determinants of child labour as independent from the socio-economic structure. In this context, there is an overemphasis on defining/describing, measuring and classifying child labour (see Edmonds 2008) at the expense of illustrating the interlinkages between political, social and economic variables. The mainstream discourse divides the activities undertaken by children as “paid vs. unpaid work”, “home-based vs. market-based work”, “heavy work vs. light work”, which is an indicator that it takes child labour as given and reflects child labour as a matter of classification rather than addressing the main reasons. The “harmful works” categorization of ILO brings the “worst forms of child labour”, resulting in a methodological focus on particular types of work at the expense of others. This, in the longer term, precludes an overall political response to child labour irrespective of their size and characteristics. The “measurement bias” in the literature leads to an incomplete picture of child labour since the measurement-oriented framework of the mainstream discourse is preoccupied with the quantitative data on child labour which means that it addresses child labour as something to decrease and eliminate irrespective of the fact that it is not child labour *per se* but the sources leading to child labour are the variables that shall be included in the analysis. In addition, child labour is a phenomenon stemming from complex interlinkages between labour and capital that can not be grasped merely through quantitative analyses on the changes in the number of working children. Similarly, although the mainstream discourse focuses on poverty as the single most

important reason, the measurement of household income and the child's contribution to household income are not always so straightforward to determine. In addition, due to these methodological discrepancies, a high number of studies are focusing on the paid labour of children which leads to a preoccupation with the paid work at the expense of unpaid work which is quite relevant particularly for the female children (see also Yücesan- Özdemir and Özdemir 2010).

In the literature, the critique of the mainstream discourse is realised through a broader analysis which challenges the dynamics not included in, even disregarded by, the mainstream discourse. One of those dynamics is the commodification of labour. Capitalism has resulted in the necessity to sell one's labour power for survival is prevalent in the critical approach. The critical discussions are challenging the assumption that capitalism is based on freedom of choice. In this regard, within the context of the dynamics of capitalism commodifying the labour power, child labour also turned into a commodity by becoming the subject of market exchange. However, it shall be noted that although they are positioned at the critical side of the literature, discussions on the commodification of child labour in Turkey are articulated to the analyses on the commodification of labour as a whole, and these discussions are not directly shaped with a child labour perspective, so the issue of commodification of child labour can only be deduced from the general discussions on production and commodification processes (Arın 2013).

The approach emphasizing the changing meaning of childhood and the transformation in the work organization can be seen as locating child labour into the broader context of production and commodification process in the sense that it refers to the differentiation of child labour between the pre-capitalist and capitalist societies which can be regarded as the integration of a temporal dimension into the analysis. However, this does not eliminate the problem that this approach also gives merely a snapshot of particular points in the historical course of capitalist development rather than providing a complete timeline illustrating the continuities

and ruptures in the production process, work organization and the forms of child labour. Also, in spite of the fact that this approach points at the close relationship between the social construction of the meaning of childhood and the standpoint towards child labour, it takes the involvement of child labour as a natural extension of the conceptualization of childhood without illustrating the exceptions, contradictions and divergences which are embedded in capitalism as a mode of production. As such, the mainstream discourse of child labour in Turkey is an example of the adoption of *positivist problem-solving theory* “taking the world as it is” in a nonhistorical or ahistorical perspective and dealing with the “particular sources of trouble” as independent variables (Cox 1981, emp. added).

While poverty is argued to be the most important reason of child labour in Turkey, the macro level picture in which poverty is also one of the dependent variables is not analysed with a holistic approach. Even in the case that migration and urbanization are integrated into the analysis, it is still lacking an in depth perspective that the historical course, political structure and socio-economic environment and the crisis situations are not fully-analysed. On the critical side of the literature, the real sector- financial sector dichotomy and the discussions on the “jobless growth”, some studies on the characteristics of capitalist development in Turkey makes it possible to think about child labour in terms of the macro-economic structure. In this regard, Keyman and Koyuncu (2006) points at the restructuring of state-society relations as a way to resolve the crisis in Turkish economy. He argues that the economic restructuring programme shaped within the context of the structural adjustment programme of IMF is based on the neoliberal macro-economic perspective resulting in the fact that financial sector has become prioritised over real production, which resulted in the phenomenon of “jobless growth”, unemployment and poverty. One of the critiques within this context is that child labour can only be comprehended through the adoption of the approach of political economy challenging the capital accumulation in the centre countries and the international division of labour. The transformation in the capital

accumulation regimes is argued to determine the production, competition and marketing dynamics between the centre and periphery countries, and within this context not only adults but also children are involved in the production process as cheap labour. Besides, the perceptual distinction between the “child” and “abstract child labour” is argued to reproduce child labour through coinciding with the perception of child labour within the boundaries of capitalism. In addition, the hegemony of neoliberal measures in the global scale are referred as weakening the measures protecting children within the household through resulting in a decrease in the wages. It is argued that capitalist convergence of agriculture has led to experiencing the unprecedented dimensions and extensions of urban poverty (Işık and Pınarcıoğlu 2001), which makes it possible to challenge the perceptions on the invisibility of domestic child labour in the urban areas.

Associated with the above-mentioned problem of a unidimensional conceptualization of the relationship between poverty and child labour, there is the issue of taking household as the main unit of analysis rather than locating children as a member of society which necessitates a macro and multidimensional perspective. In the mainstream literature, household-level livelihoods is the most pronounced context within which the children are taking part and child labour is produced, rather than referring to the socio-historical and economic context affecting also the household dynamics in a more holistic way. More specifically, the children are taken merely as one of the family members experiencing the same livelihoods in exactly the same way with other family members rather than being regarded as individuals having their own discourses based on the multiple ways how they define and interpret their own situation. In this regard, the question of whether children are passively bounded by the economic necessities experienced at the household level or they are active agents capable of controlling and changing their lives vis-s-vis the material conditions is shaping the way of assessing the reasons leading to the persistence of child labour in a given society. It is a part of the way how child labour is defined, analysed and addressed mainly on the basis of

the different meanings attributed to childhood by taking the socio-economic context leading to child labour as given, without challenging the structural determinants creating those circumstances. Children are not merely the passive and atomized members of a family; they are a part of the broader society so the reproduction of child labour is something beyond the boundaries of the household as the unit of analysis. Since children are creating an economic value, what needs to be analysed is the characteristics and dynamics of the production process itself and this requires to evaluate the persistence of child labour in relation to the historical transformation of production process shaped along the capitalism as the dominant mode of production characterised with the accumulation of surplus. Child labour is not free from the commodification of labour in the process of capitalist accumulation regime based on appropriation of the surplus created by the labourers. Referring to poverty, migration and rapid urbanisation as the main determinants of child labour are insufficient to explain child labour since the factors addressed as the “reasons” are indeed the reflections of the dynamics of capitalist mode of production in a broader sense. Hence, child labour is a social phenomenon that cannot be analysed only through household-level economic dynamics (i.e. poverty status)

CHAPTER 3

THE GLOBAL CONJUNCTURE OF THE RISE OF NEOLIBERALISM, FINANCIALISATION AND THE NEOLIBERAL TRANSFORMATION OF SOCIAL POLICY

The previous Chapter (Chapter 2) argued that while the mainstream approaches developed valuable empirical data regarding child labour, they failed to locate child labour within its context of capitalist development. It proposed that this results in the treatment of “the determinants of child labour” as independent and isolated factors and also in the inability of the approaches concerned to analyse the mutual constitution and interrelationships between each one of the variables they present as the determinants of child labour. Proceeding from this argument, the current Chapter aims to illustrate the reinforcing relationship between neoliberalism and financialization which is based on the trade-off between financial and real production, expansion of privatization and the prevalence of conservatism in the political and economic sense of the term.

The third chapter is based on a historical periodization starting from the crisis of Fordism in the 1970s and the resultant introduction of free-floating exchange rates. It then illustrates the relationship between the rise of neoliberalism and financialisation. In this regard, following Fine (2009b) it is argued that the rise of neoliberalism underpinned the prevalence of financial liberalization which in turn increased the instability in the economic and social spheres, leading the deepening of vulnerability of the masses to crises and poverty facilitated through the neoliberal “antipathy to social policy” (Fine 2009b). The neoliberal restructuring of the economic and social relations leading to the redefinition of state’s role in social reproduction constitutes one of the main areas analysed in this chapter. In this sense, it is argued that financialization led to the expanding recommodification of

public social services (Fine 2009a: 5; Fine 2009a) and of the labour, leading to exclusion of the masses from access to even the basic services accompanied by the difficulties in compensating the costs of private provision of social services (Jenson and Saint Martin 2003) that cannot be afforded by the impoverished masses.

3.1 THE GLOBAL CONJUNCTURE OF THE RISE OF NEOLIBERALISM AND FINANCIALISATION

3.1.1. Crisis of Fordism and the Collapse of Bretton Woods

1970s witnessed the structural crisis of Fordism as a model of production and accumulation, growing significance of financial markets and institutions, and the rise of neoliberalism (Tauss 2012:54). The transformation of Fordism is “a part of the broader context of changed monetary and financial conditions of the period” (Itoh and Lapavitzas 1997:192). Following the oil crises in the 1973-74 and 1978-81, rising inflation, increasing wages, rising cost of using new machinery (Harvey 2005; Hopkins et. al. 1996: 212), “overaccumulation of capital vis-a-vis the tighter supply of labour power and primary products” (Itoh and Lapavitzas 1997:192) and the resulting decrease in the profit rates (Independent Social Scientists 2011) led to the crisis of Fordism.

The period of 1970s and 1980s witnessed the termination of state regulation over foreign exchange transactions and financial flows (Ikeda cited in Hopkins et. al. 1996: 45). At the beginning of 1970s, the U.S. was forced to abandon the convertibility of the dollar into gold, signalling the collapse of the Bretton Woods system [...] and the introduction of a floating exchange rate system (Itoh and Lapavitsas 1997: 192; Tauss 2012: 66; see also Köse and Öncü 2003). The free-floating exchange rates were introduced with the aim of “stabilising” the market and was presented as the “innovative” and “functional” alternative to the Bretton Woods system. However, it has resulted in the opposite direction: “gigantic” fluctuations in the exchange rates (Tauss 2012). As stated by Jessop (2010), “[T]he massively disproportionate over-accumulation of financial capital enabled by its

dissolution from, and indifference to, other moments of the capital relation eventually led to the bursting of financial bubbles around the world” (p. 31).

Crisis in capitalist production led to the fiscal crisis of the state in advanced capitalist countries. Both advanced and peripheral states borrowed heavily from international financial markets in this period. Rise of Reagenism and Volcker Shock Therapy in U.S. led to a significant increase in U.S. interest rates from 10 percent to 21 percent. As a result, crisis of accumulation in the core revealed itself in the form of a debt crisis in the developing countries at the beginning of 1980s which has forced the indebted countries to adopt the IMF-led “structural adjustment policies” (Silver 2009: 215- 225).

3.1.2. The Relationship Between Neoliberalism and Financialization

Stagnation in the productive sectors, caused by the ever-expanding emphasis on the financial transactions vis-a-vis investment in the productive activities led to the extremely fast and ever-increasing flow of capital into the “financial industry” (Tauss 2012: 69, emp. added; also see Itoh and Lapavitzas 1997: 192). With the impetus of profit-making, investments were shifted from productive area to financial sphere (Hopkins et. al. 1996: 212-213), creating a trade-off between financial and real accumulation (Independent Social Scientists 2011; Lapavitzas 2009: 41; Onaran 2002: 277). While the financial transactions and accumulation of financial capital were surmounting, there was not any considerable growth in real accumulation (Itoh and Lapavitzas 1997: 187-200; Yeldan 2006). Free trade regulations resulted in lower levels of industrial investments and activities as well as a growing informal sector (Silver 2009: 215- 225).

“The transformation in the post-war hegemonic world order” resulted in the process of financialization, which can at the broadest level be defined “as the increasing role of financial motives, financial markets, financial actors, and financial institutions in the operation of the domestic and international economies”

(Epstein 2005:3). Essential to the process of financialisation is “the increasing transfer of capital into the financial sector (banking, insurance, stockholding, and real estate)” (Arrighi 1994; Foster, McChesney and Jamil 2011 cited in Tauss 2012: 54-55; Stockhammer 2004: 720; Fine cited in Saad Filho and Yalman 2010). The capitalist system tried to heal the decline in profit rates by means of financial capital flows into the markets of the emerging economies (Gültekin-Karakaş and Ercan cited in Ergüneş 2010: 134). Financialization was based on the extreme expansion of credits at the international level accompanied by accelerating rates of international debts, which was the fundamental strategy for reconstituting the profit rates in the core countries of the capitalist world (Camacho and Nieto cited in Lapavitzas 2009: 229, emp. original; see also Silver, 2009: 225). International bank lending reached its peak in the 1970s (Ikeda cited in Hopkins et. al. 1996: 38-68). The financial transactions between the developed countries and the emerging markets speeded up the process of internationalization of capital (Ergüneş 2010: 134).

There is a mutual relationship between neoliberalism as a hegemonic project and the rise of financialization. As clearly stated by Fine (2009), “neo-liberalism [...] [is] heavily underpinned by an extraordinary expansion and promotion of financial activity [...] It is the extension of those markets (not their inner parasitism in the form of derivatives, for example) to an ever-expanding range of activities associated with both economic and social reproduction that has marked the neo-liberal era (Fine 2009a: 4-5, emp. original; Fine 2009b:4). The reinforcing relationship between neoliberalism and financialization is based on the trade-off between financial and real production, increase in the privatization through favouring the increasing extension of shareholder value, conservatism in the political and economic sense of the term, increasing instability and vulnerability to social and economic crises, and the transformation of state-society relations reflected in the “antipathy to social policy” (Fine 2009b). Hence, neoliberalism constitutes the ideological basis of financialization, and the superfluous extension of

financial flows maintains the sustainability of neoliberalism through reproduction and transformation of economic, social and political structures (Fine 2009a; Fine 2009b).

3.1.3. Impact of Financialization on Labour

Growing prevalence of post-Fordist production process concomitant with financialisation obliged labour to encounter the complexities of the international financial flows, changes in production dynamics, competitive forces of the global markets, which significantly undermined its organisational capacity. The high employment-high wages conjuncture of the latest long-term economic fluctuation of the capitalist welfare state can no longer be sustained through monetary and fiscal policies to direct the aggregate demand since such a regulating role of the state started to be challenged in the recession period (Türel 2011: 201-207). “The consequences of this transformation on the workforce were seen in falling real wages and increased unemployment” (Hopkins et.al. 1996: 212-213), irregularity and precarious type of work. “This went along with a shift to forms of work that were under less legal control (home-working, the informal economy, “flexible” works, etc.) and a major expansion of subcontracting”. (Hopkins et.al. 1996: 212-213)

The neoliberal choice in favour of capital led to the exclusion of labour from the political agenda and the deepening of commodification of labour which takes place through the neoliberal perspective of the individual leading to the reign of financial sector over the real sector and of the individuals over the society (*methodological individualism*) (Yücesan-Özdemir 2014: 118). Hence, neoliberalism first marginalizes the productive labour vis-a-vis the financialization process and then formulizes “prescriptions” at the discursive level for inclusion defined as completely tied to the labour market status of the individuals who are already disengaged from the social basis of production. Here, the role of the state is limited

to the creation of suitable legal framework and setting a facilitating environment for surplus expropriation and paying due attention to the fact that the state action would not turn into an intervention in the Keynesian sense of the term (Buğra 2008: 78). The labour is neglected by the Post-Washington Consensus (Öniş and Şenses 2005) and pro-capital political stance of neoliberalism is materialized by the suppression of labour. In this sense, the wages are curbed, bargaining power of labour is suppressed, labourers are deprived of the financial and social gains of being organized, social services are increasingly commodified and reformulated as commodities to be accessed through the ordinary transactions within the free market. The labouring process is disentitled from its social connotations and the resulting deprivation is attributed to the individual rather than challenging the impoverishing capitalist relationships themselves.

A question relevant here is the one asked by Buğra (2008), following Geoff Wood (2004), for the countries out of the developed world; in these countries, the historical background that laid the foundations of social policy is different from that of the developed countries, and the question is “to what extent the legally regulated formal market relations determine the working life” (Buğra 2008). The rise and sovereignty of the finance capital facilitated such fragmentation of the labour market; the increasing exploitation of the labourers for the sake of finance capital was complemented with the state’s reluctance for welfare provision, which perpetuated the disadvantaged position of the labour vis-a-vis the capital. Real production is, to a large extent, disengaged from financial production and the requirements of the labour market have changed due to the technological developments and the transformation in the productive sectors. This means fewer opportunities for the labour force to be engaged in the labour market, and it is obvious that the income-generating role of a majority of the jobs in developing countries are so weak that the people are increasingly moving towards the informal area despite all the peculiarities of informal jobs (Buğra 2008: 91).

Economic growth has become dependent on financial flows, the phenomenon of “jobless growth” led to higher levels of unemployment due to the trade-off between financial and real accumulation (Köse and Öncü 2003: 133). The “activation policies” asked from the individuals to be equipped with the necessary skills required by the labour market without carefully implementing the legal provisions for facilitating a shrinkage in the informal employment practices; on the contrary, the unregistered employment has become extremely common under the mask of “flexibility” for gaining competitive advantage and attaining lower levels of official rates for unemployment (Yücesan-Özdemir 2014; Yentürk 2003; Onaran 2002).

3.2. THE NEOLIBERAL TRANSFORMATION OF SOCIAL POLICY

In global terms, the rise of neoliberalism led to the introduction of “a new social policy understanding [...] in harmony with the Washington Consensus” (Buğra 2008 cited in Öztürk 2012: 193-194). The neoliberal transformation of social policy is facilitated with the internationalization of capital (Holloway 1996: 133 cited in Köse and Öncü 2003: 131, emp. added), rise of finance-led accumulation regime, and the changing nature of work organization in the post-Fordist type of production based on profit maximization and commodification of labour. The post-war welfare state was challenged in the developed Western countries that it is “unsustainable” and cannot be pursued any more given the dynamics of neoliberal restructuring (Buğra 2008: 75; emp. added). As stated by Harvey (2006), “The ‘embedded capitalism’ of the post-war period with its heavy emphasis upon a fragile consensus between capital and labour mediated through the ‘welfare state’ [...] was no longer working” (Harvey 2006: 148, emp. original). While both the rise of informality and the dissolution of informal ties through the transformation in the mode of production urged for a strengthened state intervention for protection of the masses from poverty and exclusion, the narrow understanding of social policy perpetuates the disadvantaged position of the producing segments of the society

and pushed them to the edge of marginalization (Buğra 2008: 93-94; Öniş and Şenses 2005).

Firstly, the state's role in welfare provision has been curbed through the redefinition of the relative positions of state, society and the economy in order to open up new investment areas to financial capital with the motivation to make higher levels of profit. In the neoliberal era, a new system that would facilitate the free movement of capital was advocated since the post-war system was accused of being an obstacle in front of free trade, hindering economic growth, boosting the poverty traps and deteriorating international competition (MacGregor 2014). As argued by Köse and Öncü (2003), the state became the political facilitator for ensuring the sustainability of “economic superiority” of “money as the most general and abstract form of capital”, attributing an instrumental role to state [for] the continuity of capitalism and leading to the transformation of state-capital relationships (Köse and Öncü 2003: 108-135). The role of state in defending the interests of capital is fed by the “neoliberal antipathy” to social policy (Fine 2009b: 3). According to Fine (2009), the underpinning of financialization by the rise of neoliberalism “mark[s] the [...] subordination of economic and social policy [...] to the dictates of the promotion of markets in general and especially of finance” (Fine 2009a: 4-5).

The increasing internationalization of capital, production and the integration with the world markets had a number of implications on the macroeconomic structure of the ‘emerging economies’ (Yentürk, 2003: 14, *emph. added*). “The overall growth in the world economy has been strikingly lower and more unstable during the neoliberal era compared to earlier periods [and] premature exposure to the vagaries of financial globalization has been costly for many economies in the semi-periphery” (Öniş and Şenses 2005). This has also transformed the nature of the relationship between state and economy (Ergüneş 2010) as well as the state and society (Buğra 2008 and Yücesan-Özdemir 2014). Although the post-2001 period is characterized with “a limited degree of deviance from orthodox neoliberal

accumulation regime in the form of neoliberalism with a regulatory state component” (Öniş and Şenses 2007), the neoliberal ideology acts in a continuum through its emphasis on the secondary position of the state against the primacy of the market forces and the unlimited terrain of the financial flows. Neoliberalism transformed the political, economic and social structures of the countries worldwide through the complex mechanisms functioning within the so-called globalization process. It has survived in spite of numerous crisis through fitting itself into the specificities in the socio-economic environment of the countries (Theodore et.al. 2012) with the creation of “consumer societies” perfectly answering the requirements of the endless accumulation of capital. In Fine’s (2009a) words;

The mess that surrounds social policy is a consequence of neo-liberalism, a chaotic and shifting ensemble of ideology, scholarship and policy in practice whose leading thread has been to promote and defend financialisation, with direct and indirect implications for demands upon, and response of, social policy (Fine 2009a: 2).

Paralleling the retreat of state from the sphere of social reproduction, the motivation to make higher levels of profit lead to a subsequent change in the role of the private actors that the private sector started to fill in the gaps left from the state. Individual consumption was boosted through commodification of social services, and social reproduction is increasingly tied to the market mechanism (Yücesan-Özdemir 2014: 119). Financialization has underpinned the rise in the privatization of public social services (Fine 2009a: 5), leading to exclusion of the masses from access to even the basic services and there has been an ever-increasing demand for the welfare services due to the difficulties in compensating the costs of private provision of social services (Jenson and Saint Martin 2003).

The second characteristic of the shift in social policy is that the neoliberal project, characterized with the massive speed, density and the extension of global financial flows, created a new social policy environment which overvalues the market and

defines the social and individual rights in terms of the contributions made to the reproduction of the market mechanism. “Neoliberalism was reflected in the artificial disentanglement of the state and market from the society and the economy as if they are opposite to each other, although each of them are embedded in the broader political structure of all the economic relationships” (Theodore et. al. 2012) evident in the neoliberal restructuring of the relative positions of these institutions in terms of their roles in the process of welfare provision.

Serious social constraints as well as high political, social and economic costs provoked by the neoliberal ideological shift in the 1980s and the “structural adjustment” in the 1990s created debates about social cohesion. In the post-war period, a functioning economy with full employment and an equality agenda were regarded as the terrain of the state. However, more recently, the goal has turned into maintaining economic change and social policy has been regarded as the tool for reaching this goal through “labour market flexibility, participation and international competitiveness in the knowledge- based economy” (Jenson and Saint-Martin 2003). This, somehow, indicates an instrumental approach to social policy; in other words, social policy started to be utilized with the aim of enabling economic efficiency and social cohesion that would, in turn, facilitate the smooth functioning of the market mechanism (Jenson and Saint-Martin 2003).

The increasing commodification of labour was underpinned by the changing conception of society away from a collectivity with social and economic rights towards an individualistic concept of personal responsibilities, duties and obligations for economic growth and prosperity. State’s role shifted away from directly providing assistance to a “passive providing state to enhance self- activity, responsibility and mobilisation into paidwork among citizens” (Jenson and Saint Martin 2003). The withdrawal of the state from welfare provision is in line with the orthodox neoliberal understanding which dictates that the capitalist mode of production characterised with the free market presents the optimal environment for production, and that if the individuals are hardworking and smart enough, they can

get out of poverty without any intervention since capitalism creates an unprecedented wealth and generates high number of jobs (Yücesan-Özdemir 2014). This individualistic and marginalizing point of view is completely compatible with the general logic of the reproduction of labour in the era of neoliberalism. The post-war citizenship regime anchored in social rights (Jenson and Saint Martin 2003: 77) was challenged by the discourse of “dependency” which in itself led to the questioning of the neoliberal focus on economic growth and competitiveness while disregarding the social consequences of exclusion of the segments having no or limited access to resources. Fine (2009) makes a comparison between the Washington Consensus in terms of the state’s position vis-a-vis market and he argues that while the Washington Consensus is based on the “reliance upon market forces”, the Post-Washington Consensus focuses on “correcting market and institutional imperfections as well as their accompaniments of poverty, bad governance, inequality, and so on to include anything else for legitimacy or discretion in policy” (Fine 2009a: 8).

Hence, the neoliberal social project reformulated the society as the “active” and “inactive” individuals in terms of the level of their contribution to the overall functioning of the market mechanism and economic growth. Inactive population is illustrated as being dependent, even “parasitic”, and detrimental to economic growth and coherence, which points at “a redesigned welfare” with a concern not only of economic development but also inclusion into society by “active participation” to labour market. In this respect, social security gained new characteristics that the state intervention in the form of passive labour market policies are increasingly replaced by conditional policies requiring citizen’s contribution to economy in order to gain his/her social security. This is, in the literature, conceptualized by the discourse of “activation” or, in other words, “no rights without responsibilities” (Yücesan-Özdemir 2014: 119) which denotes that new risks prevalent within the new economic order following the challenges of the late twentieth century have been attributed to the citizen’s own efforts to face them.

This new social policy perspective led to changes in the relative positions of the society and the labour vis-a-vis the market and the capital. In line with the changing role of state in social reproduction, the social policy shaped by the neoliberal forces is marked with the transfer of state's responsibilities to third parties; family, non-governmental initiatives and the charitable organizations through the discourses of "philanthropy/charity" and "responsibility sharing". The increasing emphasis on third parties in social reproduction, to a certain degree, compensates the retreat of the state from social service provision (Buğra and Keyder 2006; Buğra 2008). The expansion in the scope of social assistance, the increasing variety of social assistance schemes and the expansion in the segments of the society covered by a growing amount of social assistance payments derive its ideological basis from the neoliberal project. The neoliberal ideology redefined the state as a set of institutions leading to low levels of production, deteriorating the mechanism of surplus accumulation, creating market distortions and wasting the resources through inefficiency in the production process. The state's responsibilities for social policy was attributed to third parties to ensure that the state is pushed away from the economic and social spheres. The society was also redefined as something "non-existent"; it was fragmented and reduced to a mere mathematical sum of the individuals which massively deteriorated the social solidarity networks. This created another dilemma of the neoliberal project since while the society was "non-existent", the welfare of the individuals was attributed to the active role to be played by the family, non-governmental organizations and charities with boosting a strong sense of philanthropy. It is the neoliberal transformation itself which has changed the role of the traditional family mechanism in welfare provision and the individuals were left with the necessity to find strategies for their own livelihoods within an unstable, blurred and highly subjective framework of social cohesion (Buğra 2008; Yücesan-Özdemir 2014).

CHAPTER 4

CHILD LABOUR IN TURKEY AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF THE RISE OF NEOLIBERALISM, FINANCIALISATION AND THE NEOLIBERAL TRANSFORMATION OF SOCIAL POLICY

Chapter 3 presented the mutually constitutive relationships between the dominant patterns of accumulation, production on the one hand, and immigration, poverty, dissolution of agricultural production and weakening of social rights on the other. The developments in the economic and social sphere since the late 1970s characterised with the growing internationalisation of capital and expanding dominance of the finance led accumulation regime underpinned by the rise of neoliberal regulatory project were discussed with the aim of unmasking the intrinsic interrelationships between the variables that are taken as given by the mainstream discourse on the determinants of child labour. The redefinition of social policy to create a wider maneuvering area for the financial capital was discussed along the changing relationship between state, society and economy, characterised with the retreat of state from the provision of public social services and the expanding incorporation of private sector into social service provision as well as the resultant recommodification of labour boosted by the discourse of “activation”, “conditionalities” and “responsibility sharing” (Buğra and Keyder 2006; Buğra 2008; Yücesan-Özdemir 2014).

On the basis of this background, the fourth chapter aims to discuss the current situation of child labour in Turkey in a way to illustrate the interlinkages between neoliberal macroeconomic environment since the late 1970s on the one hand and the perpetuation of child labour on the other. As such, it aims to locate the current state of child labour in Turkey within its underlying context of the neoliberal regulatory framework. For that purpose the chapter discusses Turkey’s articulation

into the new global division of labour in conjunction with its implications on the labour market, trade off between real and financial accumulation, dissolution of agricultural production and the emergence of new waves of immigration aggravating income inequalities and generating unprecedented patterns of poverty in urban Turkey.

Historically, the neoliberal experience of Turkey is divided into three periods, starting from the early 1980s characterised with the rise of export-oriented growth strategy, a trade-off between real production and financial accumulation, curbing of real wages, and suppression of the unionist movement. The classical mode of surplus appropriation through suppression of wages reached to its limits by the end of 1980s and the finance-led accumulation regime underpinned by the rise of neoliberalism was introduced as a macroeconomic strategy acting towards the aim of higher levels of surplus and economic growth. The period between 1989-2000 is unique in several aspects that it covers unprecedented developments in the macroeconomic sphere, having far reaching implications on the social structure of the country. More specifically, the year of 1989 constitutes one of the milestones in this sense that it is marked with the overall liberalization of capital accounts without the required economic and social infrastructure, leading to the fact that it is referred as being “premature” from many aspects and opening Turkish economy to speculative-led movements of international capital (Yeldan 2007: 2-14). Throughout the 2000s, financial transactions have increased their control over the productive sectors and labouring segments of the society through distortion of employment relations and labour market (Ergüneş 2009; Onaran 2007: 5-6).

These three periods are discussed in conjunction with the macroeconomic developments figured out in Chapter 3 in terms of their implications on labour, social policy, migration and poverty, leading to the reproduction of child labour in Turkey. The new forms of poverty as they appear in the urban areas in Turkey are discussed and it is illustrated that waves of migration stemming from the transformation of the rural space triggered the increasing utilization of urban areas

as centres for post-Fordist production and finance-led accumulation, creating unprecedented forms of poverty and inequality in the urban areas. The urban livelihoods were changed through the incorporation of financial motives to the daily lives of the masses and paved the ground for deepening poverty and social exclusion for the labouring segments of the society via expanding informality, precariousness, insecurity and flexibility in the labour market.

On the basis of this background, it is argued that while the mainstream and the critical perspectives on child labour attribute negative connotation to child labour as a phenomenon to measure, tackle and alleviate, the political economy perspective reveals the structural causes producing and reproducing the reasons of child labour as embedded within the socioeconomic and historical context. In this regard, this chapter adopts a holistic approach to illustrate the recent scope and practices of child labour in Turkey in terms of the rates of children engaged in economic activity and the areas of work that they are involved in. The trade-off between educational attainment and child labour is discussed as one of the main crossroads of household's socioeconomic situation and utilization of child labour as a coping strategy both inside and outside the house. Urban and rural dynamics of child labour are discussed so as to reveal the transformation of child labour within its spatial dynamics. The gender dimension, which is mostly evident in the practices of domestic labour together with other branches of activity performed by children, is incorporated into the analyses to figure out the transformation of gender roles in the society that affect the scope of children's involvement in economic activities. As a cross-cutting issue, the legal framework of child labour is given to illustrate how child labour is defined and addressed at the legislative sphere, and to underline how the labour legislation perpetuates the asymmetrical power relations between capital and labour, child labour being the focal point.

4.1.THE TURKISH EXPERIENCE OF NEOLIBERALISM AND FINANCIAL LIBERALIZATION

In the Turkish context, one of the most profound evidences of the transformatory nature of neoliberalism is the extension of the pro-capital macroeconomic policies adopted within the framework of internationalization of capital and production which led to the erosion of real production, dissolution of productive sectors (Öniş and Şenses 2007), deepening of poverty and inequalities despite the high growth performance. It was not the rate but the socio-political implications of economic growth that has reflected the real characteristics of the neoliberal transformation of the growth regime in Turkey, which constitutes a prominent case where, in Wallerstein's (2000) words, the capitalist mode of production perpetuated its existence through the "pressure on all direct producers to work more and to be paid less" for the sake of higher levels of surplus expropriation (Wallerstein 2000: 270). The pro-capital and anti-labour stance of the state was concretized through the devoted attempts for financial liberalization, replacement of import-substitutive industrialization with export-oriented growth policies, and the strong commitment to the recipes presented by the actors of the Washington Consensus. Neoliberal transformation of the accumulation regime has direct implications on the macroeconomic structure of Turkey via loyalty to market in the encounter with the internationalisation of production and capital, which consequently paved the ground for the dissolution of agricultural mode of production, boosted the flow of migrants to urban settlements, acted towards the creation of new forms of conflicts and contradictions in the urban space. These developments resulted in the deepening of poverty and inequalities associated with the expanding informalization and marginalization in the labour market and in the social sphere.

According to Öniş and Şenses (2007), while the 'rentiers' benefited from this encounter, the "biggest loser" was the organized labour composed mainly of the workers in the productive sectors (emp. original), hence the loser was a whole society with all the productive dynamics. The pro-capital stance of the state and the

integration process of domestic economy with the world markets did not lead to a more competitive environment in the domestic industry (Boratav and Yeldan 2001: 35-36). “The [Turkish] economy witnessed sharp shifts in the underlying economic polity with the emergence and administration of new modes of surplus extraction mechanisms throughout [...] “commodity trade liberalization in 1980 and [...] financial liberalization of 1989”. Furthermore, the financing behavior of corporations did not show significant change, and the banking sector became increasingly disassociated from credit financing and intermediation, and evolved into financiers of securitization of domestic debt” (Boratav and Yeldan 2001: 35-36; Düzgün 2012).

4.1.1. 1980-89: Early Phase of Encounter with Neoliberalism

In Turkey, the period between the 1980-89 set the foundations of the reign of neoliberalism as a hegemonic project changing the relative positions of state, society and the economy (Öniş and 2007; Yücesan-Özdemir 2014). In the 1980s, domestic borrowing was adopted as the strategy to compensate for the large current account deficits, which had a crowding-out effect on private investments and production in the real sector. The curbing of the real sector led to a decrease in employment rates and further deteriorated the stability in the labour market (Alper and Öniş, 2003) reflected on today’s Turkey as high unemployment rates despite high rates of economic growth. The implications of the oil crises in the 1970s continued throughout 1980s in the form of fiscal and financial crises, which are regarded also as distributional crises (Öniş and Şenses 2007), evident in the deepening income inequalities.

The rise of export-oriented growth strategy in the 1980s was based on the suppression of real wages and domestic demand which in turn decreased the investments in the industrial sector and deteriorated the employment-generation potential of the economy (Onaran 2002: 276; Independent Social Scientists 2008: 102), led to unemployment and deepening of inequalities. Itoh and Lapavitzas

(1997) make an overall assesment on the transformation in labour vis-a-vis the speculative financial flows in the 1980s and 1990s:

The increased efficiency and flexibility of the credit system, coupled with low interest rates did not lead to inflation in the late 1980s but to the emergence of speculative bubbles exclusively concentrated in real estate and share prices. The emergence of substantial part-time labour, the considerably weakened power of the trade unions under pressure from recession and technological change, and the depressed prices of primary products in the world market were probably important in the failure of inflation to surge when the speculative bubbles burst in the 1990s [...] As the downswing has progressed, exchange rate instability and the emergence of temporary speculative bubbles have intensified. This was certainly not imagined by the advocates of monetarism or neoliberalism. Meanwhile, working people have had to bear the burden of austerity policies, unemployment and a more unequal distribution of income and wealth encouraged by financial speculation and instability in the economy (Itoh and Lapavitzas 1997: 2012-202).

The seeds of one of the main contradictions in the Turkish socio-economic structure was put on the ground as early as the period between 1980-89 in the form of a trade-off between investments in the real sector vis-a-vis a rent-seeking behaviour fed by the gigantic gains from the unproductive ones, finance being at the top of the list, and the housing being rediscovered with its rent-bearing potential. As argued by Boratav and Yeldan (2001), “the impressive export boom of the 1980s was [...] essentially based on the productive capacities established during the [1970s]” rather than the 1980s itself (p. 6). This situation was an “anomaly” that the total fixed investments directed to manufacturing was decreasing despite the fundamental requirement for an expanding manufacturing sector given the adoption of the export-oriented growth strategy (p. 6). This “anomaly” had negative implications on the growth in the productive sectors of Turkish economy and had far-reaching consequences on the overall growth regime of Turkey since the 1980s. The decrease in the investments in the manufacturing sector is accompanied by an increase in the the housing investments “which expanded by an annual average of 24.5 percent during 1983-87 period”, so the rent-bearing nature of the housing sector was discovered in this period and had devastating effects on the growth patterns in Turkey. “The implications of this non-

conformity between the stated foreign trade objectives towards *manufacturing exports* and the realized patterns of accumulation *away from manufacturing* constituted one of the main structural deficiencies of the growth pattern of the period.” (Boratav and Yeldan, 2001: 6, emph. original). The economic dichotomy of Turkish economy since the 1980s is that maintaining the macro-economic balance necessitates to keep the real interest rates higher than the depreciation of Turkish lira vis-a-vis foreign currencies, however the very high value of Turkish lira discourages the production in export-oriented sectors due to the fact that import becomes cheaper (Independent Social Scientists 2011: 53).

In Turkey, the military regime of the 1980s was a huge step backward in the curbing of the social, political and economic rights of labour, which, to a large extent, determined the social policy environment and the mechanisms of social reproduction. Labour is commodified and the relationship between state and society is distorted through disengaging the labouring segments from the state as composed of the individuals responsible from their own livelihoods, poverty and exclusion. Yücesan-Özdemir’s (2003) statements are illuminating in terms of seeing the relationship between labour and social policy in present-day Turkey from the Gramscian perspective of hegemony. According to her, the production politics in Turkey are;

...in need of a skillful combination of consent in the area of labo[u]r organization, the skill, knowledge, and mental contribution of workers, and coercion (caused by low wages and the lack of social and political benefits). Production politics were, to a certain extent, successful in combining the coercion caused by the Taylorist-Fordist labour process and the consent manufactured by the social policies [...] The workers considered coercion as price to be paid for prosperity. However, in the contemporary Turkish workplace, to look for the “manufacture of consent” in the labour process organization amid a context of widespread joblessness, underemployment, the absence or erosion of a social security net, growing wage polarization, and employment insecurity leads to a crisis rather than a legitimacy of the production process (Yücesan-Özdemir 2003: 193).

This period created a second anomaly reflected in the labour side of the economy, which is indeed closely associated with the trade-off between productive and unproductive sectors briefly mentioned above. Throughout 1980s, high levels of foreign financial support, fiscal policies for boosting demand and suppressing the real wages were seen as the remedies to create an expansionary economic environment. Profound suppression of real wages was the main characteristic of the “classical mode of surplus creation” in the 1980s except for the fragile gains of the labour due to the populist approach in the pre-election period at the end of the decade. However, these gains were not long-lasting since the “macroeconomic policy response to the increased wage costs and the culminating fiscal deficits was complete deregulation of financial markets [in 1989]” (Yeldan, 2006; Yeldan 2001: 76) which is discussed below. The export-orientation “opened new venues for wealth accumulation based on a re-newed form of rent-seeking”, however this form of accumulation required the suppression of domestic demand through suppressing the wage incomes vis-a-vis increasing productivity signifying the emergence of the “era when the domestic economy is subjected to a new transformation towards foreign competition and integration with the global commodity and asset markets” (Onaran 2007: 5-6; Boratav and Yeldan 2001: 38). “Competitiveness of Turkish economy in exports have increased, however this is not a result of a long term progress in the labour efficiency or technological advancement but of suppression in the [...] labour costs (Boratav 2003: 187), working longer hours and asking a lower number of workers to produce a higher amount of outputs, and labour market deregulation behind the mask of “flexibility (Ergüneş 2009: 143).”

The regressive steps in unionization was parallel to these up-and-downs in the economy and the suppression of the unionist movement was one of the most obvious policies for suppression of labour within the broader context of the anti-labour stance prevailing in Turkey since the 1980s. The increase in the unionization rates as a product of the expansionary conjuncture of 1960s and 1970s slowed down at the beginning of 1980s through the repressive forces in both the political

and economic spheres. In spite of the recovery of the unionization rates in 1987-88 thanks to the revival of collective bargaining –again a reflection of the populist concerns-, the attempt of labour unions to increase the real wages was responded by the capital as low employment, de-unionization, dismissals and high turnover with an aim to suppress the real wages (Türel 2011: 201-207). This shows how “the market mechanism was utilized as a tool for weakening the trade unions and suppressing the labour for preventing counter-hegemonic strategies by the labour movement” (Yücesan-Özdemir in Coşar and Yücesan-Özdemir 2013: 129).

The developments in the 1980s led to the increasing reign of capital over labour through the malfunctioning of the export-oriented industrialization strategy, suppression of the real wages as the primary mode of capital accumulation and the regressive approach towards the collective movements and socio-political rights of the labour. The roots of chronic problems of the Turkish labour market such as weakening of the manufacturing sector, labour market segmentation, adoption of unregistered employment as a strategy to support the competitive advantage of Turkey in the “international division of labour” are located within this first phase of the neoliberal hegemony (Yeldan 2001: 96; Boratav and Yeldan 2001: 35-36).

4.1.2. 1989-2000: “Premature Financialization”

In Turkey, “the ‘classical’ mode of surplus creation based on the structural adjustment with export promotion under a regulated foreign exchange system, controls on capital inflows and [...] severe suppression of wage incomes via hostile measures against organized labour reached its economic and political limits by 1988” (Yeldan 2006: 196). The process of financial deregulation was accelerated in the second half of 1980s through the liberalization of capital accounts (Boratav 2003: 153). This process is marked by the overall financial deregulation on the basis of the decision towards the full convertibility of Turkish Lira (TRY) in 1989. By Yeldan, this decision is called as “premature liberalization” of capital account

regime, premature in the sense that it was adopted without preparing the legal basis and macroeconomic infrastructure (Yeldan 2001). This swift step deepened the already fragile macroeconomic and social structure by opening the Turkish market to the speculative attacks of the finance capital, whose impacts reached far beyond the financial sector (Öniş and Şenses 2007; Independent Social Scientists 2001). Overall deregulation of capital accounts and the structural adjustment policies implemented in the 1980s resulted in huge inflows of short term foreign capital into Turkish economy, which, in turn, generated an increase in trade deficits, having serious implications for deepening of poverty and income inequalities against the background of rising unemployment and neoliberal transformation of social policy. This “counter attack of capital” is one of the main dynamics determining the weak position of labour vis-a-vis capital in the neoliberal model imposed to Turkish society after 1989 (Boratav 2003:148).

In this period, the restructuring of the financial sector became directly associated with the functioning of the public finance and, given the unstable and fragile nature of finance capital, the determinative power of finance over the real economy –set by “high interest rates offered by the government bonds and treasury bills (Boratav and Yeldan 2001: 9)- increased the fragility and instability of the overall macroeconomic structure of Turkey. “The magnitudes involved, more or less, made it inevitable that the financial system as a whole was directly shaped by the needs and methods of financing the public sector” (Boratav and Yeldan 2001). The emergence of negative public savings stemming from domestic borrowing at high interest rates dramatically curbed the public disposable income (which declined by 39 percent during the 1990s in real terms) changing the direction of tax revenues away from public savings to interest payments. The ratio of interest payments to tax revenues rose almost without interruption from 28 percent in 1992 to 77 percent in 2000. “As a result, the economy is observed to be trapped in a vicious circle: commitment to high interest rates and cheap foreign currency (overvalued TL) against the threat of capital flight generates a floor below which real interest rates

cannot decline. When adverse impacts on the current account balance tend to become destabilizing, the only mechanism to prevent the specter of a major devaluation and to arrest currency substitution and/or capital flight is further upward adjustment in the domestic interest rates” (Boratav and Yeldan 2001: 8-9).

This period witnessed a distortion in the relationship between aggregate demand and inflow of capital deteriorating the overall growth pattern of Turkey and increasing unemployment through complex mechanisms. Within the expansionary context prior to 1989, the economy used to function within a mechanism that the expansion in demand (i.e. growth) was leading to an increase in the trade deficit and this increase was stimulating the inflow of capital (Yeldan 2006: 196). However, following the financial deregulation in 1989 the process no longer started with an expansion in demand coming from the public sector, private companies or the consumers and/or households but the factor initiating the expansionary process was the inflow of foreign capital itself. As a result, this kind of an upside-down expansionary process (i.e. short-term growth) increased the trade deficits (Boratav 2003: 191-192). “The deregulated international capital inflows has been a factor of instability for both the real and financial economy, and this instability has become a major obstacle in front of the balanced growth of national economy [...] (Yeldan 2012: 128-136; also see Öniş and Şenses 2005). During the 1990s, the surmounting interest payments in return for the foreign debts had a crowding-out effect on the investment expenditures and discouraged the private sector investments (Yentürk 2003: 38), leading to contraction in the labour demand and increase in unemployment (Onaran 2002: 278-283).

4.1.3. 2000 Onwards: The Growth Model Based on Short-Term Capital Inflows

The post-2000 macroeconomic and political environment of Turkey is marked by the deepening of the finance-led accumulation regime through the contractionary

fiscal policy, dictating further reductions in the role of state in the economy and the increasing interference of IMF to the functioning of economic, political and social arena under the names of “stabilization” and “structural adjustment” (Yeldan 2007: 2-14, epm. added). The speculative financial bubbles have further expanded, foreign deficit has increased through the overvaluation of Turkish Lira, and the public social services have been gradually transferred to the private actors for opening wider areas to the finance capital (Yeldan 2007: 2-14). Throughout the 2000s, as Ergüneş (2009) argues, financial transactions have increased their control and reign over the productive sectors and workers through the distortion of employment relations (Ergüneş 2009). “The Turkish economy became dependent, unstable and high growth rates became unsustainable” (Onaran 2007: 5-6). The almost obsessive approach about keeping inflation within pre-determined margins was perpetuated with the Disinflation Programme of the 1999, which is to the detriment of the productive sectors of the economy through increasing the instability of macroeconomic structure. It has also detrimental effects on the labour through wage indexation (Ergüneş 2010; Independent Social Scientists 2001). The Programme was not long-lasting due to the 2000-2001 crisis, the commitment in this regard was going to be repeated, even further strengtened, through the Transition to Strong Economy Programme in 2001 which covers both the public and private sector. Although there are several arguments on the positive implications of the inflation targeting on answering the demands of the real sector, increasing the capital accumulation and contributing to the competitiveness of the producers (Ergüneş, 2009: 139) what is more prevalent from our point of view is that the “disinflationist growth policy” and the subsequent inflation targeting led to the suppression of wages and a consequent increase in the proletarianization of the labour force (Independent Social Scientists 2011).

In the 2000s, the macroeconomic policies acted towards the liberalization of the capital movements for higher levels of capital accumulation in the form of surplus expropriated from labour at the expense of real production, macroeconomic

stability, social welfare and equality (Yeldan 2006; Independent Social Scientists 2001). As Yeldan (2006) illustrates, the macroeconomic situation of Turkey is marked by “persistence of price inflation under conditions of a crisis-prone economic structure, persistent and rapidly-expanding fiscal deficits, and marginalization of labour force along with dramatic deterioration of the economic conditions of the poor (Yeldan 2006). Throughout the 2000s, the macroeconomic targets such as attaining higher rates of economic growth, competitiveness, productivity and efficiency may be argued to contribute to occupying a position in the international division of labour, however, those ill-defined targets have deteriorated the organization of labour and livelihoods globally, and Turkey was no exception. The Transition to Strong Economy Programme introduced in 2001 did not present a solid strategy to support industrial production as a cure to the negative effects of neoliberal capital accumulation regime on the productive sectors, which means a continuum with the pro-capital approach acted to the detriment of the labour since the 1970s that resulted in the marginalisation of labour through “flexible” organization of production process (Independent Social Scientists 2001).

The “adjustment” and “stability” programmes adopted in line with the neoliberal transformation had devastating effects on the wages and unemployment rates, perpetuated by the policies to curb the unionist movements and organizations which declined the territory of civil control on the new forms of work organization characterized with insecurity, precariousness and fragility, changing the modes, rules and limitations of presentation and expropriation of labour power. The neoliberal era is marked with the counterattack of non-productive capital against the productive segments of the society, hence there is a fundamental trade-off between the wellbeing of labour and capital that the former was sacrificed for the short-term speculative financial gains (Yeldan 2006, Yeldan 2012, Boratav 2003). One of the most striking observations related to labour market since 1980s is the presence of rather sharp increases in national income together with too slow expansion in employment that became a chronic problem of the structure of labour

market in Turkey (Independent Social Scientists 2005:19 in Erbaş and Turan 2009). “In Turkey, between 1999-2005, employment in manufacturing sector decreased by 1.2 percent *accompanied by* a decline of 4 percent decline in the real wages, denoting a dramatic decrease in the share of labour in the total surplus value” (Onaran 2007: 5-6, emp. added). This process is referred as “jobless-growth” and it is argued to be a common phenomenon in the “underdeveloped” countries (Yeldan 2006; Yeldan 2012; Independent Social Scientists 2005:19 in Erbaş and Turan, 2009). At the core of the “jobless growth” is the speculative money inflows stemming from the high real interest rates offered by Turkey to external markets. The prevalence of speculative inflows results in overvaluation of the exchange rate (Turkish Lira becomes extremely valuable), encourages import while the demand for domestically produced goods and for the labour used in their production declined. As a result, the current deficit rises; increases in export and production concentrates on the low- value- added sectors which leads to a limited increase or a decrease in employment (Telli et.al. 2006 cited in Apak and Uçak 2007: 61). This orientation towards import adversely affects the quantity of fixed capital investments and it leads to an import boom which increases the trade deficits. (Yeldan 2012: 128-136). The current deficit undermines the domestic production and hinders the increases in employment rates and leading to the deepening of the unemployment problem in Turkey through the preference of import due to its relatively lower cost (Yeldan 2009: 20-21; Ergüneş 2009: 146). The “cheap import ‘melts’ the earnings of the domestic producers in the subsidiary industries and the producers of intermediate goods; “the cheap input pushes the domestic inputs [away] from the market”, which leads to the withdrawal of small and medium-sized enterprises and subsidiary producers from the market and this increases the dependency to import. Through this mechanism, the foreign capital drawn into the domestic market is “paid back” to foreign markets, which is called a vicious cycle (Yeldan 2009: 21; see also Yentürk 2003).

The inflation targeting policies “turned out to be a mechanism for suppression of the wages”, increase in unemployment and the perpetuation of higher rates of growth without subsequent increases in the employment rates (Ergüneş, 2009: 143); “the growth regime adopting the low-wage policy guaranteed higher rates of profit at the expense of employment and growth. (Onaran 2002: 274-275). Under the conditions of financial accumulation regime, high levels of interest rates, increasing imports and raising trade deficits combined with the over-valuation of Turkish lira vis-a-vis foreign currencies have hindered the growth rates in the real sector and the heaviest burden was undertaken by the labour side of the economy (Onaran 2002) The real wages have been suppressed with the motivation to attain higher profits, which is “the main motivation of capitalist accumulation regime” (Türel 2011: 195), and to boost the efficiency to become more competitive in the international markets (Boratav 2003: 187). Low wages led to a contraction in the domestic demand, a decrease in the labour demand and a decline in the labour force participation (Onaran 2002: 278-283).

The high employment-high wages conjuncture of the latest long-term economic fluctuation of the capitalist welfare state can no longer be sustained through monetary and fiscal policies to direct the aggregate demand since such a regulating role of the state started to be challenged in the recession period (Türel 2011: 201-207). “The consequences of the transformation on the workforce were seen in falling real wages for all those located in the former leading sectors, and increased unemployment (or irregularity and precariousness of employment). This went along with a shift to forms of work that were under less legal control (home-working, the informal economy, “flexible” works, etc.) and a major expansion of subcontracting (Hopkins et. al. 1996: 212-213). “The informal sector, usually defined as non-unionized workforce entering easy hiring and firing relationships with capital, is growing and it forms the largest sector of total employment. The increase in the number of casual workers is an important determinant in the growth of an informal economy under ‘flexibility’, as it makes the formal sector smaller”

(Yücesan-Özdemir 2003) and more difficult to be regulated by the state through the deregulation and commonality of informal labour. Deregulation has acted against the labour via distorting the relationship between labour, capital and state through disabling the mass movements and organizational power of labour vis-a-vis the marginalization and precariousness of the employment relations. Given the trend of jobless growth as a structural and chronic problem of the Turkish labour market, the neoliberal transformation of employment relations away from contractual relations to informal and precarious type of jobs will not be solved in the near future and will have further implications on social cohesion and will further deteriorate the livelihoods at the national level.

The magnitude of the fragility of the Turkish economy became more evident in its vulnerability to the crisis in 2008. As stated by Independent Social Scientist (2011), in 2008, the crisis in the foreign markets, decline in the domestic demand and the currency shock have peaked and the crisis situation has led to mass lay offs (Independent Social Scientists 2011). Consequently, the industrial sector –the “backbone of the economy” has shrunk by 22 percent in the third quarter of 2008 and, overall, the Turkish economy has shrunk by 5 percent in 2009. As argued by Independent Social Scientists (2011):

In the post-crisis period, increase in the profit rates accompanied by the expansion in the non-productive segment of the economy denotes that an extension of exploitation has expanded and surplus has surmounted. The imported inputs were increasingly used, the value of capital was diminished and profit were increased. Through this kind of a capital accumulation mode, public resources are transferred to the capital as profit. In the post-2000 period, the expansion of non-productive sectors suppresses the capitalist accumulation and this can be overcome only through increasing the exploitation in the productive sectors. This is the ultimate aim of the neoliberal project pursued by the national and international capital (Independent Social Scientists 2011: 53).

This clearly shows that in the post-2000 period the macroeconomic situation of the economy has become totally dependent on the financial flows and the intensity of exploitation has increased, which is a continuum of the policies pursued since the 1980s. Finance penetrated everyday lives of the individuals, and increased

household indebtedness emerged as a new dimension of threatening proletarianized masses. While inflation targeting policies resulted wage suppression, consumer credits and the credit cards had been introduced as a solution for boosting domestic demand. However, this has led to the ever-increasing indebtedness of the individuals and emergence of new forms of poverty and social exclusion (Independent Social Scientists 2011: 41-42). The gigantic expansion of various banking tools in the form of credit cards, consumer credits, mortgage became a strategy to expropriate the individual disposable incomes for higher rates of profit, meaning the further withdrawal of individuals to the financial sector, called as the “the financialization of incomes”. According the Lapavitsas, this means the changing nature of the financial sector that in the current situation that started to expropriate the incomes of the workers through deepening their indebtedness, which is called “financial expropriation” (Lapavitsas 2009 cited in Ergüneş 2009: 135).

4.2.NEOLIBERALISM AND SOCIAL POLICY IN TURKEY

This section explains the new social policy understanding in Turkey defined by the rise and deepening of the neoliberal project. This will be analysed under two pillars. The first pillar will discuss the retreat of the state from public service provision and the incorporation of the private sector into this domain. Secondly, the increasing recommodification of labour in Turkey against the background of financialization will be discussed. Both pillars are analysed against the background of financialization experience of Turkey since the 1990s, with a special emphasis on the post-2000 period to highlight the reflections of macroeconomic policies on social policy. Moreover the increasing prevalence of social assistance as a sporadic, arbitrary and unstable substitute of social service will be emphasised as a horizontal issue crosscutting the transformation in the social policy, decrease in public social expenditures and commodification of labour. The section also aims to set the relational moments and linkages for the discussion on the dissolution of

agriculture, waves of migration, new forms of urban poverty and inequalities which will be presented in the next section.

4.2.1. Retreat of State from Public Provision of Social Services

In Turkey, there has been a significant retreat of state in public service provision which has been accompanied by an increased incorporation of the private sector into “social” service provision. Within the broader context of reducing the state to a mere protector of the market interests as dictated by the neoliberal project, state expenditures were curbed for decreasing the tax burden on the employers which is an extension of the supply-side and profit-oriented stance of the neoliberal policies (Buğra 2008). The neoliberal doctrine relied heavily upon the market forces for the prevention of poverty however public social expenditures were curbed for opening new areas to the private sector and the financial liberalization expropriated the incomes of the labouring segments of the society for higher amounts of profits (Lapavitsas 2009) and with budgetary concerns for adjusting the balances (Coşar and Yeğenoğlu 2009).

Notwithstanding the economic and political implications of the quantitative fluctuations in the amount of public social expenditures, what is emphasized here is the growing extent of the erosion in the scope of public social service provision at discursive as well as substantive levels for the sake of allocating a broader area for the free movement and accumulation of finance capital. In Turkey, since the 1980s, there has been an increase in the market-based provision of social services. “From 1994 onwards, entrepreneurs started to move into these sectors and the private sector’s share in total education[1] and healthcare investments reached 50 percent by 1997” (Boratav et. al. 2000 cited in Yücesan-Özdemir 2003: 193-191). The area and hegemony of finance capital has been strengthened through the transformation in the service provision that the services previously presented by the state has been provided increasingly by the private sector, making the citizens obliged to refer to the market even for the basic social services such as social

security, health and education (Yeldan 2007: 2-14). The role of the private sector is redefined as one of the primary actors of “social” service provision, denoting the creation of new investment areas for the finance capital in line with the pro-capital stance of finance-led accumulation strategy. According to Fine (2009), private sector was nurtured through the financialization of non-financial activities, which is highly relevant for the Turkish case:

[...] the relationship between financialisation and social policy is neither uniform nor always or even primarily direct [...] But any form of privatisation has the potential to induce financialisation since it creates a stream of revenue that can be consolidated into assets that can become part of a derivative that is speculatively traded. At this point, the asset appears to have floated free from its roots in real activity and provision. This is an illusion for two reasons. First, financialisation is itself diverse across varieties of assets and, second, the continuing attachment to, and ultimate dependence upon, the non-financial activities from which they derive is also diverse from housing to health and, indeed, how these are themselves provided (Fine 2009: 5).

“The social security reform was ratified in a macroeconomic environment targeting a decrease in the social expenditures” (Buğra 2008: 224-232). In line with the overall transformation of the social policy environment with the rising emphasis on charitable activities for social reproduction, social security has become a matter of charitable work that can be left to the merci of other individuals (Buğra and Keyder 2006; Buğra 2008). As stated by Coşar and Yeğenoğlu (2009), “[...] either security must be obtained in the marketplace or it must be gained as a result of another person’s or institution’s benevolence”. The highly-debated Social Security and General Health Insurance Reform (Buğra 2008: 234-254) has been implemented in an environment of high levels of unemployment and informality, raising concerns specifically on the pension system due to its ignorance about the existence of a huge population of informally-employed people (Yakut-Cakar 2007 cited in Aybars and Tsarouhas 2010: 755). “Criticism raised against the [R]eform has thus described the changes as signalling a move towards ‘the marketization of services and encouragement for the private sector to collaborate in a public-private mix of

service provision', which will deepen persistent inequalities within the system" (Boratav and Ozugurlu 2006; Yakut-Cakar 2007 cited in Aybars and Tsarouhas 2010: 755).

In addition to the marketization of social security, the decrease in the public social service provision is evident in the decline in the amounts of health expenditures and the subsequent incorporation of private sector to health service provision. According to TURKSTAT Health Statistics, the proportion of total health expenditures to GDP increased from 4.8 percent in 1999 to 5.4 percent in 2012 with a decreasing trend since 2009 (6.1 percent). It is even lower when it comes to the ratio of public health expenditures to GDP; while it was 4.9 percent in 2009, it has decreased to 4.1 percent in 2012. In 2012, the amount of private health expenditures was one third of the public health expenditures with 17.7 billion TRY and 58.6 billion TRY respectively. The increasing space for the private sector is evident in the dramatical rise in the expenditures of private sector hospital in the last decade. Expenditures of private hospitals increased from 89 million TRY in 1999 to 1.5 billion TRY in 2012, which indicates seventeen-times increase. The state aims to attain "modernised" health units in "gigantic city hospitals" through higher levels of "public-private partnerships" and "cost effective health services" (Ministry of Health 2013: 113), leaving health to profit-making mechanism. In the meantime, household health expenditures have also increased from 243 million TRY in 1999 to 1.6 billion TRY in 2012, which means that the household health expenditures have increased almost seven times during the 2000s. Both government and private health investments steadily increased between 1999 and 2008, however these investments declined after 2008 (private sector investment was 1.2 billion TRY in 2008 and it has dramatically decreased to 118 million TRY in 2009) which can be attributed to the general contraction in the economy and investments following the 2008 crisis (TURKSTAT, Health Expenditure Statistics), as one of the major negative implications of the crisis-prone structure of the macroeconomic environment in Turkey since the 1980s.

Besides, social policy environment favoring social assistance over social expenditures is evident in the legal regulations on the health system. “The regulations in the health system dating back to the second half of the 1980s speeded up the transformation of health services into a “sector” managed within the free market mechanism” (Buğra 2008: 213-218). The “solution” had originated from within the mentality of social assistance and the end result was the introduction of a system called “Greencard” provided on the basis of entitlement to social security together with the level of income -the beloved means of deciding on the needs and living conditions of the individuals with a total ignorance on the huge variety of the livelihoods of the masses-. “The Greencard system was expired in 2012, however the neoliberal inspiration and the means-testing method behind it has been kept alive through the introduction of mandatory General Health Insurance (GHI) system based on the state’s compensation of GHI premiums of the poor citizens having a monthly income level of less than gross minimum income (Ministry of Family and Social Policies 2013; see also Erdoğan and Kutlu 2014: 102).

Paralleling the commodification of services in the area of social security and health, the education sector is not free from the recommodifying aspects of privatization emancipated under the neoliberal social policy regime in Turkey. The privatization agenda played a major role in the increase in the private provision of education services while the public education expenditures gradually decreased. The proportion of Ministry of National Education (MoNE)’s investments in consolidated budget investments appropriation decreased from 12,88 percent in 2006 to 9,76 percent in 2013. Although there is a sharp increase to 14,15 percent in 2014, the average proportion was 10 percent between 2006-2013. The central government budget investment appropriation decreased from 38.5 billion TRY in 2013 to 36.6 billion TRY in 2014. The dissolution of the public social services affected the budgetary allocations to education at the national level. Ratio of MoNE’s budget in GDP decreased from 0,53 percent in 1998 to 0,25 percent in

2013. Although the budget of MoNE increased from 512 million TRY in 1997 to 55.7 billion TRY in 2014, the proportion of investments in the budget of MoNE decreased from 15,01 percent to 9,32 in the same period. While the state's role in education service gradually decreased, private contributions made by the individuals increased, which is an indicator of the transfer of state's role to other parties. Individuals' support to education increased from 25 thousand TRY in 1985 to 132 million TRY in 2013. The private capital has been underpinned by the creation of new investment areas and education has become one of the most prominent "sectors" utilized with financial concerns. While the general total number of private school/class/institutions was 18.6 thousand (Ministry of National Education National Education Statistics Formal Education 2012-2013), it increased to 19.6 thousand in 2013-2014 educational year. More specifically, the total number of private education institutions in formal education increased from 6.5 thousand to 7.4 thousand (Ministry of National Education National Education Statistics, Formal Education 2013-2014).

While the services presented on the basis of citizenship rights have decreased in amount and scope, the growing utilization of social assistance as a tool for social reproduction has been strengthened and certified at the state level. In this regard, Turkish administrative system has been modified with the aim of implementing new institutional arrangements in the social services and social assistance. In this regard, the Decree on the Administrative Structure and Tasks of the Ministry of Family and Social Policies came into force in 2011 and Social Assistance and Solidarity Funds (SASFs) became a part of this Ministry under the name of General Directorate of Social Assistance, while there are separate Units for the social assistance to various target groups (Ministry of Family and Social Policies 2013). Up to date, the Ministry has focused on social assistance provision rather than a holistic and comprehensive social policy approach. The fact that the social policy tradition of Turkey "is characterised with an uneasy combination of religious motives, conservatism and philanthropy" "in a stark contrast with the rights-based"

social policy understanding is associated with the sharp increase in social assistance provision in the recent years (Yücesan-Özdemir 2013). In fact, the strategical approach of the Ministry is completely in line with the neoliberal social policy environment, dictating a shift from rights-based social services to social assistance provided as a favour. In 2013, the total amount of social assistance expenditures was 20.7 billion TRY, corresponding to 1.35 percent of the GSYİH. In the same year, the number of families benefited from social assistances was 2.2 million, 1.1 million of which have benefited from both regular and ad-hoc assistance schemes (Ministry of Family and Social Policies 2013). Total means-tested social benefits have increased from 1 billion TRY in 2000 to 17.3 billion thousand TRY in 2012 family/children benefits having the highest share with 5.1 billion TRY while the non means-tested benefits increased from 12.6 billion TRY in 2000 to 173.8 billion TRY in 2012. The trend of increase is valid also for the cash and in kind benefits. In cash benefits increased from 7.5 billion TRY in 2000 to 123.6 billion TRY in 2012, old age benefits having the highest share with an amount of 91.4 billion TRY. Out of the in kind benefits, sickness/health care has the highest share with 58.1 billion TRY out of a total of 67.4 billion TRY in 2012 (TURKSTAT Social Protection Statistics, 2000-2012).

The subjects and target groups of social assistance has significantly extended that currently it covers the family, education, health, nutrition, housing, emergency situations, the elderly and the persons with disabilities (Ministry of Family and Social Policies 2013). Through this expansion in the intervention area of social assistance, the fundamental social service fields have increasingly been curbed and transferred to the area of assistance. Delivery of free course books in primary school, and also to secondary school since 2006 may have contributed to decreasing the educational costs of the families, however it has raised concerns and questions about the content of the materials delivered and the quality of education (Ministry of Education Activity Report 2013: 40). Likewise, the Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) Programme implemented in Turkey since 2002 within the context

of the Social Risk Mitigation Project (SRMP) is challenged about the quality of the education and healthcare services provided as the conditions for receiving cash benefits (Fiszbein and Schady, 2009: 40; Garcia and Hill, 2010: 120; Handa and Davis, 2006; Reimers et. al. 2006: 29; Streuli, 2012: 594).

4.2.2. Recommodification of Labour

In Turkey, “the search for competition and the free movement of capital generate strong pressures to minimize the individual and social costs of labo[u]r” (Yücesan-Özdemir 2014). The monetary policies are formulized in a way to put inflation below a pre-determined rate (Ergüneş 2009) and the purchasing power of the masses is decreased through directing their disposable incomes towards purchasing the services previously supplied by the state corresponding to a qualitative erosion of public social expenditures (Buğra 2008). The lack of systematic and rights-based social policies played a major role in deepening the conflict between capital and labour which had already been perpetuated by the finance-led accumulation regime (Onaran 2009). “In each reform initiative in Turkey since the early 1990s, governments have tried to finance the foreign deficits by increasing the contributions made by individuals, gradually turning the social rights into commodities” (Coşar and Yeğenoğlu 2009).

The erosion of social expenditures accompanied by the rise of assistance-type interventions fed into the commodification of even the basic social services and strengtened the workfare approach in an era of jobless growth and chronic unemployment, pushing the prospects for a holistic social policy agenda further away given the increasing predominance of assistance-type transfers to the so-called “poorest of the poor”. The referral of benefit recipients to labour market is encouraged (Ministry of Family and Social Policies 2013), however this approach ignores the shrinkage of productive sectors that make it even difficult for the masses to find a decent job. At this points, Income Generating Projects and Social Service Projects are supported at the state level under the name of “activation” and

“social entrepreneurship”. The Social Service Projects target people with disabilities, patients, children living on the streets, elderly and families. In 2013, within the context of Social Service Projects, a total of 873.840 beneficiaries were supported by a total of 27.5 million TRY allocated to 257 projects. However, according to the data available for the period between 2007-2013, there are huge differences between the number of projects and the resources allocated (Ministry of Family and Social Policies 2013; see also Erdoğan and Kutlu 2014), making it difficult to reach a conclusion on the general approach to the social service projects and to make projections on the future trends of the project support in the field of social services, income generation, vocational training and employment. This point constitutes another evidence to the arbitrary and unstable nature of social assistance. More importantly, the decrease in the social expenditures and the increase in the amount of resources allocated to social service projects between 2007-2013 indicates a shift from the orthodox understanding of social service provision to a piecemeal pattern. While the linkage between social assistance and employment is addressed, the attempts are limited with piecemeal tools such as cooperation protocols between the Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MoLSS) and MoFSP instead of wide scale national level policies for job creation and income generation. Through this protocol, the people without a job and social security are directed to Social Assistance and Solidarity System (SOYBİS) (MoFSP 2013), however there is a general assumption that the recruited persons continue to work in those jobs although there are no concrete data and regular follow-ups of the labour market status of these persons.

The erosion of social expenditures fed into the commodification of even the basic social services and strengthened the workfare approach in an era of jobless growth and chronic unemployment, pushing the prospects for a holistic social policy agenda further away given the increasing predominance of assistance-type transfers to the so-called “poorest of the poor”. The assistance-based social policy approach accompanied by the suppression of labour nurtured the commodification of even

the basic needs and made the labouring segments of the society to enter into an asymmetrical relationship with the market forces for the services previously provided by the state as public social services. In Turkey, in spite of the persistence of working poverty, social assistance is provided on the basis of being out of labour market and social security is based on the labour market status of people. Given that jobless growth pattern became a persistent problem over the 2000s, the determination of the beneficiary portfolio in accordance with the labour market status and income further deteriorates the poverty situation and increases income inequality (Bulut 2011). Poverty was surmounting specifically in the urban spheres with unique characteristics perpetuating inequalities, exclusion and marginalization (Buğra 2008: 219-222).

The “activation” of the individuals is presented as the magic bullet, but there appears a dilemma that the unproductive nature of the financial mode of accumulation is favoured over real production. While the accumulation is realized increasingly through the exploitation of the labourers, “entrepreneurship” is overemphasized as a cure for unemployment masking the disability of the existing mode of production to provide the society with appropriate jobs although there are massive difficulties in access to financial and technical resources and despite fact that the labour market is not structured in a way to make it easier for the enterprises to avoid early close-downs –the discourses of “adaptability” and “competitiveness” is noteworthy here- (Buğra 2008: 93-94)³. In Turkey, the welfare was gradually replaced with “workfare” through the flexible mode of production, decrease in the social security coverage by widening labour market segmentation [existence of informal employment], and the damages in the relationship between having a job and economic prosperity which is evident in the existence of the working poor (Buğra 2008: 79).

³ Also see Özar (2009) for a discussion on the limits and peculiarities of the projects and microcredit schemes for poverty alleviation by supporting women’s entrepreneurship in Turkey. <http://www.bianet.org/biamag/kadin/116585-neoliberalizm-ve-yoksulluk>.

4.3. AGRICULTURAL DISSOLUTION, MIGRATION, URBAN POVERTY AND INEQUALITIES

This section focuses on new forms of poverty as they appear in the urban areas in Turkey. It is argued that consecutive as well as crosscutting waves of migration movements stemming from the transformation of the rural space triggered the increasing utilization of urban areas as centres for post-Fordist production and finance-led accumulation. In Turkey, the rural and urban spaces have transformed through interacting with each other; the dissolution of agricultural production structures started to dissolve and the urban space presented viable livelihood solutions to the masses originating from the rural areas. However, the case somehow changed since the 1970s that the urban space, where there were already profound inequalities and chronic problems in the provision of public services, no longer offers free housing, formal jobs or easily accessible social services (Keyder and Yenal 2011: 68-75). This, from the other side, acted as a factor decreasing the attractiveness of urban areas compared to the earlier phases of migration. Notwithstanding the multidimensionality of migration flows⁴, the focus of this section is the rural-to-urban movements, and, to a lesser extent, the urban-to-urban movements. Hence, the final destination will be urban space in order to figure out the underlying characteristics of neoliberalism and financialization leading to the phenomena of child labour in urban spaces. Bearing in mind that poverty is an evolving phenomena in Turkey, and elsewhere, the reason for choosing urban spaces as a matter of analysis is, first of all, the high prevalence of child labour in urban Turkey boosted with urban poverty. Urban poverty will be presented as an evolving phenomena caused by the pro-capital policies pursued under the name of competitiveness and integration to world markets (Onaran 2009). As such, this section constitutes the main intersection point of the analyses made on the

⁴ The migration structures are so complex that the population movement is not simply from rural to urban areas but the migration is multidirectional, showing a wide variety of population flows in accordance with the livelihood prospects (Keyder and Yenal 2013). “Opposite to the conventional opinion, more than half of the migration flows which took place between 1975-2000 were urban-to-urban movements” (Ministry of Environment and Urbanization 2009).

relationship between neoliberalism, premature financialization, jobless growth, suppression of labour, and the neoliberal transformation of social policy identified with a qualitative erosion in public social services and increasing commodification of labour.

4.3.1. From Agricultural Dissolution to Urban Poverty

In the Turkish case, the period starting from the 1980s is marked by “restructuring” of the agricultural sector, characterised with the liberalisation and “rationalization” of agricultural production and marketing processes (Öztürk 2003: 45-51, emp. added). Investment and public expenditure in agricultural sector decreased in a macro economic conjuncture directed to internal and external debt management rather than setting an overall target of increasing the income of farmers through infrastructural investments (Özkaya et. al. 2001). Agricultural support and subsidies were challenged, curbed and lifted; ultimately, income generated from agriculture was suppressed through the global price dynamics prevalent in the international markets (Pamuk 2014). The restructuring of the agricultural sector is part of the overall liberalization of the economy, evident in the IMF-led “stabilisation” policies implemented since the end of 1990s. The core of these policies was the privatization and commodification of the agricultural production process, in compliance with the 1986 GATT Uruguay Round Agriculture Agreement which is committed to curbing of the domestic support and lowering the export subsidies for agricultural produce, called by Öztürk (2012) as “transnational corporate imperialism” (Öztürk 2012: 49).

The IMF-led programmes and policy packages underlined the “urgency” of abandoning price floors, support purchases, credit and premium support. These neoliberal macro-economic policies were masked with various justifications, among all, the inflation targeting (Oyan 2001; Özkaya et. al. 2001; Kendir 2007; Pamuk 2014: 265; emp. added). The economic package introduced on 24 January

1980 was in favour of decreasing state intervention and triggering free trade in agricultural sector, at the expense of leaving the farmers without a sound supportive mechanism vis-a-vis the market conditions and of decreasing the agricultural income (Özkaya et. al. 2001). “In successive waves of liberalization, price support schemes diminished, subsidies were repealed, government guarantees of co-operative credit arrangements reneged on, and agricultural producers were left to confront the market relying on their own resources” (Keyder and Yenal 2011: 60-61). Ultimately, in the 1980s, agricultural production was behind the population growth rate for the first time in the republican era (Pamuk 2014: 271). The Agricultural Reform Implementation Project (ARIP- or the “Agricultural Reform Programme” as referred in the literature), originating from the 5 April 1994 Decisions and the Stability Package of 1999, was initiated with a decree on 1 March 2000. With this “reform”, the product prices were allowed to be determined in the free market in accordance with the demand-supply mechanism in spite of the fact that neither the GATT nor Customs Union Agreement signed with the European Community required a decrease in the agricultural subsidies (Özkaya et. al. 2001; Kendir 2007). The 2001-2005 8th Five Years Development Plan was tracking the same path that it was based on the commitments made to the IMF and World Bank. Import of agricultural produce was encouraged, which curbed domestic production together with the income of particular segments of the society whose livelihoods were based on agriculture and livestock (Kendir 2007) This transformation in the position of Turkey is defined as “the initiation of a new form of dependency boosted with the hegemony of liberal approach and vulnerability to crisis” (Özkaya et. al. 2001; Kendir 2007; Hilton in Öztürk 2012: 22). The privatisation had irreversibly detrimental effects on the marketization of agricultural produce and the price mechanism “at the expense of the poor” (Öztürk 2012: 122, emp. added). Agricultural production was discouraged and limited with quotas⁵, which is one of the most important factors leading to the gradual demise of agricultural production and impoverishing of the rural population.

⁵ Among all, the Tobacco Law dated 2002 terminated the support purchases in tobacco, which left the tobacco

On 14 March 2000, a new system called Direct Income Support (DIS) was introduced as a remedy for filling the gaps created by the curbing of mechanisms which had been protecting the small-scale producers (Oyan 2001)⁶. The system was formulized as the sole support mechanism that would substitute the previous means of support and the irrationality of such a substitution due to the nature and share of agricultural sector in the economy of Turkey is the most pronounced criticism raised against the target of abandoning the hard core support mechanisms for the sake of liberalizing the agricultural sector (Oyan 2001; Çakmak and Kasnakoğlu 2001 Independent Social Scientists 2011: 85-86), which is briefly illustrated above. Besides, the ambiguity of target groups and duration of DIS created concerns about the efficiency of the system. Also, the conditions and eligibility criteria for the small producers relying on livestock farming, which is common particularly in the Eastern part of Turkey, was not well-defined (Oyan 2001; Çakmak and Kasnakoğlu 2001). The irregularity of DIS⁷ payments has deepened the instability of agricultural income, and the small producers referred to the financial sector for receiving credits which would enable the continuity of production. This process increased the indebtedness of farmers (Öztürk 2012: 97). Direct Income Support (DIS) was reintroduced with the Agricultural Law dated 2006, however it was terminated again in 2008. “The transition from national developmentalist regulation (and protection) to market ascendancy coincided with the final disappearance of the remaining segments of mostly self-sufficient

producing households without any support for ensuring their livelihoods. The sugar beet production has also been suppressed with a quota since 1998. The state had deviated from the developmentalist protective measures, which had been introduced in the post-war period, for the agricultural sector and the small-scale producers. Farmers were no longer provided with state support for maintaining a sustainable level of production and income (Öztürk 2003; Köse and Bahçe 2009: 405).

⁶ The DIS was based on grant-type cash payments initiated in four pilot provinces, to be upscaled throughout Turkey with World Bank Credit (Kendir 2007). DIS was not free from conditionalities; there was an interval of 1-199 acres allowing the amount of payment to be made according to the size of the land owned by a farmer. In this system, direct income support was granted to the farmers independent from the level of production. Also, the farmers were provided with cash payment in return for not producing a certain agricultural produce (Keyder and Yenil 2013).

⁷ Direct Income Support (DIS) was reintroduced with the Agricultural Law dated 2006, however it was terminated again in 2008.

peasantry” in the form of “gambling [...] in a casino mostly run by giant agri-business, finance and tourism corporations”. Farmers increasingly became heavily indebted mainly due to a lack of stable income and affordable credits with low interest rates vis-a-vis the ultimate necessity to compensate the costs of agricultural input (Keyder and Yenal, 2011: 61-63). As stated by Keyder and Yenal (2013), the neoliberal policies had a negative effect on the income levels in agricultural sector which could not be compensated by the direct income support.

Since 2006, labour force participation and employment in the rural areas have been increased partly due to the reasons illustrated above, stemming both from the decelerating livelihood options in the urban areas together with the increasing “pull factor” of the rural areas. “The obsolescence of old technologies and the rise of new ones, so vital to capitalism, is simultaneously the transformation of old spatial structures into new ones” (Smith 2008: 171). However, as stated by Keyder and Yenal (2011), “the village no longer is the community of smallholding households, and village households can no longer confine their strategies to the commodities market; they will also have to bring into play their labour and land resources [...] in an unequal and uncertain status” (p. 75).

From the side of the rural livelihoods, income prospects of the rural population has widened through the developments in the transportation and telecommunication that has changed the perceptions and expectations of the rural people about migrating to urban areas for income generation (Keyder and Yenal 2013). However, this transformation limiting the livelihood options of the rural population in the urban areas is defined by Scoones (2009) as:

[...] a rosy picture of local, adaptive coping to immediate pressures, based on local capacities and knowledge, may miss out on long-term shifts which will, in time, undermine livelihoods in more fundamental ways. Long-term temperature rises may make agriculture impossible, shifts in terms of trade may undermine the competitiveness of local production or migration of labour to urban areas may eliminate certain livelihood options in the long-term (Scoones 2009: 189).

This is the path going from “producing farmer” to “needy farmer” and ultimately to the “poor farmer” (Independent Social Scientists 2011: 162, emp. original). DIS was a social policy tool to ‘cushion the blow’ (Öztürk 2012: 96, emp. original) aiming at suppressing the negative reactions of small producers to privatization, deregulation and financialization (Independent Social Scientists 2011: 85-86). The neoliberal deregulation, accompanied by the increasing commodification and internationalization of agricultural production resulted in the “reconfiguration of rural space” as a stage for competition between agriculture and various alternative ways for the utilization of the land in rural areas. The transformation in the rural areas is a part of a broader “change in the nature of commodity markets”, the overall “liberalization of the trade regime and the internationalization of agri-food production” (Keyder and Yenal 2011), marked by shrinking agricultural revenues. As coping strategies, small-scale agricultural producers moved towards “product diversification” and “contract farming”, with a growing emphasis on product quality, which have their own repercussions for the sustainable livelihoods in the countryside, tourism and construction being the more prominent of all (Keyder and Yenal 2011: 68-75; Bernstein 2008 cited in Öztürk 2012: 55).

The suppression of the collectively-restructured mechanisms in agriculture curbed the prospects for collective movement against the social consequences of such an insecure and unstable convergence of agriculture in Turkey, which is indeed a part of overall deepening of vulnerability and instability in the era of neoliberal transformation. “Turkey is a country where small-scale production is the prevailing form of production in agricultural sector and there is a high number of unorganized agricultural producers acting in the very same market with a relatively low number of buyers, who are organized and better equipped for survival in the market. However, there was not any comprehensive analysis or a sound road map on how to compensate for the social and political implications of this unprecedented shake in one of the major sectors of economy (Oyan 2001). This imbalance results in the deepening of poverty in the agricultural sector, shrinking of agricultural production

and a new wave of migration” (Öztürk 2003: 45-51) which would bring unplanned urbanization, unemployment and poverty (Kendir 2007). Keyder and Yenal (2013) categorises this migration trend as “semi-proletarianization”, in which the internally displaced people could not find a stable source of income except for waged labour”. Agricultural cooperatives were also addressed (Oyan 2001; Çakmak and Kasnakoğlu 2001).

The land is commodified and the agricultural labour force is articulated to the capitalist mode of production through wage employment created by “inflow of displaced peasants from other regions of the country”, meaning the recommodification of labour (Keyder and Yenal 2011) since “production is no longer employed for the needs and subsistence of the farmer, but for markets” (Boratav 1985: 10 cited in Öztürk 2012: 45). Marx refers to this reorganization of the labour force in the urban areas within the capitalist mode of production that “the greater the centralization of the means of production, the greater is the corresponding heaping together of the labourers, within a given space” (cited in Smith 2008: 179), which is attributed specifically to the urban space by Smith who argues that “capital differentiates out a specifically urban space which not only provides an absolute space of centralized production but also the centralization of labour power” (Smith 2008: 179). As Hilton (cited in Öztürk 2012) states;

Nevertheless, it is developing countries that are most vulnerable to the interests of international capital, even as they enter a new age of comparative prosperity. And starting from the position of a prominence of the agricultural sector, it is the rural economies that are most affected by the transformation effected by capital, and it is the fabric of village life that is most torn and ripped apart and partially patched back together in new ways by the ending of supports and opening of markets; it is urban migration and the metamorphosis or death of the village that most defines the socio-economic restructuring that occurs as a result, and it is the consequent transformation of poverty and the peasantry that characterises the human dimension of this (p. 26).

4.3.2. Urban Poverty and Inequalities Against the Background of Neoliberalism and Financialization

In the literature, the period before the 1980s is characterised by the web of relations making it possible for the rural poor to make a living after migrating to urban areas (Işık and Pınarcıoğlu 2003) which is defined as “semi-proletarianization” through informal employment relations by Keyder and Yenal (Keyder and Yenal 2013). However, migrations after 1980s have different implications. Finding decent jobs in the destination cities have become more and more difficult for the people who were previously integrated into the work organization of the rural area and are not “well-equipped” for the dynamics of work in urban areas. Starting from the 1980s, the urban and rural labour markets have undergone a major transformation that the “pull factor” of the urban areas were not as strong as the previous decades, leading to a parallel weakening of the “push factor” of the rural areas (Keyder and Yenal 2011). Urban areas are no longer a prominent destination for the rural masses due to the deepening urban poverty and “high cost of survival in cities”. The “toughness” of labour market in urban areas is perpetuated by the increasing flexibility and insecurity of labour relations, which is pointed out as the main reason for such a transformation of the migration trends. “The number of villagers who now have to be engaged in wage employment either on a daily or temporary basis has increased substantially in the past years [...]. Even in the case of more permanent non-agricultural employment, young people who work in small factories and workshops in the vicinity continue to live in the village”, which is defined as a process contributing to the “regional reallocation of populations [...] in Turkey” (Keyder and Yenal 2011).

In Turkey, as a unique experience, “internal displacement” or “forced migration” of the population living in Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia has fastened the process of “heaping together of labourers” in the urban space. “This type of immigration [...] often implied a socio-economic break from the countryside. It was also

different because it occurred where there were no established networks of family or co-locals who could help in finding work or shelter” (Goc-Der 2001 cited in Buğra and Keyder 2006: p. 220). According to Turkey Migration and Internally Displaced Population Survey (TGYONA) (2006), 86 percent of the population extracted from rural production mechanism was at working age (TGYONA 2006: 106-107 cited in Ministry of Environment and Urbanization 2009: 21) and irrespective of the space, they needed to sell their labour power for subsistence, given the deepening recommodification at the urban space with the privatization of public social services and recommodification, and became poorer compared to the pre-migration period deriving from “high levels of unemployment, lower levels of house ownership due to ‘redefinition of the gecekondü as a rent-bearing mechanism’ and increasing utilization of child labour” for subsistence at the urban areas (Bayındırlık ve İskan Bakanlığı 2009: 22-36, emp. added). Yılmaz (2008) categorises the forced migrants as underclass on the basis of exclusion occurring at economic (informality of employment and utilization of street as the most important place for income generation), social (welfare dependency, low levels of literacy and school enrolment, high incidence of child labour), political (lack of political participation and representation), spatial (the quality of the residential area), and discursive levels (territorial and ethnical stigmatization, and the “dangerous classes” approach) (Yılmaz 2008: 136-142).

The masses moved to urban areas in the early phases of migration in Turkey could, to a large extent, be integrated into the socio-economic texture in their destination areas via an intergenerational mechanism called “*nöbetleşe yoksulluk*”, which was nurtured by informality and communal ties. However, what is prevalent for the migrations after the 1980s is the “life-time” or “anomic” poverty, facilitated with the changing work organization, curbing of public social services, and erosion of the social ties (Işık and Pınarcıoğlu 2001: 77; Işık and Pınarcıoğlu 2003). According to Buğra (2007), in Turkey, “urban poverty” is created by the concentration of poor segments of the society in developed areas. Buğra and

Keyder in their 2003 UNDP study define “a new form of poverty” that cannot be “healed” through the traditional network of relatives, friends and neighbours which was generated by the boosting of market economy was created by the raising of the market economies (Buğra and Keyder 2003). Buğra (2007) also refers to this phenomenon as “modern poverty” and relates it to “changes in rural structures through which [...] the people were [dissolved] from agriculture and began to [look for jobs] in the urban area in the newly emerging activity areas within the new production processes” (Buğra 2007, see also Öztürk 2012: 33).

The public sector no longer presented viable solutions to unemployment of the masses dissolved from agriculture and the vulnerability of the masses was boosted with the shift of production process towards “outsourcing” and “subcontracting” renowned with insecurity and precariousness (Tansel et.al, Boratav et al., 1998, Şenses, 1994 and Cam, 2002 cited in Buğra and Keyder 2006). When accompanied with the erosion of public social services, this shift in the organization of work increased the vulnerability and exclusion of the masses (Buğra and Keyder 2006). Öztürk (2012) argues that the new forms of poverty faced in the urban areas is “residual poverty”, “residual in the sense that neo-liberalism [...] is no magic solvent for hardship, as well as in the sense that much of the traditional poverty of the peasantry remains but situated now in the city, moved through migration to an alternative social setting, that of the new urban underclass. This by product of the neo-liberal distillation of agriculture then nourishes the capitalist project itself with massive supplies of labour, which feed the cycle of poverty with depressed wages and unprotected working conditions.” (pp. 118-119).

In Turkey, the new poverty is manifested simultaneously with the “changing meaning of urban space” as an entity in itself. The newly emerging dimensions of urban space embodied the many faces of poverty while, at the same time, the unprecedented aspects of poverty has transformed the urban space, so there is a multidimensional interaction of determination between the emerging characteristics of urban space and poverty. As the dynamics of finance-led accumulation regime

has increasingly occupied the ordinary lives of the people, the livelihoods have been subject to a convergence through a process of “economic and political restructuring” in the urban spaces. The urban space, as the “main spatial actor of the economic and political restructuring since the 1970s” (Kaygalak 2009), produced and reproduced the new forms of work organization, spatial division of labour and the urban areas are attributed with new “intersection points” of international flows of capital and accumulation of surplus (Kaygalak 2009). The diversified experiences of the rural masses created diversified livelihoods for the migrants moving to the urban areas, creating social segmentation and stratification, as in the case of “*nöbetleşe yoksulluk*” (Oğuz and Pınarcıoğlu 2009). Notwithstanding the dissociating impacts of finance-led accumulation regime (Kaygalak 2009) particularly since the 2000s, the capital acted more as a force equalizing as well as diversifying factor through its expanding scope of intervention into the daily lives of urban masses, so the capital has “differentiated and similarized the urban experiences at the same time [...] given the uneven spatial development originating from weakening state power in terms of regulating the socio-economic sphere” (Pınarcıoğlu 1994 cited in Kaygalak 2009). Hence, the converging and stratifying effects of neoliberal transformation made the urban spaces the centres for new “knots and tensions”, pointing at the path dependency of spaces (Theodore et. al. 2012).

The “new urban reality” shaped with the incorporation of financial motives to the livelihood experiences of people creates perpetuating poverty and social exclusion not only for the migrants but also for the other labouring segments of the society via informality, precariousness, insecurity and “flexibility” (Kaygalak 2009) and increasing recommodification of labour with the advent and deepening of “urban governance” (Erder 1998 cited in Kaygalak 2009). The urban areas are attributed new roles and value as rent-bearing commodities, which is a kind of commodification of space changing the direction and focus of investments, perpetuating the recommodification of labour through the increasing referral of the

masses to the market for housing utilized for capital accumulation without making real production (Tekeli 1988, Işık 1996 and Eraydın 1988 cited in Kaygalak 2009). The neoliberal doctrine relied heavily upon the market forces for prevention of poverty –“free market prevents people from falling into poverty”-, however state was passified and the financial liberalization expropriated the incomes of the labouring segments of the society for higher amounts of profit (Lapavitsas 2009) with budgetary concerns for adjusting the balances (Eraydın 1988 cited in Kaygalak, 2009). Since the *gecekondu*⁸ no longer presents a solution to the housing of migrants, the masses increasingly refer to credits for housing in the urban areas where they came to reside in. This vulnerability of the population creates new investment areas for the financial sector, which is evident in the fact that in Turkey housing credits have the largest share among the consumer credits.

Also, in this way, according to Kaygalak (2009), neoliberal policies led to an acceleration in the social reproduction of poverty and inequalities, directly attributing urban poverty to the neoliberal political, economic and social transformation, “so what is ‘new’ in the ‘new’ poverty is its expanding scope and increasing depth” (Kaygalak 2009, emp. original). Migrants are the mostly affected groups via a three-fold process that, firstly, the labour markets in the “centres of capital” no longer absorbed the masses who are mismatched with the requirements of endless accumulation of capital; secondly, the social fabric is not as generous as it was during the previous waves of migration in presenting preventive and protective safety nets to the newcomers, and, third, the foreign debts of the state deepened the income inequalities through the distortion of redistributive mechanism (Kaygalak 2009, emp. original). “The burden of financial expansion is thrown on the shoulders of the already impoverished masses”, which is totally compatible with the process of “creative destruction” illustrated by Theodore et.al (2012). The urban population is indebted, with low or no savings. Given the increasing commodification of services, the masses became dependent on financial

⁸ Slaughter houses built by the migrants on the Treasury lands in the urban areas.

tools, credit cards being the most prominent, even for the vital areas for survival such as food and shelter, which led to unprecedented increases in the household debt burden mainly through consumer credits.

The supply-side political discourse and the labour-market oriented approach at the state level ignores the detrimental socio-economic effects of neoliberal labour market policies, specifically at the urban level. As already mentioned under the section on recommodification of labour, the workfare discourse regards labour market participation as the magic bullet solving poverty, exclusion and discrimination. A formal-job is promoted as the only way for accessing social security, dragging more than one third of the population to the sphere of exclusion (Social Security Institution 2012; Gürses 2009). At the state level, there prevailed an argument that generated wealth would trickle-down the population getting lower shares from high levels of economic growth, however this did not happen, at least given the fact that poverty is not regarded as an entity *per se* but analysed as a dependent variable that would decrease as economic growth increases; “poverty as a derivative of the economic path” with an ignorance on the fact that this approach further distorts the relationship between social and economic indicators through “reproducing the conditions of finance-led structure of the economy”, making it more problematic to present sound solutions to the prevalence of jobless growth, precarity and working poverty (Erdođdu, 2014: 85-87, see Mid-Term Programmes 2013-2015 and 2014-2016 and Tenth Development Plan 2014-2018). At the policy level, the working poor are “treated within the context of the general poverty problem [...] as the needy segments of the society” and the official discourse on the reasons for not attaining the expected trickle-down effect is referred as the lack of production and investments due to the “weakness of producer organizations” (Bayındırlık ve İskan Bakanlığı 2009), which is far from adopting a multidimensional approach to the original reasons of this “weakness”.

The piecemeal social assistance schemes and income generation projects proved not only insufficient but also inappropriate for providing decent job opportunities

to impoverished and excluded masses, reproducing poverty not only for the people out of labour market but also the segments of the society selling their labour power (Erdođdu 2014: 104-105) in the urban areas. As argued by Yücesan-Özdemir, “The individuals who are unable to compete with the market rationality are reinvented to the market sphere through social assistance” (2013). However, the overemphasis on social assistance has damaged the taxing system which had serious impact on the redistributive mechanisms and increased social inequalities (Buğra 2008, Yücesan-Özdemir, 2013). “Redistributive capacity remains the weakest link in this respect of inequalities of virtually all levels but especially in terms of gender based and regional inequalities” (Öniş and Şenses 2007). Boratav and Yeldan (2001) criticize the common explanations for income inequality made on the basis of lack of access to services and assets, and point at the necessity to analyse the rising inequalities in terms of “marginalization of labour, ‘skill-intensive’ production patterns, and dissasociation of the financial sector from the productive sphere [leading to] the [...] expansion of financial rents” (p. 36).

In Turkey, there is a high rate of working poor with 15,37 percent in 2009 (TURKSTAT 2009). However, social assistance is provided on the basis of being out of labour market and social security is based on the labour market status of people, so in a country like Turkey where jobless growth has become a persistent problem, the determination of the beneficiary portfolio in accordance with the labour market status and income levels further deteriorates the poverty situation and increases income inequality (Bulut 2011; Erdođdu 2014: 98). This approach clearly shows the short-sighted attitude of the state when it comes to social security. The state is focused on “saving the day” through short-term benefits, which is compatible with the general approach of “short-termism” imposed to political, economic and social spheres (Erdođdu 2014).

4.4. NEOLIBERAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE DEFINITION, PREVALANCE AND THE SCOPE OF CHILD LABOUR IN TURKEY

In Turkey, the dynamics of internationalization of capital and production, and the subsequent erosion of real production (Onaran 2002; Öniş and Şenses 2007) that is accompanied by the dissolution of productive sectors paved the ground for both quantitative and qualitative transformations in children's engagement in economic activities. The pro-capital macroeconomic policies dating back to 1980s led to further suppression of wages (Yeldan 2006; Yeldan 2001) and deepening of poverty (Buğra 2008; Kaygalak 2009) through the mechanisms of privatization and commodification of labour. The export-oriented growth strategy of the 1980s (Onaran 2002: 276; Independent Social Scientists 2008: 102) and the overall financial liberalization in the 1990s (Yeldan, 2006; Yeldan 2001; Boratav 2003; Öniş and Şenses 2007; Independent Social Scientists 2001) had serious implications on the wage levels (Yücesan-Özdemir 2003; Yeldan, 2006; Yeldan 2001) and employment rates accompanied with an overall transformation of the relationship between state and the labouring segments of the society. The jobless growth trend (Yeldan 2006; Yeldan 2012; Independent Social Scientists 2005 in Erbaş and Turan 2009; Onaran 2002), widespread joblessness and the growing wage polarization (Yücesan-Özdemir 2003:193) especially following the agricultural dissolution (Keyder and Yenal 2011; Keyder and Yenal 2013) and migration flows to urban areas created new forms of poverty and inequalities in the urban space (Buğra 2008, Işık and Pınarcıoğlu 2001; Işık and Pınarcıoğlu 2003; Kaygalak 2009). The neoliberal redefinition of production and accumulation attributed new roles to children in the sense that children's labour power is increasingly drawn into the capitalist mode of surplus accumulation underpinned by the neoliberal project. Neoliberalism produced and reproduced the phenomenon of child labour in different forms and varieties in line with the requirements of the capitalist production process both in rural and urban areas, the latter being the

newly-defined spatial dimension of finance-led accumulation regime (Kaygalak 2009) underpinned by neoliberal hegemonic project (Fine 2009a; Fine 2009b).

4.4.1. Neoliberal Transformation of the Definition of Child and Child Labour in Turkey

In Turkey, paralleling the neoliberal transformation of production, child labour is redefined, which is evident in the modifications in relevant legislative framework regulating the area of child labour. The first and foremost variable regulated by legislation is the definition of child, which is totally dependent upon the meaning attributed to children within the market mechanism of the capitalist demand and supply relations. In the Turkish legislation, the Labour Law no. 4857 differentiates between “child” and “adolescent” workers. According to this Law, “the workers below the age of 15 who have completed the full age of fourteen and primary education” are defined as “child” workers while the workers between the age of 15 (completed)-18 (not completed) are defined as “adolescent” workers⁹ (see also Akın 2009:62). Article 71 of the Labour Law defines the working age restrictions on the employment of children. According to this Article, “Employment of children who have not completed the age of fifteen is prohibited. However, children who have completed the full age of fourteen and their primary education may be employed on light works that will not hinder their physical, mental and moral development, and for those who continue their education, in jobs that will not prevent their school attendance”¹⁰. The Law underlines that being involved in work should not hinder their educational lives. In this respect, it is stated in Article 71 that “In the placement of children and adolescent employees in jobs and in the types of work where they are employable, their security and health, physical, mental and psychological development as well as their personal propensity and capability shall be taken into consideration. The job the child performs must not

⁹ <http://www.csgb.gov.tr/csgbPortal/cgm.portal?page=cc&id=3>

¹⁰ <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/region/eurpro/ankara/download/labouracturkey.pdf>

bar him for attending school and from continuing his vocational training, nor impair his pursuance of class work on a regular basis.”¹¹.

While the legislation implies the economically passive position of children below the age of 15, the capitalist mode of production asks for the labour power of each and every member of the society within the broader context of commodification of labour (Erder 1998 cited in Kaygalak 2009; Yücesan- Özdemir and Özdemir 2010). The unemployment and inactivity rates of the population at the working age increases due to the speculative financial flows crowding out real production (Yentürk 2003), restructuring of the productive sectors of the society, increasing labour market segmentation (Yeldan 2001; Boratav and Yeldan 2001) and “flexible” forms of production (Hopkins et.al. 1996; Independent Social Scientists 2001), the redefinition of social policy (Buğra 2008; Köse and Öncü 2003; Fine 2009a, Fine 2009b; Buğra and Keyder 2006) and the resultant urban poverty and inequalities (Buğra 2008; Kaygalak 2009; Işık and Pınarcıoğlu 2001; Işık and Pınarcıoğlu 2003) . This transformation in the socio-economic context led to the insertation of children’s labour power in various forms and intensities irrespective of their ages. Alongside the suppression of real sector under the conditions of internationalization of production and financial liberalization, the labour power of child is increasingly utilized as “submissive” (Bakırcı 2002) and “nimble” (Brown et. al 2002) actors of the capitalist production process in an asymmetrical power relations (Bakırcı 2002) with the employers asking for higher levels of production with the aim of attaining higher levels of profit.

The existence of a legislative framework ruling against the employment of children below the age of 15 does not mean the creation of appropriate conditions for the gradual elimination of children from the labour market since the main determinants of the issue is embedded in the very nature of the capitalist production itself, which cannot be addressed merely through the existence of laws and regulations. The

¹¹<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/region/eurpro/ankara/download/labouracturkey.pdf>;

<http://www.iskanunu.com/images/dokuman/4857-sayili-is-kanunu-guncel-tam-metin-2012.pdf>.

mainstream discourse points at the asymmetrical and exploitative power relations (Bakırcı 2002) that cannot be transformed through reinforcement of labour legislation among the fundamental reasons leading to the emergence and perpetuation of child labour, however it does not account for an answer why these relationships emerge and prevail as embedded to the broader political, economic and social framework. The discourse on the fragility of legislative framework and the relatively weak and submissive position of children vis-a-vis the employers do not provide a solid analysis on the reasons why the children below the age of legally acceptable ages continue to work.

There are some attempts to account for the increasing intensity of child labour within the new dynamics of production process in the capitalist era such as the perspective arguing that the children have been transformed from “apprentices” working with the aim of learning jobs and socialization into “workers” (Erder 2010) presenting their labour power in return for monetary gains for subsistence. However, this argument does not locate child labour into the broader context of the neoliberal transformation of the production process and work organization, which leads to piecemeal explanations taking child labour as disentitled from the changing nature of work in its historical and social embeddedness (Bulutay 1995). Hence, the existing legislative framework on child labour in Turkey acts on the surface of the issue in the sense that child labour is taken as disentitled from its deeply-rooted elements embedded in the political economy of neoliberal production and accumulation process since the late 1970s. Furthermore, neither the mainstream perspective nor the critical discourse on the determinants of child labour in Turkey provide a multidimensional and solid analysis on the forces commodifying the labour of children who are categorised as “child” and “adolescent” workers just for practical reasons.

The producing segments of the society are impoverished through the liberalized flow of capital expropriating the incomes of the masses (Lapavistas 2009 cited in Ergüneş 2009), the role of the state in economic and social sphere has been

reshaped which led to the further recommodification of public social services (Fine 2009a; Fine 2009b; Yeldan 2007). In such a macroeconomic environment, “child” has been redefined in terms of age which does not provide any qualitative information about the broader socioeconomic conditions or livelihoods of a child *per se*. In line with this unidimensional redefinition, child labour has been increasingly subject to the exploitative power relations (Bakırcı 2002) of the market mechanism which the relevant legislation does not address.

Hence, the labour legislation is based on an artificial split between the children in different age groups which does not speak much about the varying experiences, perceptions and relative positions of the children in different economic and social settings, which indeed go beyond the factors of parental education (Dayıođlu 2005), age (Dayıođlu 2006), gender (Dayıođlu 2008; White 1998), family size (Dayıođlu 2006; Kađıtçıbaşı 1994 cited in Bakırcı 2002; Yılmaz 2005; Adaman and Keyder 2005), residential region and urban-rural dichotomy (Dayıođlu 2006) taken as given by the mainstream discourse. Furthermore, the existing discourse on child labour overemphasises the measurement of the rates of children engaged in economic activity and mentions about the gaps and weaknesses in the implementation of the relevant legislation as a reason why child labour continues despite all the efforts at national and global levels (Bakırcı 2002) without figuring out the overall dynamics of capitalist production commodifying child labour within the context of commodified social service provision and the rise of the discourses of “activation”, “social entrepreneurship” and “workfare” (Yücesan-Özdemir 2014; Buđra and Keyder 2006; Buđra 2008) underlined throughout the neoliberal redefinition of society and social policy.

4.4.2. The Trends of Child Employment Rates Under the Neoliberal Restructuring of Labour Market

In Turkey, the legislative framework sets age limitations and several rules for the types of work that the children are allowed to do for their physical, moral and

social development, however its ignorance of the recommodifying effects of the existing mode of production and surplus accumulation is evident in the current picture and trends in the rates of children engaged in economic activity. Leaving aside all the fluctuations in the rates and numbers of working children, the neoliberal mode of production produced and reproduced child labour through deteriorating the growth pattern of Turkish economy (Yeldan 2006; Yeldan 2012; Independent Social Scientists 2005 in Erbaş and Turan 2009) and creating informal employment relations based on “easy hiring and firing” practices (Yücesan-Özdemir 2003). The expansion of informal labour relationships deepened the fragility and precariousness (Yeldan 2006, Yeldan 2012, Boratav 2003) and widespread unemployment (Yılmaz and Dülgerler 2011; Onaran 2002; Yücesan-Özdemir 2003; Köse and Öncü 2003) specifically following the waves of migration (Öztürk 2012; Işık and Pınarcıoğlu 2003; Kaygalak 2009) triggered by the restructuring of the rural space under the auspices of internationalization redefinition of agricultural production (Öztürk 2012; Keyder and Yenal 2013; Keyder and Yenal 2011).

According the available quantitative data, in the last decades, the rates of children engaged in economic activity both in paid and unpaid economic activity have decreased. TURKSTAT Child Labour Force Survey dated 2012 shows that employment rate of the children between the age of 6-17 decreased from 15,2 percent in 1994 to 5,9 percent in 2006, remaining constant between 2006 and 2012. Between 1994 and 2006, employment rates of children has decreased for all the indicators, among all, both in urban and rural areas, both for male and female, both for agricultural and non-agricultural work, and for the wage and salary earners, the self-employed, employers and unpaid family workers (TURKSTAT 2006 Child Labour force Survey). In the period between 2006-2012, the number of children working as regular or casual employees decreased from 5050 thousand to 470 thousand. However, in the same period, the number of both male and female children engaged in economic activity in rural areas increased. Besides, there was

an increase by 5 thousand in the number of male children working as regular or casual employees.

According to age-disaggregated data, the employment rate of children between the age of 6-14 and 15-17 are 2,6 percent and 15,6 percent, respectively (TURKSTAT 2012 Child Labour Force Survey). Although the employment rate in 2012 is the same with that of the results of the 2006 Child Labour Force Survey, the number of child labourers increased by 3 thousand due to the increase in the number of working children between 6-15 (TURKSTAT Child Labour Force Statistics 2006-2012). In comparison, the employment rates of children between the age of 15-17 (15,6 percent) in Turkey is higher than the global estimates which shows that “the share of children in child labour fell from 17.8 per cent to 13 per cent among 15-17 year-olds over the 12-year period from 2000 to 2012” (ILO 2013:30). Also, the fact that there was not a decrease in the employment rates of children between 2006-2012 is a serious concern both for the incidence of child labour at the second half of the 2000s and for the future trends of child labour in Turkey. In other words, the constant position of the child employment rates in 2000s implies the threat of an increase in the incidence of child labour in the period following 2012.

In Turkey, the gender differences affect the employment rates of male and female children a higher proportion of the male children are involved in employment than the female children (TURKSTAT 2012 Child Labour Force Survey). More specifically, 68,8 percent of the working children are male while 31,2 percent of the working children is female (TURKSTAT 2012 Child Labour Force Survey). That is the case also at the global level that “boys outnumber girls in all sectors”-except for the domestic work (ILO 2013:7). There is not enough evidence how the migration flows and the resultant urban poverty affected the relative positions of female and male children in terms of employment rates. However, it can be argued that the macroeconomic developments creating new forms of poverty in the urban sphere (Buğra 2008; Kaygalak 2009) transformed the practices of female child

labour due to the economic necessities. Areas previously rejected for engagement of female labour power became accepted spheres of action for the female children, going beyond the care work and household chorus, as in the case of female children working in the streets (Şişman 2006; ILO 2004; Acar 2010).

In addition to gender, the spatial dynamics also affect the rates of children engaged in economic activity. In the general sense of the term, there are differences between the urban and rural areas in terms of the incidence of child labour (TURKSTAT Child Labour Force Statistics 1994-2012; Acar 2010). There is an urban-rural distinction in terms of the employment of children that 44,8 percent of the working children between the age of 6-17 lives in urban areas while 55,2 percent of the same group lives in rural areas (TURKSTAT 2012 Labour Force Survey). Retrospectively, in the period between 1994-1999, number of children engaged in economic activities decreased for the age groups of 6-14 and 15-17 for both male and female children, except for an increase in the female children engaged in economic activity in urban areas (increase from 87 thousand in 1994 to 88 thousand in 1999). Between 1999-2012, the number of children engaged in domestic chores increased at the national, urban and rural levels and for both sexes. According to 2012 TURKSTAT Child Labour Force Survey, between 2006-2012, there was a decrease in the number of children engaged in economic activity in urban areas while there was an increase in the number of children engaged in economic activities in rural areas (TURKSTAT 2012 Child Labour Force Survey).

On the basis of the available data, it can be argued that the historical development pattern of urban-rural differences in child employment rates shows that with the decreasing pull factor of the urban areas due to “semiproletarianizing” economic forces (Keyder and Yenal 2013) exclusionary socio-economic structure (Yılmaz 2008), and deepening the inequalities in the urban sphere have implications on the utilization of child labour. Recent trends in production dynamics in urban and rural areas affected children’s economic activities in such a way that child labour is

increasingly utilized in rural areas. This shows that there are conjenctural movements and shifts between the use of child labour in different spaces, depending on the livelihood conditions presented by different regions at a particular point in time.

As an intersection point of the gender and regional differences in child labour, the issue of gender differences in children's engagement in economic activity is more clearly seen when it is analysed in terms of the urban-rural differences in child labour. "Consistent with aggregate employment patterns, gender distinctions appear to be less important in rural areas (Tunalı 2003 cited in Akin 2009). However, while quantitative data provide a snapshot of the current prevalence of the use of child labour, it is not sufficient for revealing various experiences of children living and working in different socio-economic settings. Although the children working in the streets is addressed mainly as an urban phenomenon (Şişman 2006) and the children engaged in agricultural work is assessed as a rural issue (Gülçubuk 2012; Gülçubuk et. al. 2003), the permeability of the regional characteristics and the blurring lines between urban and rural areas (Keyder and Yenel 2011; Keyder and Yenel 2013) in the neoliberal era make it harder to reach such sharp conclusions about the relationship between the type of activity performed by children and their residential region.

Likewise, the gender differences are not easily comprehended through looking at the urban-rural differences in the employment rates of male and female children. The relationship between neoliberalism, premature financialization (Yeldan 2001; Yeldan 2006; Boratav 2003; Öniş and Şenses 2005) and the suppression of labour (Independent Social Scientists 2011; Onaran 2002: 276; Independent Social Scientists 2008: 102) as well as the changing nature of work and livelihoods in the agricultural areas (Keyder and Yenel 2011; Keyder and Yenel 2013; Öztürk 2012; Oyan 2001) created "new urban underclass" (Öztürk 2012; Yılmaz 2008) in "alternative social settings" (Öztürk 2012), and the "anomic poverty" prevailing in

the urban areas (Işık and Pınarcıoğlu 2001; Işık and Pınarcıoğlu 2003) jeopardized the options presented by the urban area for livelihoods. Social reproduction of poverty and inequality (Kaygalak 2009) was facilitated through a redefinition of space as well as gender roles, which, in turn, restructured the socio-economic embroidery in the most general sense of the term. The narrow redefinition of social policy (Buğra 2008: 93-94; Öniş and Şenses 2005; Fine 2009a: 3; Buğra and Keyder 2006) and the recommodification of labour in the neoliberal era implied an overall restructuring of the production and accumulation process, underpinned by the attribution of new roles and functions to labour power of children in different regional spheres. Also, the gender-based distinctions in child labour became vague, specifically when it comes to what the working children actually do in the labour market. In other words, the branch of economic activity is reformulated through the neoliberal transformation of economic area in the post-Fordist era, which will be discussed in the next section.

4.4.3. The Convergence of the Branches of Economic Activity Performed by Children

In Turkey, between 2006-2012, majority of the working children are involved in the agricultural sector with 44,7 percent, corresponding to nearly 400.000 children. 31 percent of the working children are involved in service sector and 24,3 percent of the working children were involved in industrial sector (TURKSTAT 2012 Child Labour Force Survey). When compared to the results of the 2006 Child Labour Force Survey, the recent picture of child labour in Turkey indicates a shift from industrial and service sectors to agricultural sector. In fact, between 2006-2012, the number of children working in agriculture increased from 326 thousand to 399 thousand. In the same period, the number of children working as unpaid family workers increased from 362 thousand to 413 thousand. Number of both the male and female unpaid family workers increased in this period, specifically in the rural areas.

The findings of the 2012 Child Labour Force Survey is in line with the global trends in terms of the sectoral allocation of child workers. Globally, more than half of the child labourers work in agricultural sector, which corresponds to 98 million children. Agricultural sector is followed by the service sector which covers 45 million of children which corresponds to 32 percent of all the child labourers. Last but not the least, 12 million children work in industrial sector (ILO 2013: 7). While the global estimates show that “child labour *outside* the agricultural sector and particularly [...] in services” increases, agricultural sector constitutes by far the most important sector covering the highest number of child workers. There are also self-employment practices among the children and global estimates show that there was “a small shift towards self-employment” between the period of 2008 and 2012 (ILO 2013: 35). Accordingly, ILO identifies “priority target groups in national programmes of action” for Turkey. According to this list, in Turkey, the children living and working in the streets, in the seasonal agricultural work, in informal urban economy and domestic chorus are at the top of the list in terms of the need for action (ILO 2004: 198).

Recently, 52,6 percent of the working children are wage and salary earners while 46,2 percent of these children are unpaid family workers (TURKSTAT 2012 Child Labour Force Survey) mainly working in the small agricultural enterprises owned by their families, or simply as agricultural labourers working together with their families on the lands owned by the others. They mainly work in picking the agricultural produce from the ground, among all, cotton, hazelnut, citrus-type fruits, tobacco and sugar beet (Gülçubuk 2012: 75; United States Department of Labour 2012). While the children working in agriculture increased for both males and females in rural areas, the number of male children working in agriculture in the urban areas also increased between 2006-2012.

In Turkey, between 2006-2012, the number of children working in industry decreased from 275 thousand to 217 thousand. The number of male children

working in industrial sector was higher than the female children working in industrial sector in both urban and rural areas. In this period, there was more than 40 percent decrease in the number of female children working in this sector (TURKSTAT 2012 Child Labour Force Survey). The industrial production has decreased since the 1980s due to the crowding-out of real production in manufacturing sector (Yentürk 2003) vis-a-vis the speculative bubbles of financial accumulation (Yeldan 2007: 2-14; Jessop 2010; Itoh and Lapavitzas 1997). The contraction of the industrial sector has decreased the labour demand in industry, which, in turn, led to a decline in the prevalence of child labour in this sector. However, despite the quantitative decrease in the number of children engaged in industrial work, it is still the case that the children in Turkey perform heavy work in small- and medium-sized enterprises, in factories and sweatshops doing work in carpentry, automotive industry, food processing, shoe making, textile and furniture production under hazardous conditions (United States Department of Labour 2012). In addition to industrial sector, In Turkey, between 2006-2012, the number of children working in service sector decreased from 289 thousand to 277 thousand. Number of male children working in service sector is higher than the female children working in this sector. While there is an increase in the number of male children working in urban areas (from 14 thousand to 19 thousand), there is an increase in the number of female children working in service sector in both urban and rural areas (TURKSTAT 2012 Child Labour Force Survey).

Children working in the streets is mainly referred as an urban problem and associated with the changing production dynamics in the urban areas, as well as deepening urban inequalities and poverty which were discussed in relation to neoliberal transformation of production and accumulation process in the previous Chapter. Due to the nature of work, exact number of children working on the streets is not known, however it is clear that today a considerable number of children are working in the streets doing some form of work which does not necessitate sophisticated skills, capital or knowledge at all. The “labour relations”

regulating the work in the streets are determined by complex structures, procedures and processes. In this sense, the organization of the work is mainly based on seemingly simple demand-supply relations (Şişman 2006: 267-268) and the children enter into complex social interactions within the context of survival strategies determined and reproduced by the broader context of livelihoods in the neoliberal are. Most of the children working in the streets sell materials as handkerchief, chewing gum, *simit*, plastic bags or they polish shoes. Hence, “selling goods” is the most widespread activity that is performed by the children working in the streets due to the fact that those children can only compensate very low levels of “venture capital” to buy the goods to sell and children can perform simple activities which do not require complex cognitive skills as selling or carrying loads (Şişman 2006: 266). From the gender perspective, male children constitute between 90-100 percent of the children working in the streets (Akşit et. al 2003 and Konanç 1992 cited in Şişman 2006). Also, according to Erder (1991), there is a gender difference between the type of work performed by male and female children evident in the practices of street-working children. While male children are engaged in works requiring higher levels of physical activity, female children perform activities mainly based on selling goods (Erder 1991 cited in Şişman, 2006; Şişman 2006) or simply begging.

The economic activities performed by children are not limited to working in agriculture, services and industry sectors and on the streets. An increasing number of children work in the house, facilitating the reproduction of family as the fundamental unit of capitalist production. In Turkey, the number of children working in household chores increased both in urban and rural areas between 1999-2012 (TURKSTAT Child Labour Force Statistics 1999, 2006, 2012). The total number of children engaged in household chores increased from 4470 thousand in 1999 to 6540 thousand in 2006 and to 7503 thousand in 2012 (TURKSTAT Labour Force Statistics 1999, 2006 and 2012). Both in 2006 and 2012, number of female children engaged in household chores are higher than the number of male children

engaged in household chores both in urban and rural areas. The children continuing their education are predominantly involved in domestic chores. 50,2 percent of the children between the age of 6-17 who are attending school are doing housework, 3,2 percent of these children are involved in economic activities. For the same age group, 34,5 percent of the children who do not attend school are involved in economic activities and 38,8 percent the children engaged in an economic activity are involved in domestic work. Total number of children engaged in household chores increased from 4470 thousand in 1999 to 6540 thousand in 2006 and to 7503 thousand in 2012 (TURKSTAT Labour Force Statistics 1999, 2006 and 2012).

While the increase in the rates of child labour engaged in domestic chorus can be attributed to more sophisticated data gathering methods adopted by TURKSTAT in the recent years, the widespread utilization of child labour in domestic work is indeed associated with the expansion of the “forms of work under less legal control” (Hopkins et. al. 1996) especially in the 2000s. Spatially, the meaning of house within the capitalist form of production has been redefined in that it has been incorporated into the production process with all its resources, the family members being an important element of capitalist production as providers of labour power. The invisible nature of the work performed inside the house made it easier to utilize the child members’ labour power for the reproduction of family such as home-based care services, housework, shopping, etc (2006 Child Labour Press Release). Hence, the commodification of child labour is not limited with the work children perform outside the house. The house itself is a space for both primary and subsidiary work performed by the children for the daily functioning and subsistence of the household determined predominantly by the economic and social implications of the patriarchal structure underpinning the continuity of the capitalist mode of accumulation.

In 2013, the Regulation on the Procedures and Principles of Employment of Child and Adolescent Workers was changed in a way that the definition of “heavy and hazardous work” has been terminated. This modification is a regressive step in terms of child labour in Turkey. The list of works that may not be performed by child workers are replaced by two lists, one including the works that are permitted to be done by adolescent workers and the other one covering the works that are allowed to be performed by the adolescent workers between the age of 16-18 – mainly industrial work- which legalized the work of children below the age of 18 in heavy and hazardous works¹². Article 2 of the Regulation provides the general content of the works that the children and adolescent workers may not perform, irrespective of age. However, as stated before, the arbitrary nature of child labour makes it hard to regulate this area through implicit statements and rules. For instance, the new Regulation says that the children below the age of 18 cannot be engaged in such work which do not allow them to return to their homes following the end of the work, or works requiring a very high level of attention, standing for long hours, works harmful for their health, etc. It is stated in this Regulation that the children cannot be employed in any of the works not allowed by this Regulation, however although this legislative change may seem as banning all the hazardous and heavy work that would decrease the incidence of child labour in such sectors, it is quite controversial especially in terms of audits and penalties. More recently, the Regulation has been changed once more in October 2013 and it is stated that “the adolescent workers completed the full age of 16 who have graduated from the vocational and technical educational institutions within the context of Law on Vocational Education dated 5 June 1986 and no. 3308 may perform any work irrespective of the limitations stated in this Regulation provided

¹² <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/ekonomi/26415684.asp>

that their health, safety and morality are protected”¹³ which paved the ground for further levels of subcontracting and employment of cheap labour¹⁴.

The educational attainment of working children constitutes another concern affecting the livelihood prospects of the children in Turkey. The privatization of educational services, the decrease in the state expenditures in the area of education and the changing role of state in provision of educational services illustrated in Chapter 3 had devastating effects on the educational attainment and prospects of children in Turkey. According to 2012 Child Labour Force Survey, 50,2 percent of the working children did not attend school. Educational enrolment dramatically decreases as the age of a child increases. More specifically, while 49,8 percent of the working children between the age of 6-14 attend school, only 34,3 percent of the children between the age of 15-17 attend school (TURKSTAT 2012 Child Labour Force Survey). In terms of working hours, the Labour Law no 4857 and relevant regulations set the legal limitations that “the working time of school attending children during the education period must fall outside their training hours and shall not be more than two hours daily and ten hours weekly. Their working time during the periods when schools are closed shall not exceed the [...] legally determined limitations.”¹⁵ However, the nature of work that is done by the children is so complex and arbitrary which causes one of the challenges in terms of educational attainment of those children. Since there is usually a lack of employment contract and legally-regulated employment relations even for the children above the age of 14 who are allowed to work according to law, the children engaged in a huge variety of work such as working in the streets, in seasonal agricultural work or in sweatshops are subject to arbitrary arrangements dictated to them as the rules for the working hours. This means that once a children

¹³ <http://www.alomaliye.com/2013/cocuk-ve-genc-iscilerin-calistirilma-2510.htm>

¹⁴ <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/ekonomi/26415684.asp>

¹⁵ <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/region/eurpro/ankara/download/labouracturkey.pdf>

starts to be engaged in an economic activity, the arbitrary arrangements in terms of the organization of work hinders the attendance to school.

Acar (2010) compares the educational level of children working in the streets and in the service sector and shows that the former group has much lower levels of schooling (Acar 2010). On average, the educational attainment of the children working in the streets is very low. In fact, majority of those children attended only to primary education or they have dropped school while they were primary school students (43.5 percent) or they are still at primary school (32 percent). Importantly, “10.1 percent of the children working in the streets have never attended school” (Acar 2010). When it comes to the service sector, the rate of children having graduated from primary school is 48.1 percent (so it is higher than their counterparts working in the streets) and 40.7 percent of them are secondary school graduates and all the children working in the service sector has enrolled to school (Acar 2010). Although the educational attainment of the children working in service sector is higher than that of the children working on the streets, the number of children continuing to secondary school is very low (Acar 2010: 1016). The findings of Şişman (2006) point at even lower levels of educational attainment among the children working in the streets. Şişman (2006) shows that enrollment rates of the children working in the streets is very low. More specifically, 18.2 percent of the children do not attend school (Şişman 2006). There are even children who are working on the streets *and* they are below the age of primary education. This is one of the most serious implications of child labour on children’s educational prospects, and livelihoods in general. A considerable amount of children work in the streets despite the compulsory education. A majority of the children who do not enrolled to even the compulsory education are either illiterate or they only know how to read and write. Only 3.5 percent of the children working in the streets are primary school graduates (8-years compulsory education) which implies that they are below the age of 14. It is estimated that 44.8 percent of the children who are not enrolled to compulsory education do not go school due to

“economic reasons”. However, it is not clear why the economic conditions prevent these children from being enrolled to compulsory education (Şişman 2006).

The children working in seasonal agricultural work are mainly below the age of 15, meaning that they fall within the age of compulsory education, however they are either absent from school for a considerable amount of time in some cases extending even to 7 months a year or they do not attend school at all (Gülçubuk 2012: 75) mainly due to the long working hours in agricultural sector preoccupying the daily routines of those children (Gülçubuk et. al. 2003). Gülçubuk (2003), in his study conducted in a village of Adana in 2003, illustrates seasonal agricultural work as follows:

They [children working in seasonal agricultural work] do not have any profession or skill that they can use apart from their labo[u]r and they form the group of children who work under the “worst conditions” in agriculture because they have to carry water, gather firewood, harvest cotton and pick fruit, hoe, and weed as well as their strength allows, sometimes alone or with all their family members and work at a tempo that is hard to bear. These children who are deprived of education or receive minimum education lead their life under the worst conditions (Gülçubuk et. al. 2003: 1389).

The existing data on the educational attainment of the working children show that the redefinition of social policy through the retreat of state from the educational services and the increasing incorporation of private sector to the area of education with the incentive for profit-making led to a double burden on the shoulders of the children in Turkey. On the one side, their access to educational services are jeopardized due to the impoverishing effects of the neoliberal accumulation regime on the livelihoods through the commodification of labour; and on the other side, the educational services have increasingly being commodified and left to the market mechanism within the broader context of the commodification of services previously presented by the state.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In Turkey, there is a rising interest in the phenomenon of child labour which parallels the rising incidence of child labour specifically in the urban areas. The growing interest on this subject has led to the creation of a rich literature on various aspects of child labour, among all its main determinants. However, the existing literature fails to account for a holistic account on the determinants of child labour. On the basis of this discrepancy, the thesis has two main arguments: Firstly, it argues that while mainstream theoretical approaches provide highly valuable empirical data on factors that they depict as determinants/aggravators of child labour, (such as poverty cum migration, cum technological developments, cum urbanisation), these factors are taken as given and are not further problematised, giving way to *ad hoc*, incremental and partial solutions to child labour. The second argument of the thesis is derived from the discrepancy in the problematization of child labour in the mainstream discourse that understanding the underlying mechanisms facilitating the spread of child labour requires a holistic political economy approach that locates evolution of child labour within its context of capitalist development and crises both globally and in Turkey since the 1980s. In this regard, the political economy approach presents a more comprehensive perspective on the economic, social, political and cultural determinants producing and reproducing child labour since it incorporates child labour within the broader context of the rise of neoliberalism, the penetration of financialization into everyday lives of the masses and the intensifying commodification of labour. Such an extensive problematization of the determinants of child labour provides better insight on the structural interlinkages between variables that the mainstream literature takes as given, e.g. poverty, urbanisation, migration, and technological developments.

In order to describe the main lines of approaches that have shaped the mainstream discourse, the second chapter makes an assessment of the available literature on causes and prevalence of child labour into two main categories. The first category is the mainstream discourse that has been shaped along the capitalist production process and neoliberalism while the second group is the critical discourse that identifies and criticizes the main motives of the mainstream discourse and attempts to present alternative policy routes within the context of this critique. The mainstream discourse is shaped along three main pillars; the rights-based approaches associating child labour to the lack of rights and lack of access to rights; the transformation in the conceptualization of childhood, work organization and child labour; and the perspectives referring to migration, urbanization, poverty and urban poverty as the most significant reasons of child labour in Turkey. The existing critique of the mainstream discourse is based on the incorporation of the dynamics ignored by the mainstream discourse, *inter alia*, the capitalist mode of production and commodification of labour which are addressed as the main reasons of the commodification of child labour. Although the critical discourse presents a broader perspective of the emergence, evolution and perpetuation of child labour, it fails to provide insight about the unique experiences of children at a micro level. Therefore, the current discursive environment of Turkey regarding child labour lacks a holistic vision since it reduces child labour to a matter of definition, categorization and measurement so neither of these two approaches provide a fully-fledged analysis of the determinants of child labour in Turkey. Hence, this chapter argues that the mainstream approach, providing valuable empirical data on the variables depicted as causes of child labour, fails to problematize the original sources of the emergence and perpetuation of child labour. This partial and piecemeal approach proved insufficient in analysing the underlying mechanisms of the emergence and spread of child labour in urban Turkey, which indeed requires a relational perspective that would unmask the prevailing causalities. This kind of a discursive attitude also has political and social implications that it jeopardizes the

prospects for tackling child labour as a rapidly-spreading phenomenon in various forms and appearances in urban Turkey.

Departing from this assesment, the third chapter illustrates the global context defined by the rise of financialization as underpinned by neoliberalism, suppression of labour vis-a-vis capital, and the transformation of social policy is illustrated by taking the crisis of Fordism as the starting point due to its significant role in the neoliberal transformation of economic, political and social structures at the global level since the late 1970s. The neoliberal restructuring of state's role in social reproduction is analysed along the recommodification of services previously presented by state, and the increasing recommodification of labour further impoverishing the masses and deteriorating their livelihood options.

The fourth chapter deals with locating the phenomenon of child labour in urban Turkey within the context of capitalist development. The Turkish experience of post-Fordist production, financial liberalization and finance-led growth regime are analysed so as to account for the dynamics leading to agricultural dissolution, migration, urban poverty and inequalities. The changing social policy environment in Turkey is illustrated as the main channel through which social reproduction of poverty and inequalities take place. Hence, the prevailing incidence of child labour is associated with the rise of neoliberalism, the jobless growth facilitated by the finance-led growth regime, the degradation of social policy, the expansion in the commodification of labour and the alterations in the meaning of urban areas as the main spatial sphere of financialisation. In an era of speculative financial flows crowding-out real production, the increasing labour market segmentation and expansion of precarious production structures under the name of flexibility, and the gradual withdrawal of state from the economic and social arenas bolster urban poverty and inequalities which in turn perpetuate child labour in Turkey along the lines of spatial forces, gender-based dynamics and the legislative framework. The variables analysed as isolated from each other in the mainstream discourse are indeed closely associated and they are produced and reproduced with the changing

dynamics of capitalist development, which in turn have a direct impact on the incidence and continuity of child labour as embedded to the texture of urban spaces in Turkey

REFERENCES

Acar, H. "Children Working in the Streets and in the Service Sector in Turkey- 'A Comparative Study'." *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 7 (1), 2010: 1009-1019 <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=5&sid=c9c27843-69e7-4145-8fe2-db416fec6f51%40sessionmgr11&hid=16> (accessed: 21 September 2013).

Akbaş, E. and Atasü- Topçuoğlu, R. "Modern Çocukluk Paradigmasının Eleştirisi." *Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet*, 20 (1), 2009: 95-103 <http://asosindex.com/journal-article-abstract?id=1666> (accessed: 21 September 2013).

Akın, L. "Working Conditions of the Child Worker in Turkish Labour Law", *Employ Respons Rights J*, (21), 2009: 53-67 <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=3&sid=a2bf0115-399a-4070-aab2-e9b169d503ec%40sessionmgr110&hid=106> (accessed: 11 September 2013).

Alkire, S. *The Capability Approach and Human Development*, Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative <http://www.ophi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/OPHI-HDCA-SS11-Intro-to-the-Capability-Approach-SA.pdf?cc8bca> (accessed: 30 January 2013).

Alper, C. E. and Öniş, Z. "Financial Globalization, the Democratic Deficit, and Recurrent Crises in Emerging Markets: The Turkish Experience in the Aftermath of Capital Account Liberalization", *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, 39 (3), May-June 2003: 5-26. <http://0eds.a.ebscohost.com.library.metu.edu.tr/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=33&id=16ff87cc-c3c6-42e9-b91b-e241451dbd5a%40sessionmgr4003&hid=4108> (accessed: 29 June 2014).

Altıntaş, B. *Mendile, Simite, Boyaya, Çöpe... Ankara Sokaklarında Çalışan Çocuklar*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003.

Apak and Uçak. "Ekonomik Büyümenin Anlamlılığı ve Gelişmişlik: Türkiye Ekonomisi Üzerine Bir İnceleme", *Muhasebe ve Finansman Dergisi*, 34, Nisan 2007: 57-65.

Arat, Z. "Analyzing Child Labor as a Human Rights Issue: Its Causes, Aggravating Policies and Alternative Proposals." *Human Rights Quarterly*, 24 (1), 2002: 177-204.

Arın, T. *Kriz, Devlet, İktisat ve Sosyal Güvenlik Politikaları*, collected by Cengiz Arın, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2013.

Aybars, A.İ. and Tsarouhas, D. "Straddling Two Continents: Social Policy and Welfare Politics in Turkey", *Social Policy & Administration*, 44 (6), 2010: 746-763
<http://0-eds.a.ebscohost.com.library.metu.edu.tr/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=36&sid=16ff87cc-c3c6-42e9-b91b-e241451dbd5a%40sessionmgr4003&hid=4108> (accessed: 29 June 2014).

Bakırcı, K. "Child Labour and Legislation in Turkey." *The International Journal of Children's Rights*, 2002: 55-72
<http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com.ezproxy.sussex.ac.uk/content/10.1163/157181802772758128;jsessionid=rr69pb10k1hk.x-brill-live-01> (accessed: 21 September 2013).

Ballet, J., A. Bhukuth, and K. Radja. *Child Labour, Human Rights and the Capability Approach*. Working paper. France: University of Versailles Saint Quentin, 2005
http://www.researchgate.net/publication/228920336_Child_Labour_Human_Rights_and_the_Capability_Approach (accessed: 10 September 2013)

Basu, K. and P. H. Van. "The Economics of Child Labor" *The American Economic Review*, 88 (3), 1998: 412-427.

Ben-Arieh, A. *Measuring and monitoring the well-being of young children around the world*. UNESCO Background Paper for the EFA Global Monitoring Report, 2007.

<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001474/147444e.pdf> (accessed: 18 June 2013).

Bhalotra, S. and Heady, C. *Child Farm Labor: The Wealth Paradox*, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/ The World Bank, 2003 <http://wber.oxfordjournals.org/content/17/2/197.short> (accessed: 11 September 2013).

Boratav. K. and Yeldan. E. *Turkey, 1980-2000: Financial Liberalization, Macroeconomic Instability, and Patterns of Distribution*, 2001, <http://yeldane.bilkent.edu.tr/B&YCEPA2002.PDF> (accessed: 29 July 2014).
Boratav, K. *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi: 1908-2002*. Ankara: İmge, 2003.

Brown, D. K., Deardorff, A. V. and Stern, R.M. *The Determinants of Child Labour: Theory and Evidence*, RSIE Discussion Paper No. 486, September 2002, <http://fordschool.umich.edu/rsie/workingpapers/Papers476-500/r486.pdf> (accessed: 13 August 2014).

Buğra, A. *Kapitalizm, Yoksulluk ve Türkiye’de Sosyal Politika*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık

Buğra, A. “Poverty and Citizenship: An Overview of the Social-Policy Environment in Republican Turkey”. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 39, 2007: 33-52.

Buğra, A., and Keyder, Ç. “The Turkish welfare regime in transformation”. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 16, 2006: 211- 228 <http://0-esp.sagepub.com.library.metu.edu.tr/content/16/3/211.full.pdf+html> (accessed: 20 December 2013).

Buğra, A. and Yakut-Çakar, B. “Structural Change, the Social Policy Environment and Female Employment in Turkey”, *Development and Change*, 41 (3), 2010: 517-

http://uvt.ulakbim.gov.tr/uvt/index.php?cwid=9&vtadi=TSOS&c=ebsco&ano=144563_49edc5416fb75ce187fbfc65da2b3c88&? (accessed: 20 December 2013).

Bulut, M. "Sosyal Güvenlik Sistemlerinde Sosyal Yardım Yaklaşımı ve Türkiye'de Durum", *Yardım ve Dayanışma Dergisi*, 2 (3), Ocak-Haziran 2011: 57-64.

Bulutay, T. Türkiye'de Çalışan Çocuklar (Türkçe özet) Child Labour in Turkey. T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü Uluslararası Çalışma Örgütü, Ankara: 1995.

Cox, R. W. "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory." *Millenium*, 10 (2), 1981: 204-254.

Coşar, S. and Yeğenoğlu, M. "The Neoliberal Restructuring of Turkey's Social Security System", *Monthly Review*, April 2009, <http://0-content.ebscohost.com.library.metu.edu.tr/pdf10/pdf/2009/MRV/01Apr09/37287572.pdf?T=P&P=AN&K=37287572&S=R&D=a9h&EbscoContent=dGJyMNHr7ESegLc4yOvsOLCmr0yepdSsqe4SK%2BWXWXS&ContentCustomer=dGJyMPGnrIG2qbdNuePfgex43zx> (accessed: 29 June 2014).

Çakmak, E. and Kasnakoğlu, H. "Türkiye'de Tarım Politikaları: Böyle Gelmiş, Böyle mi Gitmeli?", *İktisat Dergisi*, 412, April 2001.

Dayıoğlu, M. and Assaad, R. *The Determinants of Child Labor in Urban Turkey*, ERF Working Paper Series, Working Paper No. 0302, paper presented at the Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics Seminar, Minneapolis, Minnesota and at the 9th Annual Conference of ERF, Sharjah, UAE. 2002 <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=5&sid=081e0476-5532-4f9a-a5e9-0cd0b817d206%40sessionmgr11&hid=115> (accessed: 3 November 2013).

Dayioğlu, M. “Patterns of Change in Child Labour and Schooling in Turkey: The Impact of Compulsory Schooling.” *Oxford Development Studies*, 33 (2), 2005: 195-210.

Dayioğlu, M. “The Impact of Household Income on Child Labour in Urban Turkey.” *Journal of Development Studies*, 42 (6), 2006: 939-956 <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=a7ec9471-2aec-4452-8d08-0d50009e8123%40sessionmgr13&hid=4> (accessed: 11 September 2013).

Dayioğlu, M. “Mother’s and Children’s Employment in Turkey” *Journal of Developing Areas*, 2008: 95-115

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40376196> (accessed: 11 September 2013).

Düzgün, E. “Class, State and Property: Modernity and Capitalism in Turkey”, *European Journal of Sociology*, 53 (2), August 2012: 119-148 <http://0-linksource.ebsco.com.library.metu.edu.tr/FullText.aspx?linkout=http%3a%2f%2fdx.doi.org%2f10.1017%2fS0003975612000070> (accessed: 1 September 2014).

Edmonds, E. V. *Does Child Labour Decline with Improving Economic Status*. NBER Working Paper, 2003 <https://www.dartmouth.edu/~eedmonds/vninc.pdf> (accessed: 14 October 2013).

Edmonds, E.V. *Defining Child Labour: A Review of the definitions of child labour in policy research*. ILO Working Paper, 2009 <http://www.ilo.org/ipecinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=11247> (accessed: 27 September 2013).

Ennew, J., W. E. Myers, and D. P. Platue. "Defining Child Labour as if Human Rights Really Matter" in *Child Labour and Human Rights- Making Children Matter*, ed. Burns H. Weston, USA: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2003.

Erbaş, H. and Turan, F. "The 2001 Economic Crisis, Its Impacts and Evaluations: The Case of Workers and Small Employers in Ankara", *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 41 (1), 2009: 79-107 <http://0-rp.sagepub.com.library.metu.edu.tr/content/41/1/79.full.pdf+html> (accessed: 20 January 2014).

Erder, S. "Çalışan Çocuklar: Çıracı mı?", 'İşçi mi?', in *Türkiye'de Çocuk Emegi*, ed. Kemal İnal, Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi, 2010.

Erdoğan, N. and Bora, T. (ed.s) *Yoksulluk Halleri: Türkiye'de Kent Yoksulluğunun Toplumsal Görünümleri*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007.

Erdoğan, S. and Kutlu, D. "Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Çalışan Yoksulluğu: İşgücü Piyasası ve Sosyal Koruma Politikaları Bağlamında Bir Değerlendirme", *Çalışma ve Toplum*, 2, 2014.

Ergüneş, N. "Finansallaşma Döneminde Geç Kapitalistleşen Ülkelerin Stratejileri: Türkiye Örneği", *Praksis*, (22), 2010: 131-149 http://uvf.ulakbim.gov.tr/uvf/index.php?cwid=9&vtadi=TSOS&c=ebsco&ano=115806_f0676d8608212e70b14ccac884519853& (accessed: 19 July 2014).

Epstein, A.G. *Financialisation and the World Economy*, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, 2005.

Ersoy, M. *The Problems of Articulation of Migrants into the Urban Life and the Future of Cities in Developing Countries: The Turkish Case*. APSA Congress

Paper, 2009 <http://www.melihersoy.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/> (accessed 24 April 2013).

Ertürk, Y. “Child Labour in Turkey”, in *The World of Child Labour- An Historical and Regional Survey*, ed. Hugh D. Hindman, USA: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.: 2009.

Fine, B. *Financialisation and Social Policy*. UNRISD Conference Paper on the ‘Social and Political Dimensions of the Global Crisis: Implications for Developing Countries’, 12-13 November 2009a
[http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BD6AB/httpNetITFramePDF?ReadForm&parentunid=6519FB6C1D1B68A8C12576A3002B40E8&parentdoctype=eventauxiliarypage&netitpath=80256B3C005BD6AB/\(httpAuxPages\)/6519FB6C1D1B68A8C12576A3002B40E8/\\$file/Fine.pdf](http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BD6AB/httpNetITFramePDF?ReadForm&parentunid=6519FB6C1D1B68A8C12576A3002B40E8&parentdoctype=eventauxiliarypage&netitpath=80256B3C005BD6AB/(httpAuxPages)/6519FB6C1D1B68A8C12576A3002B40E8/$file/Fine.pdf) (accessed: 30 August 2014).

Fine, B. *Social Policy and the Crisis of Neo-Liberalism*. Prepared for Conference on “The Crisis of Neo-Liberalism in India: Challenges and Alternatives”, Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS) Mumbai and International, 13-15 March 2009b
<http://www.networkideas.org/ideasact/jan09/PDF/Fine.pdf> (accessed: 16 July 2014).

Fine, B. “Neoliberalism as Financialisation”, in *Economic Transitions to Neoliberalism in Middle-Income Countries: Policy Dilemmas, Economic Crises, Forms of Resistance*, eds. Alfredo Saad-Filho and Galip Y. Yalman, London: Routledge, 2010.

Fiszbein, A. and Schady, N. *Conditional Cash Transfers- Reducing Present and Future Poverty*. World Bank Policy Research Report, 2009
<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCCT/Resources> (accessed 10 May 2013).

Garcia, S. and Hill, J. “Impact of conditional cash transfers on children's school achievement: evidence from Colombia”, *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 2 (1); 2010: 117-137.

Göç-Der, *Zorunlu Göç Araştırma Raporu: 1999-2001*. İstanbul: Göç-Der, 2002

Gülçubuk, B. “Tarımda Çocuk Emeği Sömürüsü ve Toplumsal Duyarlılık.” *Çalışma ve Toplum*, (2), 2012: 75-93
http://uvt.ulakbim.gov.tr/uvt/index.php?cwid=9&vtadi=TSOS&c=ebsco&ano=142782_2f66fabb51fce57bbe26ac033ad7e54a&? (accessed: 11 September 2013).

Gülçubuk, B., Karabıyık, E. and Tanır, F. *Baseline Survey on Worst Forms of Child Labour in the Agricultural Sector: Children in Cotton Harvesting in Karataş, Adana*, 2003, www.ilo.org/ipeginfo/product/download (accessed: 21 September 2013).

Gürses, D. “An Analysis of Child Poverty and Social Policies in Turkey”, *Journal of Developing Societies*, 25(2), 2009: 209-227.

Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies. *Turkey Migration and Internally Displaced Population Survey*. Ankara: Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies, 2006.

Handa, S. and Davis, B. “The Experience of Conditional Cash Transfers in Latin America and the Caribbean”, *Development Policy Review*, Overseas Development Institute, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 24 (5), 2006: 513- 536.

Harvey, D. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Harvey, D. "Neo-Liberalism as Creative Destruction", *Geogr. Ann.*, 88 B (2), Swedish Society for Anthropology and Geography, 2006: 145-158
<http://ehis.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=4&sid=48318a1b-d921-48f8-a452-2ff4eb6576ba%40sessionmgr112&hid=109> (accessed: 8 January 2014).

Hilton, A. "Foreword", in *Agriculture, Peasantry and Poverty in Turkey in the Neo-Liberal Age*, Murat Öztürk, The Netherlands: Wageningen Academic Publishers, 2012 www.WageningenAcademic.com/Turkey

Hopkins, T.K., Wallerstein, I.M. and Casparis, J. *The Age of Transition: Trajectory of the World-System 1945-2025*. London; Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Zed Books; Leichhardt, NSW, Australia: Pluto Press, 1996.

ILO, *Child Labour: A textbook for university students*, 2004
http://www.ilo.org/ipeinfo/product/viewProduct.do;jsessionid=0a038009cf092347d4a598b4732bbfe8cc6d4f5d273.hkzFngTDp6WImQuUaNaLaxD3lN4K-xalah8S-xyIn3uKmAiN-AnwbQbxaNvzaAml-huKa30xgx95fjWTa3eIpkzFngTDp6WImQuXahySc3yPaxmNcgb48OX3b4Dtgj15eMbynknvrkLOlQzNp65In0__?productId=174 (accessed: 19 July 2014).

ILO Convention Concerning Minimum Age for Admission to Employment (Convention no. 138)
http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:C138 (accessed: 25 October 2013).

ILO Türkiye Ofisi, Önemli Bir Konu: Çocuk İşçiliği 2009
http://www.ilo.org/public/turkish/region/eurpro/ankara/about/ilo_cisc.htm
(accessed: 25 October 2013).

ILO. *Making Progress Against Child Labour- Global Estimates and Trends 2000-2012*. Geneva: ILO, 2013.

Independent Social Scientists. *2008 Kavşağında Türkiye: Siyaset, İktisat ve Toplum*. İstanbul: Yordam Kitap, 2008.

Independent Social Scientists. *Ücretli Emek ve Sermaye: derinleşen küresel kriz ve türkiye'ye yansımaları*, eds. Erinç Yeldan and Ebru Voyvoda, İstanbul: Yordam Kitap, 2011.

Independent Social Scientists. *Türkiye'de ve Dünyada Ekonomik Bunalım 2008-2009*. eds. Oktar Türel and Ebru Voyvoda, third edition, İstanbul: Yordam Kitap, 2011.

Işık, O. and Pınarcıoğlu, M.M. "Nöbetleşe Yoksulluktan Kuralsız Yoksulluğa", *Görüş*, Temmuz 2003: 50-53.

Işık, O. and Pınarcıoğlu, M.M. *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Gecekondulaşma ve Kent Yoksulları, Sultanbeyli Örneği*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2009.

Itoh, M. and Lapavitsas, C. *Political Economy of Money and Finance*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Jenson, J. and Saint-Martin, D. "New routes to social cohesion? Citizenship and the Social Investment State", *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 28(1), 2003: 77-99.

Jessop, B. "The continuing ecological dominance of neoliberalism in the crisis", in *Economic Transitions to Neoliberalism in Middle-Income Countries: Policy Dilemmas, Economic Crises, Forms of Resistance*, eds. Alfredo Saad-Filho and Galip Y. Yalman, London: Routledge, 2010: 24-38.

Kaygalak, S. "Yeni Kentsel Yoksulluk, Göç ve Yoksulluğun Mekansal Yoğunlaşması: Mersin/ Demirtaş Mahallesi Örneği." *Praksis*, (2), 2001: 124- 172 <http://www.praksis.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/002-Kaygalak.pdf> (accessed: 10 November 2013).

Kaygalak, S. *Kentin Mültecileri: Neoliberalizm Koşullarında Zorunlu Göç ve Kentleşme*. İstanbul: Dipnot, 2009.

Kendir, H. “Küreselleşen Tarım ve Türkiye’de Tarım Reformu”, in *Türkiye’de Kapitalizmin Güncel Sorunları*, eds. Fuat Ercan et. al., 2007.

Keyder, Ç. and Adaman, F. *Türkiye’de Büyük Kentlerin Gecekondu ve Çöküntü Mahallelerinde Yaşanan Yoksulluk ve Sosyal Dışlanma*. Report for the European Commission General Directorate Employment, Social Affairs and Equality, 2005 http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/social_inclusion/docs/2006/study_turkey_tr.pdf (accessed: 3 May 2013).

Keyder, Ç. and Yenil, Z. “Agrarian Change under Globalization: Markets and Insecurity in Turkish Agriculture”, *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 11 (1), January 2011:60–86 <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=7&sid=042cabd5-6f86-4294-8138-926b60326d5d%40sessionmgr4005&hid=4103> (accessed: 13 May 2014).

Keyder, Ç. and Yenil Z. *Bildiğimiz Tarımın Sonu: Küresel Köylülük ve İktidar*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2013.

Keyman, F. and Koyuncu, B. “Globalization, Alternative Modernities and the Political Economy of Turkey.” *Review of International Political Economy*, 12 (1), 2005: 105-128 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09692290500049896> (accessed: 14 October 2013).

Köse, A.H and Öncü, A. “İktisadın Piyasası, Kapitalizmin Ekonomisi”, in *İktisat Üzerine Yazılar- I- Küresel Düzen, Birikim, Devlet ve Sınıflar*, eds. Ahmet H. Köse, Fikret Şenses, Erinç Yeldan, İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık, 2003.

Lapavitsas, C. (ed.) *Finansallaşma ve Kapitalizmin Krizi*. İstanbul: Yordam Kitap, 2009.

MacGregor, S. “Refah Devleti ve Neoliberalizm”, in *Neoliberalizm: Muhalif Bir Seçki*, eds. Alfredo Saad-Filho and Deborah Johnston, İstanbul: Yordam Kitap, 2007.

Ministry of National Education. National Education Statistics 2012-2013 http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/istatistik/meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2012_2013.pdf (accessed: 24 August 2014).

Ministry of Family and Social Policies. 2013 Yılı Faaliyet Raporu http://sgb.aile.gov.tr/upload/Node/23478/files/2013_idare_faaliyet_raporu.pdf (accessed: 24 August 2014).

Ministry of Health. 2013 Yılı Faaliyet Raporu http://www.sgb.saglik.gov.tr/content/files/faaliyet_raporu_2013/index.html (accessed: 24 August 2014).

Ministry of National Education. National Education Statistics 2013-2014 http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/istatistik/meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2013_2014.pdf (accessed: 24 August 2014).

Ministry of National Educational. 2013 Yılı İdare Faaliyet Raporu http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2014_04/30032306_meb_2013_idare_faaliyet_raporu.pdf (accessed: 24 August 2014).

Müderrişoglu, S., Uyan-Semerci, P., Yakut-Cakar, B., Karatay, A. & Akkan, B.E. *Child Well-Being Document*. UNICEF Turkey and Turkish Republic Ministry of Development Study Paper, 2013

<http://panel.unicef.org.tr/vera/app/var/files/c/h/childwell-beingdocument-en.pdf>
(accessed: 23 June 2013).

Onaran, Ö. “Katı Emek Piyasası Söyleminin İdeolojisi”, in *Küreselleşme, Emek Süreçleri ve Yapısal Uyum*, 7. Ulusal Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi, (ed.) Ahmet Alpay Dikmen, Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği, 2002.

Onaran, Ö. *İşsizlik ve Alternatif Politikalar*. Türkiye’de İşsizliğin Çözüm Yolları ve Sendikalar Çalıştayı Raporu, DİSK, 14 April 2007
http://www.bagimsizsosyalbilimciler.org/Yazilar_Uye/Onaran_Mayis07.pdf
(accessed: 29 July 2014).

Onaran, Ö. “Crisis and post-crises adjustment in Turkey: implications for labour”, in *Turkey and the Global Economy: Neo-liberal restructuring and integration in the post-crisis era*, eds. Ziya Öniş and Fikret Şenses, New York: Routledge, 2009.

Oyan, O. “Tarımda ‘Yapısal Uyarılama’ ve Türkiye’nin Çıkarları”, *İktisat Dergisi*, 412, April 2001.

Öniş, Z. and Şenses, F. “Rethinking the Emerging Post-Washington Consensus”, *Development and Change*, 36 (2), 2005: 263-290
<http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=6face581-b17e-42df-add3-f8eec37c95cd%40sessionmgr4003&vid=11&hid=4205> (accessed: 19 July 2014).

Öniş, Z. and Şenses, F. *Global Dynamics, Domestic Coalitions and a Reactive State: Major Policy Shifts in Post-War Turkish Economic Development*. ERC Working Paper, September 2007
<http://www.erc.metu.edu.tr/menu/series07/0706.pdf> (accessed: 1 August 2014).

Özar, Ş. *Neoliberalizm ve Yoksulluk*. İstanbul: Amargi, 2009
<http://www.bianet.org/biamag/kadin/116585-neoliberalizm-ve-yoksulluk> accessed: 24 August 2014.

Özkaya, T., Oyan, O., Işın, F. and Uzmay, A. “Türkiye Tarım Ekonomisi Nereye Götürülüyor”, *İktisat Dergisi*, 412, April 2001.

Öztürk, Y. “Yeni Yasal Düzenlemeler ve Tarım Sektörü”, *İktisat Dergisi*, 435, 2003.

Öztürk, M. *Agriculture, Peasantry and Poverty in Turkey in the Neo-Liberal Age. The Netherlands: Wageningen Academic Publishers, 2012*
www.WageningenAcademic.com/Turkey.

Pamuk, Ş. *Türkiye'nin 200 Yıllık İktisadi Tarihi*, İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2014.

Reimers, F., Da Silva, D. C., Trevino, E. *Where is the 'Education' in Conditional Cash Transfers in Education*, UNESCO UIS Working Paper, 2006
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org> (accessed 28 April 2013).

Roelen, K. and Camfield, L. *A Mixed Method Taxonomy of Child Poverty: A Case Study From Rural Ethiopia*. University of Oxford Young Lives Working Paper no. 76.
http://www.younglives.org.uk/publications/WP?b_start:int=20 (accessed: 18 July 2013).

Scoones, I. “Livelihood perspectives and rural development”, *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36 (1), 2009: 171-196
<http://0-www.tandfonline.com.library.metu.edu.tr/doi/pdf/10.1080/03066150902820503>
(accessed: 17 May 2014).

Silver, B. *Emeğin Gücü: 1870'ten Günümüze İşçi Hareketleri ve Küreselleşme*. İstanbul: Yordam Kitap, 2009.
Smith, N. *Uneven Development*, third edition, Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2008.

Social Security Institution, Unregistered Employment Statistics 2012
www.sgk.gov.tr (accessed: 24 August 2014).

Stockhammer, E. “Financialisation and the slow-down of accumulation”, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 28 (5), 2004: 719-741.

Streuli, N. “Child protection: a role for conditional cash transfer programmes?”, *Development in Practice*, 22 (4) ; 2012: 588-599.

Şişman, Y. “Sokakta Çalışan Çocukların Yaşam Koşulları ve Gelecek Beklentileri”, *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2006/2: 251-276
http://uvt.ulakbim.gov.tr/uvt/index.php?cwid=9&vtadi=TSOS&c=ebsco&ano=67443_da70a4886eb361249a788ebc982ee11d&? (accessed: 11 September 2013).

Tauss, A. “Contextualizing the Current Crisis: Post-Fordism, Neoliberal Restructuring, and Financialization”. *Colombia Internacional* (76), Julio a Diciembre de 2012: 51-79
<http://ehis.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=48318a1b-d921-48f8-a452-2ff4eb6576ba%40sessionmgr112&hid=109> (accessed: 8 January 2014).

Tekeli, İ. “Yerleşme Yapıları ve Göç Araştırmaları”, in *Değişen Mekan: Mekansal Süreçlere İlişkin Tartışma ve Araştırmalara Toplu Bakış 1923-2003*, ed. Ayda Eraydın, Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayınları: 2006.

Theodore, N., Peck, J. and Brenner, N. “Neoliberal Kentçilik: Kentler ve Piyasaların Egemenliği”, *İdealkent*, (7), 2012: 21-37.

Turkish Republic Ministry of Environment and Urbanization. *Kentleşme Şurası: Kentsel Yoksulluk, Göç ve Sosyal Politikalar*, Komisyon Raporu, Nisan 2009.

TURKSTAT Child Labour Force Statistics 1994-2012
http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1007 (accessed: 10 June 2014).

TURKSTAT Child Labour Force Surveys, *Press Releases 2006 and 2012*
<http://www.turkstat.gov.tr> (accessed: 10 June 2014).

TURKSTAT, Health Expenditure Statistics 1999-2012
http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1084 (accessed: 24 August 2014).

TURKSTAT. Social Protection Statistics 2000-2012
http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1040 (accessed: 24 August 2014).

TURKSTAT *Results of 2009 Poverty Study*
http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1013 (accessed: 24 August 2014).

Türel, O. *Geç Barbarlık Çağı*. İstanbul: Yordam Kitap, 2011.

Uçkaç, A. (2010). “Türkiye’de Neoliberal Ekonomi Politikaları ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Yansımaları”. *Maliye Dergisi*, 158, 422- 430.

United States Department of Labor. 2012 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor <http://www.dol.gov/ilab/reports/child-labor/findings/2012TDA/turkey.pdf> (accessed: 12 August 2014).

Uyan- Semerci, P., Müderrisoğlu, S., Karatay, A., Akkan, B.E., Kilic, Z., Oy, B. and Uran, S. *Esitsiz Bir Toplumda Çocukluk: Cocugu ‘İyi Olma Hali’ni Anlamak-İstanbul Ornegi*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press, 2012.

Wallerstein, I. M. *The Essential Wallerstein*. New York: New Press, 2000.

White, H., Leavy, J. and Masters, A. “Comparative Perspectives of Child Poverty: a review of policy measures.” *Journal of Human Development*, November 2010: 379-396.

Yeldan, E. “Neoliberal Global Remedies: From Speculative-Led Growth to IMF-Led Crisis in Turkey”, *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 38 (2), 2006: 193-213.

Yeldan, E. *Patterns of Adjustment under the Age of Finance: The Case of Turkey as a Peripheral Agent of Neoliberal Globalization*, PERI Working Paper Series, 2007: 2-24
http://www.peri.umass.edu/fileadmin/pdf/working_papers/working_papers_101-150/WP126.pdf (accessed: 10 August 2014).

Yeldan, E. *Küreselleşme Sürecinde Türkiye Ekonomisi: Bölüşüm, Birikim ve Büyüme*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2012.

Yentürk, N. *Körlerin Yürüyüşü: Türkiye Ekonomisi ve 1980 Sonrası Krizler*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2003.

Yılmaz, B. “Türkiye’de Sınıf-Altı: Nöbetleşe Yoksulluktan Müebbet Yoksulluğa”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, 113, 2008: 127-143.

Yılmaz, H.B. and Dülgerler, Ş. “Children Working on the Streets in İzmir.” *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 39 (1), 2011: 129-144
<http://ehis.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=c9c27843-69e7-4145-8fe2-db416fec6f51%40sessionmgr11&hid=16> (accessed: 21 September 2013).

Yücesan- Özdemir, G. and Özdemir, A.M. “Türkiye’de Çocuk Emeği ve Sosyal Politika: Alternatifi Düşünmek İçin Egemen Söylemin Eleştirisi”, in *Türkiye’de Çocuk Emeği*. ed. Kemal İnal, Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi, 2010.

Yücesan-Özdemir, G. “Neo-Liberal Social Policy and Production Politics in Turkey”, *Turkish Studies*, 4 (3), Autumn 2003: 178-198
<http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=8&sid=6face581-b17e-42df-add3-f8eec37c95cd%40sessionmgr4003&hid=4205> (accessed: 19 June 2014).

Yücesan-Özdemir, G. “AKP’li Yıllarda Sosyal Politika Rejimi: Kralın Yeni Elbisesi” in *İktidarın Şiddeti: AKP’li Yıllar, Neoliberalizm ve İslamcı Politikalar*, eds. Simten Coşar and Gamze Yücesan-Özdemir, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2014.

Appendix 1

TURKISH SUMMARY

Küresel düzeyde çocuk işçiliğine yönelik ilgi özellikle 1990'lerden bu yana giderek artmaktadır. Gerek dünya çapında gerekse Türkiye düzeyinde çalışan çocukların oranına ilişkin mevcut veriler çocuk işçiliği ile mücadele yönünde gösterilen çabalara ve bu alanda yürütülen çalışmalara rağmen çocuk işçiliğinin giderek yaygınlaştığına işaret etmektedir. Bu tez, çocuk işçiliğinin artan öneminin sebeplerine ilişkin olarak literatürde yer alan hakim söylemin bir değerlendirmesinin yapılmasını ve Türkiye'de çocuk işçiliğinin gelişim sürecinin, kapitalist gelişmenin siyasal iktisadı ve Türkiye'de özellikle 1980'lerden bu yana yaşanan krizler bağlamında ele alınmasını hedeflemiştir. Tezin iki temel argümanı bulunmaktadır. Birincisi çocuk işçiliğinin belirleyenlerine ilişkin hakim söylemin, çocuk işçiliğinin belirleyenleri olarak gördüğü etmenlere ilişkin (örn. yoksulluk, göç, teknolojik gelişme, kentleşme) oldukça faydalı ampirik veri sağlamasına rağmen bu etmenleri verili olarak kabul edip esasında birbirlerine sıkı sıkıya bağlı olan bu etmenleri birer bağımsız değişken olarak aldığı ve daha geniş bir düzlemde sorunsallaştırmaktan uzak olduğudur. Tezin ikinci argümanı ise çocuk işçiliğini sürekli kılan yoksulluk, kentleşme, göç ve teknolojik gelişme arasındaki yapısal bağlantıların kavranabilmesi için kapitalizmin özellikle 1970'lerden bu yana değişen dinamiklerinin (sermayenin uluslararasılaşması, parasal sermayenin artmakta olan egemenliği, finansal sermayeye dayalı kapitalizm vb.) ve bu eğilimlerin neoliberal siyasal iktisat çerçevesindeki yansımalarının yanı sıra bu süreçlerin bir sonucu olarak emeğin metalaşmasındaki derinleşmenin analize eklenmesinin gerektiğidir.

Bu tez beş bölümden oluşmaktadır.

Birinci bölüm tezin amacı, temel argümanları ve içeriğine ilişkin genel bir giriş niteliğindedir.

İkinci bölüm çocuk işçiliğinin gerek küresel düzeyde gerekse Türkiye’de artan önemini değerlendirmektedir. Bu bağlamda, ilk olarak, çocuk işçiliğinin belirleyenlerine ilişkin hakim söylem betimlenmekte, ardından hakim söylem tarafından yapılan analizi sorunsallaştıran eleştirel yaklaşım sunulmaktadır. Çocuk işçiliği konusundaki hakim söylem, kapitalist üretim süreci ve neoliberalizmin temel dinamikleri düzleminde oluşmuş iken, eleştirel söylem hakim yaklaşımın söz konusu tek boyutlu analizini olumsuzlamakta ve çocuk işçiliğinin belirleyenleri konusunda alternatif açıklamalar getirmektedir.

Hakim söylem üç ana eksen çerçevesinde sunulmaktadır: i) Çocuk işçiliğini çocukların haklara erişimi konusundaki eksiklik ve zorluklara bağlayan yaklaşım; ii) Çocuk işçiliğinin yaygınlaşmasını çocukluk, işin örgütlenmesi ve çocuk işçiliği konusundaki kavramsallaştırmalarda yaşanan dönüşüme bağlayan yaklaşım, iii) Türkiye’de çocuk işçiliğinin görülmesinin önde gelen sebepleri olarak göç, kentleşme, yoksulluk ve kentsel yoksulluğu gösteren yaklaşım. Hakim söylem, çocuk işçiliğini bir tanımlama, sınıflandırma ve ölçüm meselesine indirgemektedir ve bu sebeple çocuk işçiliğinin sebeplerine ve bu sebepler arasındaki içsel ilişkilere yönelik bütüncül bir bakış açısına sahip olmaktan uzaktır.

Çocuk işçiliğinin belirleyenlerini eleştirel bir düzlemde ele alan yaklaşımlar ise çocuk işçiliğini kapitalist gelişme, emeğin metalaşması ve kapitalist sistemde sermaye birikiminin dinamikleri bağlamında analiz etmektedir. Hakim söylemi şekillendiren temel argüman ve yaklaşımlar, çocuk işçiliğinin nedenleri ve sürekliliği konusundaki mevcut literatür bağlamında betimlenmiştir. Eleştirel yaklaşım, hakim söylemin analize dahil etmediği bir faktör olarak olarak kapitalist üretim biçiminin eğin metalaşmasını doğuran etkileri üzerinde durmaktadır. Ancak, hakim söylem ile karşılaştırıldığında daha geniş bir perspektif sunan eleştirel yaklaşım da çocukların ekonomik faaliyetlere katılım bağlamında mikro düzeydeki deneyimlerini yansıtılabilmeyi sağlayacak kapsamlı bir analize vermemektedir. Bu sebeple, Türkiye’de çocuk işçiliğine ilişkin mevcut söylemsel bağlam çocuk işçiliğinin tanımlanması, sınıflandırılması ve ölçülmesi ekseninde şekillenmekte

olup çocuk işçiliğini tek boyutlu bir düzeye indirgemekte ve bütüncül bir analiz yapmaktan uzak kalmaktadır. Mevcut söylemin söz konusu kısmi ve tek boyutlu yaklaşımı kentsel mekanda çocuk işçiliğinin yaygınlaşmasının altında yatan nedenleri ortaya koymakta yetersiz kalmaktadır.

Tezin üçüncü bölümü 1970'lerin sonunda yaşanan Fordizmin krizi ile başlayıp günümüze uzanan bir tarihsel süreci izlemektedir. Bu bölümde, bir siyasal hegemonik proje olarak neoliberalizmin yükselişi ve neoliberalizmin sosyo-ekonomik dinamikleri tarafından desteklenen finansallaşma sürecinin kitlelerin geçimlerine nasıl sirayet ettiği ve yoksulluğun yeniden üretiminde nasıl bir rol oynadığı tartışılmaktadır. Çocuk işçiliğinin belirleyenlerine ilişkin hakim söylem, çocuk işçiliğinin ölçülmesi ve ortadan kaldırılmasına odaklanırken bu olgunun ortaya çıkması ve yeniden üretilmesinin temelinde yatan yapısal ilişkisellikleri açıklamakta yetersiz kalmakta ve bu yönüyle tek boyutlu bir analiz yapmaktadır, bu sebeple üçüncü bölüm Türkiye'de çocuk işçiliğinin yapısal nedenlerini siyasal iktisat yaklaşımı ile analiz etmekte ve hakim söylem tarafından büyük ölçüde ifade edilmeyen makroekonomik ilişkisellikleri ele almaktadır. Bu anlamda siyasal iktisat yaklaşımı çocuk işçiliğinin tarihsel, ekonomik, toplumsal ve kültürel düzeydeki belirleyenlerini ortaya koymakta daha geniş bir hareket alanı sağlamakta ve neoliberalizmin 1970'lerin sonu itibarıyla yükselişinin çocuk işçiliğinin süreklilik kazanması ile sonuçlanan dinamiklerini açıklamakta daha kapsamlı bir analiz yapmaya olanak sağlamaktadır. Çocuk işçiliğinin hakim söylemde ele alınış biçimine yönelik olarak yapılan değerlendirmeden hareketle, çocuk işçiliğinin yaygınlaşması ve yeni görünüm kazanmasının küresel çapta ve Türkiye'de 1980'lerden bu yana yaşanmakta olan makroekonomik ve sosyal dönüşüm bağlamına yerleştirilmek suretiyle analiz edimesinin gerekliliği vurgulanmıştır. Finansal birikim modelinin neoliberalizm ile simbiotik bir ilişki içinde olduğu ifade edilmekte, finansal hareketlerin serbestleşmesinin kitlelerin gelirlerinin müsadere edilmesi ile sonuçlandığı belirtilmektedir (Lapavitsas 2009 cited in Ergüneş 2009). Toplumsal yeniden üretimde devletin rolünün geçirdiği dönüşüm, en temel sosyal

hizmetlerin dahi piyasa ilişkilerine konu olması (Fine 2009a: 5; Fine 2009a) şeklinde tezahür eden yeni bir sosyal hizmet anlayışının yükselmesi ve emeğin yeniden metalaşması ile kendini göstermektedir. Devletin toplumsal yeniden üretimdeki konumuna ilişkin bu yeni anlayış, yoksulluğun yeniden üretiminin temel belirleyeni oluşturmaktadır. Söz konusu dönüşüm, sosyal politika kavramının yeniden tanımlanması (Buğra 2008; Köse and Öncü 2003; Fine 2009a, Fine 2009b; Buğra and Keyder 2006) anlamına gelmekte olup aynı zamanda devlet-toplum, devlet-piyasa toplum-piyasa ilişkilerinin de yeniden şekillendiğine işaret etmektedir. Bu bölüm, bir yanda hakim sermaye birikim ve üretim modeli ile göç, yoksulluk, tarımsal çözüme (Öztürk 2012; Keyder and Yenal 2013; Keyder and Yenal 2011) ve sosyal haklardan yararlanmanın güçleşmesi arasındaki bağa işaret etmekte ve bu haliyle hakim söylemin bağımsız değişkenler olarak aldığı etmenler arasındaki ilişkiselliğe dikkat çekmektedir. Sosyal politikanın finans sermayeye daha geniş bir hareket alanı yaratılması amacıyla yeniden tanımlanması, devletin hizmet sağlayıcı rolünden giderek uzaklaşması ve özel sektörün bir hizmet sağlayıcı olarak bu alanlarda giderek daha geniş bir rol oynamasına sebep olmuştur. Emeğin yeniden metalaşması; “aktivasyon politikaları”, “koşullu yardımlar” ve “sorumluluğun paylaşılması” (Buğra and Keyder 2006; Buğra 2008; Yücesan-Özdemir 2014). söylemleri ekseninde derinleşmiş ve sosyal politikanın dar anlamda yeniden yorumlanması (Buğra 2008: 93-94; Öniş ve Şenses 2005; Fine 2009a: 3; Buğra ve Keyder 2006) sürecinin toplum üzerindeki en temel implikasyonlarından birini teşkil etmiştir. Diğer bir deyişle, neoliberalizmin yükselişi ile finansallaşma arasındaki ilişki emek üzerinde tahakküm kuran mekanizmaların yaratılmasında etkili olmuş, bu durum ise toplumsal yeniden üretimin sosyal hizmetlerin metalaşması (Fine 2009a; Fine 2009b; Yeldan 2007) aracılığıyla kitlelerin hizmetlerden yararlanma olanaklarını önemli ölçüde azaltmış, yoksulluk ve eşitsizlikleri süreklileştirmiş ve sosyal politikanın neoliberal dönüşümü yoksullaşma sürecini hızlandıran bir etmen olarak hareket etmiştir.

Dördüncü bölüm, üçüncü bölümde sunulan tarihsel dönüşümü temel almakta ve Türkiye’de çocuk işçiliğinin mevcut durumuna ve yeniden üretimine ilişkin bütüncül bir değerlendirme yapmayı hedeflemektedir. Bu sebeple, Türkiye’de çocuk işçiliğinin değişimi kapitalist gelişme bağlamında ele alınmıştır. Türkiye’de post-Fordist üretim, finansal serbestleşme ve finansa dayalı büyüme modelinin Türkiye örneğindeki tezahür biçimleri tartışılmış; göç ve kentleşme ile eşitsizliklerin yeniden üretiminin temel dinamikleri ele alınmıştır. Bu kapsamda, 1970’lerden bu yana farklı görünümlere bürünerek varlığını sürdüren neoliberal üretim ve birikim modelinin Türkiye’de çocuk işçiliğinin yaygınlaşması, yeni özellikler edinmesi ve daha uzun erimli sonuçlar doğurmasına olanak sağlayan makroekonomik ortamı hazırladığı ifade edilmiştir. Finansallaşmaya dayalı sermaye birikim modeli, reel ücretlerin baskılanması, işsizlik (Yılmaz and Dülgerler 2011; Onaran 2002; Yücesan-Özdemir 2003; Köse and Öncü 2003) ve yoksulluk ile doğrudan ilişkili bir etmen olarak sunulmuştur.

Dördüncü bölümde ele alındığı üzere; Türkiye’de neoliberalizmin deneyimlenme biçimi, temel olarak üç döneme ayrılan bir tarihsel süreç içinde gerçekleşmiştir. 1980-1989 yılları arasındaki dönem ihracata yönelik büyüme stratejisi, finansal birikim modelinin gerçek üretimi dışlayıcı etkisi, reel ücretlerin baskı altında tutulması ve düşürülmesi, emeğin örgütlenmesini zayıflatmaya yönelik düzenlemeler yapılması gibi etmenler tarafından şekillendirilmiştir. Bu dönemde yüksek düzeyde birikim ve büyüme hedeflenmiş, küresel ölçekte finansal alanda yapılan düzenlemeler Türkiye’de sermaye birikim modelinin yeniden şekillenmesine sebep olmuştur. 1989 yılında sermaye hareketlerinin serbestleştirilmesi ile Türkiye ekonomisi uluslararası sermayenin spekülasyon hareketlerine açılmıştır (Yeldan 2007: 2-14). 2000’li yıllardan itibaren finansal spekülasyona dayalı birikim modelinin işgücü üzerindeki olumsuz etkileri derinleşmiş, işgücü piyasasına güvencesizlik ve eğretilik hakim olmuştur (Ergüneş 2009; Onaran 2007: 5-6). Dördüncü bölümde yer alan tartışma ve analizler aracılığıyla Türkiye’de çocuk işçiliğinin boyutları ve niteliği neoliberal proje

kapsamında analiz edilmiştir. Reel üretim ile finansal spekülasyona dayalı birikim modelinin, çocukların işgücü piyasasının aktif birer aktörü olarak konumlandırılması üzerindeki etkileri tartışılmış ve reel üretimin finansal hareketlerin devasa büyüklükleri ve yüksek düzeyde rant yaratan doğası karşısında ikincil konuma düşmesinin temel sebebinin Türkiye'nin "yeni küresel işbölümüne" eklenme biçiminde yattığı belirtilmiştir. Tarımsal çözülme ve göç dalgaları, söz konusu eklenmenin sosyo-ekonomik birer yansıması olarak ele alınmış; küresel düzeyde benimsenmiş olan yeni üretim ve organizasyon biçimleri bu süreçleri hızlandıran, derinleştiren ve farklı mekansal düzlemlerde farklı görünümlere bürünerek varlığını 2000'li yıllarda da sürdüren olgular olarak analize dahil edilmiştir.

1898'dan günümüze kadarki süreci kapsayan söz konusu dönemlendirme, Türkiye'de tarımsal çözülme, göç ve yoksulluğun yeniden üretimi bağlamında çocuk işçiliğinin yeniden üretimine ortam sağlayan koşulların yaratıldığı tarihsel süreci ortaya koymak için sunulmuş olup yoksulluğun kentsel mekandaki derinleşme süreci de bu tarihsel sürece dayandırılmıştır. Fordizmin krizi ile başlayan süreç, tarımsal çözülme ve göçün ardından kentsel mekanda ortaya çıkan yeni yoksulluk biçimleri ile yapısal düzeyde yakından ilişkili bir olgu olarak ele alınmış ve bu yapısal değişiklikler çocuk işçiliğinin kentsel mekanda yeni biçim ve nitelikler kazanarak sürmesinin altında yatan temel nedenleri doğuran süreçler olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Türkiye'de kentsel mekanda ortaya çıkan yeni yoksulluk biçimleri post-Fordist üretim ile birlikte kırsal mekânın dönüşümünün kent mekânını dönüştüren süreçleri de tetiklediği belirtilmiş ve bu değişimler reel üretimden ziyade finansal sermaye hareketlerinin serbestleşmesine dayalı büyüme modeli tarafından belirlenen olgular olarak ele alınmıştır. Büyük bir hızla artan finansal hareketler her iki mekansal düzlemde hanehalklarının benimsedikleri geçim stratejilerini derinden etkilemiş ve özellikle üreten kesimler için derinleşen bir yoksulluk ve sosyal dışlanma sürecinin de tetikleyicisi olmuştur. İstihdam ve işgücü piyasası üzerinde geri döndürülemez etkileri bulunan finansal dayalı büyüme

modeli çalışan kitleler için yoksullaştırıcı etkiler yaratmış; istihdamın güvencesizleşmesi, eğretileşmesi ve “esnekleşmesi” suretiyle yoksulluğu farklı düzeylerde derinleştirmiştir. Söz konusu analiz aracılığıyla, finansal serbestleşmenin kırsal ve kentsel mekanda kitlelerin geçimlerini etkileme biçimleri üzerinde durulmuş ve çocuk işçiliğinin mekansal boyuttaki değişimini hazırlayan tarihsel süreç analiz edilmiştir.

Hakim söylem tarafından birbirinden kopuk değişkenler olarak ele alınan faktörler olarak yoksulluk, göç kentleşme ve teknolojik gelişme arasındaki bağlantılar daha açık bir şekilde ortaya konmuş ve çocuk işçiliğinin Türkiye'nin mevcut ekonomik ve toplumsal görünümünü oluşturan etmenler arasındaki nedensellik bağları yoluyla tarihsel süreçler tarafından oluşturulduğu belirtilmiştir. Türkiye'deki sosyal politika yapım ve uygulama süreçlerinin değişimi yoksulluk ve eşitsizliklerin yeniden üretiminin temel mekanizması olarak sunulmuştur. Çocuk işçiliği neoliberalizmin yükselişi ve finansal serbestleşmeye dayalı büyüme modeli tarafından yaratılan “istihdam yaratmayan büyüme”, sosyal politikanın kapsamının daralması, emeğin metalaşması ve finansallaşmanın temel mekansal boyutu olarak kentsel mekânın üretim anlamında yeni işlev ve görevler üstlenmesi ile derinleşmiş ve süreklileşmiştir. Devletin sosyal alandaki etkinliğinin azalması ve sosyal politikanın neoliberal çerçevede yeniden tanımlanması (Buğra 2008; Köse and Öncü 2003; Fine 2009a, Fine 2009b; Buğra and Keyder 2006), igücü piyasasının artan segmentasyonu, eğreti üretim ve istihdam biçimlerinin yaygınlaşması (Yeldan 2006; Yeldan 2012; Boratav 2003; Yücesan-Özdemir 2003) ve reel ücretlerin baskı altında tutulması ile birleşince emeğin metalaşmasını hızlandırmış ve çocuk işçiliğini mekansal, cinsiyet-temelli ve yasal süreçler ekseninde süreklileştirmiştir. Devletin sosyal hizmet sağlayıcılığı rolünden sıyrılmaya başlamasından geriye kalan boşluk sosyal yardım uygulamaları ile doldurulmaya çalışılmıştır ancak sosyal yardımın kurgulanış, uygulanış ve dağıtım mekanizmaları zaman içinde farklılık göstermeye açık ve büyük ölçüde keyfi olduğundan sosyal yardımın bir sosyal politika aracı olarak vurgulanması sosyal hizmetleri dışlayıcı ve yoksulluğu

derinleştirici bir rol oynamıştır. Bu noktada özel sektör bir hizmet sağlayıcı olarak devreye girmiş ve özellikle sosyal güvenlik, sağlık ve eğitim gibi temel sosyal hizmetlerin kar güdüsü ile sunumu, bu hizmetlere erişim konusunda ciddi sorunlar doğurmuştur. Bireylerin geçimleri giderek daha yoğun bir biçimde ekonomik alandaki etkinlikleri ve işgücü piyasasına katılım durumları temelinde şekillenmektedir ve bu durum “aktivasyon”, “sosyal girişimcilik” ve “üretime daha fazla katılım” gibi söylemlerle sürdürülmekte emeğin yeniden metalaşmasını kolaylaştıran bir etken olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır (Yücesan-Özdemir 2014; Buğra and Keyder 2006; Buğra 2008).

Dördüncü bölüm kapsamında i) Türkiye’de çocuğun ve çocuk işçiliğinin kavramsallaştırılmasındaki dönüşüm, ii) neoliberal dönemde işgücü piyasasında yaşanan değişim bağlamında çalışan çocuk oranlarındaki değişim ve iii) çocuklar tarafından gerçekleştirilmekte olan işlerin kapsamındaki farklılaşma ele alınmıştır.

Söz konusu üç temel başlığın tümünü etkileyen unsurlar olarak mekansal boyut, cinsiyet-temelli yeniden yapılanma ve konuya ilişkin yasal çerçeve çocuk işçiliğinin neoliberal dönüşümünün içeriğini çok boyutlu bir şekilde yansıtılabilmek amacıyla yatay konular olarak ele alınmıştır. Bu bağlamda, konunun mekansal boyutunu yansıtmak amacıyla kırsal ve kentte çocuk işçiliğinin görünümüne değinilmiştir. Ayrıca çocuk işçiliğinin, çocukların eğitime katılımları üzerindeki olumsuz etkileri üzerinde durulmuş, hanehalkı düzeyindeki geçinme stratejilerinden biri olarak çocuk işçiliğinin araçsal boyutunun yanı sıra kırsal ve kentsel mekandaki dönüşümün çocukların eğitim hayatlarını etkileyen önemli unsurlar olduğu vurgulanmıştır.

Üretim ve birikimin neoliberal dönüşümü çocuğun ve çocuk işçiliğinin yeniden tanımlanması sürecini de beraberinde getirmiştir. Bu bağlamda, çocuk kavramı da yeniden şekillenmiş ve yasal düzenlemeler gerek çocuk gerekse çocuk işçiliği kavramlarının kazandığı anlamlara paralel bir biçimde değişikliğe uğramıştır. Çocuk emeği, kapitalist arz-talep mekanizması ekseninde piyasada yeni işlevler

üstlenmiş ve yasal düzenlemeler 15 yaşın altındaki bireyleri işgücüne katılım bağlamında inaktif aktörler olarak ele alsa da, eğreti, güvencesiz ve “esnek” çalışma biçimlerinin yaygınlaşması (Hopkins et.al. 1996; Independent Social Scientists 2001), “uysal” ve “idare edilebilir” (Bakırcı 2002) olarak görülen çocuk emeğinin daha yaygın bir şekilde talep edilmesi ile sonuçlanmış, ayrıca reel üretimin dışlanması (Yentürk 2003) sonucu ortaya çıkan istihdam yaratmayan büyüme modeli işsizliği artırdığı ölçüde (Yılmaz and Dülgerler 2011; Onaran 2002; Yücesan-Özdemir 2003; Köse and Öncü 2003) yoksulluğu ve eşitsizlikleri de artırmış (Buğra 2008; Kaygalak 2009; Işık and Pınarcıoğlu 2001; Işık and Pınarcıoğlu 2003) ve çocuk emeği arzını artırmıştır (Erder 1998 cited in Kaygalak 2009; Yücesan- Özdemir and Özdemir 2010; Boratav and Yeldan 2001). Bu koşullar altında, yasal düzenlemeler tarafından belirlenmiş olan yaş sınırlamaları pratik düzeyde beklenen kısıtlayıcılığa ve caydırıcılığa yol açmamakta, neoliberal dönüşüm yaştan bağımsız olarak, daha yüksek kar ve artık değer oranları elde edilmesi amacıyla bireylerin emeğini talep etmekte ve kitleleri yoksullaştıran sermaye birikim süreçleri bu talebe hızlı ve sürekli bir biçimde cevap verilmesine sebep olmaktadır.

Türkiye’de 1990’lardan bu yana ücretli ve ücretsiz işlerde çalışan çocuk oranları azalmış olmasına rağmen (TÜİK Çocuk İşgücü İstatistikleri) 2006-2012 yılları arasında ekonomik olarak aktif çocuk oranlarında bir azalma olmaması, çocuk işçiliği ile mücadele amacıyla gerçekleştirilmekte olan programların bu olguyu yaratan dinamiklerin derinlemesine bir analizinin yapılmasından ziyade yüzeysel ve kısa vadeli çözümler etrafında hareket edildiğini göstermektedir. Bu durum, 2012 yılı sonrasında çalışan çocuk oranlarından artış olması riskini barındırmaktadır. Çocuk işçi oranları kırsal ve kentsel alanlarda farklılık göstermekte olup 2012 yılı itibarıyla kırsal alandaki çocuk işçi oranları kentsel alandaki çocuk işçi oranlarından fazladır (TURKSTAT 2012 Labour Force Survey; Acar 2010). Bununla birlikte, 1994-1999 yılları arasında kentsel alanda ücretli bir ekonomik bir faaliyete katılan kız çocuk oranı artış göstermiştir (TÜİK Çocuk

İşgücü İstatistikleri 1994 ve 1999). Bu durum, cinsiyet rollerinin geçirgen bir düzlemde yer aldığı tespitini de doğrular niteliktedir. Ayrıca, 1999-2012 döneminde ulusal, kırsal ve kentsel düzeyde ev içi işlere katılan çocuk sayısı hem kız hem de erkek çocuklar için artış göstermiştir (TURKSTAT 2012 Child Labour Force Survey). Tarım sektöründe çalışan çocuk oranlarının son yıllarda artış göstermiş olması (TURKSTAT 2012 Child Labour Force Survey) kent ile kır ayrımının belirsizleşmekte olduğu ve kentsel alanların artan yoksulluk, sosyal dışlanma (Yılmaz 2008) ve “yarı-proleterleşme” (Keyder and Yenal 2013) sebebiyle çekiciliğini yitirmesi ile birlikte kırsal alandaki geçim stratejilerinin yeniden çeşitlenmeye başladığı ve 2000’li yıllardaki göç dalgasının kırdan kente doğru giden tek boyutlu bir nüfus hareket olmanın ötesinde farklı mekansal düzlemler arasındaki çok yönlü bir harekete işaret etmektedir (Öztürk 2012; Keyder ve Yenal 2011; Keyder ve Yenal 2011; Keyder and Yenal 2013). Çocuk işçiliğinin cinsiyet-temelli ve mekansal arzı ve talebi statik olmaktan çok değişken bir nitelik göstermekte olup bu alandaki temel belirleyen, makroekonomik yapı tarafından belirlenmek üzere belli bir yerde belli bir zaman dilimindeki geçim olanaklarıdır ve bu anlamda farklı mekanlar arasında yüksek düzeyde bir hareketlilik söz konusudur (Keyder and Yenal 2011; Keyder and Yenal 2013). Bu geçirgenlik, çocukların yaşadıkları yer ile yaptıkları işler arasında da doğrudan bir belirleyicilik ilişkisi kurmayı da olanaksız kılmaktadır, örneğin kırsal alanda yaşayan çocukların tarımsal işlerde kentsel alanda yaşayan çocukların ise sokakta çalıştığı gibi tek değişkenli tespitler durumun kapsamını ve niteliğini tam anlamıyla yansıtmaktan uzaktır (Gülçubuk 2012; Gülçubuk et. al. 2003). Neoliberal politikalar ile çocuk kavramının yeniden tanımlanması ve finansal hareketlerdeki serbestleşme ile birlikte kır ve kent mekanının da farklı işlevler kazanması, mekansal olarak çocuk işçiliğinin de biçim ve nitelik anlamında yeni boyutlar kazanmasına sebep olmuştur.

Toplumsal cinsiyet rollerinin çocuk işçiliğinin kapsamını, niteliğini ve boyutunu belirlemedeki rolünün neoliberalizm ile nasıl yeniden şekillendiği mevcut veriler

ışığında ele alınmıştır. Özellikle ev içindeki çalışma pratikleri düzeyinde kendini gösteren toplumsal cinsiyet rollerinin çocuk işçiliğinin değişen görünümü çerçevesinde yeni özellikler kazanmaya başlarken öte yandan bu rollerin çocukların ekonomik bir faaliyete katılım durumlarını belirleyen en temel faktörler arasında yer aldığı belirtilmiştir. Gerek küresel düzeyde gerekse Türkiye’de ekonomik faaliyetlere katılan erkek çocuk oranları kız çocuk oranlarından fazladır (TURKSTAT 2012 Child Labour Force Survey; ILO 2013:7) ancak mevcut veriler göç ve kentsel yoksulluk süreçlerinin erkek ve kız çocuk emeğinde meydana gelen niteliksel değişimler hakkında derinlemesine bilgi sağlamamaktadır. Ayrıca, kız çocukların daha fazla temsil edildiği ev içi çalışma pratiklerinin dönüşümü de yalnızca nicel veri analizi ile kavranamayacak kadar çok boyutlu ve çok değişkenlidir. Ayrıca, neoliberal dönüşüm ile birlikte daha önceden daha çok erkek çocuklar tarafından temsil edilen işlere kız çocuklarının katılımının artması, derinleşen yoksulluk karşısında toplumsal cinsiyet rollerinin belirsizleşebildiği bir geçirgenliğe işaret etmektedir (Şişman 2006; ILO 2004; Acar 2010; Buğra 2008; Kaygalak 2009; Tunalı 2003 cited in Akın 2009). Çocuk emeğinin ev ekseninde giderek yoğun bir biçimde kullanılması, yasal mekanizmalar yoluyla denetlenmesi zor olan istihdam biçimlerinin yaygınlaşmasına paralel bir biçimde meydana gelen bir değişim olup özellikle işgücü piyasasında 2000’li yıllardaki dönüşümün sonuçlarından birini teşkil etmektedir. Ayrıca, neoliberalizmin yükselişi ile birlikte hane de yeniden tanımlanmış olup ataerkil yapı kapitalist üretim biçiminin temel taşıyıcılarından biri olarak sistemin devamlılığı yönünde hareket ederken, öte yandan derinleşen yoksulluk ve eşitsizlikler ataerkil yapının da değişime uğramasına neden olmuştur.

Çocuk işçiliğine ilişkin yasal çerçeve çocuk işçiliğini üreten ve yeniden üreten asimetrik güç ilişkileri (Bakırcı 2002) çerçevesinde bir yatay konu olarak analize dahil edilmiştir. Çocuk işçiliğinin yasal düzenlemeler yoluyla azaltılması hedeflenirken yasaların kurgulanışı ve uygulanışı çocuk işçiliğini doğuran

asimetrik güç ilişkilerini (Bakırcı 2002) yeniden üreten bir mekanizma olarak hareket etmektedir.

Tez, sonuç bölümü ile sona ermektedir.

Appendix A
TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü X

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü

Enformatik Enstitüsü

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

YAZARIN

Soyadı : SAĞLAM
Adı : BURCU
Bölümü : SOSYAL POLİTİKA

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : TOWARDS AN APPRAISAL OF THE
ACADEMIC LITERATURE ON DETERMINANTS OF CHILD LABOUR IN
TURKEY

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans X Doktora

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

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ