

RURAL WOMEN IN TURKEY (1923-):
AN EXAMINATION OF THE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURE
AND THE ENVIRONMENT IN TURKEY THROUGH GENDER LENSES

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

BY

ÖZGE YÜKSEKKAYA

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

DECEMBER 2018

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

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

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşe İdil Aybars
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. Sheila Pelizzon
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aylin Topal (METU, ADM) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Sheila Pelizzon (METU, ECON) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Berker (Hacettepe Uni., EKO) _____

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 : ÖZGE YÜKSEKKAYA

Signature :

ABSTRACT

**RURAL WOMEN IN TURKEY (1923-):
AN EXAMINATION OF THE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURE
AND THE ENVIRONMENT IN TURKEY THROUGH GENDER LENSES**

Yüksekkaya, Özge

MSc., Department of Social Policy

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Sheila Pelizzon

December 2018, 187 pages

Although first development and later neoliberalism have been viewed as carriers of progress and prosperity, their non-economic costs, on rural women and the environment, have not received much attention. This thesis is an attempt to focus on the developments in the capitalist world economy and their effects on agriculture, peasant life and the environment in Turkey through an examination of the status of rural women by focusing on three time periods: The Early Republican era, the developmentalist period and the neoliberal stage. This thesis is not only an attempt to fill the gap in the existing literature, but it also aims to contribute to social policy making for the mentioned actors and to raise awareness on the issue.

Keywords: Development, Neoliberalism, Turkey, Rural Women, The Environment

ÖZ

TÜRKİYE’DE KIRSAL KADINLAR (1923-): TOPLUMSAL CİNSİYET MERCEĞİ İLE TÜRKİYE’DE TARIMIN VE ÇEVRENİN DÖNÜŞÜMÜ ÜZERİNE BİR İNCELEME

Yüksekkaya, Özge

Yüksek Lisans, Sosyal Politika Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Sheila Pelizzon

Aralık 2018, 187 sayfa

İlk olarak kalkınma ve daha sonra neoliberalizm ve küreselleşme, ilerleme ve refahın aracı olarak görülmelerine rağmen, ekonomik olmayan maliyetleri, özellikle kırsal kadın ve çevre üzerindeki, gereken dikkati çekmedi. Bu tez kapitalist dünya ekonomisindeki gelişmeler ve bunların Türkiye’de tarım, köylü hayatı ve çevre üzerindeki etkilerini kırsal kadının konumu üzerinden üç farklı döneme odaklanarak çalışmayı amaçlamaktadır. Sözü geçen üç zaman dilimi sırasıyla erken Cumhuriyet, kalkınmacı ve neoliberal dönemi içine almaktadır. Bu tez sadece var olan literatürdeki eksiklikleri tamamlamak için bir çabayı içermemekte, aynı zamanda sözü geçen aktörler için sosyal politika yapımına katkıda bulunmayı ve bu konuya dikkat çekmeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Kalkınma, Neoliberalizm, Türkiye, Kırsal Kadın, Çevre

To S.P. and all women

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Sheila Pelizzon for her continuous support and encouragement. She not only helped me keep on track throughout the thesis writing process, but she also enabled me to see the world from a different perspective. During our meetings she not only helped me improve my thesis but also widened my horizon on many diverse topics. She was patient and optimistic even when I despaired for not being able to fulfill her or my own expectations. She never stopped believing in me, and always encouraged me to continue my work by giving me the most valuable advices. She is the wisest, wittiest, most patient and thoughtful person I have ever had the chance of spending time with. Without her insights and criticism neither this thesis would be possible, nor would I be the person I am today.

The author would also like to thank the committee members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aylin Topal for her insightful and valuable comments regarding the thesis, and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Berker for his valuable questions and comments.

I thank my professors from the department of International Relations at METU, Assist. Prof. Dr. Ceren Ergenç, Assist. Prof. Dr. Onur Bahçecik and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özgehan Şenyuva for their inspirational lectures and for encouraging me to pursue my master's degree in Social Policy. I especially thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Ceren Ergenç for her continuous support and belief in me.

I would like to thank the library personnel for their patience and efforts as I ordered many books from the Books Stacks Collection, and I constantly bothered them with finding the books that were missing or misplaced. I thank the Graduate School of Social Sciences for teaching me that superfluous perfection may lead to destruction.

This study was supported by the Heinrich Böll Stiftung Association in Turkey. With their financial and professional support, they eased the thesis writing process considerably. I am deeply grateful to them.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my family who encouraged and supported me throughout my thesis writing. I cannot thank them enough for putting up with me during my distressful times. I am more than grateful to my sister Ezgi Yüksekaya who has always supported me and believed in me. I thank especially Cemile Pehlivan for her proofreading of the thesis, for her insightful and encouraging comments as well as for our talks about academic issues. I thank Deniz Perçin for giving me wise and comforting advices during my difficult times. Finally, I thank Kıymet Patır and Seda Yerli for their valuable assistance and unending support. I am also thankful to my friends Hüsne Karaçar and Benu Büken for their support, encouragement and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Justification	3
1.2 Literature Review	5
1.2.1 Development Literature	5
1.2.2 Women and Development Literature	7
1.2.3 Women and the Environment Literature	9
1.2.4 Turkish Agriculture Literature (1923-Today)	9
1.2.5 Rural Women in the Turkey Literature	10
1.2.6 Literature on the Environment in Turkey	12
1.3 Conceptual Framework	12
1.4 Procedure	14
2. THE EARLY REPUBLICAN PERIOD (1923-1939)	23
2.1 General Background	23
2.2 Rural Women in Turkey Between 1923-1939	27
2.2.1 Ideology	28
2.2.2 Social Status and Reproduction of Generations	32
2.2.3 General Background to Women’s Labor	33

2.2.3.1 Family Constellation and Women’s Labor	34
2.2.3.1.1 Zone 1	34
2.2.3.1.1.1 Class 1.....	34
2.2.3.1.1.2 Class 2	35
2.2.3.1.1.3 Class 3	36
2.2.3.1.2 Zone 2	36
2.2.3.1.2.1 Class 1	36
2.2.3.1.2.2 Class 2	36
2.2.3.1.2.3 Class 3	37
2.2.3.1.3 Zone 3	37
2.2.3.1.3.1 Class 1	37
2.2.3.1.3.2 Class 2	38
2.2.3.1.3.3 Class 3	38
2.2.4 Legal Status: Inheritance and Property Ownership	39
2.2.4.1 Zone 1	40
2.2.4.1.1 Class 1	40
2.2.4.1.2 Class 2	41
2.2.4.1.3 Class 3	41
2.2.4.2 Zone 2	41
2.2.4.2.1 Class 2	41
2.2.5.2.2 Class 3	42
2.2.4.3 Zone 3	42
2.2.4.3.1 Class 1	42
2.2.4.3.2 Class 3	42
2.2.5 Decision-making Capacity	43
2.2.5.1 Zone 1	43
2.2.5.1.1 Class 1	43
2.2.5.1.2 Class 2	43
2.2.5.1.3 Class 3.....	43
2.2.5.2 Zone 2	43
2.2.5.2.1 Class 2	43
2.2.5.2.2 Class 3	44

2.2.5.3 Zone 3	44
2.2.5.3.1 Class 1	44
2.2.5.3.2 Class 3	44
2.3 The Environment	44
2.4 Conclusion	44
3. THE DEVELOPMENTALIST PERIOD (1940-1967/73)	48
3.1 Introduction	48
3.2 World Conjuncture.....	48
3.3 Turkish Politics and Economy	49
3.4 Turkish Agriculture	50
3.5 Rural Women in Turkey between 1940-1967/73	56
3.5.1 Women and Development	56
3.5.2 Ideology	57
3.5.3 Social Status and Reproduction of Generations	57
3.5.4 Family Constellation and Women's Labor	59
3.5.4.1 Zone 1	59
3.5.4.1.1 Class 1	59
3.5.4.1.2 Class 2	59
3.5.4.1.3 Class 3	60
3.5.4.2 Zone 2	62
3.5.4.2.1 Class 1	62
3.5.4.2.2 Class 2	62
3.5.4.2.3 Class 3	64
3.5.4.3 Zone 3	64
3.5.4.3.1 Class 1	64
3.5.4.3.2 Class 2	65
3.5.4.3.3 Class 3	65
3.5.5 Ownership of Property	66
3.5.5.1 Zone 1	67
3.5.5.1.1 Class 1	67
3.5.5.1.2 Class 2	67

3.5.5.1.3 Class 3	67
3.5.5.2 Zone 2	68
3.5.5.2.1 Class 1	68
3.5.5.2.2 Class 2	68
3.5.5.2.3 Class 3	68
3.5.5.3 Zone 3	69
3.5.5.3.1 Class 1	69
3.5.5.3.2 Class 3	69
3.5.6 Decision-making Capacity	69
3.5.6.1 Zone 1	69
3.5.6.1.1 Class 1	69
3.5.6.1.2 Class 2	70
3.5.6.1.3 Class 3	70
3.5.6.2 Zone 2	70
3.5.6.2.1 Class 1	70
3.5.6.2.2 Class 2	71
3.5.6.2.3 Class 3	71
3.5.6.3 Zone 3	72
3.5.6.3.1 Class 1	72
3.5.6.3.2 Class 3	72
3.6 The Environment	72
3.7 Conclusion	77
4. THE NEOLIBERAL PERIOD (1967/1973	80
4.1 Introduction	80
4.2 World Conjuncture	80
4.3 Turkish Politics and Economy	85
4.4 Turkish Agriculture	86
4.5 Rural Women in Turkey since 1967/73	92
4.5.1 Women and Neoliberalism	92
4.5.2 Ideology	93
4.5.3 Social Status and Reproduction of Generations	94
4.5.4 Family Constellation and Women's Labor	100

4.5.4.1 Zone 1	100
4.5.4.1.1 Class 1	100
4.5.4.1.2 Class 2	101
4.5.4.1.3 Class 3	103
4.5.4.2 Zone 2	105
4.5.4.2.1 Class 1	105
4.5.4.2.2 Class 2	105
4.5.4.2.3 Class 3	107
4.5.4.3 Zone 3	107
4.5.4.3.1 Class 1	108
4.5.4.3.2 Class 2	108
4.5.4.3.3 Class 3	108
4.5.5 Ownership of Property	110
4.5.5.1 Zone 1	112
4.5.5.1.1 Class 1	112
4.5.5.1.2 Class 2	112
4.5.5.1.3 Class 3	112
4.5.5.2 Zone 2	113
4.5.5.2.1 Class 1	113
4.5.5.2.2 Class 2	113
4.5.5.2.3 Class 3	114
4.5.4.3 Zone 3	114
4.5.5.3.1 Class 1	114
4.5.5.3.2 Class 3	114
4.5.6 Decision-making Capacity.....	115
4.5.6.1 Zone 1	115
4.5.6.1.1 Class 1	115
4.5.6.1.2 Class 2	115
4.5.6.1.3 Class 3	116
4.5.6.2 Zone 2	116
4.5.6.2.1 Class 1	116
4.5.6.2.2 Class 2	116

4.5.6.2.3 Class 3	116
4.5.6.3 Zone 3	117
4.5.6.3.1 Class 1	117
4.5.6.3.2 Class 3	117
4.6 The Environment	117
4.7 Conclusion	120
5. CONCLUSION	124
REFERENCES	139
APPENDICES	
A. GROUPINGS OF RURAL CLASSES IN TURKEY	160
B. A SUMMARY IN TABLES	162
C. TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET	176
D. TEZ İZİN FORMU/THESIS PERMISSION FORM	188

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: Use of Agricultural Inputs in each Region	76
TABLE 2: Current Fertility, Turkey, 1998	95
TABLE 3: Current Fertility, Turkey, 2013	95
TABLE 4: The Use of Modern and Traditional Methods by Currently Married Women.....	97
TABLE 5: Fertility by Background Characteristics, 1998	98
TABLE 6: Fertility by Background Characteristics, 2013	99

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANAP – Anavatan Partisi (Motherland Party)

AoA - The Agreement on Agriculture

ARIP - Agricultural Reform Implementation Program

CHP – Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (Republican People’s Party)

DIS – Direct Income Support (Doğrudan Gelir Desteği)

DP – Demokrat Partisi (Democrat Party)

GAP - Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi- Southeastern Anatolia Development Project

GATT – General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

GMOs - Genetically Modified Organisms

IMF – International Monetary Bank

MARA - Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs

SAPs – Structural Adjustment Policies

TNCs – Transnational Companies

TRIPS – Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights

TZDK - Türkiye Zirai Donatım Kurumu (Turkish Agricultural Extension Agency)

WTO – World Trade Organization

CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION

First development and later neoliberalism have been fiercely advocated by people like Walt Whitman Rostow (1959), Alexander Gerschenkron (1962) and Milton Friedman (1962) as the carriers of progress, prosperity and liberty while the negative effects of their policies on what may be called the “factors of subsistence”¹ – time, labor and space, and on the rural women have been consistently overlooked. This thesis attempts to demonstrate the effects of changing agricultural policies on peasant life and on the environment in Turkey through an examination of the status of rural women.

Although the status of the rural women has never been very high in Turkey, it started to worsen in the 1950s with the new agricultural developments as well as waves of rural-urban migration. The process of migration was mainly caused by the mechanization in agriculture that was advocated by the development experts. Ester Boserup (1970), in *“Woman’s Role in Economic Development”*, explained that mechanization in agriculture generally led to an increase in the status of men *vis-à-vis* that of women due to technical knowledge and development projects that favored men. As a result of being discouraged from participating in from agricultural activities due to increased productivity of male-led agriculture, women left production whenever their husband increased the income of the family (Boserup, 1970). Furthermore, my personal contact with my relatives revealed that socially, things have gotten worse especially for women since the 1950s. This

¹ The term “factors of subsistence” was borrowed from my thesis advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Sheila Pelizzon. I am thankful to her for her contribution.

took place first in rural areas, then in the cities upon migration². Arguably, the most recent wave of the decline in the status of rural women has been caused by the penetration into the countryside of neoliberal policies. Neoliberalism can be defined as the increased infiltration of the free market into every sphere of the society and economy, and the creed that unencumbered markets will bring prosperity to all.

Considering all these processes, it is important to realize that what happened in the capitalist world economy were outcomes of the policies of the ruling elites of the core states. Then, these policies affected the lives of individuals. These three levels of analysis make up of the core of the thesis. For, the thesis explores how the core states and TNCs associated with them initiated the transformations in the global capitalist system, and how the resulting policies implemented by both core, semi-peripheral and peripheral states have affected the livelihoods of the people.

People like Vandana Shiva and Maria Mies (1993), Vandana Shiva (1988) and Gita Sen and Karen Grown (1987) have explained the effects of processes such as colonialism, development and neoliberalism on women and sometimes, the environment, in Third World countries. They came to the conclusion that things have gotten worse for women when policies that were affected by such processes were applied. Following this, our research question is ‘How did these trends play out in Turkey?’. Impression is that in spite of some social and historical differences, these trends reflected themselves in Turkey as well as in many other peripheral and semi-peripheral countries.

It is at the core of this thesis to explore the interrelated transformations that occur simultaneously in the lives of women and in the state of the environment. This will be done by focusing on agriculture which connects them. Women and the environment are linked in different ways. “Women relate to natural resources as part of their livelihood strategies” (McMichael, 2008, p. 255). That is, it is

² Migration has caused problems, as well but our primary focus is on the countryside.

women who engage in the provision of food and other necessary materials for living by using natural resources such as fuel, e.g. wood, and water (Boserup, 1970; Shiva, 1988; Sontheimer, 1991). Therefore, women, especially those women who constantly fight for survival by engaging in productive activities, reflect the 'subsistence perspective' which consists of the fundamental necessities of life. This is considered to be their main connection to nature (Shiva & Mies, 1993). Also, ecofeminist writers have established a parallel between patriarchal violence towards nature and towards women (Shiva & Mies, 1993).

Rural women have rarely been the main target of state policies since its establishment. However, development projects which ignored the wellbeing of rural women have contributed to the decline in the status of rural women as an 'unintended consequence'. Impression is that after the 1980s neoliberalism increased and deepened the existing inequalities between countries and between the rich and the poor within countries. This further worsened the status of rural women who have remained as a disadvantaged group for decades. This has partly been connected to disregard for the state of the environment in agricultural policies.

1.1 Justification

This thesis is an attempt to fill a gap in the literature of rural sociology in Turkey and contribute to the accumulation of a body of knowledge. The Turkish social science literature has many deficiencies regarding the effects of agricultural transformation on the female half of the population.

The rural areas have been neglected generally both in academic writing and in policy making for the past few decades in Turkey. However, this does not stem from the lack of problems in the rurality. On the contrary, the rural parts of Turkey have had their share of problems in line with the transformations that have been imposed on the entire world, and this has brought new challenges for the people who make a living through agricultural production, especially for rural women, and also for the environment. The latter has been on the passive side of

the agricultural practices shaped by human beings, and has been exploited in new ways. Excluding few exceptions, studies about Turkish agriculture have been dormant since the 1980s. Therefore, this thesis is an attempt to bring ‘The Agrarian Question’ and its effects back in the focus of social scientists in Turkey.

This study is necessary, it is argued, because the penetration of market forces into agriculture has affected rural women differently from men. This problem has demonstrated itself mainly in terms of certain imbalances in access to resources, and limitation to activities within the household once men and women left the countryside. This has affected women more than men as after migration women have tended to stay at home engaging in the reproduction of the household members while men went to find employment. Even when women found employment, they were often employed in the informal sector and the jobs they worked in brought less income to them relative to what the men earned³. Thus, migration has resulted in a clearer split in economic activities and a more gendered division of labor. This has disadvantaged women relative to men. Although this situation refers to the urban sphere after they leave the countryside and migrate to cities, and while this is also an effect of capital penetration, our primary focus is on what happens to rural women. Also, there is a strong connection between peasant women and the environment. But these were rarely mentioned by the policy makers and the academics. Although many studies paid sufficient attention to the transformations in peasant life and in agricultural practices, they ignored the role of rural women and the environment. These are the major deficiencies of conventional narratives and mainstream literature. This is true for example of Aydın (2010), Keyder (2009) and Keyder & Yenal (2011, 2013). This thesis attempts to counter the presumptions of the mainstream narratives and to fill a gap in the existing literature. The potential contribution of this thesis to the general body of knowledge is that there is no study which

³ Although in most of the production types women worked as unpaid family labor, they had access to real means of production and to the fruits of their labor, though not in monetary terms. But in cities, while some women were gainfully employed, this did not necessarily increase their welfare because of the increase in costs of living and lack of access to real means of production.

examined the agricultural transformation in Turkey through gender lenses with an attribution to the peasant life and the environment.

Finally, the thesis plays a role in raising awareness towards one of the most undermined, neglected and even disdained groups of people in the world. It is important for its ability to demonstrate how the prices of the certain policies imposed by the agencies of the capitalist world economy are paid by the people and the environment who once partially managed to remain outside of such global forces. Also, the thesis can potentially be used in social policy making processes to help rural women and to draw attention to the well-being of agricultural producers and of the environment.

1.2 Literature Review

In order to understand the dimensions of the transformation of agriculture and its effects on peasant life, on rural women and on the environment, we examine relevant literatures below.

1.2.1 Development Literature

It is important for this thesis to capture the meaning and trends in development in order to understand the relationship between development and agriculture, rural women and the environment. Therefore, a history of development ideas is presented.

Walt Whitman Rostow (1959) popularized the economic-oriented approach of modernization theory. According to him, economic growth was a linear set of stages which would eventually reach maturity when high consumption levels, high rates of urbanization and industrialization were achieved. Alexander Gerschenkron (1962) equated development with industrialization. He stated that in order to catch the opportunities presented by industrialization, backward countries should follow the line of ‘development’ of the advanced countries. According to Gerschenkron (1962), the same processes of industrialization could take place anywhere and anytime. Therefore, in order to achieve the level of

industrialization that advanced countries had, backward countries must have a long period of proper⁴ capital accumulation. Samuel Huntington (1973) considered development from the social, economic and political dimensions. He also associated social, political and economic change with urbanization, increased rate of literacy, industrialization, increased political consciousness and participation. All these authors viewed development as original and inherent in Western societies. All of them associated development with urbanization and industrialization by de-emphasizing the rurality and women⁵.

Modernization theory came under attack in the 1960s by scholars such as Andre Gunder Frank (1966) and Immanuel Wallerstein (1974). A. G. Frank (1966) saw underdevelopment as the result of centuries long unequal and exploitative relations between the satellite/periphery and metropolitan/core countries. Similarly, Wallerstein⁶ (1974) stated that the capitalist world-economy depended not only on the expropriation of the surplus value of laborers by owners of means of production, but also on the expropriation of surplus value of the entire world by core states. This process of expropriation occurred both in terms of agricultural and industrial capital (Wallerstein, 1974).

What was lacking in these works was the focus on agriculture/countryside and women. The mainstream development literature which viewed development as merely economic growth cared solely about urbanization and industrialization, which prevented it from seeing the inherent value of agriculture and agricultural

⁴ The adjective 'proper' is necessary here because Gerschenkron mentioned the possibility of capital owners not using the capital in industrial investment. Therefore, this is more about the conditions under which capital is accumulated and invested, not so much about the accumulation of capital *per se*. For further information, please see: Gerschenkron, A. (1962). *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective: A Book of Essays*. Belknap Press of Harvard University. p. 40

⁵ In general, development ideology and projects ignored women. But when they included women they did so mainly within the context of their reproductive role and birth control. This did not necessarily make a positive contribution towards women's status. For more information and a case study please see: Bunkle, P. (1993). "Calling the shots? The international politics of Depo-Provera." in *The Racial Economy of Science*, Bloomington Indiana: Indiana University Press.

⁶ Wallerstein did world-systems analysis which was different from dependency theorists.

producers. All of these scholars seem to have considered that development would affect men and women equally. The possible exception was McMichael (2008) who focused on the critique of development by reflecting on the three-way relationship between women, the environment and agriculture, and their transformations during different time periods.

1.2.2. Women and Development Literature

Second wave feminism raised a series of concerns, namely that women were excluded from development or did not benefit from it. The first feminist critique of development was *Woman's Role in Economic Development* by Ester Boserup (1970). In her work, Ester Boserup claimed that European powers' intervention in rural relations in Africa resulted in gender inequality as men were trusted with machines or supervising agricultural production. According to her, this discrimination created a difference between the levels of production of men and women, which eventually led to women's withdrawal from agriculture. As a result of gender inequality in education, the disadvantaged position of women continued in the city as uneducated women could not find many employment opportunities which were not low-paid or unskilled. As a solution to gender inequality, Boserup advocated education for women. This, she said, would lead to an increase in productivity and competitiveness on the part of women and improve their status. Whether it was the lack of education and productivity that led to women's subordination is another issue that needs to be raised. In spite of its groundbreaking character, *Woman's Role in Economic Development* maintained the common misjudgments of modernization theory. In several places of her book, she stated that migration to cities and transition from agricultural to non-agricultural activities was a necessary, but not in itself sufficient, precondition for economic development (1970, p. 158, 174). Barbara Rogers (1981) was influenced by Boserup's (1970) book and by neoliberalism. Rogers (1981) focused also on rural development. To counter the 'male-led' development efforts, she suggested that women would "be a powerful force for improvement in the success rate of development projects and programs provided they participate fully

in the benefits of these” (Rogers, 1981, p. 121). At best this is a statement which would see women and development benefiting each other, at worst it can be accused of using women as a means of helping development. Irene Tinker (1990) also wrote about the negative impacts of development on women. She claimed that planners who once opposed to the inclusion of women in development were now trying to design programs to make sure that women join and benefit from them. She mentioned that this was mainly a pragmatic strategy as involvement of women in such plans worked better and used the funds more efficiently. She claimed that this helped thousands of women to receive “credit or education or jobs” (Tinker, 1990, p. 5). Both Rogers (1981) and Tinker (1990) seem to have been influenced by market and have developed worldviews which regarded women as instrumental to the success of the market.

As opposed to these liberal interpretations of women and development, Gita Sen and Karen Grown claimed that “women’s experiences with processes of economic growth, commercialization and market expansion are determined by both gender and class” (1987, p. 25). They not only criticized the existing development efforts but they also brought a fresh look into women and development from the perspective of the Third World women, their cultural, political and economic oppression as well as their relationship with the environment. As a solution to women’s ‘underdevelopment’, Sen and Grown (1987) recommended the creation of women’s organizations for empowerment.

Throughout her book, Naila Kabeer (1994) focused on the theoretical explanations of women and development, its practice, and the relation between the theory and the practice with the help of some examples regarding the latter. She criticized development by saying that “...it has been the greed for profit of the few, backed up by control over the levers of power, that has shaped the patterns of distribution in development” (Kabeer, 1994, p. 70). She claimed that development projects did not regard women as productive and contributors to development but as passive and reproductive recipients. She also touched upon the ‘women question’ from the point of view of neoliberalism: after 1980, women

started to be seen as agents of development as food farmers, nimble fingers in export factories and as micro-entrepreneurs, and micro-credit recipients.

Although their work still counts as revolutionary for speaking out about what was lacking in the mainstream narratives, some of these authors tended to disregard agriculture, rural women and the environment (Kabeer, 1994), or sustained the misjudgments of the mainstream modernization theory regarding development (Boserup, 1970; Rogers, 1981; Tinker, 1990).

1.2.3. Women and the Environment Literature

As mentioned earlier, women and nature were seen to be connected through subsistence work, their productivity and receivers of male violence and domination (Shiva & Mies, 1993; Shiva, 1988; Sontheimer, 1991). In spite of these works, this area of research has been underexplored. There has been usually no focus on the relations between women and nature through changes in agriculture by relating it to economic, social and political dimensions of the capitalist world economy.

1.2.4. Turkish Agriculture Literature (1923-Today)

Among those who examined the historical evolution of Turkish agriculture, none have concentrated on the status of rural women and the state of the environment. Some studies focused on the history of the relationship between the state, non-state actors, international organizations and agriculture by relating them to happenings in the capitalist world economy (Keyder, 2009; Keyder & Yenal, 2013; Oral, Sarıbal & Şengül, 2013; Pamuk, 2009). On the other hand, authors like Zülküf Aydın (2010), Oğuz Oyan (2004) concentrated on the effects of neoliberalism rather than on the previous periods, with a minor focus on the employment aspects of agricultural transformation. Zülküf Aydın (2010) and Çağlar Keyder & Zafer Yenal (2011, 2013) also explained the processes of de-

peasantization⁷. Others wrote about the types of agricultural producers in Turkey and their evolution with agricultural transformation (Akşit, 1985; Keyder, 1983a, 1983b, 1993, 2009; Tekeli, 1977). Gülten Kazgan (2003), on the other hand, mentioned specifically the relationship between agriculture and economic development. While most of these authors examined Turkish agriculture as a whole, some others focused on case studies in different regions of the country (Hinderink & Kıray, 1970; Keyder & Yenal, 2011). This enabled us to learn more in detail the processes of transformation in regions with different landholding sizes, agricultural products, degrees of mechanization etc.

What none of this addressed were the issues of rural women and the state of the environment. Changes in agriculture do not affect men and women equally, a factor which has been ignored by development projects and these authors. The environment has tended to be viewed as the holder of an infinite amount of resources, which is clearly a misperception. To overcome these misjudgments, one needs to be more comprehensive in their understanding of agriculture.

1.2.5. Rural Women in the Turkey Literature

Many of the writings on Turkish women have been written from the point of view of urban women⁸. Deniz Kandiyoti (1997), in her book “*Cariyeler, Bacılar, Yurttaşlar*”, focused on the evolution of gender identities in Turkey, she looked at different relations which shaped this change. These different relations ranged from rural-urban migration to state, nationalism, religion and so on. The focus on rural women was very limited and took place only within the context of rural-urban migration. Similarly, it was hard to find mentions of rural women in Saniye

⁷ De-peasantization and/or de-agrarianization were defined as “a long-term process of occupational adjustment, income-earning reorientation, social identification and spatial relocation of rural dwellers away from strictly agricultural based modes of livelihood” (Bryceson, 2002, p. 726).

⁸ For a striking study on the lack of studies on Turkish rural women, please see: Ecevit, Y. 2011. Türkiye’de Kadın Emeği Konulu Çalışmaların Feminist Tarihçesi. In *Birkaç Arpa Boyu... : 21. Yüzyıla Girerken. Türkiye’de Feminist Çalışmalar*. Prof. Dr. Nermin Abadan Unat’a Armağan, Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Dedeoğlu and Adem Elveren's book (2012) "*Türkiye'de Refah Devleti ve Kadın*" except for one article (Toksöz, 2012). Likewise, there were very few mentions of rural women in Nermin Abadan Unat's (1982) book "*Türk Toplumunda Kadın*". Other than these works, there were only a few people who focused directly on the status of rural women in Turkey such as Mehmet Ecevit (1991-3), Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör and Jeroen Smits (2007), Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör (2011), and Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör and Miki Suziki Him (2016). Status of rural women vis-à-vis men or urban populations (men and women) is related to changes in policy or world trends. But there is virtually nothing written about how changes in the capitalist world economy have affected rural women in Turkey. Also, none of these authors examined the relationship between rural women and the environment. We hope to make up for these deficiencies.

As opposed to the dominant ideas in the literature which mentioned the negative effects of rural-urban migration on women's status, Gülten Kazgan (1982, p. 147) claimed that migration to cities dramatically increased women's status and welfare. Although this was potentially the case in the sense of economic and material welfare⁹, there are a few dimensions to this that need to be taken into account. For instance, although the economic status of family may have increased because it acquired a monthly income in the city, this economic 'welfare' did not necessarily translate into an increase in women's welfare and status because it was not equally distributed among family members. Although rarely mentioned, this rise in income was generally matched by an increase in the costs of living, which in real terms simply resulted in zero-sum gain. Besides, the existence of things like infrastructure or paid employment in the city should be juxtaposed with the withdrawal of women from economic and social activities when they migrate. Thus, it appears that city life does not always bring improvement for women's status although it may improve consumption levels. It is possible that Gülten Kazgan (1982), who assumed that it does, took into account only the economic side of the issue without considering social variables.

⁹ By material welfare we mean the existence of running water, electricity, infrastructure etc.

1.2.6. Literature on the Environment in Turkey

While the literature on agricultural transformation underexplored the status of rural women in Turkey, it almost totally overlooked the effects of transformation on the question of environment. There was only marginal attention to the issue in the works of very few authors that were examined in the previous sections (Kazgan, 2003; Keyder & Yenal, 2013). One resource that dealt with the environmental degradation that came with neoliberalism did so from a non-agricultural perspective (Arsel, 2012). In other words, it did not reflect the link between the agricultural transformation and the state of the environment. Authors such as Hoşgör (2011), Hoşgör & Him (2016), Hoşgör & Smits (2007), who focused on the changes in agriculture and rural women did so without focusing on the environment.

On the other hand, those authors who referred to environmental degradation affected by agriculture did so without direct reference to transformations in the global world economy or women (Aksoy & Özsoy, 2013; Barlas, 2013; Yazgan, 2003). Moreover, few authors who examined the effects of neoliberal agricultural transformation on the environment dealt with the transformations taking place globally without paying attention to Turkey in particular (Atalık, 2013; Aysu, 2015). To prevent such confusions, this subject area needs further research which focuses on the state of the environment with its implications on rural women as it is affected by the neoliberal agricultural transformation in Turkey.

1.3. Conceptual Framework

Most of the works examined above point to the missing points that motivated the writing of this thesis. After having examined them, we also would like to give the accounts of certain works that are parallel to what we will do regarding Turkey. The works to be mentioned have successfully conveyed the relationship between women and general economic trends in the peripheral and semi-peripheral countries from a critical point of view, by doing class analysis and by sometimes including the environment. To examine these works is important for

our broader conceptual framework as our analysis has many similarities with these cases. Although there are several works written on this issue, it should suffice to look at two of the most prominent works, to convey the general idea.

In *Development, Crises, and Alternative Visions: Third World Women's Perspectives*, Gita Sen and Karen Grown (1987) explained experiences of women from different classes with processes of development. They also focused on many other issues such as militarization and violence, the effects of debt crisis on women and so on. Unlike proponents of development, they viewed development from a critical perspective, they refrained from claiming that there was only one method and line of 'development' that was symbolized by the Western countries and that it would eventually benefit all. Instead, they claimed that the beneficiaries of development were far from being the majority, and exploitative relations between countries and between men and women during and as a consequence of the processes of so-called economic growth could not be ignored. Moreover, they emphasized that the experiences of men and women with development were different, and that women's encounter with commercialization and economic growth were determined by their class as well as their gender. They were sensitive to many issues ranging from women's labor, to their property ownership, their access to common resources, women's reproductive rights etc. Albeit marginally, they also mentioned women's relationship with the environment.

In their book *Ecofeminism*, Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva (1993) also looked at the effects of development on women and the environment in the Third World countries. They criticized development for its restrictive characteristic and having adverse effects on women and on the environment. In addition, they also mentioned the inequalities between countries and the possibility or desirability of the Third World countries to 'catch up' development level of the Western countries. They paid extensive attention to women's relationship with the environment, women's role in preserving biodiversity and how development resulted in poverty and environmental degradation. They presented a critique of the modern science and formulated a new 'feminist' research. In *Ecofeminism*, it

is also possible to find accounts of women's reproductive rights and challenges that face them and a critique of the effects of world trade on agriculture in addition to many others. In short, both Mies and Shiva (1993) helped to bring a critique of the mainstream development by pointing at inequalities and relationships of exploitation among countries, and they avoided falling the trap of excluding women and the environment while doing so. By criticizing the effects of development on especially poor women and the environment in the Third World countries, they avoided the pitfalls of liberal feminism which urged further development and commercialization for women's wellbeing. By considering poorer women and the environment that have been omitted from the analysis of development or women, they drew significant attention.

Our focus is similar to the focus of these scholars. We, too, look at the effects of development and its paradigms on women and the environment. Although these works examined both rural and urban women, our focus is primarily on rural women. Although the works provided by these authors are quite extensive in geographical scope, our primary focus will be on Turkey, but as we will mention parallels between Turkey and other third World countries should be kept in mind. Similar to these authors, especially to Gita Sen and Karen Grown (1987, p. 9), we, too, try "to link ... the micro-level activities to a macro-level perspective". While they also explained colonial rule in the Third World prior to development, due to historical and social differences we will suffice to mention the Republican period in Turkey.

1.4 Procedure

This thesis will concentrate on the relationship between the developments in the capitalist world economy and their implications for the status of rural women through an investigation of agriculture and the environment in Turkey. In the following chapters, 'pictures' of three time periods in Turkish agriculture will be presented with reference to its implications on rural women and the environment. These periods reflect the world economic trends and will consist of: 1923-1939, 1940-1967/73, and 1967/73 to the present. A chapter on each will be given. While

the main focus is to be on the time periods 1940-1967/73 and 1967/73 to the present, the second chapter deals with 1923-1939 period as a base and a point of departure. These periods have been selected on the basis of the operation of the world-system, role of the state in economy, significant social, political, economic and technological changes, and broad agricultural changes that correspond to each period. The thesis will be written from a critical position that counters the conventional narratives and mainstream literature namely that modernization enhances women's status (Rogers, 1981; Tinker, 1990).

We will make use of historical-comparative research throughout the thesis because we aim at an understanding of long-term societal change and attempt to explore the general trends that have occurred in the society. Also, understanding the changes in women's status can only be possible through a comparison across different periods. For this, we will try to combine historical macro-foundations with micro-behavior, describe both layers and link them to one another (Katznelson, 2003; Neuman, 2000). For, "neither the life of an individual nor the history of a society can be understood without understanding both" (Mills, 1959, p. 3). Both qualitative and quantitative; and primary and secondary data will be used.

While this thesis will be written within the context of Turkey, it is important to realize that these transformations have been and are taking place in many countries, most of which are located in the global South. This thesis deals with only a small sample of the bigger picture. Yet we attempt to frame the thesis with a world perspective, thus, the continuous connection to the wider world should be kept in mind. The thesis will be written within the conceptual framework of the World-Systems Analysis (Wallerstein, 1974, 1979a, 2004). Our unit of analysis is not only the nation-state, Turkey, *per se*, but we also would like to draw attention to the interactions between several units within the world-system. The world-systems analysis deals with "a spatial/temporal zone which cuts across many political and cultural units, one that represents an integrated zone of activity and institutions which obey certain systemic rules" (Wallerstein, 2004, p. 17). Also,

we will apply world-systems analysis¹⁰ into Turkish rurality. Although our study is smaller in scale and more limited in terms of duration, we find it appropriate to borrow the concept of ‘Three Economic Zones’ analogy from world-system analysis (Wallerstein, 1979a). This is because of the existence of three economically differentiated zones in Turkey¹¹. This differentiation was made on the basis of the degree of market orientation of each zone.

The three zones have been designated as follows. The first and most commoditized¹² zone (*Zone 1*) roughly covers the Western and Southern parts of the country along the_Mediterranean coast. It roughly extends along the coastal line from Edirne to Adana. It has traditionally had the highest degree of commoditization, market orientation and specialization in cash crop production. It had the earliest integration into the world markets, in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. This was in large part due to the closeness of these regions to “a commercial center and/or a large port and ease of transportation to and from market center[s]” (Margulies & Yıldızoğlu, 1987, p. 271). The land tenure in these regions has been a mixture of petty commodity production and big farms¹³. This region specializes in products such as figs, raisins, tobacco, olive oil and

¹⁰ Other methods and approaches will be adopted as needed in order to present as coherent a picture as possible of the processes that have undermined rural women in Turkey.

¹¹ In addition to defining the characteristics of each zone, it is also important to explain the relations and interaction between these zones. However, due to limited literature on the subject and spatial limitations, this could not be done here.

¹² Commercialization and commoditization can be understood as terms which explain market penetration into a peasant economy, but from different points of view. While commercialization reflects a modernist approach which understands this transition as ‘the liberation of the rational calculator’; commoditization, the Marxist approach, views the same transition as commoditization of ‘outputs, inputs, land and labor’. According to the latter, the producer is not freed, but forced to make rational decisions and accumulate to survive. While in commercialization approach the peasant converts into a farmer, in commoditization approach the peasant turns into a Petty Commodity Producer (PCP) (Keyder, 1993). As there is not much of a difference in their view regarding the transition process (Keyder, 1993), we will use both terms interchangeably.

¹³ Sharecroppers and landless peasants also existed.

opium (Jacoby, 2006; Keyder, 1981, 2009; Keyder & Yenal, 2013; Kurmuş, 1982; Margulies & Yıldızođlu, 1987; Oral, 2013a; Oral et al., 2013).

The medium zone (*Zone 2*) which includes the Black Sea and Central Anatolia regions is rather heterogeneous. This zone covers the coastal line of the Black Sea (Giresun, Gümüşhane, Kastamonu, Ordu, Rize, Samsun, Sinop, Trabzon, Zonguldak) and interior provinces which include provinces like Ankara, Bolu, Kütahya, Uşak, Afyon, Çankırı, Kayseri, Çorum, Nevşehir, Yozgat, Konya and Niğde. This less commoditized zone has had both subsistence¹⁴ and market orientation, and was integrated into world markets at a much later period¹⁵. Small/medium enterprises and ownership of small and medium parcels of land characterize these regions, with the exception of some large enterprises specializing in cereals and small numbers of sharecroppers and landless peasants. Grain (Central Anatolia), tea and hazelnuts (Black Sea) distinguish this zone from others (Keyder, 1981, 2009; Oral, 2013a).

The least commoditized zone (*Zone 3*) is Eastern and Southeastern Turkey, which includes Kahramanmaraş, Gaziantep, Şanlıurfa, Muş, Diyarbakır, Mardin, Erzincan, Erzurum, Kars, Hakkari, Bingöl, Bitlis, Ağrı, Elazığ, Sivas, Malatya, Adıyaman, Iğdır, Ardahan and Şanlıurfa. These regions have had the lowest degree of market orientation and commercialization. While the Eastern region has been more of an example of subsistence production with family labor; Southeastern Anatolia has been characterized by the existence of a rural labor

¹⁴ There are two possible trajectories for subsistence economies. The first path ends up with economic extinction because the villages which specialize in the cultivation in grains continue to do so even when the prospects of a surplus are low. This results in weak commercialization. In the absence of the existence of money income or possibility of diversifying economic activities, migration to cities takes place. This, in turn, contributes to a demographic decline in the village, and a limited number of people conducting subsistence activities. The second path ends up with subordinate commercialization. This characterizes the villages, which, unlike the former type, was able to market its agricultural surplus while continuing subsistence activities. Thus, these villages had a higher degree of commoditization (Keyder, 1983b).

¹⁵ Towards the end of the nineteenth century with the expansion of commercialization and due to the construction of railways, production for market in this zone increased. However, this was limited to a few provinces in the zone, the majority of provinces have remained outside of the process of integration into the world markets until the first half of the twentieth century (Oral, 2013a; Keyder, 2009).

market (Keyder, 1981; Margulies & Yıldızoğlu, 1987; Oral, 2013a; Oral et al., 2013). This zone has had large landowners, small family farms, sharecroppers and rural agricultural workers, small family enterprises and sharecroppers were geared mainly towards non-commercial production. On the other hand, the large landowners who used labor dependent on land transferred some of their surplus to market (Tekeli, 1977). These regions have specialized in the production of live animals, the main export has been a limited amount of angora wool (Keyder, 1981; Margulies & Yıldızoğlu, 1987; Oral, 2013a; Oral et al., 2013).

As it can be understood, there have been different classes in the Turkish countryside. Since rural transformation did not affect each class in the same way and also women's status did not remain the same across classes, this thesis should be sensitive to class. To simplify matters, we will divide rural social classes into three, in terms of the size of landholdings¹⁶, market orientation and the type of labor used¹⁷: the first class consists of large landowners producing either completely or partially for the market by relying on outside labor and/or mechanization. The second class includes medium and wealthy enterprises producing for the market by using family labor, and in later periods taking advantage of mechanization. The third class consists of small enterprises and agricultural workers (Akşit, 1985; Çınar & Silier, 1979). The former's land was not sufficient for the subsistence of the family and therefore they had to supplement it with outside work. Therefore, they either sold their labor or engaged

¹⁶ The size of the land is a contentious issue in classifying social classes. Several authors drew attention to the fact that land size by itself could not be used as criteria to define classes because different regions had different features (Boratav, 1980; Çınar & Silier, 1979). Therefore, type of product cultivated, quality of inputs used and regional characteristics should also be used to decide the rural class structure (Sirman-Eralp, 1988). When we talk about the size of landholdings, we refer to those large, medium and small landowners in accordance with the regional criteria, we do not mean definitive and general land size applicable to all producers in the country.

In addition to size of landholdings, type of product cultivated, quality of inputs used and regional characteristics have been used to decide the size of an enterprise (Sirman-Eralp, 1988).

¹⁷ You may find a graph regarding the rural class structure in the appendix.

in sharecropping¹⁸. An even lower group, agricultural workers, on the other hand, became wage-laborers. We can say that as one moves towards the upper segments of the class structure, market orientation and use of modern technology increases (Çınar & Silier, 1979). There have been different reactions within each social class to different social transformations.

The status of rural women changed in accordance with the size of the family (which changed in accordance with the size of the enterprise¹⁹), the type of the labor used in the enterprises, and the level of commoditization. In Turkey, large and wealthy landowners generally formed large families which were considered to be patrilineal²⁰ and patriarchal²¹ (Kandiyoti, 1997; Timur, 1972). The justification

¹⁸ Sharecroppers, who owned small parcels of land insufficient for subsistence, have had traditional agreements with landowners, which slightly differed from region to region. But in general, this agreement involved the provision of land and part of capital for production by the landowner; and labor and the remaining part of the capital by the sharecropper. The parties would share the output based on a previously agreed share, which was generally 50/50, which changed later (Boratav, 1980; Hinderink & Kıray, 1970; Morvaridi, 1992).

¹⁹ There has been a direct relationship between the size of the landholding, socioeconomic status and the size of the family. The larger the landholding, the wealthier the family, and the more extended the family has been (58.1%). This proportion of extended families decreased as one moved lower down the rural class structure. The lower strata tended to form nuclear families. For instance, 45.9 % of small landowners, 64% of sharecroppers and 79% of landless workers had nuclear families (Timur, 1981).

Also, these are general comments and they extend across regions. Therefore, for instance, the status of women in an upper class family in Zone 1 is more likely to be the same as that of an upper class family of Zone 2, rather than either one of them have in common with women in the lower classes.

²⁰ Kinship relations are based on the father's lineage (Timur, 1972).

²¹ Classical patriarchy was explained in terms of 'the rule of father within the family' and within work place. In this system there was clear dominance of old over young and of men over women. Also, the status of a person in the society was defined by family system (Kandiyoti, 1988; Timur, 1972), and by their occupation. Kandiyoti (1988) marked the breakdown of classical patriarchy with increased autonomy of sons after finding non-agricultural work. By not greatly diverging from this, we claim that patriarchy does not solely have social or cultural roots. One also needs to take into consideration its broader and perhaps more universal political and economic origins which result in subordination of women. In the contemporary world, dominance of men over women is maintained by the state mechanisms (Pelizzon, 2009). But this does not mean that women do not have resistance strategies to cope with such pressure or to increase their position relative to men.

for the continuation of large patriarchal families²² was said to be property, especially the desire to concentrate land, that emerged out of relations of production. When this property lost its importance so did the concept of the extended family (Timur, 1972).

To measure changes in status of rural women we have isolated the following variables: family constellation, women's access to property ownership through purchase or inheritance, and their access to knowledge and participation in decision-making processes within family. The first variable is important in showing the level of dependence on women's labor because in different families which own different sizes of land, the degree of need for women's labor is different. Since there is a parallel between the transformation of agriculture and patterns of landownership, family size and women's labor, this variable is necessary. The second variable refers to what conditions are present in women's access to owning property, what is the state's and society's position on the subject. Understanding the inequalities in access to ownership of property is important in showing how agricultural transformation affects rural women's status.

The final variable is about rural women's family voice, whether they have equal access to worldly knowledge, whether they can equally and fully participate in decisions regarding the selection of crops to cultivate, workers to hire, machinery to use, how to spend family income, entering into contractual relations etc. This variable, too, is a connection between rural transformation and rural women's status, as the degree of commercialization increases, the weight of such economic decisions also increases. Therefore, it can be a good criterion in understanding whether there are discrepancies in men and women's voice.

²² Although these families did exist, they were far from being the rule in Anatolia. The dominant idea that Anatolian society consisted of large patriarchal families before industrialization and modernization; and that only with modernization was there a transition to nuclear families does not seem to hold ground because the majority of the families were nuclear, both in the city and in the countryside (Timur, 1972; Vergin, 1985).

In addition to these variables, we will also look at some macro-level trends that concern rural women. These are; the views of general economic and political ideology that dominates the world at a given time towards women, state's ideology regarding rural women and patterns of social reproduction. Ideology is an important indicator in understanding the role and status of rural women within the hegemonic system and in the eyes of the state. Also, women's control over their bodies, and over the number of children they want to have is a significant factor in determining their status. However, this is also related to the state's population policies and the need for family labor in agricultural enterprises as well as the family's living standards.

These variables present a general understanding about the place of rural women within economy, society and family. We deliberately do not include a variable regarding women's participation in economic activities to measure their status because although there may be exceptions, work does not always translate into higher status. This assumption has been one of the main limitations of liberal and some Marxist feminists²³. However, based on the literature regarding family

²³ Another problem with the so-called 'Western Feminists' has been their understanding of the 'Third World women'. One reason why they came up with a definition of the 'Third World women' was to differentiate between 'Western women' defined as 'liberated, having control over their own bodies, and secular' vis-à-vis the 'Third World women' defined as 'underdeveloped, religious, veiled, dependent etc.' This led to 'not-so-real' generalizations about Third World women, which made them resemble a singular, unreal, homogenous group rather than plural, real and heterogeneous individuals. This has been regarded as a colonizing effect of Western Feminism.

Another issue was that many writings by the so-called 'Western Feminists' have generalized the 'Third World women' and regarded them as 'universal dependents'. According to 'Western Feminists', oppression did not take place in specific contexts or places, but was something that every woman of the Third World experienced before and after coming into contact with the 'oppressors'. Thus, women were regarded as a 'powerless' group even prior to interacting with others in the society, which made them more of a victim than they actually were (Mohanty, 1984). Making generalizations such as 'all women in the West are autarkic and all women in the Third World are dependents' does not only not reflect the reality but it also obscures the meanings and values attached to terms like autarky and dependency. For instance, in certain contexts, being a dependent and not having 'autarky' through work may be of high status, especially for women.

We are aware of this pitfall of making universal generalizations. To avoid this, we will try to explicitly state the specific contexts in which transformations take place. But even when we use phrases like 'patriarchal pressure remained intact in large families in the Mediterranean, Central Anatolia and Southeastern Anatolia', we do not mean that women in these families did not have any survival strategies to fight back. We do not think women are powerless victims of male oppression. We believe that women are actors who have the ability to change their situations. Also, it should be pointed out that the degree of what is considered to be a problem changed from

(Timur, 1972), we find it appropriate to establish a causal relationship between the size of the family and the degree of patriarchy²⁴. This results in the formation of a parallel between women's participation in economic activities and level of patriarchy because in enterprises relying on family (women's) labor, nuclear families which were considered to be less patriarchal prevailed. In short, women's economic participation did not directly increase their status, but most working women were found in nuclear families where patriarchy was claimed to be less important.

The variables will remain more or less the same across different time periods and regions as much as possible. However, there will be more emphasis on some variables in different time periods or regions. In addition, there is unevenness of data concerning different time periods, constants (agriculture, rural women and the environment) and variables. Not all periods and factors have been given equal attention in the literature. This thesis will have to reflect these deficiencies.

one class/gender to another. For instance, whereas the fact that a woman who was not employed in a formal job was considered to have low status by an academician or an upper class Western-oriented liberal Feminist, this may be a sign of high social status for the woman that does not work. As much as possible we will try to avoid such value-judgments. In order to close such a gap between different groups regarding perceptions, more studies at the societal level should be conducted.

²⁴ Within this context, the term patriarchy refers to the preference of boy children, imbalances among men and women in terms of ownership of property, household decision making power etc. which result in the domination of men within the household and community.

CHAPTER 2

THE EARLY REPUBLICAN PERIOD 1923-1939

The period from 1923 to 1939 has been included because it remains within the boundaries of the world economic downturn starting in 1918, because it marks a break from the Ottoman period, because it presents particular characteristics regarding the interaction of the state with economy and agriculture, and because it forms a point of comparison to what comes later.

2.1 General Background

Until the late 1940s, the structure of agriculture remained more or less the same in the country, namely one can observe the pattern with ‘Three Economic Zones’ and the various sizes of household and landholding. Although, exceptionally, small numbers of large commercial enterprises existed, most of the producers focused on non-commercial agriculture with ‘primitive’ means of production, and were either small and medium or large (feudal) in size (Özbay, 1990, 2015). Although in the following pages we also explained the large enterprises and women’s status in them, their numerical inferiority²⁵ to small and medium producers should be kept in mind. Considering that the situation of small subsistence producers did not change dramatically up to the 1950s, the following analysis will be made mainly in terms of commercial producers. During this period,

²⁵ According to a study made by P. M. Zhukovsky, in 1933 5% of families owned 65% of all land (Ünal, 2012) whereas around 97% of families operated “on holdings of less than 50 hectares” (Jacoby, 2006, p. 40). According to 1979 data, in Turkey, enterprises having 201-500 decares of land consisted of 3.1 % of all enterprises and held 17.9% of all land, and those enterprises which had more than 500 decares consisted of 0.6% of all enterprises and held 11.9% of all land (Çınar & Silier, 1979)

agriculture constituted the main economic channel of integration into the world economy; the economic surplus was produced mainly in the agricultural sector, and it was through the selling of this surplus in exchange for manufactured goods that ... [Turkey's] ... relationship ... [to] ... the world economy materialized (Keyder, 1981 p. 11).

Therefore, Turkey's function in the international division of labor was to specialize in agricultural production, as agriculture was the only sector in which the country could acquire surplus through commodity production (Keyder, 1981). Also, agriculture was the major source of national income in Turkey. According to 1935 data, 85% of the population lived in the countryside and engaged in subsistence agriculture (Birtek & Keyder; 2009; Hershlag, 1958; Jacoby, 2006; Keyder, 1981; Margulies & Yıldızoğlu, 1987; Oral et al., 2013; Özbay, 2015; Toksöz, 2011). Therefore, it was not surprising for the state to demonstrate a special interest in this sphere of the economy. The main aim of the state was "to protect the producer", "to base industrial development on local raw materials", "to encourage progress in transport, especially in railways" and "to bring about a rise in the level of production and standard of living of the villages" (Hershlag, 1958, p. 3). To do this, the state actively promoted commercialization especially among large landowners. During this period, the involvement of the non-state actors and their savings was limited, therefore, the state was the leading actor (Şenses, 2017; Toksöz, 2011).

For the purposes of increasing export-oriented production, in the first years of the republic, the state focused on the large landowners, mainly in the most commoditized zone (Gürel, 2014; Jacoby, 2006). This was in line with the world economic requirements to increase raw material and commodity production in the periphery. The state incentivized large producers to increase agricultural production by importing 2000 tractors and distributing them to big farmers, mainly in Cilician region (Birtek & Keyder, 2009). The state abolished tithe (*Ust/öşür/* agricultural tax) in 1925 as a concession to big landowners. It also distributed land to landless peasants in 1927, 1929 and 1934. However, this

distribution did not solve the problem of landlessness²⁶. Landless peasants continued to work as tenants or agricultural workers under difficult conditions during this period (Birtek & Keyder, 2009; Caporal, 1982; Hershlag, 1958; Jacoby, 2006; Keyder, 1981, 2009; Margulies & Yıldızoğlu, 1987; Oral et al., 2013). The state also regulated important agricultural matters such as “the extension of irrigation, distribution of plants and seeds, encouragement of certain produce such as hazelnuts, lemons, mandarins and tea” as well as cotton for industry, “support of plantations, and exemption of new vegetable gardens from taxes for a period of 10 years” (Hershlag, 1958, p. 54).

The production of cotton for industrial purposes was also promoted²⁷. Farmers were encouraged to establish cooperatives to sell their surplus and to buy inputs. The Republican state increased the activities of the Agricultural Bank²⁸ (*Ziraat Bankası*) that was created during the late nineteenth century. The bank was trusted with the “granting of loans, purchase and sale of agricultural produce, dealing in materials needed by the peasant, purchase of land and its improvement, participation in companies interested in agriculture, and normal banking activities” (Hershlag, 1958, p. 55). The Republican state also speeded up the process of railway and road construction to facilitate the movement of cereals and crops for export (Jacoby, 2006; Keyder, 1981; Margulies & Yıldızoğlu, 1987).

²⁶ According to a 1933 study, “more than 30% of 15 million peasants were landless” (Ünal, 2012, p. 25). But it is likely that this number was exaggerated. People like Çağlar Keyder and Şevket Pamuk (2009) said that the issue of landlessness and land reform was exaggerated for political purposes, that the reason why people were poor and working on someone else’s land was not because they did not have access to land but because they did not have means of production such as ox and plough.

²⁷ There were a number of other crops produced in the country. For instance, in *Zone 1*, sunflower seeds, olives, rice, corn, tobacco, vegetables and fruits, sugar beets, grains, cotton, figs, seedless grapes, citrus were produced. In *Zone 2*, wheat, barley, green lentils, chickpeas, beans, sugar beets, angora wool, tea, and hazelnuts were produced. In *Zone 3*, production of wheat, barley, lentils, cotton, sugar beets, grapes, apricots, livestock and wool production have been important (Ünal, 2012).

²⁸ This was a semi-official bank. However, the state was the main force behind its operations during this period.

Before 1929, the market oriented big farmers were the strategic allies of the state. This was mainly due to their role in producing surplus for the national and world market and because of their strong integration into the world economy. Before the economic crash of 1929, agricultural output in export products such as cotton, tobacco, figs increased mostly in the Aegean and Cilician regions (Margulies & Yıldızoğlu, 1987) due to favorable terms of trade. However, when the Great Depression²⁹ hit the world, as a result of reduced purchasing power, demand for commercial goods decreased. Following a reduction in the production of commercial goods, the country's exports also decreased. This mainly damaged the large landowners who engaged in production for the national and world market, and it also weakened their alliance with the state. This decrease in exports meant a reduction in foreign currency earnings, which the country needed in order to import staple goods. In order to make up for the lack of imports and to promote an autarkic development model, the state adopted import substitution policies in food materials by encouraging the production of staple goods within the country (Birttek & Keyder, 2009). This meant that the subsistence wheat and cereal producers of the Central Anatolia would have had to be integrated into the national economy by means of increased commercialization. Therefore, the state turned its attention from large producers to middle producers and the alliance between the state and the middle producers strengthened. As a result, small and medium producers in Central Anatolia increasingly started to produce for the market. The role of producing agricultural surplus and transferring this surplus into industry through state mechanisms was assigned to middle producers (Birttek & Keyder, 2009; Şenses, 2017).

The state tried to mitigate the effects of the world economic downturn on middle producers through price supports in 1932. When these price supports were combined with 50% increase in cultivated areas by 50% and an increase in the prices for agricultural goods in world markets, production increased. At first, the

²⁹ "The overproduction of agricultural products and the mounting stocks made agricultural prices vulnerable to shocks in demand, international lending and the international financial system. This disequilibrium allegedly accounted for the precipitous fall in agricultural prices during the depression" (Federico, 2005, p. 951)

symbiotic relationship between the state and peasantry benefited both of the parties. However, because of its market dependency, it also rendered the latter vulnerable to market prices, manufacturing goods and prices, and taxes that demanded a share from their produce. Therefore, the middle peasants who used to be uninterested in politics, became vested in political transformations that affected their conditions. A new politicized electorate was thus created.

There were several reasons why the state applied étatist policies in the 1930s. The first reason was, as mentioned, the lack of private capital accumulation. The second reason was the memory of the negative consequences of the liberal trade policies applied during the final period of the Ottoman Empire. And the final reason was the world conjuncture. Both the USSR and the capitalist countries such as the USA adopted policies that encouraged and promoted the state's active role in the economy. The USSR did this with central planning in order to increase industrialization, the USA did it by coming up with 'New Deal' which put aside market oriented policies (Şenses, 2017). Only in the last a couple of years of the 1940s, did the state allow private and foreign capital to accelerate its activities in the country. This was realized with concessions given in the form of Marshall Aid.

2.2 Rural Women in Turkey Between 1923-1939

In order to measure the status of rural women, we had isolated the following variables: ideology, social status and reproduction of generations, family constellation, women's access to property ownership, and decision-making capacity of women. These variables are important in understanding how women were viewed in the eyes of the state, how their status changed with agricultural transformation and across different classes.

2.2.1 Ideology

In the book called "*Turkish Woman in History*" which was published by the Ministry of Interior (1937), Anatolian women are praised for continuing the old Turkish civilization in their villages, and for working in the villages alongside

men and without veils (İncirlioğlu, 1998; Ministry of Interior, 1937). The following quotation from Atatürk explains this situation:

Let us study the situation in our country as it is to-day. We shall see two phases, one where women plough the fields with men, and ride to neighbouring villages to sell their eggs ... and corn, and after buying what they need, they return to their villages and assist their husbands and brothers in their various occupations. The legendary life behind latticed windows in our towns is undoubtedly due to the influence of the life of the Court on the population³⁰. Gentlemen, ignorance in our country is not limited to women, it's universal (Ministry of Interior, 1937, p. 25).

Even though the 'village woman' was seen as the real representative of Turkish women, most of the state policies aiming at 'modernity' did not reach them (Kandiyoti, 1997; Toska, 1998). The novelties such as the Civil Law, the right to vote and to be elected had been for a long time exclusively used by a small minority of urban bourgeoisies women (Arat, 1997; Kandiyoti, 1989). The state authorities who so desperately tried to erase the traces of the Ottoman influence in the society and attempted to modernize the country (Durakbaşa, 1998) found clothing (both men's and women's) one way of achieving change. For men, the Islamic way of dressing was prohibited in the Dress Code. For women to stop wearing veil, instead of decreeing a law, the state targeted gradual social change common behavior via speeches and encouragements (Arat, 1998a; Caporal, 1982; Kandiyoti, 1997) such as:

In some places I have seen women who put a piece of cloth or a towel or something like it over their faces . . . when a man passes by. What is the meaning and sense of this behavior? Gentlemen, can the mothers and daughters of a civilised [sic] nation adopt this strange manner, this barbarous posture? It is a spectacle that makes the nation an object of ridicule. It must be remedied at once (Vojdik, 2010, p. 678).

The Civil Law of 1926, adopted from Swiss Civil Code is also revealing vision of women in the eyes of the state. First of all, this Code, which replaced the

³⁰ This was probably a sign of family's status. It is important in demonstrating the status difference of women in urban and rural areas: one works, the other does not. While in the eyes of the state the rural women have the higher status because it fits into its ideology, in social life it is probably the urban women who have a higher (class) status.

Islamic rule present in the Ottoman Empire, was important in introducing gender equality in marriage, divorce, inheritance and child custody (Arat, 1998a, 1998b; Arat, 1989, 1997; Caporal, 1982; Kandiyoti, 1989; Ministry of Interior, 1937; Müftüler-Bac, 1999; Vojdik, 2010). However, in continuity with the previous Islamic Law, the Civil Code recognized the man and the father as the loyal head of the household³¹ (Arat, 1989, 1997; Müftüler-Bac, 1999; O’Neil & Toktaş, 2014). While this law abandoned the tradition of putting women under men’s tutelage; instead of adopting equality between the sexes, it made men the heads of households which gave them the right/priority to be the first among equals³² (Caporal, 1982). Arguably, this resulted in the social and legal domination and authority of men over women through state mechanisms, whereas earlier, this authority stemmed from the religion and customs. Most of these novelties in the legal area remained on paper for most women because in addition to Civil Law there was also the application of Sharia Law and customary Law in the country, which maintained unequal treatment against women (Caporal, 1982). Yet, women were given the right to vote in local elections in 1930, and in national elections in 1934 (Arat, 1998b; Arat, 1989, 1997; Kandiyoti, 1989; Ministry of Interior, 1937; Müftüler-Bac, 1999; Vojdik, 2010).

The evidence suggests that historically, women in Turkey have been seen as instruments of showing that the country was moving in a certain direction. During the Ottoman Empire, this direction was towards embracing the tradition of controlling women’s modesty through their clothes. In the Republican times, this direction was changed towards modernity and Westernization, which required women to be seen as Western-oriented, again through how they were dressed. The real purpose of changing women’s clothing was not to liberate women but use it as an instrument to give Turkey the appearance of a ‘civilized’ country acceptable

³¹ The head of the household was responsible for the choice of place of residence, sustenance of his wife and children, and he was personally responsible for his savings. For more information, please see: <http://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/5.3.743.pdf>

³² This regulation was changed in 2002 mainly due to harmonization processes with the EU, and made men and women fully equals in the family (Kavas & Thornton, 2013).

to the West (Arat 1998a; Arat, 1997; Gemalmaz, 2005; Kandiyoti, 1989; Müftüler-Bac, 1999; Vojdik, 2010). It marked a transition from the oppression of women by Islamic means to oppression of women by state means. This oppression came to light on several occasions when women were warned when they wore skirts that were 'too' short. Whenever they went slightly out of dressing norms; they were labeled as 'loose women'. The main purpose remained for women to preserve their 'virtue' as it was when they wore veils (Arat, 1998a; Durakbaşa, 1998; Kandiyoti, 1989; Müftüler-Bac, 1999; Tekeli, 1985).

During most of this period, the state focused on rural women mainly in terms of their reproductive roles. One of the most important reasons for this was the state's desire to make up for the population loss in previous wars and to raise loyal Turkish citizens (Tekeli, 1985). Even Atatürk, the founder of the country and an advocate of equality of men and women, was of the opinion that no other occupation should undermine women's 'duty' as mothers (Browning, 1985; Caporal, 1982; Durakbaşa, 1998; Kandiyoti, 1997; Müftüler-Bac, 1999). As an answer to the question by a woman 'What should Turkish women be like?', Atatürk said this:

The Turkish woman should be the most enlightened, most virtuous and most reserved woman of the world... The duty of the Turkish woman is raising generations that are capable of preserving and protecting the Turk with his mentality, strength and determination. The woman who is the source and social foundation of the nation can fulfill her duty if she is virtuous (Arat, 1998b, p. 5).

The state adopted different visions regarding rural women. As previously mentioned, it praised them for their hero-like roles in the war; and at the same time it also viewed them as instrumental in reproduction of the population and in helping urban women raise their status by participating in professional employment. Rural women were assigned what can be called an inferior and assistive role in the eyes of the state.

While *the modern Turkish woman* is taking part in the industrial, scientific, political and artistic progress *of the country; the brave*

villager is incessantly working *in her village* and with untiring efforts, forms a beautiful and loving model of self-sacrifice and devotion to her modern sisters who are engaged in various occupations³³. (Ministry of Interior, 1937, p. 33)

These words are quite condescending, and they put rural women at a subordinate level. This is in a way the state itself seeing urban women rising above the shoulders of rural women. While both rural and urban women were contemporaneous and modern, the former were seen as ‘pre-modern’ whose only job was to feed and support the urban women. All in all, rural women received almost zero benefits from the reforms, and were expected to sacrifice their interests and labor both for the social and economic development of the country, for men and urban women and for an emerging bourgeoisie.

During the Republican period³⁴, women’s education was deemed to be important. Educational policies had three purposes. The first one was to lead a class of women to higher education for them to become professionals. This role was fulfilled mainly by the middle and upper class urban women. Secondly, the state designed a special line of schools named the Girls’ Institutes for middle and upper class urban women which would help them become role models in line with the “state’s westernized, secular self-image”. Thus, both a new type of women’s identity was formed, and the state found itself a way to support and legitimize its power. These were “modern” institutions to “train housewives”. This was clear in their education programs; in addition to general knowledge on Turkish, geography, mathematics, history etc., they were also trained in occupational courses that consisted of fashion design, sewing-cutting, embroidery, childcare, cooking and house management (Gök, 2007, p. 96). Finally, as for the rural women, primary education was obligatory. But other than this limited window of education opportunity, rural women were expected to “work hard, produce more, and raise more children”. At best they only received 5 years of compulsory

³³ Emphasis added by the author.

³⁴ Although this was a symbol of the first period according to our timing, it continued into the second period, as well.

primary education. However, in general, gender bias dominated the education system of the Republic by assigning importance to the education of males; and by educating women in themes such as motherhood, household chores, or occupations such as midwifery, nursing etc. However, most of the educated women did not see this as a problem, they did not think the system was gender biased and they were content with the education they received (Arat, 1998b).

2.2.2 Social Status and Reproduction of Generations

During the Republican period, pro-natalist policies were adopted by the state. Because production was mainly non-mechanized and based on family labor during this period, the economic importance of children was high. During this period, families who depended on family labor for production also favored an increase in the birth rate because the ‘net wealth flow’ was from the young to the old people. In other words, among families where market economy and hired labor were not important, more children meant more family labor to be used in agriculture, and more wealth to be transferred to the elderly (Özbay, 2015). Besides, as land was relatively plentiful during this period, the introduction of commoditization and capital penetration into small family farms did not lead to a dispossession of land (Tekeli, 1985). Although commoditization increased family dependency on the market, the existence of unused land (Shorter, 1985; Karaömerlioğlu, 2000) to those who had labor and means to use it postponed the obligation of family to adjust its birth practices to changing economic conditions. Due to existence of land, increasingly more people could be accommodated on existing available land. Therefore, the elderly who were dominant in household decision-making did not choose to make decisions that would reduce the birth rate. (Özbay, 2015).

Socially, the status of rural women depended on their reproductive³⁵ role along with age-based seniority and their role as laborers. The older they got, the

³⁵ Reproduction refers to two things. 1. Generational reproduction. 2. Daily maintenance of the workforce.

more authority they acquired. Because the importance of old people in agriculture and within families was still important, age did bring status to old women who could exert control over their sons, daughters-in-law and even their husbands. Also, their status was improved when they gave birth to a child, especially to a male offspring (Kandiyoti, 1977, 1990; Toksöz, 2011).

2.2.3 General Background to Women's Labor

The Republican policy towards women in general was not gender equality but an expectation that women will fight for national development by putting their demands as women and as individuals second (Arat, 1998a; Kandiyoti, 1989; Müftüler-Bac, 1999). Neither Ottomans nor Republicans really cared about raising the status of women or liberating them, and in both cases, women were considered to be the 'second sex' (Arat, 1998a). What politicians in different time periods did was to legitimate their rule by using women as pawns (Kandiyoti, 1989, 1997).

Both during the First World War and the War of Independence, women participated in the wars either alongside men or by carrying war supplies or engaging in food production for the family and for the country³⁶ (Ministry of Interior, 1937). This contribution of women especially to winning the War of Independence did not go unnoticed by the founders of the Turkish state. Populist politicians praised the Anatolian peasant women who made many sacrifices to save the country from the enemies, and who lived in their villages without adopting the 'backward' clothing trends that the urban women had.

During 1923-1949, women's labor in agriculture was very important both because of the role of agriculture within the economy and because of the losses in male labor following the First World War and the War of Independence (Toksöz,

³⁶ It is claimed that once the war was over, the women went back home in silence (Tekeli, 1985). In spite of undertaking so called 'man's' tasks, the status of women or customs regarding their role in the society did not change radically (Arat, 1989).

2011). They either worked as non-paid laborers on their family farms, or as cheap labor in others' fields³⁷, especially in the production of labor intensive products such as sugar beet, cotton, tobacco and tea. Women engaged in many activities ranging from the preparation of land for production, to cultivation, harvesting, food processing and marketing. In spite of their importance, women's status in rural areas does not seem to have changed much since the Tanzimat period to the late 1940s (Arıkan, 1988; Caporal, 1982; Duben, 1985; Kandiyoti, 1977; Kırkpınar, 1998; Özçatalbaş & Özkan, 2016; Toksöz, 2011).

2.2.3.1 Family Constellation³⁸ and Women's Labor

2.2.3.1.1 Zone 1

2.2.3.1.1.1 Class 1

In spite of a short period during the 1930s, the commercially oriented large farms of *Zone 1* increased their market integration, and benefited from the periods of world economic expansion with the help of the state. They even had limited mechanization. Here the existence of large landholdings resulted in the continuation of joint families. However, as we have mentioned above, these producers were limited in number³⁹. In such upper-class families, women did not participate in agriculture when wage labor and mechanization could be used. They were mostly confined to domestic activities. Men, on the other hand, dealt with tasks that required the use of tractors, commercial transactions and supervision of

³⁷ Men also worked as cheap laborers in others' fields. However, it is logical to argue that women were paid less than men.

³⁸ Studies regarding family structure in the Turkish rurality in the Republican period with respect to different zones and classes are nearly non-existent. Therefore, we had to adapt the studies that mentioned later periods or derived general trends regarding the family constellation in the Turkish rurality to our class and zone analysis during this period.

³⁹ This is clear in Timur's (1972) family structure study. In this study, as opposed to 14.4% of extended patriarchal families formed by large landowners, nuclear families (67.4%) dominate. This was attributed to the numerical superiority of sharecroppers and tenants in the region. The study was conducted among a sample of 626 households.

production. This resulted in a strong sexual division of labor (Kandiyoti, 1997; Özbay, 2015)⁴⁰.

2.2.3.1.1.2 Class 2

Middle producers of this zone had continuing commercialization. Among these landowners, where commercial production was practiced, people tended to form nuclear families. In this production type, women's participation in agriculture increased due to further commercialization⁴¹. Even though mechanization was not visible, there was a gendered division of labor because men acquired dominance over commerce and interaction with the outside world whereas women dealt with agriculture and reproduction of the household (Ertürk, 1987; Kandiyoti, 1997; Sirman, 1990⁴²). But this division was less intensive than what was the case with large landowners of the same zone, due to lack of mechanization⁴³.

⁴⁰ These are general comments found in the works of these authors. Although these authors did not specifically talk about this period, zone or class, it is logical to suppose that these deductions also apply here because they present similar characteristics to what was mentioned in these works such as the existence of mechanization, commercialization, large landownership etc.

⁴¹ This increased labor was mainly due to women spending increasingly more time to produce for exchange and simultaneously engaging in household subsistence (Ertürk, 1987; Kandiyoti, 1997). It is logical to assume that this correlation was repeated in other places where similar processes took place.

⁴² Yakın Ertürk's (1987) article was a case study in Mardin in the late 1970s. Deniz Kandiyoti (1997) talked about general trends regarding family structure. Nükhet Sirman (1990) made her analysis in terms of cotton producers in an Aegean village presumably in the late 1980s. However, we found it logical to apply their general comments regarding effects of commercialization between sexes to other zones and time periods, as well because the conditions that brought about the transformations, i.e. commercialization, division of labor etc. are in common.

⁴³ This was inferred from the fact that 2000 tractors were bought in this period by the state with the intermediation of wealthy large landowners, and they were exclusively distributed to such large landowners mainly in the Cilician region (Birtek & Keyder, 2009). Under these conditions, it is logical to suppose that middle producers did not have enough resources to buy tractors, and therefore they did not have them.

2.2.3.1.1.3 Class 3

There were no data on commercial small landowners and sharecroppers in this zone. Therefore, our analysis of variables will not reflect on these groups.

Agricultural workers generally formed nuclear families. In such families both women and men, and even children had to sell their labor. Male heads of households made the deals with employers, and controlled the payments. Women's and children's labor were controlled by men (Kandiyoti, 1997).

2.2.3.1.2 Zone 2

2.2.3.1.2.1 Class 1

During this period, large landowners of this zone had not yet come into picture. Therefore, the following analysis of variables will be made without this class.

2.2.3.1.2.2 Class 2

In the 1930s, mainly as a result of the effects of the Great Depression and state policies, the small and middle producers of *Zone 2* were integrated into the market. As a result and due to factors such as favorable terms of trade and increase in cultivated areas, the production of cereals increased. Due to lack of mechanization, women's labor was used in agricultural production as well as in subsistence production and reproduction of the household. Among middle producers, similar processes to the same class in *Zone 1* were experienced, namely, commercialization, women's increased labor, and gendered division of labor (Ertürk, 1987; Kandiyoti, 1997; Sirman, 1990).

2.2.3.1.2.3 Class 3

Because of the wars and low living standards, male labor was scarce. Therefore, in order to make up for labor shortage, joint families in which three generations lived prevailed. In spite of the existence of large patriarchal families, due to lack of commercialization and mechanization, and due to the participation of women in agriculture, there was little sexual division of labor. Productive and reproductive activities were not separated from one another with definite lines. Women participated heavily in production, and men had responsibilities in reproduction, especially in the reproduction of family such as child raising (Özbay, 1990)⁴⁴.

Number of sharecroppers and landless peasants were limited here, so were the data about them. Therefore, they will not be explained here.

2.2.3.1.3 Zone 3

2.2.3.1.3.1 Class 1

As mentioned earlier, the commercialization waves of the Early Republican era hardly had any effect on this zone. Similar to *Zone 1*, large landowners here, too, formed joint families (Timur, 1972). Women did not participate in agriculture in such families and were confined to the domestic sphere. Men, on the other hand, dealt with the supervision of production, hiring workers etc. (Kandiyoti, 1997; Özbay, 2015; Tekeli, 1977). This resulted in sexual division of labor.

⁴⁴ These are general trends regarding the Republican period and small producers. Therefore, it is logical to assume that they also apply here.

2.2.3.1.3.2 Class 2

Middle producers in this zone did not exist.

2.2.3.1.3.3 Class 3

Small producers⁴⁵ generally formed nuclear families and operated in villages which remained relatively outside of market and state institutions⁴⁶. In these villages, women were “more effective in exerting control over resource management and daily activity” (Ertürk, 1987, 1991, p. 145). Women’s participation in production was more active in places where modernization was the least institutionalized, or in small producers relying on family labor which showed resistance to such processes, and in mountain villages rather than in plain villages. Since these producers depended heavily on family labor, although exploitation of women’s labor increased, they took active role in domestic and market production. This, according to Ertürk (1990), enabled women to find bargaining means in social relationships

Similar to that class of *Zone 1*, among landless agricultural workers of this zone, nuclear families were formed (Timur, 1972), all family labor was used, and men dealt with monetary transactions (Kandiyoti, 1997).

⁴⁵ One article we have found on subsistence oriented small producers was written in 1990 and reflected the situation of women in Eastern Anatolia presumably in the 1980s (Ertürk, 1990). However, since the specific conditions, namely, women’s active participation in production, lack of commercialization and mechanization etc., which led the author to reach the conclusion she reached can be applied to the period 1923-1939, we found it appropriate to apply it to the mentioned period and to small producers in Eastern Anatolia.

⁴⁶ Such villages which remained outside of the orbit of the market conducted their economic activities through reciprocity and exchange mechanisms. They exchanged goods either with their neighbors or with the grocery store found in the village, which maintained the village’s interaction with the outside world. Naturally, production in these villages was not oriented towards profit but towards subsistence (Akşit, 1966; Keyder, 2009).

2.2.4 Legal Status: Inheritance and Property⁴⁷ Ownership

Marriage and inheritance are two important ways for women to acquire property. With the introduction of Civil Law of 1926, gender equality in inheritance and property ownership was adopted (Arat, 1998b; Ministry of Interior, 1937; O'Neil & Toktaş, 2014, 2017). However, as noted, there was a big gap between the legal reforms and the reality of social life. Especially in the villages, village customs and Islamic Law (Caporal, 1982; Ministry of Interior, 1937; O'Neil & Toktaş, 2014) were used in the inheritance of land. These practices which favored men resulted in the unequal economic power of women who were either excluded from the process or were given a share of land that was less in quantity or worse in quality land than what they were entitled to by law. The fact that these were applied more often than the Civil Law in villages meant that women were disadvantaged in terms of inheritance of land and property rights in the villages in spite of legal changes (Caporal, 1982). Although this unlawful process could be challenged in court, most women did not seem to pursue this supposedly because of lack of knowledge, money and skill or because they did not want to risk alienating their family members (O'Neil & Toktaş, 2014; Uzun & Çolak, 2010).

One of the reasons for this discrimination was the notion that it was the sons who continued the patrilineage while daughters would marry into another family to continue their family line (Caporal, 1982; Duben, 1985; Kandiyoti, 1990; Uzun & Çolak, 2010). The desire of the family to keep the assets in a certain household

⁴⁷ We can differentiate several types of property within our context: land, agricultural machinery, sheep, cattle, houses and other buildings, bee hives etc. are capital goods that can be used to generate and accumulate wealth. They can be sold, rented, and used as collateral to borrow money. The second type of property, i.e. jewelry and some moveable property, is generally owned by women. Although these are a form of property, in most cases, they cannot be used as collateral to borrow money from banks (FAO, 2016). Jewelry can be used as a form of creating wealth when it is exchanged for money and then for a commodity or for the acquisition of a capital good. But it is quite difficult to do this and it is indirect which means that women have a harder time in becoming owners of property. Besides, there have been instances where women's jewelry that they received as bride-price was spent by their husbands and other male family members (Ilcan, 1994). Therefore, while the previous group can be used a form of property from which profit can be made, the second group is more of a commodity than property.

and to prevent land fragmentation reinforced gender inequality in inheritance and property ownership and resulted in the reaccumulation of land and other property in the hands of sons (Caporal, 1982; Kandiyoti, 1990). Another reason why women could not equally inherit land although they worked on the land maybe even more than men is because it was a common belief in the society, and in the capitalist world-economy, that processes related to buying and selling etc. should be under men's control (Uzun & Çolak, 2010). The resulting absence of women in market oriented families from all the processes in commodity chain such as marketing, transportation etc. except for production, resulted in their not having the material benefits of their labor both in terms of money and also in terms of land.

Although the law allowed separation of property between spouses as an egalitarian measure, this potentially had contradictory results in application. Most of the time the law ignored the fact that the reason why men could acquire property was because their wives took care of production and reproduction at home as a way to subsidize off-farm earnings⁴⁸ of their husbands. If before the marriage, the couple decided that they will have separate properties, the property of the husband acquired during marriage could be counted as his upon divorce or inheritance, and the effect of women's labor in the husband's acquiring such property would be discounted (Arat, 1989). In practice, the law ignored women's unpaid labor at home and ran into problems; as was the case in many other countries.

2.2.4.1 Zone 1

2.2.4.1.1 Class 1

In terms of property ownership, even though their number was limited, the entrance of tractors into agriculture by large landowners and their ownership by

⁴⁸ This was possible in the cases where male members of the household engaged in waged work, which would emerge in the later periods.

men resulted in an increase of the gaps in property ownership between men and women (Ecevit, 1994)⁴⁹. This was because tractors could be used to open more land to cultivation, to acquire rental income and to accumulate capital. This, in turn, would aggravate the already existing gaps in ownership of land, houses, cattle and sheep etc. between men and women.

2.2.4.1.2 Class 2

Mechanization did not yet exist among commercial middle producers. Therefore, gaps in property ownership in tractors had not begun yet, although it is logical to assume that there was differentiation between men and women in terms of land ownership and ownership of cattle, sheep etc. When opportunities to accumulate capital emerged in such families, such gaps changed household dynamics in favor of men because their ownership of capital advantaged them over women (Ecevit, 1994).

2.2.4.1.3 Class 3

In landless families, mechanization was not used. Therefore, property gaps between men and women in terms of tractors were invisible. Therefore, it is logical to suppose that although women did not receive money for their work, the near absence of mechanical and commercial processes which created gender hierarchies and inequalities in property ownership enabled women to preserve their status within the family.

2.2.4.2 Zone 2

2.2.4.2.1 Class 2

In commercial producers, tractors did not enter into production. However, gaps in property ownership in other types of property were visible. Similar to

⁴⁹ The statement that property ownership was gendered was a general statement in the work of Ecevit (1994), and because similar processes took place during this time in certain zones and classes, it was found appropriate to apply this idea here.

Zone 1, in case of opportunities to accumulate capital arose, ownership of property benefitted men (Ecevit, 1994).

2.2.4.2.2 *Class 3*

In small non-commercial producers, property inequalities stemming from tractors were not visible (Ecevit, 1994) but discrepancies in terms of other types of property such as house, land, sheep and cattle were⁵⁰. But, even though women did not legally own such property, they had use rights, they had access and control over their produce.

2.2.4.3 *Zone 3*

2.2.4.3.1 *Class 1*

Tractors were not visible in large landowners during this period⁵¹. Therefore, there were fewer gaps in terms of tractor ownership, but inequalities in the ownership of other property types such as land, sheep, cattle etc. were present.

2.2.4.3.2 *Class 3*

Among this class, similar patterns to small producers of *Zone 2*, and landless workers of *Zone 1* were observed.

⁵⁰ In his article Ecevit (1994) states that some people claim that such differences were not very significant in economic terms in a non- or little commodified system. The reason why differentiations in terms of other property types did not lead to gender inequality was because such families were unable to create a noticeable surplus that would create gaps in wealth. Therefore, it did not really matter who owned such property so long as capital was not accumulated in the family. However, Ecevit (1994) claims that such statements disregard property based inequalities. But he does not explicitly refute this claim, and he does not clearly answer the question; in a petty commodity producing household which cannot accumulate wealth, does it really matter who owns property other than issues of prestige and presumably more power in decision-making process?.

⁵¹ We inferred this from the fact that tractors were owned by large landowners in the Mediterranean during this period (Birttek & Keyder, 2009).

2.2.5 Decision-making Capacity

2.2.5.1 Zone 1

2.2.5.1.1 Class 1

In large landowning families, the entrance of limited mechanization and further commercialization increased men's power vis-à-vis women in the process of decision-making within the family. Among such extended families, it was almost always the old men who made decisions (Timur, 1972)⁵². Therefore, there was both an age and gender hierarchy.

2.2.5.1.2 Class 2

In terms of decision-making power, in middle producers, commercialization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women and older men (Ertürk, 1987)⁵³.

2.2.5.1.3 Class 3

Among landless families, lack of commercialization and presence of women's control over resources contributed to their decision-making power within family (Ertürk, 1987, 1990).

2.2.5.2 Zone 2

2.2.5.2.1 Class 2

Among middle producers, commercialization reduced women's decision-making capacity vis-à-vis men (Ertürk, 1987). However, it is logical to argue that this process was experienced here in a less intensive way because commercialization did not have as long of a history here as in *Zone 1*.

⁵² Although this was a 1968 study, because the the society had not changed by much until then, we found it logical to apply it to this period.

⁵³ This was a case study regarding Mardin in the late 1970s. However because it mentioned transition from subsistence to commercial economy among small producers, we believe that it can be applied to this period, and different zones and classes, as well.

2.2.5.2.2 *Class 3*

In small non-commercial production types, as women participated in production on relatively equal terms and as their labor was extremely needed, they applied a considerable amount of power in decision-making and they had control over their labor and their produce (Ertürk, 1987, 1990).

2.2.5.3 *Zone 3*

2.2.5.3.1 *Class 1*

In large landowning families, it is logical to argue that the inequalities in terms of ownership of property and women's confinement to household activities as well as existence of extended families reflected itself in inequalities in women's decision-making power (Timur, 1972).

2.2.5.3.2 *Class 3*

In small producers, processes similar to that of *Zone 2* were experienced, namely women exerting control over decision-making due to lesser commercialization (Ertürk, 1987, 1990).

Landless families of this zone have presented similar characteristics to those of *Zone 1* (Ertürk, 1987, 1990).

2.3 *The Environment*

The environment and the environmental destruction caused by agricultural practices did not receive attention during this period.

2.4 *Conclusion*

Within the sphere of national politics, although women in general and rural women in particular received a certain amount of attention from the government, this did not necessarily result in an improvement in their position. On the contrary, their reproductive role and self-sacrificing 'nature' have been repeatedly emphasized by the policymakers, which deepened their secondary position vis-à-

vis men and urban women. Clothing was used to indicate a sociopolitical ideology of the polity. Although property and inheritance rights as well as the Civil Code seem to have changed the compass in favor of gender equality, the practice was otherwise, which got its justification from habitual customs and religion. These traditions contributed to obscuring women's legal right to inherit and own property and land. Finally, selection of men as the head of the household perpetuated the subordination of women as deepened and approved by the state policies. Viewing peasants in general, and peasant women in particular as pre-modern, traditional, beings that were out of Time and devoid of change (Fabian, 1983) enabled and justified the existence of such policies. It is logical to suppose that the lack of studies made on peasant women in the Ottoman Empire (Metinsoy, 2016) was an expression of the attention they received. When lack of attention towards peasant women in the Ottoman Empire is juxtaposed with the Republican policies, a change regarding visioning rural women becomes apparent. Whereas in the former, rural women received almost no other attention than being the sole food providers for the entire nation especially during war times, in the latter, in addition to this instrumentality, the state entered into a process of actively constructing rural women's identity. Moreover, another difference between the two political entities was that with the latter, i.e. the Republic, policies against rural women became more systematic and legitimate because of the nation-state character of the state.

In short, during this period, the state policies targeting rural women did not have much of an effect on the status of women in the society. What led to a considerable change in it in some agricultural zones was the limited capital penetration. With the introduction of tractors⁵⁴ as a money making activity in mainly rich large landowning families of the *Zone I*, we see a differentiation in incomes of men and women in upper class families. With tractors, men had access to new forms of property, i.e. tractors which they could use in cultivation or have rental income, whereas women did not. Their access to such property was not

⁵⁴ It is important to emphasize that this differentiation in wealth was the result of the state's policies to modernize the country through further commercialization.

improved in practice, although it was possible in theory. Their control over non-capital property such as jewelry was not full, and even if it was this was far from bringing about sustainable accumulation. Although we do not fully agree with the liberal feminist claim that work brings status, differentiations in property ownership did result in a kind of gendering or differential in income between men and women. Among middle landowners of *Zone 1*, exploitation of women's labor intensified as commercialization increased. It also contributed to differentiation of public and private spheres, which separate men's and women's tasks. Differences in property ownership was limited to land and cattle. Increased commercialization and contact with the outside world gave men decision-making power. Similar processes occurred regarding middle landowners of *Zone 2* in terms of these variables. However, in their case, commercialization was a newer phenomenon compared to the same class of *Zone 1*, therefore, exploitation of women's labor had newly started among these producers. Small landowners of *Zone 2*, however, experienced different processes. Due to absence of production for profit, there was not an increase in women's labor. Besides, because of lack of public-private differentiation, men and women participated in similar tasks. Therefore, there was little sexual division of labor, this contributed to men and women having similar power in decision-making processes. Regarding property ownership, there was only differentiation in terms of land, and livestock. Large landowners in *Zone 3* did not have commercialization. However, as women did not participate in agricultural activities, there was sexual division of labor. Gaps were visible in the ownership of land and animals. Also, due to the existence of joint families, old men had disproportionate power in decision-making. Finally, small landowners of this class presented similar characteristics to that of *Zone 2*, namely limited commercialization, absence of public-private differentiation, little or no sexual division of labor, little gap in property ownership, similar power regarding decision-making processes etc.

In sum, in households where commercialization did not dominate, wealth and economic power was distributed more equally within the family. The fact that commercialization did not dominate does not mean these households did not get

involved in money. We mean that they have not yet developed dependency on the market. It is true that in some families women did not have the full control over material benefits of their labor (Kandiyoti, 1990), but they did not come to a point of starvation, either. In zones and classes where nuclear families and non-commercial production predominated, they managed to apply a certain degree of authority within the household thanks to their labor, reproductive roles and age. The fact that they did not receive money did not necessarily mean they had low status (İncirlioğlu, 1998). However, among families where commercialization dominated or newly entered, economic power dynamics within the household shifted in favor of men as opposed to women. This was the result of state's promotion and large landowner's adoption of commercialization and modernization. This was the beginning of wealth differentiation between men and women in the Turkish countryside.

CHAPTER 3

THE DEVELOPMENTALIST PERIOD 1940-1967/73

3.1 Introduction

We mark the process of world economic upturn as 1940-1967/73⁵⁵, because we think that the world economy that had been in downturn since 1914/18 was revived with the beginning of the Second World War, which accompanied the rise of the US to world hegemony. By 1967 and definitely by 1973, however, this upward trend started to dissolve, and the glorious years of economic expansion came to an end as “worldwide profit levels had begun to fall” (Wallerstein, 1996, p. 211).

3.2 World Conjuncture

After the Second World War, economic expansion took place under the leadership of the USA. During the period of US hegemony⁵⁶, a number of economic policies helped it preserve its economic supremacy. Keynesian demand management resulted in an effort to match high production with high

⁵⁵ In explaining the world economic cycles, Kondratieff cycles have come to be used. According to this explanation, A phase signifies economic expansion whereas B phase means stagnation and contraction in world-economy (Hopkins & Wallerstein, 1996).

⁵⁶ “A dominant state exercises a hegemonic function if it leads the *system* of states in a desired direction and, in so doing, is perceived as pursuing a universal interest” (Arrighi, 1990, p. 367). Strong military, currency, and the existence of a hegemonic enemy enabled the USA to conduct its hegemonic functions.

consumption. Consumerism was facilitated by Fordist⁵⁷ production and full employment⁵⁸ strategy, and Keynesian welfare state enabled the functioning of the Fordist regime. What may be called the ‘Fordist-Keynesian regime of accumulation’ was regarded as “a particular phase of capitalist development” during which “investments in fixed capital” were to regularly increase “productivity and mass consumption”. This process was to be accompanied and supported by “adequate governmental policies and actions, social institutions, norms and habits of behavior” (Arrighi, 1994, p. 2). Other practices such as military aid, economic development schemes, food dumping, and the Green Revolution also predominated in this period in order to shape periphery and semi-periphery in accordance with the US economic and political purposes. These trends were all reflected in Turkey.

3.3 Turkish Politics and Economy

The CHP slowly lost support from the peasantry especially due to policies⁵⁹ pursued during the years of Second World War. One of the consequences of these policies was that the government increased its share of agricultural surplus in an

⁵⁷ Fordism referred to the standardization of production. Production was realized in small parts, and then fitted together in an assembly line. The aim of this practice was to produce affordable consumer durable goods especially for the rising middle class.

⁵⁸ By full employment, we mean full male employment because most women were seen as housewives during this period (Pelizzon & Casparis, 1996).

⁵⁹ When the labor force was mobilized due to war, wheat producing areas were affected because they followed labor intensive production methods. Their produce and surplus effectively decreased which increased their intolerance towards the state. Besides, as a result of a general scarcity of consumer goods, prices increased by four to fivefold between 1939-1944. But the state continued buying agricultural goods from producers at a stable price. As producers started selling on the black market because of this stable price policy, the state came up with the practice of forced purchase and increased taxation. This was the peak of the anti-agriculturalist policies that the state followed during the war period. These policies alienated the middle peasants from their alliance with the state (Birtek & Keyder, 2009). The war policies, especially labor force mobilization, affected small and middle peasants more negatively than large landowners. This was because small and middle landowners were dependent on labor for surplus whereas large landowners had tractors which helped them accumulate surplus even in the absence of labor force (Birtek & Keyder, 2009; Keyder, 2009).

unequal manner during war years by forced sale of agricultural products, confiscations, and new taxes on producers (Keyder, 1993; Pamuk, 1988). These measures resulted in increased politicization among producers, especially middle producers due to their exposure to market and state policies. Although CHP tried to appeal to peasants with a land reform⁶⁰ in 1945, this did not prevent their electoral defeat in the 1950 elections by Democrat Party (DP)⁶¹.

3.4 Turkish Agriculture

During much of the post-WWII period, Turkey followed an accumulation path based on commercial capital. In the new international division of labor after the war, Europe and the Middle East would be restructured to sustain the capitalist system. Within it, Turkey's role⁶² was to become a provider of agricultural goods⁶³ (Tören, 2006). In the aftermath of the post-WWII period, with Truman Doctrine, Turkey was included in 1947 in the Europe's recovery plan. Thus, Turkey received grant and aid in exchange for military dependence and economic liberalization.

⁶⁰ This reform had two main goals. One was to reduce the size of the landholdings that were too large, the second one was a more radical one: to distribute to sharecroppers, tenants and agricultural wage laborers the land they worked on. This was the contentious Article 17 of the reform. This clause received much strong criticism from the large landowning section of the ruling party, headed by Adnan Menderes who opposed the reform saying that it was a violation of private property and that "the agricultural policy should focus on the technical rather than the social aspects of cultivation". The Article 17 was only applied on public land for a short time. And it was abolished when the DP came to power (Birtek & Keyder, 2009; Singer, 1977, p. 95).

⁶¹ The DP first emerged as an opposition within CHP. Some of its members were large landowners (Birtek & Keyder, 2009) from the commercialized Western parts of the country.

⁶² This role was praised and promoted via the US aid to Turkey (Keyder, 1989).

⁶³ Exports mainly consisted of grains (Ahmad, 2015) such as wheat and barley, tobacco, figs, opium, raisins, silk and wool (Pamuk, 2009).

Turkey's role as the provider of raw materials and agricultural goods was justified by the US experts⁶⁴ who 'discovered' that the welfare of an average individual in Turkey was not affected by industrialization and they did not receive the fruits of economic growth. Therefore, the attention was to be directed towards agriculture. This coincided with the desires of millions of small producers who had paid the price for Turkish industrialization but never benefited from it (Keyder, 1989) in terms of an increase in their income and welfare. It was also in line with the interests of large landowners and commercial capital because they wanted further accumulation opportunities and integration with international capital (Tören, 2006).

The Marshall Plan⁶⁵ encouraged Turkey to follow this path of commercialization (Tören, 2006). It was thought that with aid, agricultural surplus would increase and some of that surplus would be transferred to fifteen European countries to ensure their recovery from war and their welfare⁶⁶ (Coffing, 1974; Hershlag, 1958; Tören, 2006). With the remains of the surplus, Turkey would try to reduce the cost of living within the country. Via the Marshall Plan, the aim was to mechanize agriculture, to encourage the use of artificial fertilizer and modern agricultural techniques and to provide cheap and easy loans. This helped not only

⁶⁴ The experts were M.W. Thornburg et.al. who prepared a report to evaluate Turkey's position in 'economic development' and to determine where the US aid would be used. The report was reflective of 'modernism', and it concluded Turkey as an underdeveloped country based on the measure of 'linear progress' of the Western countries. This report started to be prepared after the declaration of the Truman Doctrine (Tören, 2006). It is possible that the idea of economic development first came to Turkey with this report.

⁶⁵ At first, Turkey was not seen worthy of receiving loans from the Plan. Only after Turkey prepared a project to increase coal and agricultural goods production, she became a recipient of Marshall Plan in 1948. This project was in line with the report by the American experts in 'Turkey's Role in Development Plan' (Tören, 2006).

⁶⁶ As we will mention later, there was a grain glut in the USA during this period. Therefore, one might wonder why Turkey was needed to feed post-war Europe. We know that the USA tried to get rid of this surplus during the war by giving food aid to countries under German occupation, which was later opposed by Britain and was terminated. Moreover, the USA fed Europe after the Second World War, as well (George, 1977). However, there is little information on a comparison between American and Turkish aid to Europe. The exact dates of such aid are difficult to find. The data we have found are not sufficient to make a cross-analysis. Further research on the subject is needed.

to speed up production for the market in Turkey, but it also linked the capital accumulation process to the export of agricultural goods and raw materials (Tören, 2006). This was facilitated by a road network that was built to connect the countryside to the city and to increase the market expansion (Keyder, 1983; Özbay, 2015). This ‘aid’, however, was tied. Most often American loans and export incomes were used to purchase tractors and other motor vehicles from the USA (Keyder, 1989; Tören, 2006).

Political parties, also, supported foreign aid to Turkey. Whereas CHP supported it on the basis of getting closer to reaching the level of ‘civilized nations’, the DP found it useful in joining the international capital (Tören, 2006). In the post-war period, “the ideology of advancement shifted away from the primacy of self-sufficiency and non-belligerency to emphasize the importance of alliance with the West as a source of aid and security, and for advancement” (Lippe, 2000, p. 94). Especially during the DP rule, Western aid was seen as a way to get rid of the negative effects of war on the peasantry and agriculture, and to lead to economic development (Lippe, 2000). Overall, the expectations of the USA found reflections in the Turkish elite (both CHP and DP) and policies.

Another means by which the USA expanded its sphere of influence was ‘development’. Although it was never clearly defined in any official texts, in Truman’s inaugural speech, development⁶⁷ was attributed such features as economic growth, anti-communism etc. In contrast, underdevelopment was associated with poverty, misery, inadequate food, disease, and primitive and stagnant economic life. Although he claimed that development was promoted to bring about peace and prosperity (Truman, n.d.), its real purpose was for the USA

⁶⁷ In its orthodox paradigm, development was associated with economic growth that took place in progressive stages. It was equated with Westernization because Western countries which participated in the capitalist world economy completed their ‘development’ by having attained high mass consumption, technology and economic progress. Accordingly, underdeveloped countries could reach this level by imitating the Western development path and by creating a political and economic system based on private enterprise and representative democracy (Wilber & Jameson, 1973).

“to break open the closed trading blocks of Europe’s and Japan’s territorial empires”, and to make raw materials of these countries available to the highest bidder without any special reservations for any particular country (Reifer & Sudler, 1996, p. 14).

Development not only had economic foundations, but also political roots; to prevent the expansion of communist ideology at the expense of economic liberalism⁶⁸ (Leys, 1996). To realize development, ‘modern’ values and practices of the core were to be transferred to the elites of national governments in the periphery through education and technology (Leys, 1996). These ‘modern’ values and practices consisted of capital investment, industrial and scientific techniques including mechanization of agriculture⁶⁹ and building of dams (Rai, 1997).

Ties with the USA and with the West, in general, were further strengthened by participation in the Korean War. Turkey joined the war with the expectation that it “would lead to economic growth and greater diplomatic and military power” (Lippe, 2000, p. 93). In particular, the Turkish government wanted to get a formal commitment from the USA to Turkish security. As a result, Turkey became a NATO member in 1952 (Lippe, 2000).

The Korean War also had an effect on Turkish agricultural exports. Because the war boom increased demand for raw materials, Turkey’s agricultural exports were positively affected (Ahmad, 1995; Keyder, 2009; Singer, 1977). Increased exports, populist state policies which supported the peasantry by offering high

⁶⁸ According to Truman; “all freedom is dependent on freedom of enterprise... The whole world should adopt the American system... The American system can survive in America only if it becomes a world system” (George, 1977, p. 78).

The concept of development gained pace when the Chinese Communist Revolution took place in 1949, and when independence movements were intensified (Leys, 1996).

⁶⁹ This was reflected in Turkish agriculture. Since the late 1940s, in Turkey, tractor use increased exponentially. The share of the import of agricultural machinery within all imports rose from 1% to 8%. While the number of working tractors in 1946 was a little over 1.000, in 1955 there were 43.000 tractors, there were 116.110 in 1971 and 243.000 in 1975 due to the US aid (Aydin, 1989; Keyder, 1989).

prices and supports, and overall world economic expansion⁷⁰ had a positive effect on agricultural income in Turkey. Until the mid-1950s, agricultural income steadily rose⁷¹ (Hershlag, 1958; Singer, 1977).

After the end of the economic boom brought about by the Korean War, Turkish agriculture lost its momentum. Import of agricultural tools decreased after 1954. Instead, with an agreement signed between the USA and Turkey, the USA channeled aid in the form of money and agricultural surplus⁷² into Turkey (Tören, 2006). The involvement of Turkey in PL-480 followed the poor crop of 1954⁷³. It is logical to suppose that this also resulted from the potential reduction in agricultural production when prices declined after the end of Korean War. Within this framework, grains, fats, rice, powdered milk and oil were imported (Coffing, 1974; Tören, 2006) thanks to 386.00.000 dollars worth of Turkish Lira that was transferred by the USA to Turkish Central Bank by 1962 (Tören, 2006). PL-480 had a negative effect on producers by holding down food prices. Cereal prices

⁷⁰ The overall capacity of the world-economy expanded, trade and financial activities increased and the role of the state expanded (Ikeda, 1996).

⁷¹ Agricultural income that was 1007 TL in 1950 increased to 1277 TL in 1956 (Tekeli, 1978, p. 304). The increase in agricultural income was parallel to the increase in the prices for products. For instance, the price of wheat increased from 22-27 kuruş per kilogram in 1951 to 30 kuruş in 1955. And the price of rye increased from 18 kuruş in 1951 to 25 kuruş in 1955 (Hershlag, 1958, p. 226).

⁷² The USA had excess grain reserves due to introduction of technical inputs (George, 1977). To get rid of the grain surplus which had storage and management costs, to find markets for the US products and to expand international trade, a program called PL-480 (Public Law 480-Food For Peace Program) was created in 1954. Via PL-480, a lot of Third World and some European countries received food aid from the USA. The effects of PL-480 on the recipient countries have been detrimental (George, 1977; Pelizzon & Casparis, 1996). For this please see Chossudovsky, M. (1998). *The Globalization of Poverty: Impacts of IMF and World Bank Reforms*. Halifax, N.S.: Fernwood, George, S. (1977). *How the Other Half Dies: The Real Reasons for World Hunger*. Montclair, NJ: Allanheld, Osmun. Kapoor, I. (2008). *The Postcolonial Politics of Development*. London: Routledge. Pelizzon, S. & Casparis, J. (1996). World Human Welfare. In *Age of Transition: Trajectory of the World System, 1945-2025*. Palgrave Macmillan. Young, E. M. (2012). *Food and Development*. New York: Routledge.

⁷³ "On November 15, 1954, Turkey became the first nation to sign a PL-480 commodity agreement" (Coffing, 1974, p. 11).

increased less than general wholesale prices during 1954-1961. Therefore, it is logical to conclude that “PL-480 imports did serve to counteract the general inflationary tendencies –which, though it may be [have been] hard on farmers, increase[d] the stability of the economy” (Coffing, 1974, p. 20).

After the DP was ousted from power with the May coup in 1960, frustration among people grew. It was seen that closer ties with the West did not solve every problem in the country, because by mid-1950s, the prosperity and economic growth of the first half of the decade was replaced by stagnation and inflation⁷⁴. As a result of incentives given to agriculture, grain exports and land under cultivation increased until the second half of the 1950s, but landlessness and rural-to-urban migration also increased. Per capita income and unemployment increased simultaneously. Investment in state enterprises decreased, but this did not lead to growth in the private sector (Lippe, 2000). After the 1960 coup, industry again gained prominence over agriculture (Gürel, 2014; Pamuk, 2009).

The Green Revolution was a part of the US project of development, and it was defined as “breeding plants that would bear more edible grain and thus increasing yields without increasing cultivated crop areas” (George, 1977, p. 113; Shiva, 1991). The emergence of the Green Revolution in the era of grain glut was a curious question. The answer lay in the input side of agricultural production because for an increase in output, the new High Yielding Variety Seeds (HYVS) had to be accompanied by inputs such as fertilizers, tractors, irrigation equipment, seeds etc. (Pelizzon & Casparis, 1996). Although its main purpose was claimed to eradicate hunger by increasing food supply, the Green Revolution was in fact an attempt to find markets for transnational agribusiness companies to sell agricultural inputs. This started in the late 1940s with the development of Mexican wheat varieties by the Rockefeller Foundation (Frizzell, 1968), and later in the 1960s and 1970s it spread to other countries, namely “India, Pakistan, Turkey”, the Philippines, North African countries etc. (George, 1977, p. 115)

⁷⁴ This was because of the end of the Korean War boom, non-existence of land to open for cultivation that would prevented an increase production and export income.

The Green Revolution in Turkey moved in accordance with the US demands. The study team sent by the USAID to oversee the process of application of the ‘revolution’ made policy recommendations regarding importing HYVS, improving market facilities, irrigation and agricultural techniques, giving incentives to producers for the purchase of inputs etc. (Participant, 1967, 27). These were realized by the Turkish government to the letter. Thus, a dependence of Turkey on agricultural inputs⁷⁵ was created. Simultaneously, the USA and potentially the agribusiness TNCs expanded their markets for agricultural inputs through the Green Revolution. Neither the environment, poor producers, and rural women nor the economic difficulties⁷⁶ were a concern to them. These will be mentioned later.

3.5 Rural Women in Turkey between 1940-1967/73

3.5.1 Women and Development

Development has not benefited women. For a long time, development has had a male bias which ignored women’s labor and interests (Verschuur, 2014). The resources brought about by development were used and owned almost exclusively by men. For instance, men monopolized the new agricultural machinery and compelled women to work with old agricultural tools. This increased the productivity differences between men and women. During land reforms when land ownership was formalized, men acquired land ownership vis-à-vis women. Thus, women became unpaid family laborers on their husbands’ land and became detached from their produce whereas they used to be the owners of their produce on family owned land. Finally, development projects which did not consider women’s well-being caused displacement of women from agricultural labor force.

⁷⁵ New seed varieties were imported from Mexico and the USA excessively (60 tons in 1966, 20.000 tons in 1967). Expertise and training were provided by the USA (Participant, 1967, 27; Frizzell, 1968).

⁷⁶ As the use of fertilizers and other inputs increased, it became difficult to find foreign exchange to import them (Brown, 1968).

As most women could not participate in new industrial jobs, they were marginalized (Boserup, 1970).

The linear and gendered discourse of development was institutionalized through both state policies and international institutions with particular gendered outcomes. State-led development led to concentration of power in the hands of the elite and the marginalization of the subaltern publics (Rai, 1997, p. 17),

including women. Similar trends were valid for Turkey.

3.5.2 Ideology

Neither the Democrat Party government nor the governments following it made policies for rural women. “The policies of the new administration ...[DP] ... included no provisions that would imply a shift in the approach of the state towards gender issues” (Arat, 1998b, p. 13).

3.5.3 Social Status and Reproduction of Generations⁷⁷

During 1940-1965, the government was still promoting pro-natalist policies. “The import, manufacture and distribution of contraceptives were prohibited” and “education and voluntary efforts on behalf of birth control were forbidden” (Özbay & Shorter, 1970, p. 1). However, after 1965, this policy was reversed at least partially due to the US influence because there was an active promotion of a reduction in population rates by the USA and by the universities supported by the American foundations such as Ford and Rockefeller. In the promotion of the Green Revolution in Turkey ‘population bomb’ rhetoric was used. Such foundations advocated that Turkey’s agriculture would not be able to feed the increasing population; despite of absence of a visible danger of famine. This raises questions about the actual intentions of these actors.

To promote research and action on population control and family planning, the USA and Ford and Rockefeller Foundations poured a lot of resources into

⁷⁷ In spite of the findings below, the research on reproduction in Turkey is limited. Data are not divided into rural and urban areas of regions. Therefore, inferences are only preliminary.

universities. In 1965, with the efforts of a Rockefeller Foundation fellow Dr. Nusret Fişek, the Turkish parliament “narrowly repealed its anti-contraception laws and passed a Family Planning Law”. Medical centers and clinics channeled resources⁷⁸ to family planning (Erken, 2016; Rose & Erdem, 2000, p. 142). Between 1963-1973 the number of married women who wanted to reduce fertility for any reason increased. Also, between the same years, the number of rural women who used contraceptives increased from 15% to 30.2% (Özbay, 2015, p. 70). This was parallel to the state policies and actions of the said foundations and the USA. Thus, Turkey’s population policies were determined by the USA and foundations associated with it, with the cooperation of the Turkish state. While this consequently increased women’s use of contraceptives⁷⁹, there is no direct connection that this increased women’s control over their bodies because the decision to use contraceptives may have been made by their husbands or because of economic difficulties. Regardless, birth rates decreased. The decline in the number of children that was had and macro-level social changes, namely urbanization, reversed the wealth flow from the old to the young people. Wealth was transferred from old to young people for the younger generations to take advantage of economic and social opportunities. Simultaneously, old people’s authority has been fiercely challenged by younger generations of men and women. As a result, the status that age brought started to decrease (Özbay, 2015), and they received a lesser portion of the wealth created in the family because they were no longer the creators of this wealth. Most of old women were in a disadvantaged position as they no longer received the unquestioned respect and obedience from their daughters-in-law, although they had demonstrated such respect and obedience towards their own mothers-in-law (Kandiyoti, 1988; 1997).

⁷⁸ These resources were provided by Rockefeller Foundation due to the Turkish government’s unwillingness (Rose& Erdem, 2000).

⁷⁹ According to a 1963 study, majority of the women wanted to limit their fertility whereas their husbands wanted more children, and 63% of rural and 84% of urban women wanted to learn more about contraceptive methods (Özbay, 2015). As a result of an increase in the number of women who used contraceptive methods, it can be inferred that they had more opportunities to have a say over their reproductive rights.

3.5.4 Family Constellation and Women's Labor

3.5.4.1 Zone 1

3.5.4.1.1 Class 1

Large landowners of this zone took advantage of the Marshall Plan, development programs and the Green Revolution. Thanks primarily to government facilitation⁸⁰, they increased their use of mechanization and other chemical inputs via easier access to loans, and thus, they increased commercialization. They also employed outside labor. They expanded their land and share in agricultural production, often at the expense of small producers (Keyder, 2009; Özbay, 2015; Singer, 1977). Among large landowners in this zone, joint patriarchal families continued to exist because families could afford it (Kandiyoti, 1985). Whereas men engaged in tasks that were assigned higher status such as mechanical and commercial business (Özbay, 2015), women dealt with domestic chores (Kandiyoti, 1997) due to the existence of hired labor. This was a sign of their high class status compared to women of lower classes. But this situation was also a sign of gendered division of labor within family.

3.5.4.1.2 Class 2

Middle producers also expanded their production in most of this period, they took advantage of commercialization and mechanization (Sirman-Eralp, 1988). They mostly formed nuclear families (Timur, 1972). The authority of the elderly⁸¹ was limited here both because of the existence of nuclear families and because younger men were in a better position to come into contact with the outside world

⁸⁰ Although the DP government claimed otherwise, it generally supported rather well-to-do producers. It facilitated the processes of the purchase of inputs, marketing opportunities, enhancing profits, cutting taxes etc. for them. However, the majority of the producers who were not wealthy went unnoticed, or they benefited marginally from such programs through spill-over effects (Singer, 1977).

⁸¹ The authority of household head lay in the fact that traditionally the oldest man held the resources.

through education and technology (Kandiyoti, 1985). Thus, they improved their economic status vis-à-vis old men. Young women, too, gained authority vis-à-vis old women. However, this did not positively affect young women's standing vis-à-vis young men and men in general (Ecevit, 1991-3). This class occasionally required hiring of outside labor because of increased market exposure (Tekeli, 1977). Selling more for the market necessitated producing more. As family labor was not sufficient for increased scale of production, outside labor was needed. Outside labor was generally supplied through women who could gather labor force of neighbors, especially in places like Söke where cotton production demanded more labor force (Sirman, 1990; Sirman-Eralp, 1988). Commercialization increased women's labor, but not necessarily their status. They had to engage simultaneously in both household reproduction, subsistence agriculture and production for the market (Ertürk, 1987; Kandiyoti, 1997).

3.5.4.1.3 Class 3

Small producers, sharecroppers and landless people had to meet the challenges of macro-economic developments. On the one hand, increased cotton production also increased the need for seasonal labor in this zone because some processes of cotton production required labor power. Such seasonal labor was generally provided from other regions (Karpat, 1960). On the other hand, small landowners and especially sharecroppers in the Mediterranean lost their livelihoods due to displacement which resulted from mechanization⁸². Other small landholdings were absorbed into large landholdings. Consequently, they began to search for alternative employment opportunities in the countryside as seasonal laborers or in the city (Gürel, 2014; Hinderink & Kıray, 1970; Karpat, 1960; Robinson, 1952). In places where small peasant enterprises dominated, the

⁸² Whereas tractors created a new class within the villages that consisted of former village artisans, former sharecroppers and agricultural workers and enterprising individuals, for the repair and maintenance of the mechanical tools (Karpat, 1960), the negative effects of tractors were much more pressing because "in a country like Turkey, one tractor with equipment to match, may displace as many as ten village farmers" (Hinderink & Kıray, 1970, p. 29).

transition to production for the market and purchase of tractors and other inputs led to borrowing and indebtedness due to insufficient land. Again those who lost their land either became agricultural laborers or migrated to city (Tekeli, 1977). Those who did not lose their land continued agricultural production with old tools (Karpat, 1960). This required certain changes in the structure of the family⁸³, as well. Among extended families that existed in limited numbers in this class, young men searched for waged work in or outside of agriculture. This contributed to the erosion of authority of older men as the sole owner of economic resources (Kandiyoti, 1990). As young men became household heads, they acquired more control over their lives and issues such as marriage, and formed nuclear families, generally outside of village (Rasuly-Paleczek, 1996). Among these families older women lost authority vis-à-vis young women; but young women did not necessarily improve their position vis-à-vis their husbands (Ecevit, 1991-3). Therefore, this was not a net gain, and can even be considered as a net loss for older women because women lost the security of old age, and the obedience of younger generations. In families who were already nuclear, economic difficulties caused a more marked differentiation between men and women because it was men who looked for waged work whereas women and children stayed behind and dealt with agricultural work to support the family (Ilcan, 1994; Özbay, 2015; Sirman-Eralp, 1988⁸⁴). This resulted in a difference between men and women both in terms of money making abilities, and in terms of sexual division of labor because in subsistence communities, it had been common for both men and women to engage in agricultural production (Ilcan, 1994; Özbay, 2015). Landless families, as similar to previous period, continued to live in nuclear families in which both men and women, and even children, worked in agriculture (Kandiyoti,

⁸³ Earlier we mentioned that a similar process took place in the Class 2 of this zone. However, an important difference existed between Class 3 and Class 2. Whereas in Class 2 changes happened to take more advantage of commercialization through exploiting educational and technical opportunities, Class 3 had to go through changes in the family and production types in order to avoid a complete breakdown of their production system, and to maintain their survival. The main difference between the two was their ways to respond to commercialization which stemmed from their economic capacity and class position.

⁸⁴ These are based on inferences from case studies.

1997; Tekeli, 1977; Timur, 1972). Evidence at hand does not indicate a change in their situation compared to the previous period (Tekeli, 1977), except for a potential increase in their number.

3.5.4.2 Zone 2

3.5.4.2.1 Class 1

Large landowners⁸⁵ of this zone had gone through similar processes to the Class 1 of *Zone 1*. Although they came into being later, they managed to take advantage of processes of commercialization and mechanization. Thus, they became capitalist farmers, and immensely increased their landholdings (Oral, 2013a). Joint families were formed by this class. Men dealt with commercial and mechanical tasks while women remained within the boundaries of the domestic sphere (Kandiyoti, 1997; Özbay, 2015; Tekeli, 1977). This resulted in a sexual division of labor. Although they had low status within household, they had greater class status vis-à-vis women of other classes.

3.5.4.2.2 Class 2

Middle landowners in Central Anatolia continued to use family labor with modern tools and inputs in the production of grains (Akşit, 1988). Among these producers, joint families were replaced by nuclear and transient extended families. In joint families, the power and the authority of the elderly within the family decreased because younger generations took advantage of increased education opportunities and technical inputs (Kandiyoti, 1985). This process resulted in the formation of nuclear families in some families, in others, joint patriarchal families were transformed into transient extended families in which young men fulfilled the role of heads of household, instead of old men (Kandiyoti, 1990). This process mostly benefited young men, but young women also had their share especially due to the decreased power of their mothers-in-law. However, this did not

⁸⁵ Class 1 of *Zone 2* was formed during this period. Small and middle grain producers had been integrated into national economy in the post-1929 period. Those middle landowners who benefitted from mechanization opportunities presented by the state concentrated land and oriented their efforts to capitalist farming (Oral, 2013a).

drastically improve their position in relation to their husbands (Ecevit, 1991-3). Among this class, increased commercialization also increased women's labor (Kandiyoti, 1997).

Middle landowners that lived in the Black Sea region increased commercial production especially in labor-intensive products (Oral, 2013a). Those small enterprises which engaged in subsistence production or production for the local market converted to modern enterprises producing for a larger market (Tekeli, 1977). In middle landowning commercial families of this zone, both joint and nuclear families continued to be formed. In the Black Sea region, as commercialization increased, so did the burden of women and children, and old people who were left behind to deal with agriculture. This was because men migrated temporarily or permanently to find waged work while women and children were left behind so their work burden increased (Özbay, 2015). This resulted in an increased differentiation between men and women in terms of money earning and in terms of tasks they engaged in. As men found waged work, their involvement in productive and reproductive tasks at home decreased. For instance, according to a case study made by Suzan Ilcan (1994) conducted in Northwestern rural community of Turkey, prior to migration, men used to spend more time in the fields with their wives and relatives in subsistence agriculture.

This can be explained for example by the fact that both in Central Anatolia and the Black Sea region, before men worked outside of the village, both men and women dealt with child raising. But when migration became necessary, although women received a certain amount of help from neighbors and their parents, this activity became feminized⁸⁶. When there emerged a difference between manual labor and capital intensive tasks, and the former was assigned to women, it was seen as 'shameful' for men to deal with labor-intensive work such as carrying water, wood etc. (İncirlioğlu, 1998). As a result, increased commercialization

⁸⁶ It is logical to suppose that this trend was also valid in all zones and classes where commercialization led to male migration.

intensified women's labor and the sexual division of labor which emerged in the previous period. It also 'feminized' socialization of children.

3.5.4.2.3 Class 3

Small landowners and sharecroppers of this zone experienced similar processes to that of Class 3 in *Zone 1* namely; increased land loss due to land concentration, seeking waged work in the countryside or in the city. Similarly, family arrangements and the role of the elderly followed the same pattern as in the Class 3 of *Zone 1*. The emergence of sexual division of labor and differences in earning power as a result of commercialization and waged labor was also the case here, especially among small subsistence producers (Ilcan, 1994; Özbay, 2015) because sharecroppers were almost nonexistent in this zone (Timur, 1972). Among landless laborers, who were also few in number, it is logical to assume that the pattern from the previous period was valid.

3.5.4.3 Zone 3

In line with the modernist ideology, in the 1950s, Turkey built giant dams and hydroelectric projects to address the energy problems. This was the unofficial beginning of the Southeastern Anatolia Project (GAP) (Çarkoğlu & Eder, 2005). More details about the GAP will be given in the next chapter because the core of the project started later, and the problems became more visible in later periods.

3.5.4.3.1 Class 1

Large farming enterprises in this zone were incorporated into the national economy during this period. As a result, the region started to commercialize. As a result of loans spent on fertilizers, insecticides and improved seeds and mechanization, as well as fertilizers, insecticides and improved seeds, semi-feudal landlords entered into a process of becoming commercial farmers (Aydın, 1989; Keyder, 1983). Among large landowning families of this zone, joint patriarchal families continued to be formed (Tekeli, 1977; Timur, 1972). Similarly, there were differences between men and women in terms of their tasks. Men took part

in commercial and mechanical business, which became important during this period mainly because of national integration schemes and increased commercialization. Women, on the other hand, continued to be confined to the domestic sphere (Kandiyoti, 1997; Özbay, 2015; Tekeli, 1977).

3.5.4.3.2 Class 2

According to our classification, middle landowners did not exist in this zone. Therefore, the following analysis will be made without them.

3.5.4.3.3 Class 3

Among sharecroppers, tenants and small subsistence producers of this zone, displacement from land emerged as a result of the process of transition of large landowners to capitalist farmers brought about a series of enclosure movements (Aydın, 1989; Keyder, 1983). The emergence of unemployment and the consequent search for waged work created differences in family structures, and between men and women in terms of their role in money-making activities and gendered division of labor (Ilcan, 1994; Özbay, 2015). Nuclear families dominated. The erosion of the authority of old men and women took place here, as well (Ecevit, 1991-3). Among those small producers⁸⁷ who managed to continue production on their small plots, transition to production for the market involved replacement of traditional exchange mechanisms of which women were also a part with increased prominence of commercial public domain, in which men dominated. Although women produced exchange value by producing for the market, they remained outside of “social network of the exchange market”. Thus, “while women become physically restricted to a private sphere of activity, the

⁸⁷ Yet among other small producers who were not entirely dominated by market economy, cooperation between sexes was a common phenomenon. In the production of labor-intensive goods, labor of the entire family was needed. So long as men did not work outside of the village, they participated in production next to women. In the absence of men, the day-to-day affairs of the household and of the village were conducted by women, which provided them with “a vital position in village life”. Therefore, in such less commercial and less profit oriented production types, “the relationships between men and women within the village and the household structure are fairly egalitarian (Ertürk, 1987, p. 90).

product of their labor is drawn more and more into the public domain where they no longer have direct control over their labor power” (Ertürk, 1987, p. 89, 1988, p. 10⁸⁸). Landless agricultural workers of this zone increased in number during this period due to enclosures and land concentration. They continued to live in nuclear families and the entire family participated in agricultural waged work (Tekeli, 1977).

3.5.5 Ownership of Property

In this period, especially due to the Marshall Plan and the Green Revolution, the use of tractors and other inputs increased exponentially (Aydın, 1989; Keyder, 1989). The ownership of this property differed according to zones, classes and between men and women. Mexican wheat and other HYVS demanded heavy amounts of fertilizer, and without proper fertilization and irrigation, the seeds would “produce only a fraction of their potential returns” (Participant, 1967, 27, p. 40). This issue of affordability effectively caused a differentiation between wealthy and poor zones, classes and genders. In general terms, the Green Revolution widened the gap among different regions in the country. Whereas these inputs benefited producers in *Zone 1* where irrigation (Pelizzon & Casparis, 1996) was existent and where the soil was fertile, it did not demonstrate the exact same positive effects in other zones where such favorable conditions were nonexistent. To acquire these inputs, lower classes had to deal with problems such as borrowing, bankruptcy and land loss. The upper classes, on the other hand, could easily gain access to the Green Revolution technologies because they could afford them or acquire loans more easily (George, 1977). Moreover, land ownership was a determining factor in access to loans, tractors, other Green Revolution inputs and extension services. This disadvantaged women who did not own land by preventing them from competing in cash-crop production (Pelizzon

⁸⁸ Although these were the findings of a case study realized in Mardin, it is logical to assume that this process repeated itself in other zones and across different classes, as well, so long as commercialization resulted in a differentiation between public and private domains, while confining women to the latter and increasing male domination over women.

& Casparis, 1996). Therefore, the fact that women did not own land became more of a disadvantage because they could not accumulate capital.

3.5.5.1 Zone 1

3.5.5.1.1 Class 1

In large landowning classes, there was already inequality between men and women in terms of access to property ownership (in the previous period). This differentiation increased when the number of tractors increased (Özbay, 2015). Also, as the effects of the Green Revolution were the greatest in this class, it is logical to suppose that the differences between men and women in terms of access to inputs, and therefore their ability to accumulate wealth widened.

3.5.5.1.2 Class 2

Among middle landowners of this zone, tractors were used in production (Sirman-Eralp, 1988). Also, as the Green Revolution could be taken advantage of by the wealthier classes, it is logical to suppose that men of this commercial class had access to the inputs. This created differentiation in property ownership (Ecevit, 1991-3). It also made women's lack of access to property, i.e. land, more significant because they could not acquire loans to get inputs.

3.5.5.1.3 Class 3

Among some small landowners and even fewer sharecroppers, mechanization was visible. In addition to the already existing differentiation between men and women in earning income, tractors, i.e. a means to accumulate wealth, were exclusively owned by men (Ecevit, 1991-3). Among landless agricultural workers, there was no differentiation in terms of ownership of tractors between men and women because mostly, they did not own any.

3.5.5.2 *Zone 2*

3.5.5.2.1 *Class 1*

Large landowners of this zone, entered into a process of commercialization. Because they had large amounts of land that could be used as collateral, they could buy tractors (Oral, 2013a). Because further accumulation was possible here, property ownership deepened the existing inequalities between men and women (Ecevit, 1991-3). Similar to Class 1 of *Zone 1*, here too, the Green Revolution inputs demonstrated a gendered pattern whereby men could acquire them thanks to land ownership whereas women could not.

3.5.5.2.2 *Class 2*

For middle landowners in this zone, in Central Anatolia, much of the grain production became mechanized (Akşit, 1988; İncirlioğlu, 1998). Again the expansion of tractor ownership restricted women's access to property ownership due to lack of other types of property that could be used as collateral for loans (Ecevit, 1991-3). The Black Sea region, on the other hand, due to its geographical characteristics and labor intensive production had low mechanization (Çınar & Silier, 1979). Therefore, it is logical to suppose that gaps between men and women in terms of tractor ownership did not increase. It is also logical to suppose that the Green Revolution inputs were used by this relatively wealthy class, which created inequalities between men and women as similar to that of the same class in *Zone 2*.

3.5.5.2.3 *Class 3*

Among small landowners of this zone, similar patterns to those of *Zone 1* took place. Considerable use of tractors in agriculture among some producers resulted in formation of inequality between the sexes in terms of property ownership, which disadvantaged women relative to men (Çınar & Silier, 1979; Ecevit, 1991-3). Sharecroppers and landless agricultural workers were few in number in this zone.

3.5.5.3 Zone 3

3.5.5.3.1 Class 1

Large landowners acquired tractors as a result of state help and transition to commercial farming. Men also took advantage of the Green Revolution technologies and inputs (Aydın, 1989). Thus, differences in property ownership were consolidated during this period (Özbay, 2015).

3.5.5.3.2 Class 3

Among sharecroppers and small landowners of this zone, mechanization was visible albeit to a lesser extent. Therefore, there were gaps in property ownership between men and women in families owning tractors (Ecevit, 1991-3).

3.5.6 Decision-making Capacity

During this period, in the country as a whole, there was a rapid expansion in ready-made-clothes, food and cleaning supplies such as tomato paste, detergents, soap etc. While the purchase of such goods from the market reduced the time spent by women doing domestic chores, it also reduced women's control over the distribution and consumption of them within household. This resulted in a double standard in terms of consumption between men and women; men were fed more and better than women (Kandiyoti, 1997). In places where commercialization widened men's area of influence vis-à-vis women, women retreated to the private sphere. Thus, their relation to and knowledge about the outside world decreased, which reduced their decision-making capacity (Ertürk, 1987).

3.5.6.1 Zone 1

3.5.6.1.1 Class 1

Among large landowners who formed joint patriarchal families, decision-making power belonged almost disproportionately to older men (Timur, 1972).

Increased commercialization and mechanization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women's (Ertürk, 1987⁸⁹).

3.5.6.1.2 Class 2

Among middle producers, production of goods for the market increased men's exposure to knowledge and activities of the outside world in terms of deals with cooperatives, banks, merchants etc. However, women remained outside of such relations, which created inequality between men and women in terms of access to world of knowledge, and affected the status of the latter negatively (Ertürk, 1987; Sirman, 1990). This increased men's decision-making capacity vis-à-vis women and old men (Ertürk, 1987). Women's decision-making capacity increased vis-à-vis old women, but it was undermined by that of men because of men's monopoly over public domain (Ecevit, 1991-3).

3.5.6.1.3 Class 3

Among small producers and sharecroppers of this zone, it is logical to suppose that increased public differentiation due to commercialization, men's wage work, their interaction with the outside world and women's confinement to agriculture and household subsistence resulted in men's dominance over women in decision-making processes (Ertürk, 1987). The power of older women in decision-making processes was undermined due to transformations regarding the family (Ecevit, 1991-3).

3.5.6.2 Zone 2

3.5.6.2.1 Class 1

Similar to large landowning class of *Zone 1*, men, especially old men, retained control over decision-making processes presumably as a result of their

⁸⁹ Although these were the findings of a case study realized in Mardin, it is logical to assume that this process repeated itself in other zones and across different classes, as well, so long as commercialization resulted in a differentiation between public and private domains, while confining women to the latter and increasing male domination over women.

active role in agricultural commercial transactions and mechanization (Ertürk, 1987; Timur, 1972).

3.5.6.2.2 *Class 2*

Like middle producers of *Zone 1*, commercialization and mechanization, changed the decision-making dynamics in favor of young men vis-à-vis old, and young women vis-à-vis old women. However, between young men and women, the former had more control over the conduct of family's life because of their role in commerce and mechanics (Ecevit, 1991-3; Ertürk, 1987). In this middle class, the deepening of commercialization also deepened the inequality between men and women in terms of interaction with the outside world. Similar to Class 2 of *Zone 1*, men increasingly entered into relations with the world outside of the village as an extension of their handling of family commercial transactions. Women, on the other hand, were increasingly drawn outside of public domain (Sirman, 1990⁹⁰). Men made all major decisions such as “the farming routine, all major sales and purchases, the marriage of children, visits to the doctor” etc. (İncirlioğlu, 1998, p. 205).

3.5.6.2.3 *Class 3*

Among those small producers and sharecroppers who found wage work and who had limited mechanization and commercialization, decision-making power of men was expected to increase vis-à-vis women because of their interaction with the outside world. However, to a certain extent women could preserve their control over the resources because the difference between public and private spheres in terms of agricultural production had not yet become very deep. Because men and women retained similar roles in the absence of market oriented production and mechanization, there were fewer gaps in decision-making capacity of men and women (Ertürk, 1987). However, older women were disadvantaged because their role in decision-making decreased (Ecevit, 1991-3).

⁹⁰ Although this study focused on Class 2 of *Zone 1* similar processes should apply here, as well, albeit to differing degrees.

3.5.6.3 Zone 3

3.5.6.3.1 Class 1

Large landowners presented similar characteristics to those of other zones. Women's participation in decision-making was severely constrained by men, particularly old men (Timur, 1972).

3.5.6.3.2 Class 3

Among the lower classes of this zone, women and men's participation in decision-making process continued in similar lines to the same class of other zones. Among those producers who became fully market oriented in an environment of centralized production under the supervision of landlord, landlords' domination over men and men's domination over women was common. Due to differentiation between domestic and public spheres, and because women increasingly became confined to the former, men dominated the public realm. As a result of this hierarchy, women participated less in decision-making process in the household, and even less in the community. The only manner they could apply some influence over decision-making was through exchange of gossip to affect male opinion (Ertürk, 1987⁹¹). However, among producers who did not commercialize entirely and who used all family labor, women participated more in decision-making within household and within community, especially when men were absent during the day. Therefore, they exerted direct control over the conduct of affairs. Moreover, the authority and decision-making power of the older women within household decreased due to family transformations (Ecevit, 1991-3).

3.6 The Environment

The Green Revolution damaged the environment by destroying biological diversity, by causing disinfected crops, polluting water sources and soil and

⁹¹ Although this study was made in Mardin, i.e. Zone 3, so long as conditions regarding public-private differentiation were the same, it is logical to suppose that it can be extended across classes and zones.

causing desertification, salination and erosion etc. (Shiva; 1991, 2000a). Excessive use of chemicals started during this period, which we mark as the intensification of environmental degradation in Turkey. The sharp increase in the use of these inputs was due to the influence of the Green Revolution.

In 1962, Rachel Carson wrote a revolutionary book called "*Silent Spring*". Only after this, were the environmental problems that were created by the use of chemical inputs in agriculture noticed. In this book, Carson talked about the harms realized by different types of insecticides and pesticides on humans, other living beings and the environment. Although excessive amounts of chemical inputs entered into Turkish agriculture during this period, the environmental problems were disregarded. Therefore, in this section, we will first look at how the effects of inputs were evaluated by Carson and other sources, what kinds of inputs were used in Turkey, and how we can derive conclusions about the effects of inputs in Turkey by looking at these sources. We wish to remind that this is only a preliminary study, and more research is needed to understand the gravity of the issue.

Rachel Carson stated that types of chlorinated hydrocarbons which were used as insecticides damaged livers and other organs or tissues because of their storage within the body. The ratio of storage⁹² was especially high for agricultural workers and workers in the insecticide plants. Through links of food chains, such chemicals were passed from one organism to another. Therefore, poison could be passed on from mother to offspring. Residues remained in the soil and foodstuffs. Aldrin, Endrin and Dieldrin were the types of chlorinated hydrocarbons which were toxic. However, Endrin was the most toxic of all, when it was used "it killed enormous numbers of fish, fatally poisoned cattle that have wandered into sprayed orchards, has poisoned wells and has drawn a sharp warning from at least one state health department that its careless use endangers human lives" (Carson,

⁹² "According to various studies, individuals with no known exposure (except the inevitable dietary one) store an average of 5.3 parts per million to 7. Parts per million; agricultural workers 17.1 parts per million; and workers in insecticide plants as high as 648 parts per million! So the range of proven storage is quite wide and, what is even more to the point, the minimum figures are above the level at which damage to the liver and other organ or tissues may begin" (Carson, 1962, p. 22)

1962, p. 27). Another set of insecticides were alkyl or organic phosphates which caused acute poisoning among people who applied it or who came into contact with drifting spray accidentally. They had the ability to destroy enzymes that fulfilled essential functions, and their target was the nervous system (Carson, 1962).

M. A. Altieri (2000) claimed that fertilizers, too, polluted the environment because of wasteful application and because they were used inefficiently by crops. A proportion of fertilizer that was not consumed by the crops ended up in surface or groundwater. Nitrogen in the nitrate form came from fertilizers and when it was above safety levels, it polluted well water in many parts of the USA. Certainly, such high levels of nitrate were hazardous to human health, and caused air pollution and global warming (Altieri, 2000).

The coming of the Green Revolution to Turkey was a curious⁹³ event. It came to Turkey in 1965, in Tarsus, when a Turkish farmer and businessman, Mehmet Can Eliyeşil⁹⁴, planted Mexican wheat variety which yielded more than the native crops. Later, the Ministry of Agriculture in Turkey came into contact with the USA and requested that specialists would prepare programs to speed up Turkish

⁹³ In the Participant Journal (1967, 27) published by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Green Revolution in Turkey was justified by world food crisis and population increase. To solve this, the introduction of HYVS and population planning was recommended. However, this was misleading. We searched for an evidence of existence of famine in Turkey during this period, which could justify this intervention, We found none. It was true that Turkey imported grain from the USA since 1954 due to one year of wheat shortage, but there is good reason to believe that such 'aid' was less a result of famine threat than the US desire to dump her surplus. This effectively proves our claim that the Green Revolution was not introduced to eradicate hunger by increasing food supply, but to create outlets for agricultural inputs. Although the source of such inputs was not explicitly stated anywhere, it is logical to suppose that it was the agribusiness companies because it was advocated that "only agribusiness firms can supply these new inputs efficiently" (Brown, 1970, p. 59).

⁹⁴ The use of new seed varieties was actually deemed unsuited for local use by the government research stations. However, when Mehmet Can Eliyeşil planted the seeds that he smuggled through a 'friend', this judgment was considered invalid (Brown, 1970). Later, this practice was followed by 101 Çukurova families, who imported the seeds 'through their own resources'. Finally, the government granted permission (Participant, 1967, 27). The data on import of agricultural inputs by Turkey are sketchy and incomplete. We do not know the exact supply chain of these inputs. Further research should be directed into this topic to discover the degree of US influence on the adoption of Green Revolution in Turkey.

agriculture. Thus, the production and excessive use of harmful agricultural inputs in Turkey were realized under the auspices of the USA. The production of a number of chemical insecticides which were known to be hazardous was overlooked/passed over⁹⁵. The inputs such as seeds, fertilizers, loans, training were made available by the Turkish Ministry of Agriculture⁹⁶ (Frizzell, 1968). The result was praised for being a miracle by the experts. 8 factories⁹⁷ were opened in Turkey to control pest and insecticide problems in agriculture. Some of these were domestic and some foreign (Participant, 1967, 25). Shell was one of the leaders of the agricultural chemical industry. Its work in Turkey benefited extensively from its research stations found in the USA, the Great Britain and Germany. Shell, in its factory first in Beykoz and then in İzmit, produced Endrin, Aldrin and Dieldrex⁹⁸. It was also to open a new unit to produce organo-phosphorus (Participant, 1967, 25). The amount of chemical fertilizers used was 13.283 tons in 1948, and it rose to 2.448.000 tons between 1963 and 1970. Before 1963, 45.000 tons of 'improved' seeds were distributed, this rose to 227.000 tons between 1963 and 1969 (Tekeli, 1978, p. 304, 306). These developments were mentioned proudly by the journal whereas their effects on the environment and on the population wer entirely ingored.

The first traces of the Green Revolution were found in the high-rainfall coastal Çukurova plateau, and partially in dryland farming in Central Anatolia

⁹⁵ Carson stated that chemicals such as DDT, a type of chlorinated hydrocarbons, were claimed to be hazardous by the Food and Drug Administration in 1950. Also, several states warned about the use of Endrin (1962). However, the opening of hazardous insecticide factories in Turkey corresponded to a much later period. A good question to ask here is why the production of such harmful chemicals in Turkey were allowed and even encouraged by the USA, when it was known even before that date that they constituted a threat to human health and the environment.

⁹⁶ The Prime Minister Süleyman Demirel himself took active role in promoting the Green Revolution in Turkey, especially in order to gain the support of the market oriented and politically active producers (Brown, 1968).

⁹⁷ Namely, Koruma, Hektaş, Agromerck, Mudiltipi, Kimyagerler, Shell. Sandoz would begin production shortly (Participant, 1967, 25).

⁹⁸ A Dieldrin compound.

(Frizzell, 1968). Later it spread to other regions. This is clear in the table below. Unconscious use of pesticides since the 1950s resulted in “negative impacts on soil and air quality, as well as on human health” (Tanrıvermiş, 2003, p. 557). We know that many agricultural laborers, men, women and children, worked in the Mediterranean region where such harmful chemicals were excessively used. Potentially, the residues of insecticides such as Endrin, Aldrin and Dieldrex poisoned generations by passing on the poison from mother to offspring. Their health was negatively and irreversibly affected by these chemicals. By potentially polluting the wells, fertilizers affected human health. If such danger was noticed by people, water would have to be brought from a further distance to avoid contamination. Because it was mostly women and children who carried water, it is logical to suppose that this increased women’s workload. Although such environmental and human health hazard has been most prominent in *Zone 1*, it is valid for other zones, as well. In the following table, the percentage of tractors, of pesticide etc., used in each region among producers owning 1-20 dönüm can be observed:

TABLE 1. Use of Agricultural Inputs in each Region (%)

	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3	
	Aegean and Marmara	Mediterranean	Central Anatolia	Black Sea	Eastern Anatolia	Turkey
Tractors	42.7	33.9	39.8	6.9	31.1	31.1
Artificial Fertilizer	50.8	75.4	63.4	83.6	30.2	66.5
Pesticide	68.7	70.2	37.6	35.3	33.2	53.9
Irrigation	31.7	75.4	55.1	5.0	26.9	37.7

(Çınar & Silier, 1979, p. 59)

This table reflects the trends among the poorest class. The amount of agricultural inputs used increased when one went upward in the class rank (Çınar

& Varlier, 1979, p. 62). It is interesting that the excessive amount of chemicals used by the wealthiest class potentially affected the men, women and children of the lowest class, i.e. landless laborers because wealthy producers withdrew from production except for mechanical tasks or supervision of production.

Another environmental problem was the increased pressure on the common pasture land. As incentives and prices encouraged the production of cash-crops like cotton, more common land was opened to cultivation. This increased pressure on the already overused grazing land⁹⁹ (Aktan, 1957).

3.7 Conclusion

During the first half of this period, a dependency relationship between Turkey and the USA was developed. Turkey received assistance in cash, loans, foodstuffs, agricultural inputs and weaponry from the USA in exchange for fulfilling its role in the new world order, i.e. to become a provider of agricultural goods and raw materials and to help contain communism. Focusing on such promises as development, agricultural prosperity, and getting closer to the West also benefited the Turkish political elite, especially the DP. They enjoyed wide public support for giving importance to agriculture and for their partially realized promises to pour the fruits of economic development to the public. The ideology of development was tied to the export of agricultural raw materials to the core and Turkey's ability to constitute a market for core-based technical assistance. This was predicated on Turkey's readiness to participate in wars. These were all in line with the expectations of the core from the periphery and semi-periphery. The costs of such dependency on public, especially rural women, the environment and the country, in general have been detrimental.

The agricultural policies that were imposed by the USA through the Turkish governments which aimed at development enhanced regional, class and gender inequalities. Wealthy producers extensively benefited from the agricultural

⁹⁹ The limitation on using common land also caused hardships among less wealthy producers especially in Western Anatolia because they no longer had the opportunity to provide a part of their incomes from animals grazing on common land (Singer, 1977).

policies. Certain middle producers took advantage of the new agricultural developments by furthering commercialization and getting wealthier. However, lower classes have been adversely affected from the policies. There was nearly no change regarding the status of women in large landowning families compared to the previous period. Only women in large landowning class of *Zone 3* experienced worse terms in property ownership when tractors entered into production. Women in all middle producers of *Zone 1* experienced intensified exploitation of their labor, increased sexual division of labor, and greater differentiation in terms of tasks men and women engaged in. They engaged in subsistence and commercial production as well as household reproduction, they offered their labor *gratis* whereas men pocketed the profits. Also, with tractors entering the agriculture, property differentials increased visibly between men and women. Increased commercialization and public-private differentiation increased men's worldly knowledge and their decision-making power. Women in small landowning and sharecropping families also faced bad conditions. The effects of commercialization were more indirect in their case. Commercialization and development negatively affected the welfare of the household by depriving them of resources. Presumably, the exploitation of women's labor started and income differentials between men and women were created. Although there were no data regarding this group in the previous period, it is logical to suppose that the introduction of new inputs and expansion of tractor ownership increased property differentials. Women were disadvantaged in terms of decision-making power with increased commercialization. Women in middle landowning families experienced similar processes as the same class in *Zone 1*. Their status was negatively affected in the face of increased commercialization and mechanization. Small producers of this zone also faced similar difficulties regarding exploitation of their labor and property differences as small producers of *Zone 1*. However, among some of these families where commercialization was little and where public-private differentiation was not deep women applied a considerable amount of decision-making power. Women in small landowning families of *Zone 3* also went through similar processes as small producers of other zones. The importance of age

decreased during this period, which affected rural women adversely. Although the use of birth control increased, it is difficult to establish a direct relation between this and women's increased control over their bodies because it is not clear whether decisions were made by women, or by men or a result of changes in living standards.

Development of the Green Revolution in Turkey also affected the environment and human health negatively. The increased use of chemicals such as pesticides, insecticides and fertilizers not only increased the economic problems experienced by certain groups of producers, but they also harmed the environment. However, this went unnoticed.

In short, development and the related trends that were imposed by the USA on countries such as Turkey had negative effects on women and the environment as well as on certain classes. Although these ideas were promoted on the grounds that they would bring prosperity to all, this remained an unrealized propaganda for the majority of the population.

CHAPTER 4

THE NEOLIBERAL PERIOD 1967/73-

4.1 Introduction

The downturn in the world-economy began in 1967/73 as “the way capitalism has been working since about 1970” has significantly changed¹⁰⁰ (Arrighi, 1994, p. 4). Therefore, we mark this as the beginning of a new economic paradigm in the world-system which had repercussions on both the core and peripheral and semi-peripheral states.

4.2 World Conjunction

After 1967/73, a series of political and economic events led to the decline of the US hegemony and downturn in the world-economy. The US hegemony entered into a crisis in three different spheres. By 1973, it retreated from the military hegemony because of the troubles in Vietnam, from the economic hegemony due to the difficulty in sustaining the post-war mode of production and regulation, and from the ideological hegemony because of loss of legitimacy of the war against Communism (Arrighi, 1994, p. 300-1). These marked the decline of US hegemony. After 1973, the US could not keep up with its world governmental functions. The world was almost left to govern itself, which caused further destabilization of what remained of the post-war order and accompanied “a steep decline of US power and prestige through the Iranian Revolution and the hostage crisis of 1980” (Arrighi, 1994, p. 301).

¹⁰⁰ However, there are serious “difficulties involved in theorizing the transition to flexible accumulation” (Arrighi, 1994, p. 4)

Keynesian policies were no longer able to solve the economic¹⁰¹ problems (Harvey, 2005). Lack of economic growth was combined by a general rise in prices, i.e. inflation. Unsold inventory as a result of Fordist overproduction resulted in a rise in prices so that businesses did not incur losses (Arrighi, 2007). To overcome these challenges, a ‘new’¹⁰² set of economic principles, i.e. neoliberalism, was instituted around the world, often through force.

Neoliberalism

is a theory of political economic practices proposing that human well-being can best be advanced by the maximization of the entrepreneurial freedoms within an institutional framework characterized by private property rights, individual liberty, unencumbered markets, and free trade... [In neoliberalism]... the role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices (Harvey, 2007, p. 22).

The neoliberal capitalist state tended to promote “the interests of private property owners, businesses, multinational corporations, and financial capital” (Harvey, 2005, p. 7). During this cycle of capital accumulation, finance capital gained importance vis-à-vis productive capital and the nation-state (Arrighi, 1994). The rise of financial capital at the end of the 1970s, which took place at the end of each hegemonic cycle, corresponded to the rise of neoliberalism in the case of US systemic cycle of accumulation (SCA). When the expansion of trade and

¹⁰¹ “By the end of the 1960s embedded liberalism began to break down, both internationally and within domestic economies”. Embedded liberalism was a reconciliation of market and society. “The practices of domestic interventionism would tame the socially disruptive effects of markets without, however, eliminating the welfare and efficiency gains derived from cross-country trade” (Abdelal & Ruggie, 2009, p.153). Other economic problems included unemployment and inflation which caused stagflation, and fiscal crises experienced by many states. The “US dollars had flooded the world and escaped US controls by being deposited in European banks. Fixed exchange rates were therefore abandoned in 1971” (Harvey, 2005, p. 12).

¹⁰² There were a few differences about liberalism and neoliberalism that needed to be made clearer. Firstly, while previously the British government imposed free trade, during neoliberalism, free trade was imposed by international organizations such as WTO and the IMF. Secondly, the absence of gold standard in neoliberalism and the advancements in transportation and communication technologies made financial expansion much more flexible and limitless compared with the 19th century liberalism.

production of the US SCA came to an end in the 1970s, the signal crisis of the cycle occurred and this was followed by financial expansion during which the method of profit accumulation was moved away from trade and production to finance (Arrighi, 1994, p. x). Thus, finance capital has penetrated into various sectors from which it had been absent.

The creators of neoliberalism were people who occupied important positions in governments and institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank. Under the name of Structural Adjustment Policies (SAPs) and in exchange for debt rescheduling¹⁰³, they promoted “deregulation, privatization and the withdrawal of state from many areas of social provision”, more flexible labor market laws as well as “austerity policies and fiscal restraints” (Harvey, 2005, p. 24; Harvey, 2007). Neoliberalism was an instrument to reverse the reconciliation between capital and labor that had been established during Keynesianism, and it was a way to restore upper class power. This was visible from the fact that unlike the promises, it did not bring about economic stimulation to capitalism in a way to bring general prosperity, but it did lead to increased wealth and power of elites within countries, which caused greater social inequality (Harvey, 2005). Also, because of high labor costs in the core, a solution to the crisis of Fordism was to re-locate industry to the periphery (Ikeda, 1996). This increased inequality among and within countries.

In the 1960s and 1970s, development had come under attack. Dependency theorists criticized it because modernization ignored the relationship between the metropolitan and satellite states that was based on exploitation and extraction of surplus (Frank, 1966). Feminists criticized it on the grounds that modernization

¹⁰³ These debts were the results of loans borrowed by the developing states. Due to cutbacks on foreign aid and economic crisis, many Third World Countries felt pressured to accept loans offered by Western banks, which were simply trying to make profit by using petrodollars invested in them by Arab countries. Many peripheral countries which mainly exported raw materials found themselves in a trap when Fordist period during which there was a huge demand for raw materials came to an end and gave way to the rise of financial capital. This made it difficult for them to pay back their debts, and they had to undergo a series of debt rescheduling which made it easier for the international financial institutions to impose neoliberal policies on them (Payer, 1975). For more information, please see Payer, C. (1975). *The Debt Trap: The IMF and The Third World*. Monthly Review Press.

had a male bias and therefore it ignored women, and even worsened their situation (Boserup, 1970; Sen & Grown, 1987). The environmentalists drew attention to the environmental degradation brought about by modernization (Carson, 1962; Shiva, 1991). Development was also criticized for its urban bias which sustained the idea that cities had a privilege in development plans which led them to receive the lion share of resources (Lipton, 1977). This was at the expense of rurality which was exploited harshly to provide surplus to cities. In spite of these critiques, development continued to advocate mechanization, regional development projects that would cause gender inequality and environmental degradation, urban bias, cash crop production etc.

Although these core ideas of modernization did not change, its shape was changed. Development ideology took a new shape with the new economic paradigm, i.e. neoliberalism, in the form of SAPs. This was a means to transform development in a way that it would function with minimum state intervention and that would allow repayment of Third World debt. SAPs promoted export oriented production in the periphery to finance development and to pay back debts. However, export oriented cash-crop production reduced the subsistence base of the periphery (Marshall, 1999) and due to devaluations of currencies of peripheral countries, exports became cheaper (Moberg, 1992). As a result, export income decreased and debts could not be paid. In spite of this change in method, development in the form of neoliberalism continued to have negative impacts on peripheral and semi-peripheral countries, women, the environment, and rurality.

Simultaneously accompanying these developments, there emerged a change in the functioning and organization of agri-business TNCs. Formerly, they could only provide agricultural inputs. Therefore, they tried to expand markets for these products by supporting state involvement in agriculture (Aydın, 2010). However, “from circa 1968 onwards, transnational corporations have developed into an integrated system of production, exchange and accumulation” (Arrighi, 1990, p. 403).

The internalization within a single organizational domain of activities and transactions previously carried out by separate business units enabled vertically integrated, multi-unit enterprises to reduce and make more calculable transaction costs- costs, that is, associated with the transfer of intermediate inputs through a long chain of separate organizational domains connecting primary production to final consumption (Arrighi, 1994, p. 239).

Once they completed their vertical integration, they did not make do with only selling agricultural inputs. They got involved in production, inputs, marketing etc. This was facilitated by novelties brought about in the process of globalization, as well.

While there is no single definition of globalization¹⁰⁴, in my definition, it can be explained in terms of the increased mobility of capital (especially financial capital), a bigger role for the transnational corporations (TNCs), greater interdependence among states and the intensification of the global division of labor. It was claimed that globalization was ‘created’ to justify the neoliberal project, that consisted of the imposition of the rules of a global free market as well as the strengthening of Western capitalism in different economic zones of the world. In addition to this, globalization can be seen as sum of the processes by which Western capitalism expanded its sphere of influence through multilateral control. The continuous need for capitalism to find new sources of profit presented itself during globalization in the form of economic expansion into or domination over the Third World countries by the Western elites. Largely in contrast to imperial forms of control over the colonies, this time domination was realized with the help of the Third World governments in the process (Held & McGrew, 2000).

As TNCs were deeply engrained in the international markets, they were sensitive to international demand. As the demand from the periphery and semi-

¹⁰⁴ The absence of a single definition of globalization can be attributed to the multidimensional character of the term. It has had material, spatio-temporal and cognitive aspects (Held & McGrew, 2000). As different people put emphasis on different aspects of globalization, there was no unity regarding the definition of the concept.

periphery during this period was inclined towards cash crop and high value added food production, they promoted the production of these by displacing traditional and subsistence crops. They tried to achieve this goal by discouraging state subsidies for traditional crops and promoting contract farming (Aydın, 2010). The US TNCs had such great organizational scope and complexity that they were not subject to any state authority, and had the power to impose their ‘laws’ on every member of the interstate system (Arrighi, 1990). In the case of the US, however, they had the government-backing. Such an expansion of TNCs in the sphere of agriculture resulted in destruction of income generating activities for small agricultural producers due to vulnerability against the fluctuating markets. This caused depopulation in rural areas. It affected women more than men, and has also resulted in a deteriorated environment.

4.3 Turkish Politics and Economy

The 1970s were a turbulent period in Turkey. A series of coalition governments and social crises and economic problems¹⁰⁵ dominated. Such an environment of crises was a good leverage for the international financial institutions as they excused it to “pressurize the country into implementing liberalization policies” (Aydın, 2010, p. 154). The economic and military dependency on the USA that was created in the previous period was consolidated. The USA and IMF offered aid and debt rescheduling in an attempt to make Turkey an example of a ‘successful’ market economy and to contain Communism after threats such as the invasion of Afghanistan by the USSR and coming to power of a socialist party in Greece (Ahmad, 1995).

¹⁰⁵ These problems included “significant structural weaknesses”, the “bottlenecks of the ISI” (import-substitution industry), balance of payments problems and debt issues (Aydın, 2010, p. 154). One of the reasons for borrowing money was that the amount of remittances decreased after 1973 because of crisis. The amount of debt increased even further throughout the years as economy worsened.

Under the supervision of Turgut Özal¹⁰⁶ who was appointed as the chief economic advisor, a series of economic decisions were taken on 24 January 1980 to transform the Turkish economy in line with the market rules. These measures were quite harsh and could not be implemented in the presence of a democratic government and social opposition. Therefore, to sustain an environment of ‘serenity’, similar to many other peripheral and semi-peripheral countries, neoliberalism was instituted in Turkey by a violent *coup d’état* on 12 September, 1980. Economic policies by which neoliberalism had been installed on 24 January and foreign policy were left untouched by the junta government (Ahmad, 1995).

Although Turkey had a short period of political ‘stability’ with Turgut Özal and ANAP (Anavatan Partisi-Motherland Party), after the junta left the government to civil rule; the 1990s marked the beginning of another decade of political uncertainty. The liberalized agricultural policies of coalition governments of the late 1990s impoverished the masses of agricultural producers who were accustomed to state support. As a result, they were alienated from the coalition parties (Aydın, 2010). The result was the victory of a newly established party, i.e. the AKP (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi- Justice and Development Party), which has been singlehandedly ruling the country since 2002.

4.4 Turkish Agriculture

During this period, the international division of labor in food was reshaped again. Whereas the core focused on the production of low-value foods, the task of the periphery and semi-periphery was to produce high-value cash crops (Aydın, 2010). This was promoted by the international organizations and favored the TNCs. Turkey, as well as other peripheral and semi-peripheral countries complied with this ‘norm’ and they incurred great losses.

Neoliberalism in agriculture took slow steps in the 1980s. Price supports and subsidies that marked the previous period were radically reduced for most

¹⁰⁶ He was educated in the USA and had close relations with the IMF and World Bank (Ahmad, 1995).

products and were kept stable for a few others. International actors increasingly dominated Turkish agriculture. The IMF and the World Bank, desired to reduce public expenditures in Turkey, and demanded through the SAPs that subsidies in agricultural inputs be reduced, price supports be eliminated and interest rates on agricultural loans be increased (Yenal, 2013). The IMF and World Bank not only internationalized Turkish agriculture but also restructured it so as “to prioritize the production of high value cash crops” over traditional food production, in line with the demand from TNCs. They “eliminated the traditional agriculture and established... [a]... free marketism in production, trade and distribution”, restructured administrative bodies that regulated agriculture and promoted privatization of these bodies and state enterprises (Aydın, 2010, p. 151-152; Keyder & Yenal, 2011). Agricultural inputs such as seeds, fertilizers, insecticides etc. were increasingly commodified as a result of the liberalization of international trade¹⁰⁷.

In the 1980s, the TNCs that had been operating in Turkey since the 1950s increased their role in agriculture and food sector (Yenal, 2013). After 1980, contract farming¹⁰⁸ started to replace small-scale agricultural production. This was promoted and encouraged by the state¹⁰⁹ and the Agricultural Bank which

¹⁰⁷ Liberalization of international trade was in line with the global food order in which different parts of the world were given the task to produce either low or high value foods. Therefore, the movement of these products had to be freed (Keyder & Yenal, 2013). Although increases in the price of agricultural inputs disadvantaged producers, it brought further accumulation for the TNCs which supplied them.

¹⁰⁸ After 1980, to increase the profit levels in agriculture, production had to be controlled more tightly and it had to be standardized. This was to be achieved mainly by contract farming. Contract farming not only facilitated mass production but it also enabled the process of standardization in agriculture by forcing all producers to use the same inputs (Gürel, 2014). With contract farming, producers became passive recipients rather than active participants in production (Lewontin, 2000).

¹⁰⁹ Contract farming is a kind of agricultural production in which “large numbers of independent-looking farmers carry out production of agricultural commodities for a company” (Aydın, 2010, p. 178). Through contract farming, states worldwide helped increase the power of the TNCs as they enacted patent laws that forbade producers to use different inputs. As the ‘promoted’ inputs were supplied by certain TNCs, agricultural input industry was monopolized across the world (Gürel, 2014).

provided loans to producers and corporations which engaged in contract farming (Gürel, 2014). The IMF and World Bank gave the US based TNCs the power to decide the kind, quality and quantity of the products (Aydın, 2010). TNCs also consolidated power by entering into partnership with local corporations and benefiting from their production facilities, settled brand names and reputation (Yenal, 1999; Kendir 2009).

Small changes were made in agricultural policies during the 1990s due to elections. The coalition parties who lacked public support could not dare to sharply reduce subsidies, wages and services. Therefore, to maintain legitimacy, political parties gave concessions¹¹⁰ away from free marketism (Aydın, 2010; Gürel, 2014). However, the governments still continued to operate in accordance with a neoliberal logic.

During the 1990s, the European Union became an active actor in Turkish agriculture. The signing of the Customs Union agreement between the EU and Turkey in 1996 signified a restructuring of Turkish agriculture in line with EU demands. The EU expected Turkey to achieve the same level of efficiency as the EU in agriculture without active state support that was the case in the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of the EU. The Turkish government agreed to this to receive additional economic resources from the EU after the fiscal and monetary crisis that broke out in 1994 (Aydın, 2010).

The full effects of neoliberalism on agriculture came only in the late 1990s and early 2000s (Aydın, 2010). ARIP (the Agricultural Reform Implementation Program) was initiated by the World Bank in 2001. This was an extension of the previous liberalization policies, and intensified the process. With ARIP, the privatization of agricultural institutions such as TZDK, TEKEL, sugar factories etc. speeded up. Agricultural cooperatives were reformulated in accordance with the directives of the World Bank. This gave the World Bank the ability of direct

¹¹⁰ Concessions such as interference by the state in price formation, reintroduction of subsidies and support prices for certain agricultural products etc. (Aydın, 2010).

intervention in “the agricultural support system, hazelnut and tobacco¹¹¹ production” as well as the production of sugar¹¹² beet (Aydın, 2010, p. 160). By introducing quotas on these crops, it promoted the production of agricultural goods that were in demand in international markets (Gürel, 2014) -- such as strawberries, mushrooms and kiwis (Aydın, 2010). Also, prices of agricultural goods in Turkey came to approximate world prices. In line with the world trend, the state reduced its subsidies and moved away from production and trade of agricultural products to organization of production, extension and improvement of the quality of products (Aksoy, 2005).

With the encouragement of the WTO, the state took a step to make up for the abolition of price supports and subsidies. The social tension that would emerge out of this was eased by introducing Direct Income Support (DIS)¹¹³. This was because the WTO promoted the idea that producers should produce not in accordance with state supports, but on the basis of market prices (Gürel, 2014). This was a clear sign of neoliberal practices and was widely criticized¹¹⁴. DIS was

¹¹¹ Tobacco Law of 2001 came as a response to the desires of the IMF and World Bank to open Turkish markets to TNCs. State withdrew from the procurement of tobacco. Consequently, many tobacco producers were left to the mercy of the TNCs, and marketing of tobacco was left to the so-called free market (Aydın, 2010, p. 171).

¹¹² Pressures from the giant US corporation Cargill, agreements with the IMF, pledges made to World Bank and promises made to the EU caused Turkey to regulate its sugar production regime (Aydın, 2010, p. 163).

¹¹³ “The DIS was a short-term measure to overcome some losses of farmers and to encourage them to continue with farming ...[not in the production of traditional crops]... but in the production of alternative crops” (Aydın, 2010, p. 176). Producers who had up to 199 decares (1 decar= 1000 m²) would receive the TL amount of 5 USD. Land that was under 500 m² was not taken into consideration and was not paid (Official Gazette, 2000: 24010). The upper limit was increased to 500 decares in 2002.

¹¹⁴ Because the DIS required peasants to go through a costly registration process to receive the support (Aydın, 2010). Moreover, the DIS represented a narrower scope compared with the previous price supports and subsidies, and recipients suffered from late payments (Ecevit, Karkıner & Büke, 2009). Therefore, most of the producers did not even apply. As a result, the DIS, which was designed as a poverty alleviation project benefited mostly those large landowners who were able to afford the costs of registration (Aydın, 2010; Döner, 2012). The DIS was also a tool to limit the production of certain crops

terminated in 2010 (Gürel, Küçük, Taş & 2018), and was replaced by the regional specialization scheme.

In this system that was created by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA), Turkey was divided into regions for which different crops were envisaged. These were claimed to have been selected on the basis that the country had low supply or that the region had comparative advantage in that crop. Accordingly, support would only be given to those producers who cultivated the crops that were defined by MARA for that region. This practice attracted criticism because the so-called desired crops would reflect the interests of the international financial institutions as well as agribusiness TNCs, which would increase the country's dependency on these institutions (Aydın, 2010), and which also would reduce the independence of producers regarding what they wanted to produce. Secondly, it was criticized because it favored large and medium-scale producers over small producers (Gürel et al., 2018). This criticism stemmed from the fact that this scheme held that small landowners were not efficient producers, which consequently speeded up the process of land consolidation with a new land law (Aydın, 2010).

As contract farming expanded its area of influence, the agricultural input TNCs as well as national companies and joint ventures¹¹⁵ took hold on producers in Turkey¹¹⁶ especially in the 1990s and 2000s (Aksoy, 2005; Gürel, 2014). The problem was especially dire in the case of seeds¹¹⁷. Agrarian Law (2006) and The

¹¹⁵ “The number of private seed companies increased from fewer than five before the reforms to about 80 by 1990, including several subsidiaries, some joint ventures and many international licensees”. Also, most of the research concerning seed was carried out by international capital (Aksoy, 2005, p. 244). This was a clear sign that multinational and other private companies had increased their presence in Turkish agriculture. This had detrimental effects on producers from different zones, classes, genders and on the environment. This will be explained later.

¹¹⁶ It is possible to see the vertically integrated TNCs contracting the farmers for the production of tomato paste- canned tomatoes, sugar beets and its derivatives, maize etc. in different parts of the country (Oral, 2013b, p. 345).

¹¹⁷ Those producers who were barred from using their traditional seeds and who bought genetically engineered seeds from the TNCs such as Monsanto had to return to these companies

Seed Law (2006) have been complementary in facilitating the penetration of agro-capital in Turkey (Aydın, 2010). The Seed Law made it obligatory for the seeds that were sold on the market to be registered and certified, which prevented the market exchange of traditional seeds. Thus, a source of additional income for poor producers was undermined (Gürel, 2014). The Agrarian Law, too, paid attention to intellectual property rights that were ingrained in the Seed Law. It also linked state support to contract farming (Aydın, 2010). Thus, it paved the way for creating the dependence of producers on the TNCs.

Although neoliberal agricultural policies were insignificantly modified for short intervals, such as that between 2007-2009¹¹⁸, due to fears of social instability, the general neoliberal approach has never been abandoned (Keyder & Yenil, 2013). Despite the fact that AKP governments have followed general neoliberal ideology, albeit with short intervals, which upheld ‘efficiency’ in agriculture rather than well-being of the producers, the people in the countryside have been one of the biggest supporters of the AKP government. On average, approximately 50% of the rural voters voted for the AKP since 2007 (Gürel et al., 2018, p. 1). There have been accounts which explained this phenomenon on the basis that rural people were irrational or ignorant about the policies of the AKP. However, these were far from explaining the underlying reasons behind this strong support. Instead, Gürel et al. (2018) came up with a new explanation. According to their account, there were several reasons for the support of the rural voters for the AKP. Firstly, the neoliberal assault on the rurality was not attributed

next year to buy seed (Lewontin, 2000). This was because unlike the traditional seeds, the corporation seeds did not regenerate (Shiva, 2000b), and had to be bought each year, which put financial strain on producers. Such policies were not only promoted by the TNCs. They were also encouraged and in certain cases, reinforced by the WTO, the USA and other core countries (Aydın, 2010).

¹¹⁸ This included price support and input subsidies. Agricultural prices in Turkey were over the world prices by 38% between 2007-2009 (Keyder & Yenil, 2013, p. 210). The real purposes of these concessions were to enable agricultural productivity, product variation, and to increase quality and competitive power. The goal was not to transfer income to producers, if the producer made profit, this was a reward for their well-integration into the market (Keyder & Yenil, 2013).

to the AKP government, because it was the DSP-MHP-ANAP coalition government in the late 1990s and early 2000s that started the great transformation in Turkish agriculture. Secondly, it was claimed that voters used both the ballot box and negotiation with the government to demand change. Finally, partially as a response to the reaction by voters, the AKP made small concessions regarding neoliberal agricultural policies that were mentioned earlier, they speeded up the process of proletarianization in villages and brought new social policies that were aimed at low-income groups (Gürel et al., 2018, p. 3).

In short, whereas during the developmentalist period, Turkish agriculture was developed under the auspices of the USA, during the neoliberal period, this dominating role was fulfilled by TNCs with the assistance of the international organizations and the USA. Those producers who complied survived; most of them were impoverished. They had to find other sources than agricultural production to maintain survival.

4.5 Rural Women in Turkey Since 1967/73

4.5.1 Women and Neoliberalism

As noted earlier, the worldwide economic expansion period of 1940-67/73 had accompanied full male employment. Although the economic conditions were favorable, this had not translated into women's mass employment. On the contrary, women were defined as dependent non-workers. During the period of economic downturn, however, women's employment increased mainly due to the insufficiency wages which tended to be lower. However, in spite of an increase in women's employment, women have been overwhelmingly located in lower-paid and part-time jobs without social protection (Toksöz, 1997). Reductions in state's welfare expenditures disproportionately affected women, and caused 'feminization of poverty' (Pelizzon & Casparis, 1996). Women in the global South were more negatively affected by the downturn. Because of the relocation of world manufacturing to the periphery, they were compelled to work under unsafe conditions for low wages, without job security and without social security.

Regarding the effects of downturn and neoliberalism on rural women in “Third World” areas, Mies and Shiva (1993)¹¹⁹ have said that due to land-grabs and privatization of common land, rural women’s workload increased and their income was effectively reduced. Because water, wood, wild fruits etc. could not be acquired from the nearby common land, they had to spend more time and energy acquiring them because of having to go further to collect these items. Also, women could no longer do agriculture or husbandry on common land because of privatizations.

4.5.2 Ideology

Although feminists had already started criticizing development on the grounds that it did not help women, that it created inequalities and that it made life more difficult than before (Boserup, 1970; Mies & Shiva, 1993; Sen & Grown, 1987), development experts continued creating programs that did not take into consideration these critiques. They carried on with projects that not only maintained but also deepened the inequalities between men and women. They sacrificed the interests of women for further modernization. This was potentially because lives of women and subsistence workers and the environment were not deemed to be important by the planners, and it was thought that the price for development could be paid by them.

Especially towards the end of the 1970s, the Turkish state came up with a series of rural development projects for the less developed regions, especially in Eastern and Southeastern Turkey. These projects were applied by the state in cooperation with NGOs, the World Bank, the UN and some private institutions. Most of these projects which included necessary training and extension tasks for technology transfer, however, were directed to men. Therefore, these programs either ignored women, or included them on sex-specific terms such as training them in home economics, childcare, food preservation etc. These skills, however,

¹¹⁹ These authors have noted these problems in connection with other places than Turkey. We attempt to discover whether there is a resemblance between what happens in other parts of the world and in Turkey.

were not marketable and did not provide women with social recognition because these activities were seen as extensions of domestic chores. Most teachers were men, female technicians did not exist. And most of the time women's participation in extension activities were prevented or not presented as an option by planners and authorities on the grounds that the 'villagers were conservative' (Ertürk, 1987, 1990), that is, they would not allow women to participate in these activities. "Hence a major bias ...[was]... introduced from the outset, often resulting in avoidance of the issue rather than challenging it. As a result, 'modernization' promote[d] the segregation of women with status attached to women's domesticity" (Ertürk, 1991, p. 148). In short, "despite the Ministry's (Forestry, Agriculture and Rural Affairs) concern in integrating women producers into their policies and programs" the rural development projects were "neither designed to include women nor" did they "have a separate section directed at women" (Ertürk, 1988, p. 36).

4.5.3 Social Status and Reproduction of Generations

The anti-natalist state policy that started in 1965 was reversed in the 2000s. From then on, pro-natalist policies were back in the state discourse (Yüksel, 2015) mainly due to an increase in an ageing population (Ministry of Development, 2014). However, as opposed to this discourse and policies, birth rate decreased¹²⁰ (Kavas & Thornton, 2013). This is visible from the tables below;

¹²⁰ In 1930, there were 7.1 children per woman which decreased to 4.3 in 1978, 3.1 in the 1980s (Kavas & Thornton, 2013, p. 234) and 2.0 in 2013 (TAYA, 2013, p. 172)

TABLE 2: Current Fertility, Turkey, 1998

Age group	Residence		Total
	Urban	Rural	
15-19	55	68	60
20-24	141	211	163
25-29	139	178	150
30-34	97	85	93
35-39	32	60	42
40-44	14	12	13
45-49	0	2	1
TFR15-49	2.39	3.08	2.61
TFR15-44	2.39	3.08	2.61
GFR	87	107	94
CBR	22.8	24.7	23.4

Note: Rates are for the period 1-36 months preceding the survey. Rates for age group 45-49 may be slightly biased due to truncation.

TFR: Total fertility rate expressed per woman.

GFR: General fertility rate (birth divided by number of women 15-44) expressed per 1,000 women. (TDHS, 1998, p. 38)

TABLE 3: Current Fertility, Turkey, 2013

Age group	Residence		Total
	Urban	Rural	
15-19	28	45	31
20-24	114	168	124
25-29	131	161	136
30-34	102	111	104
35-39	46	54	48
40-44	7	7	7
40-45	3	1	2
TFR15-49	2.16	2.73	2.26
GFR	75	90	78
CBR	17.6	17.2	17.5

Note: Age specific fertility rates are per 1,000 women. Rates for age group 45-49 may be slightly biased due to truncation.

TFR: Total fertility rate expressed per woman.

GFR: General fertility rate expressed per 1,000 women aged 15-44.

CBR: Crude birth rates, expressed per 1,000 population.

(TDHS, 2013, p. 60)

The studies on population and reproduction during this period were limited concerning our purposes. As the research did not take into consideration the rurality based on the geographic regions and different classes, it was difficult to make inferences regarding the birth practices of the zones. Also, the criteria used in the surveys were different, which made it difficult to make a sound comparison across different periods even with the limited variables. For these reasons, this part of our chapter will be only preliminary.

Overall, although people like John D. Rockefeller III claimed that contraception and birth control brought greater self-determination for women, and although it was claimed by its proponents that birth control led to increased welfare among people (Hartmann, 1997), the reasons for and results of birth control in Turkey have been at best complicated. The use of birth control methods did increase and birth rates did decrease. But it is difficult to conclude that this led to more control of women over their bodies because it is not clear whether these decisions belonged to women or whether they were simply a result of the economic hardships of the time. There is good reason to believe that it was the latter. As neoliberal economic policies intensified the survival struggles of poorer classes, it is logical to suppose that households reduced their birth rates to cope with new challenges. Therefore, women's use of these methods referred more to their reduced well-being and difficulty in sustaining another member within the household, than their increased power over their own bodies. Also, it is difficult to observe an increase in the welfare of poor people that resulted from a decrease in birth rates, which has been the claim of people who were the proponents of population control. These challenges make it necessary to adopt a more comprehensive perspective while looking at social reproduction. Below, a comparison between the use of modern and traditional methods by currently married women can be found;

TABLE 4: The Use of Modern and Traditional Methods by Currently Married Women

	Current Users %		Total
	Modern Methods	Traditional Methods	
1983	44	56	61.5
1978	36	64	50

(TPHS, 1983, p. 94).

This ratio of married women who used any method of contraception rose to 63.9 in 1998 (TDHS, 1998, p. 48), and to 73.5 in 2013 (TDHS, 2013, p. 79). By looking at these data, and decline in the birth rates, it is logical to suppose that wider knowledge and use of contraception led to a potential increase in women’s control over their bodies, so long as it was themselves who made the decision to use these tools and so long as these decisions were not made in order to cope with economic challenges.

To see the effects of the agricultural policies after the beginning of the 2000s on the population, we would like to examine two charts showing the total fertility rates in 1998 and 2013. Although they were not sensitive to class or rural-urban differentiation across regions, they were found to be useful to give an idea about the situation.

TABLE 5: Fertility by Background Characteristics, 1998

Background Characteristics	Total Fertility Rate	Percentage Currently Pregnant	Mean Number of Children ever born to women age 40-49
Residence			
Urban	2.39	4.8	3.82
Rural	3.08	5.4	5.02
Region			
West	2.03	3.5	3.43
South	2.55	5.3	4.46
Central	2.56	5.5	3.84
North	2.68	4.4	4.36
East	4.19	8	7.9
Education			
No educ./Pri. Incomp.	3.89	6	5.63
Pri. Comp/Sec. Incomp	2.55	5.4	3.4
Sec Incomp/+	1.61	2.6	1.84
Total	2.61	5	4.22
Rate for women age 15-49 years.			

(TDHS, 1998, p. 37)

TABLE 6: Fertility by Background Characteristics, 2013

Background Characteristics	Total Fertility Rate	Percentage Currently Pregnant 15-49	Percentage Currently Pregnant 40-49	Mean Number of Children ever born to women age 40-49
Residence				
Urban	2.16	4.28		2.74
Rural	2.73	5.02		3.54
Region				
West	1.93	4.13		2.44
South	2.48	3.79		3.06
Central	1.89	3.4		2.66
North	2.08	4.01		2.84
East	3.41	6.94		4.83
Education				
No educ./Pri. Incomp.	3.76	6.71		4.63
Primary school	2.75	3.79		2.82
Secondary school	2.45	4.07		2.31
High school and higher	1.66	4.49		1.72
Wealth Quintile				
Lowest	3.32	5.87		4.38
Second	2.61	4		3.31
Middle	2.27	4.71		2.86
Fourth	1.71	3.49		2.53
Highest	1.72	4.44		2.14
Total	2.26	4.42		2.92
Note: Total fertility rates are for the period 1-36 months prior to the interview.				

(TDHS, 2013, p. 62)

As it can be seen, the decrease in the birth rates in regions in less developed zones, i.e. Central, North and East, was a lot greater than in West and South. We claim that this was because the former regions had to radically change their lives in the face of new economic conditions which they experienced much harder. Also, it is logical to suppose that the more developed regions already had low birth rates. Therefore, it would be illogical to expect as much of a drastic fall in their birth rates. The importance that age brought continued to fall (Kandiyoti, 1985) during this period, as well, as wealth transfer was from old to young people (Özbay, 2015) and as nuclear families increasingly replaced extended families.

4.5.4 Family Constellation & Women's Labor

In terms of rural-urban differences, between 2006-2011, the dissolution of extended families was more rapid and intense in the rurality¹²¹. The number of people who lived with their relatives within the same house decreased in the rurality (from 52.5% in 2006 to 36.6% in 2011) whereas it increased from 47.5% in 2006 to 63.4% in 2011 in the urban areas (TAYA, 2013, p. 73). Overall, the number of nuclear families in the country increased from 60% in 1968 to 81% in 2013 (Kavas & Thornton, 2013, p. 232).

4.5.4.1 Zone 1

4.5.4.1.1 Class 1

Although neoliberal policies negatively affected producers due to reduced subsidies, loan terms etc., their effects on the wealthiest class, i.e. large landowners, have not been negative. Large landowners took advantage of the market conditions as well as the DIS. Many large landowners started to engage in contract farming to accumulate wealth. They made deals with big factories and supermarkets. In the meantime, they became the beneficiaries of the economic support provided to contract farmers by the state as in the previous period. They

¹²¹ It is logical to suppose that this was because of economic hardships in the rurality that resulted from agricultural policies.

continued hiring outside labor (Gürel, 2014). This class continued to have joint patriarchal families in which men engaged in commercial and mechanical activities whereas women did not take part in agricultural production (Kandiyoti, 1997; Özbay, 2015; Tekeli, 1977). Although these women had low status within their families, they had higher class status¹²² vis-à-vis women of lower classes. This was a continuation of the previous period.

4.5.4.1.2 Class 2

A few middle producers increased their wealth as they could afford inputs and survive the lack of government support (Gürel, 2014). However, the rest were negatively affected by neoliberal developments. Their profits fell¹²³ due to reduced government support and prices, and increased input prices (Aydın, 2001)¹²⁴. As the negative effects of commercialization increased, e.g. increased production, increased differentiation between public and private spheres, so did the labor of women and the difference between men and women's tasks (Sirman, 1990). The commercial market in which agricultural products were exchanged has been the public domain of men which replaced traditional exchange mechanisms of which women were also a part (Ertürk, 1987). This created inequalities¹²⁵.

As a response to the challenges presented by neoliberalism, many middle landowners increased the scale of production and additionally, produced subsistence food in their gardens. Women had to work more in commercial

¹²² This was the case in all large landowning classes.

¹²³ For instance, cost of wheat was 15 kuruş. Producers asked for 17.5-20 kuruş from the government. However, the government offered only 8.1-10.2 kuruş (Aydın, 2001, p. 14), as a result of which producers incurred losses.

¹²⁴ Although this study was based on a research in a village in the Aegean region and in Central Anatolia, we found it appropriate to adapt the related transformations to our zone analysis because the conditions that prevailed in these villages were a sample of the more general transformations that took place countrywide.

¹²⁵ This was visible in all zones and classes in which cash-crop was owned and controlled by men, and women were reduced to invisible and unremunerated laborers.

production, and additionally had to engage in subsistence production, which exclusively became a women's job. It was generally men who pocketed the profits from the selling of cash crops and agricultural surplus. Women provided their labor *gratis*, but they did not have any control or a say over the household income and resources (Aydın, 2001). This was the evidence of a very serious material disadvantaging of women. They had to work three jobs, i.e. cash-crop production, subsistence agriculture and reproduction of the household. Also, because of the neoliberal assault on agriculture and promotion of cash-crop production, the war on subsistence production was intensified. This was an idea promoted by the IFIs and TNCs, and affected the mentality of the producers. In order to survive in the market economy, middle producers were compelled to prioritize by the force of economics cash-crop production over subsistence production. This reduced the area of subsistence production which increased the time and energy spent on subsistence activities because they substituted labor and time for area. This disproportionately increased the exploitation of the labor of women¹²⁶. Among some families, men found non-agricultural jobs. To survive in difficult economic conditions and as a last resort, producers sold their agricultural tools and reduced their consumption. Women who often engaged in labor-intensive tasks compensated for the loss of agricultural tools by working harder whereas men spent their time idly in coffeehouses. As families became poorer, quality and quantity of food worsened for everyone, but women were more affected. Their consumption was disproportionately reduced vis-à-vis men and children because women spared less in quantity and worse in quality food for themselves after they fed their husband and children¹²⁷ (Aydın, 2001). In short, among this class, sexual division of labor of the previous period intensified.

¹²⁶ This trend was valid among middle producers of *Zone 2*, as well.

¹²⁷ This practice had been in place during previous periods, as well among the most impoverished producers. However, it is logical to suppose that this became more common as more families changed their consumption patterns to cope with negative conditions.

Similar to the previous period, the elderly continued to lose authority within families (Kandiyoti, 1985), which improved young men's status vis-à-vis old men, and young women's status vis-à-vis old women, but not women's status in comparison to men¹²⁸ in general (Ecevit, 1991-3).

4.5.4.1.3 Class 3

Because the state reduced supports given to small producers, and because their income was not sufficient to buy the inputs¹²⁹ without the state subsidies or loans on good terms, they became more and more dependent on the market, their income and profit decreased and their debts increased (Gürel 2014; Morvaridi, 1992¹³⁰). This was because of a reduction in the price of products such as grains, legumes, sugar beets etc. This caused indebtedness among small producers¹³¹ to banks and usurers. When they faced increased production risks and dependence on the market, it became increasingly difficult for them to pay their debts (Keyder & Yenal, 2013). To meet these challenges, some of them sold their labor power. They were proletarianized in increasing numbers. Some of them migrated to cities, others remained in the countryside and found waged work in other villages¹³² and commuted to work on a daily basis (Gürel 2014; Keyder & Yenal, 2011; Morvaridi, 1992). Developments such as the Tobacco Law, the Seed Law

¹²⁸ This was valid for all zones and across all classes except for large landowning households.

¹²⁹ The input prices increased due to liberalized international trade and they were increasingly commodified (Keyder & Yenal, 2013).

¹³⁰ Although Morvaridi's (1992) study was about a village in Eastern Anatolia, because the economic difficulties faced by the small producers were similar, it was adapted to this zone.

¹³¹ Although this problem also potentially affected middle landowners, small landowners were more disadvantaged because they had limited land and capital (Keyder & Yenal, 2013).

¹³² This was more common than permanent migration to cities. This was because, unlike the developmentalist period, life was much more difficult and expensive in the cities. Finding a job was equally more difficult (Keyder & Yenal, 2013). This was also valid in other zones.

and the Agrarian Law forced these impoverished producers to enter into contract with agribusiness firms to receive state support. Thus, they reduced producers' autonomy on deciding the type and amount of crops to produce and made them more dependent on the companies and on the market¹³³ (Aydın, 2010).

As a result, the difference between men and women in terms of moneymaking activities increased. Female labor that remained in agricultural production was exploited more deeply. This was caused in some instances by the cultivation of more than one cash crop¹³⁴ to increase the income of the household in order meet the challenges presented by the neoliberal paradigm (Morvaridi, 1992). As more land was diverted to cash crop production, space for subsistence production that women engaged in decreased, but its intensity and burden increased (Shiva, 1988)¹³⁵. As a result of the attack on subsistence production by the neoliberal agricultural policies, women were disadvantaged even further and their material-wellbeing decreased¹³⁶. Commercialization also reduced women's access to their produce (Ertürk, 1987, 1988) because cash-crops that women produced were sold on the market, not consumed by women. Nor did women receive payment for their labor or a share from the profits.

The authority of the elderly continued to decrease. There did not seem to be a change in the status of rural women among the landless laborers and

¹³³ This was the case among the small landowners of other zones, as well.

¹³⁴ For instance, based on a case study realized by Behrooz Morvaridi in Iğdır, due to economic difficulties, people cultivated cereals with sugar beets, cotton and vegetables and fruits. These competed for resources (Morvaridi, 1992), including female labor.

¹³⁵ This was a worldwide trend. However, taking into consideration the increased importance given to cash-crop production in Turkey, it is logical to suppose that similar processes occurred in Turkey, as well.

¹³⁶ This was the case in other zones among small producers, as well.

sharecroppers, except for an increase in their number¹³⁷ (Günaydın, 2010). As this zone had a lot of tourism potential, common land was taken over by private actors to build hotels etc. This resulted in less access to common resources such as wood, land for grazing animals and for the use of other domestic needs by the local people (Keyder & Yenil, 2013)¹³⁸. This had potentially more negative implications for women who were in charge of supplying these resources from the common land. Thus, such privatizations affected subsistence production and rural women badly.

4.5.4.2 Zone 2

4.5.4.2.1 Class 1

Similar to the large landowning class of the *Zone 1*, this class, too, took advantage of the changing economic conditions. They benefited from the DIS. Sexual division of labor dominated in which women did not engage in agricultural production whereas men conducted commercial and mechanical business in the agricultural enterprise (Kandiyoti, 1997; Özbay, 2015; Tekeli, 1977). Outside labor was used (Gürel, 2014).

4.5.4.2.2 Class 2

Among the middle producers of Central Anatolia, reduced state subsidies on products such as sugar beet, wheat and pulses caused economic problems (Aydın, 2001). As the production of these crops was capital-intensive, it was costly for many producers to switch to another crop (Keyder & Yenil, 2013). In addition to macro-economic policies, these producers were also negatively affected by the overuse of underground water by commercial agriculture which reduced the potential for animal husbandry, which was an important source of income for poorer families (Aydın, 2001).

¹³⁷ This was the case in other zones, as well.

¹³⁸ While this potentially affected middle landowners as well, because small landowners, sharecroppers and landless peasants depended more on common resources due to their disadvantaged class position, they were more negatively affected by these developments.

As a result, many producers reduced their consumption and overused natural resources such as forests due to excessive goat-raising, overexploitation of underground water etc. Again the reduction of consumption was gendered, it affected women more negatively. Women consumed worse quality and less in quantity because they ate after they fed their children and husband. Some poorer middle landowners migrated on a seasonal basis to work in agriculture. Wealthier middle producers, on the other hand, chose to diversify their income by migrating to towns or cities to engage in commercial business (Aydın, 2001). This increased the differences between men and women's income earnings. In Central Anatolia, the difference between men and women in terms of mechanical and commercial work was also visible, in that men dealt with mechanical and commercial tasks whereas women were involved in labor-intensive production (Savran Al-Haik, 2016; Sirman, 1990).

A lot of producers in the Black Sea region increasingly derived a large portion of their income from waged work. This was because they depended on the market for their daily needs and because of the decline of prices given to their products such as hazelnuts (Keyder & Yenal, 2013). Increased commercialization and intensified production of tea augmented women's labor. Because there was no mechanization accompanying this, production was mostly labor-intensive. Women's agricultural work increased, and they also had to devote more time and energy to subsistence work, because commercial production competed for time and energy with subsistence production. Although this increased both men's and women's labor, women worked harder and for longer hours, as they also had to deal with social reproduction of the household. Some men looked for paid jobs outside of village. Among some families, young male migration brought about co-residence of in-laws with the wife and grandchildren. When migration took a permanent character, transitional extended families gave way to nuclear families¹³⁹ (Berik, 1990)¹⁴⁰. Thus, women's labor and the differential between

¹³⁹ This repeated in other zones and classes where male migration to find waged work took place.

men and women in terms of money earning increased (Hann, 1993). Child-raising and reproductive activities continued to be feminized during this period, which deepened sexual division of labor (İncirlioğlu, 1998)¹⁴¹. Overall, women were being required to work three jobs –the subsistence and social reproduction from before but now also increased work on cash crops.

4.5.4.2.3 Class 3

Small producers of this zone were impoverished due to reduced state support, increased input prices, indebtedness etc. (Keyder & Yenal, 2013). Many men left agricultural production to work for a wage, which in this group also increased men and women’s income differences (Kandiyoti, 1997). The authority of the elderly continued to decrease (Kandiyoti, 1985). Landless laborers and sharecroppers increased in number and continued their existence in conditions similar to the previous period (Günaydın, 2010).

4.5.4.3 Zone 3

The GAP (Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi- Southeastern Anatolia Development Project) was described as an “integrated regional development program, aiming to improve the economic base of one of the least developed regions of the country, improve education levels and the status of women, and to foster democracy” in the region (Harris, 2005, p. 185). It was implemented in Adıyaman, Batman, Diyarbakır, Gaziantep, Kilis, Mardin, Siirt, Şanlıurfa and Şırnak. The GAP brought increased commercialization of agriculture in the region. Although the official start of the project came later, by then, the construction of several dams had been completed. The projects did not take into consideration the social and economic fabric of the region. Neither did they include “the local know-how, the

¹⁴⁰ It is logical to assume that these observations that were based on a series of field works realized by Günseli Berik in 1983 about carpet weavers and agricultural structures in 10 villages in Western and Central Anatolia also apply here because of the similarity of agricultural conditions.

¹⁴¹ It is logical to suppose that this was valid in all zones and classes where sexual division of labor was deep.

genuine needs of the local population, and their practical experiences”. Therefore, projects that prioritized “the maximization of electric output and agricultural yield” had many negative effects which were only partially remedied after dams were completed. These effects consisted of the neglect of long term objectives such as “education, agricultural training, crop breeding, improving health services” etc. (Çarkoğlu & Eder, 2005, p. 169).

4.5.4.3.1 Class 1

Large landowners accumulated wealth in new ways during this period. They took advantage of the DIS system by registering their land that was more than 500 donums on their relatives (Gürel, 2014). They were also the main beneficiaries of the GAP. The rise in overall wealth in the region, that resulted from the introduction of large-scale irrigation and cash-crop production, was accumulated in the hands of these wealthy landowners (Keyder & Yenal, 2013; Konak, 2013). Men’s participation in cash-crop schemes, and their control over commerce and mechanics as well as their interaction with the outside world increased their power within the household vis-à-vis women. This was manifested in the form of men’s control over women’s labor and over what women produced (Ertürk, 1987). This power was already dominant due to the existence of extended families and sexual division of labor that came from the previous period.

4.5.4.3.2 Class 2

Middle landowners did not exist in *Zone 3*. Therefore, the following analysis of variables will be made in terms of Class 1 and 2 regarding *Zone 3*.

4.5.4.3.3 Class 3

Due to the ongoing war against the PKK, state policies, dam building and irrigation projects, practices of the large landowners, i.e. firing sharecroppers from land, in the region, many people were displaced. For example, after the state put a quota on tobacco production, in Adıyaman and in several other places, many producers left agriculture and became seasonal laborers (Gürel, 2014). Or they

faced unemployment (Keyder & Yenil, 2013). As land was seized by dam construction, many people became landless (Konak, 2013). “While compensation was offered to large landowners, small landowners and sharecroppers, ... landless peasants were offered no compensation and were forced to migrate to urban areas as unskilled, unemployed and poor” (Konak, 2013, p. 57). In contrast to this observation from Nahide Konak, Ercan Ayboga (2009) claimed that only a handful of large landowners were recognized the right to compensation¹⁴². In Adiyaman, producers whose land was flooded due to the construction of Çamgazi dam became seasonal laborers (Gürel, 2014). With the construction of Atatürk, Keban, Karakaya and Sir between 1974-1992, 117.000 people were displaced (McCully, 1996, p. 328-9). Also, many poorer producers were unable to afford increased input prices without government subsidies (Gürel, 2014; Keyder & Yenil, 2013). As irrigation increased land prices, it became increasingly difficult for small producers and landless peasants to buy land (Konak, 2013). The subsistence economy was women’s and poor people’s means of survival because they could sustain their livelihoods by growing subsistence crops or doing animal husbandry. However, the GAP provided irrigation for the agricultural land and directed it to cultivation of cash-crops such as cotton. This interrupted the subsistence production because land and resources were taken away from subsistence and devoted to commercial production. This negatively affected poor producers, and particularly women because women’s labor was exploited more intensively in cotton production as increased production for profit required increased labor input. As a result, labor-intensive processes such as hoeing and picking cotton demanded more of women’s labor. Moreover, women and families had a much narrower means of survival due to difficulties in sustaining

¹⁴² Compensation to the displaced people was given on the basis of land ownership. Thus, it was mostly large landowners who were compensated. Small landowners, sharecroppers and landless workers, however, received little or no compensation because they had little or no land titles. Even when they received compensation, this was insufficient for them to build a new life in the city which had limited infrastructure for the new populations (Ayboga, 2009). Although the article did not specify, it is logical to suppose that the compensation was given to the landowner within the household, i.e. men, and was assumed by the authorities that women would get their share from this. However, looking at the historical practice of depriving women from access to property and other resources, it becomes obvious that women did not receive anything after displacement, neither from men in their families nor from the government.

subsistence agriculture. Consequently, they produced less of items such as milk, yoghurt, wool, flour, and they were forced to buy them. Because of the inability to produce these goods, they also could not make money by selling them, which was previously a source of income (Konak, 2013). This made social reproduction a lot more difficult to sustain, which consequently increased market dependency.

The lack of facilities¹⁴³ such as road, water, canalization etc. put an extra burden on women (Ertürk, 1988, 1990) because tasks such as carrying water from a distance etc. belonged to them. Some of the people who were dispossessed from their property and who were displaced, became proletariat in the cities. Most of them joined the ranks of agricultural workers¹⁴⁴ who were harshly exploited. By extension, women, and even children, also became agricultural workers alongside men. Women were paid less, contracts were made with the male head of the household and women simultaneously had to deal with reproductive activities at home (Gürel, 2014). Increased per capita income in the region due to the GAP did not translate into an improvement in the living standards of the poorest class. They did not have access to this wealth. The GAP was “a maldevelopment because it has worked against the traditional subsistence economy, women, poor and landless people”. All these developments increased women’s dependence on men (Konak, 2013, p. 57) because they no longer had access to what they produced due to cash-crop oriented production and because of the absence of a comprehensive subsistence economy.

4.5.5 Ownership of Property

The Green Revolution and HYVS were replaced by the Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) during this period. “Genetic engineering technology transferr[ed] the DNA sequences for individual traits in ways that could not occur

¹⁴³ From this, we deduce that a certain kind of rural development would help women. However, this development should be the right kind, the kind that would not create inequalities, that would give rural producers the means they needed to produce what they felt they should produce.

¹⁴⁴ Most of these people were of Kurdish origin. It is a fact that Kurdish agricultural workers were paid less and exploited more vis-à-vis other workers of other ethnicities (Gürel, 2014).

naturally” (Shiva, 2000a, p. 83). The emergence of genetically modified seeds gave way to increased corporate control over seed sector. Since GM seeds were patented by big TNCs, small producers had access to seeds only through the market. Because states as well as rules of international trade imposed on producers the use of certified seeds, they could no longer sell agricultural goods produced by traditional, uncertified seeds. Because patented seeds did not regenerate, producers became dependent on suppliers of seeds because they had to purchase seeds every year (Shiva, 2000a). The transition from the Green Revolution to biotechnology brought about further corporatization, commercialization over seeds and chemicals as well as plant breeding, and heavier reliance on cash crop production (Shiva, 1988).

In Turkey, the inputs of the Green Revolution such as fertilizers, insecticides, tractors¹⁴⁵ etc. continued to be used. Loans which depended on land ownership continued to be a significant source in acquiring these inputs. This disadvantaged women’s access to property ownership. However, in certain cases, men of lower classes were also disadvantaged. They could not buy inputs because of the loss of land or increase in input prices and reduced state subsidies (Keyder & Yenal, 2013). Therefore, it is logical to suppose that in some cases, neoliberal policies reduced the economic difference between men and women of poorer classes by lowering men’s income, rather than increasing women’s. Although this meant a reduction in property ownership inequality, it is logical to suppose that the absence of property brought about new and more intense ways of exploitation of labor of women. This was valid among all classes and zones, in which loss of property was experienced.

¹⁴⁵ The number of tractors was 654.636 in 1988, this rose to 902.513 in 1998 and to 1.306.738 in 2017 (TURKSTAT, 2018).

4.5.5.1 Zone 1

4.5.5.1.1 Class 1

Similar to the previous periods, differentials among men and women in terms of access to property ownership continued among large landowners. As men owned land, they could purchase inputs or acquire loans to buy inputs (Özbay, 2015). They depended less on state subsidies and were less affected by market prices.

4.5.5.1.2 Class 2

Middle landowners, too, had access to agricultural inputs. This was gendered because it was men who could get loans and made contracts to buy tractors or other sorts of inputs. Women were prevented from accumulating wealth because of their lack of land ownership (Ecevit, 1991-3). However, among other middle landowning producers, it is logical to suppose that access to property ownership worsened for men, as well because of the selling of agricultural tools or inability to buy them due to increase prices and reduced state support (Aydın, 2001). Although this reduced property ownership differences between men and women, it increased women's work burden¹⁴⁶.

4.5.5.1.3 Class 3

Among some small landowners and sharecroppers, men bought tractors through loans or debt. This increased property ownership differentiation between men and women. However, among many small landowners, macroeconomic policies resulted in land loss (Aydın, 2010). This negatively affected their access to other types of property. Therefore, between men and women of this group, it is logical to suppose that differentiation in terms of property ownership decreased (Aydın, 2001). In other words, instead of enabling equal property ownership

¹⁴⁶ It is logical to suppose that this was valid in other zones and classes that experienced similar processes.

between men and women, neoliberalism created equality between men and women by depriving the former of property¹⁴⁷. As landless workers did not generally own any land, tractors or other inputs, there was not really a differentiation between men and women in terms of property ownership.

4.5.5.2 Zone 2

4.5.5.2.1 Class 1

Large landowners continued to accumulate wealth by acquiring agricultural inputs. Their large amounts of land could be used as collateral to get loans when necessary. This was a sign of the continuation of gaps in property ownership among men and women of this class (Özbay, 2015).

4.5.5.2.2 Class 2

While tractors were used extensively among the middle landowners of Central Anatolia (Akşit, 1988; İncirlioğlu, 1998), it was not quite the case in the Black Sea region. This was because of the hilly topography which favored labor-intensive production in the region (Çınar & Silier, 1979). Nevertheless, both in Central Anatolia and in the Black Sea region, agricultural inputs such as fertilizers, insecticides, herbicides etc. were used. This supposedly increased the agricultural ‘productivity’¹⁴⁸ from which men pocketed the profits, that contributed to disadvantaging of women in terms of material welfare.

¹⁴⁷ It is logical to assume that this was also repeated in other zones and across classes which experienced property loss.

¹⁴⁸ While this ‘productivity’ was understood by producers and economists in merely economic and material terms, the costs of such ‘productivity’ have constantly been ignored. Such profits were made possible because the price for women’s labor or for the environmental degradation went unpaid, even unrecognized. Thus, while women and the environmental resources were exploited for the sake of ‘productivity’, neither women nor the environment received anything in return.

4.5.5.2.3 Class 3

Among some of the small landowners who bought agricultural tools (Çınar & Silier, 1979), property ownership imbalances between men and women were created (Ecevit, 1991-3). However, among many others, neoliberal policies led men to lose ownership of property, which reduced property differentials (Aydın, 2010; Keyder & Yenal, 2013) between men and women. This was not the case among landless peasants because they did not own property.

4.5.5.3 Zone 3

4.5.5.3.1 Class 1

Large landowners of this zone increased their wealth through increased ownership of inputs. Especially they benefited from the GAP and took advantage of the inputs promoted by this project (Konak, 2013; Keyder & Yenal, 2013). This furthered the inequality in property ownership between men and women.

4.5.5.3.2 Class 3

Not many small landowners and sharecroppers in this zone owned tractors and other inputs. However, there were some who did, and this contributed to inequalities in the ownership of land, tractors and other inputs between men and women, and growing inequality between households in this group. Lack of land ownership not only prevented women's access to other types of property but it also disadvantaged them in terms of their control over the process of irrigation. As they could not participate in the water user groups¹⁴⁹ because they did not formally own land, they could not have a say over irrigation (Konak, 2013). This was decided by the landowning men and benefited their crops while it disadvantaged women's crops. Difference between men and women of landless households in terms of property ownership was minimum.

¹⁴⁹ This was a novelty that came with the GAP. Water user groups were created to manage irrigation services at the tertiary level to realize such ambitious goals as bringing about "efficiencies with respect to expenditures and irrigation delivery, ... promoting sustainability of irrigation resources over time, ... fostering closer state-society linkages by providing institutional bridges between farmers and state agencies" (Harris, 2005, p. 185).

4.5.6 Decision-making Capacity

Wider commercialization and mechanization increased men's area of influence and decision-making capacity vis-à-vis women within the household. As public-private differentiation increased, women's control over resources decreased (Ertürk, 1987). The introduction of contract farming reduced the producer's control over the production process and type of the crop. However, it gave men the right to sell and control the labor of women. As contracts were made by men, men could contract their wife's labor without additional remuneration going to her. It also gave contract maker, i.e. the husband, supervisory role over his wife's labor¹⁵⁰.

4.5.6.1 Zone 1

4.5.6.1.1 Class 1

As commercialization and mechanization had the greatest reflection among large landowners, differentials in decision-making power between men and women was also the greatest here. However, old men participated more than young men in decision-making here. This reduced women's standing within family (Ertürk, 1987; Timur, 1972).

4.5.6.1.2 Class 2

Among middle landowners, women's standing in the family decision making process was never high, but it was further reduced. Men had wider decision-making power than women. As noted earlier, although young women gained a certain amount of say over household decision-making because older women had lost authority, they did not necessarily gain power vis-à-vis their husbands (Ecevit, 1991-3). Knowledge about the outside world, i.e. business, buying, selling, tractors, mechanics etc. almost exclusively belonged to men who dealt with cooperatives, banks, marketing processes etc. (Sirman, 1990)

¹⁵⁰ I am thankful to my thesis advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Sheila Pelizzon for bringing this point up.

4.5.6.1.3 Class 3

Among small producers and sharecroppers, men's decision-making and knowledge increased due to limited commercialization and mechanization (Sirman, 1990). Public-private differentiation continued among this class, which reduced women's control over resources. Equal participation in reproductive activities decreased as a result of this public-private differentiation (Ertürk, 1987). Older women lost authority vis-à-vis younger women. However, younger women did not gain vis-à-vis young men (Ecevit, 1991-3).

4.5.6.2 Zone 2

4.5.6.2.1 Class 1

Similar processes to the experiences of large landowners took place among this class, as well. Old men retained authority within household. Increased commercialization and mechanization increased men's knowledge and area of influence vis-à-vis women (Ertürk, 1987; Timur, 1972).

4.5.6.2.2 Class 2

Among middle producers, similar processes to those of the same class in *Zone 1* repeated, i.e. loss of authority of old women, increased differentiation between men and women in terms of knowledge about and interaction with the outside world (Ecevit, 1991-3; Sirman, 1990), women's reduced participation in the household and community decision-making process etc. as a result of public-private differentiation (Ertürk, 1987).

4.5.6.2.3 Class 3

Small landowners went through the same processes to the same class of *Zone 1*. The increased public role of men disadvantaged women (Sirman, 1990), and resulted in less participation of men in reproductive activities due to their absence that resulted from waged work.

4.5.6.3 Zone 3

4.5.6.3.1 Class 1

Large landowners of this zone went through similar processes to those of the same class in other zones. Increased commercialization and mechanization increased men's decision-making power over women's (Ertürk, 1987; Timur, 1972).

4.5.6.3.2 Class 3

Among small landowners and sharecroppers, as more integration into money economy led to more public-private differentiation, and as the GAP resulted in disadvantaging of the subsistence economy in favor of cash-crop production (Aksoy, 2005; Konak, 2013), women's control over production decreased. Men's worldly knowledge increased relative to women (Sirman, 1990). As the expansion of commercialization and the introduction of the GAP affected new masses of people, more women who had been relatively outside of market economy and the GAP were brought under the negative impacts of these developments. Among those producers who remained less affected from these processes, women retained control over decision-making process and production and reproduction. Authority of the older women decreased, but authority of young women over young men did not improve (Ecevit, 1991-3).

4.6 The Environment

The environmental problems that became visible in the previous period intensified. Natural resources were overused¹⁵¹, excessive amounts of waste were disposed, pesticides and other chemical inputs were heavily used¹⁵², soil was

¹⁵¹ As it was explained earlier, this was especially a result of the macroeconomic policies which forced middle and small producers to exploit natural resources more heavily to make up for their income loss (Aydın, 2001).

¹⁵² The increase in the number of contract farmers had a direct effect on the increased use of chemical inputs because contract farming used more inputs in comparison to non-contract farming.

eroded due to overgrazing, improper land use and deforestation, irrigation projects and overuse of underground water resources caused water and soil-related problems (Pamuk, 2009, p. 387). Over-irrigation led to loss of soil fertility especially in the Harran Plain in Şanlıurfa (Keyder & Yenal, 2013). In addition, preservation of genetic diversity of crops became a problem due to policies that advocated monoculture (Pamuk, 2009, p. 387). Although a set of legislation was passed, it was not implemented properly and the environmental problems continued to increase.

The overuse of fertilizers, i.e. nitrate, polluted the groundwater in the GAP region, which made water unsafe for human consumption (Konak, 2013). Among babies who consumed nitrate through consumption of vegetables, water and processed foods, an illness called infant cyanosis emerged. Sodium nitrate has also had the potential to cause irregular heartbeats, diarrhea, exhaustion, dizziness and dyspnoea¹⁵³. It can also threaten human health in the form of creating carcinogens in the stomach by coming together with secondary amines (Zabunoğlu & Öner toy, 1993, p. 41). It is logical to suppose that the overuse of chemical inputs resulted in similar problems, in other zones, as well. It was especially the case in *Zone 1*, where 2/3 of all pesticides were used. Almost half of pesticides were used only in the Mediterranean (Kılınçer et. al., 1998). In addition to the problem of overuse of chemical inputs that was amounting in the previous period, a new series of environmental problems came into picture during this period. These were namely the environmental degradation that resulted from the GAP and from biodiversity loss. The use of chemical inputs brought about

This caused further problems in soil fertility, over-irrigation due to overuse of nitrate fertilizers and contamination of surface and underground water (Oral, 2013b).

Although the use of chemicals increased overall, this demonstrated fluctuations during which their use was reduced (Oral, 2013). It is logical to suppose that reductions in the use of chemicals resulted from reduced state subsidies for inputs. Those producers who could not afford inputs whose prices fluctuated due to fluctuations in currency had to give up use (Aydın, 2001; Kılınçer et. al, 1998). Although this did not undo the previous environmental destruction, it nonetheless must have prevented further destruction for when inputs were not used.

¹⁵³ Shortness of breath or breathlessness.

dependency on the TNCs. Corporations such as Ciba-Geicy, Bayer, Sandoz, Pfizer have taken part since the 1950s in the production of pesticides (Yenal, 2013) and insecticides.

The construction of dams and irrigation systems caused land erosion, salinization, “poor soil and water quality, and vulnerability to pest outbreaks” (Konak, 2013, p. 55). Especially the problem of salinization caused the retirement of approximately 15% of agricultural land. The irrigation and water resources development schemes carried negative health effects, i.e. schistosomiasis and malaria, especially on pregnant women and young children¹⁵⁴. As mentioned, groundwater that was polluted by fertilizers was also used for drinking and irrigation which had health risks (Konak, 2013).

Because the new agricultural system promoted homogeneity in crops, many people chose to engage in monoculture because it was profitable. This reduced traditional farmers’ competitiveness because they did not get good prices. Also, traditional agriculture which was based on crop diversity was in danger as monoculture became common. This reduced biodiversity (Aksoy, 2005). This was especially hard on women because their contribution to biodiversity and other indigenous agricultural practices were rendered invisible¹⁵⁵. Women’s knowledge regarding biodiversity was rendered superfluous with the preference of monoculture. While women used to utilize their knowledge regarding such diverse processes as seed preparation, soil choice, plant requirements, soil enrichment, plant diseases, companion planting etc., such knowledge was deemed unessential in industrial agriculture (Mies & Shiva, 1993). The promotion of monoculture also increased the already heavy reliance on insecticides and pesticides (Andow, 1983), as well as on fossil fuels (Shiva, 1988) which contributed to environmental problems.

¹⁵⁴ Pregnant women were vulnerable because of their changed physiological state, and children were affected because they did not acquire immunity.

¹⁵⁵ Although this was a worldwide trend, it was found possible to apply to Turkey, as well because the conditions were similar.

Degradation of the environment and the decreased status of rural women went hand in hand. As cash crop production was promoted, use of chemicals and excessive use of natural resources caused environmental problems. It also put strain on subsistence economy because land and resources were devoted to production for the market. Thus, the environmental problems caused by industrial agriculture hit subsistence and reproduction, in which women were the dominant actors. Women who were responsible for tasks such as fetching water, doing subsistence agriculture etc. were forced to compete with the cash-crop production for scarce resources. This caused overexploitation of environmental resources and of women's labor. Moreover, due to the effects of chemicals that were used in agriculture, women had to go further to avoid doing subsistence agriculture on polluted soil and with contaminated water (Shiva, 1988), that was caused by industrial agriculture. This resulted in further exploitation of their labor, whereas what they received in return was often worse in quality. This effectively reduced women's means for survival.

As noted earlier, the growth in tourism in *Zone 1* led to the opening of arable land for construction of hotels etc. This reduced the amount of agricultural land, common land, grazing land, forests etc. As a result, pressure on existing land and resources increased, and they were overexploited (Keyder & Yenil, 2011). Also, it became difficult for women who have been responsible for tasks such as collecting wood, wild fruits etc. to acquire them from common land that became limited. Also, they no longer had grazing land for animal husbandry. Therefore, agricultural patterns that caused environmental problems also increased women's burden and reduced their status.

4.7 Conclusion

Neoliberalism has increased inequality among countries, within countries and between men and women. Although it was seen as an opportunity to save the world from economic downturn, it not only failed to do this but also deepened its effects for most people. What it achieved was the restoration of class power of the elites and dominance of TNCs and finance capital in the world economy.

The Turkish governments have been proponents of neoliberalism. However, its implications on the people, especially women and on the environment have been disregarded. Agricultural policies were made in line with the neoliberal ideology and with the international division of labor. This led, among many middle and small producers as well as sharecroppers and landless workers, to reduced production, seasonal, temporary or permanent migration, the adoption of survival strategies. Although this affected men as well, its implications on rural women and on the environment have been worse.

These effects have been most detrimental among rural women of middle and small landowning households of all zones. Among middle landowners of *Zone 1*, women's status changed for the worse as their labor was exploited more intensively, differentiation in terms of ownership of property was reduced because men lost property, but this potentially increased further exploitation of women's labor. They participated less in decision-making processes because increase in men's worldly knowledge gave men the authority to make decisions. Among small landowners and sharecroppers of this zone, women's status also worsened. Their labor was exploited more deeply, income differentials increased between men and women, men lost property which reduced gaps in property ownership but potentially increased women's work burden. They also had less power in decision-making as commercialization increased public-private differentiation and as women were confined to the latter. Among middle landowning households of Central Anatolia, rural women experienced similar processes to those of the same class in *Zone 1*. Different from this trend, regarding women in Black Sea, property differences were less because of limited number of tractors. Among small landowners and sharecroppers of *Zone 2*, similar processes to those of the same class in *Zone 1* visible. Among the lowest class of *Zone 3*, the situation was also similar. In addition, however, the GAP destroyed the subsistence base of this class in favor of cash crop production, women's exploitation increased but their survival became more at risk. In terms of property ownership, their status worsened as their lack of property prevented them from participating in decision-making processes regarding production. They participated less indecision-making

as commercialization restricted their sphere of influence. In short, as commercialization increased women had to spend more time and energy on subsistence and commercial agriculture as well as on household reproduction. They were unpaid, their labor was unrecognized. Neither was there an improvement in their status regarding property ownership and decision-making. They lost the authority that age brought. Birth rates decreased but it is hard to claim that this was because of women's increased control over their bodies because of the prevailing control over women's bodies by men and due to economic difficulties among agricultural producers.

Agricultural practices of this period caused considerable environmental destruction. Among many factors, continuation of the Green Revolution technologies as well as overexploitation of environmental resources that resulted from worsening living conditions in the rurality caused this. The environmental degradation affected women most. Time and energy spent on subsistence activities such as finding wood, water, wild fruits etc. increased. Health hazards caused by environmental problems affected women and children more directly.

In conclusion, during this period in Turkish agriculture, women's interests and the environment were sacrificed for the so-called agricultural productivity. If productivity is defined as having more outputs by investing the same or fewer amounts of inputs, what happened in the Turkish agriculture, and for that matter in the Third World countries which experienced similar processes, was nothing that resembled productivity. Increased outputs were the case, but inputs or the costs had also increased, but these were ignored. The IFIs and TNCs as well as governments and wealthy agricultural producers pursued increased productivity by favoring large and middle commercial landowners, and they justified such an attitude by increased outputs in agricultural products. What they ignored or did not care was the hidden costs that were paid for such 'productivity'. In order to make it possible, women had to provide labor *gratis*, they also had to spend time and energy on subsistence and reproduction of the household, which became more difficult over time, so that these would not be purchased at the market. The

environment was another victim. To increase the so-called agricultural productivity, large amounts of fertilizers, insecticides, pesticides etc. were used, which damaged the environment in irreparable ways. However, those who were responsible for these ills have avoided paying for these costs, which contributed to their disillusion of increased 'productivity'. Thus, the claim that modern agriculture has brought productivity is misleading, at best.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

At the beginning of this thesis, we have set out to discover the effects of macro-level economic policies on peasant life, on the status of rural women and on the environment in Turkey. We tried to understand this question by looking through the historical processes that both the world and Turkey had experienced. This was necessary for us to make a comparison regarding the status of Turkish rural women across different time periods. Also, the status of rural women was not uniform across different geographical zones and classes. Therefore, we had to be sensitive to geographical economic differences as well as to different rural classes. To do this, we divided the Turkish rurality into three economically differentiated zones by making use of ‘Three Economic Zones’ analysis of Immanuel Wallerstein. Similarly, class structure was another determinant in measuring the status of rural women because this affected the family structure, and by extension the degree of exploitation of women’s labor. For instance, Timur (1972) and Kandiyoti (1997) established a direct link between the size of the family and the degree of patriarchal¹⁵⁶ order. They said that the bigger the family, the more patriarchal the relations. Secondly, if family labor was used in a farming enterprise, women participated more actively in agricultural activities. The opposite was true for enterprises which relied on outside employment and on mechanization. Thirdly, in self-providing village economies, every family was an independent production unit and the labor of all members was needed. Finally, the deepening of commercialization in small and medium farms increased reliance on

¹⁵⁶ By patriarchy these authors meant the disproportionate power of the oldest men within the household.

women's labor. In cases when more market involvement resulted in dispossession of land and the emergence of a rural proletariat, the need for women's labor also increased because the family needed to survive with all it had (Kandiyoti, 1997). This was not necessarily to the benefit of women as it meant they were working harder to get the same or less. In general, women's status depended on a variety of factors.

Our findings have helped us to justify our initial claim that first development and later neoliberalism lowered the status of rural women in Turkey. This process was affected heavily by system-level economic and policy transformations. Core states have been the advocates of economic paradigms such as modernization and neoliberalism in the world-system. And the peripheral and semi-peripheral governments implemented developmental and neoliberal policies on the rurality. They did so because they in part assumed it will allow them to catch up with 'the West' and partially because this was imposed on them by the core countries, international organizations and TNCs. What we have found in our research regarding Turkey was no exception to the general rule. Although it has generally been the claim that developmental and neoliberal policies bring liberty, prosperity and welfare for all people, our research has shown that this was incorrect. Neither development nor neoliberalism had a positive effect on rural women, poorer classes or on the environment in Turkey.

If they ever considered rural women, government agencies, development experts and even some scholars assumed that agricultural policies that would supposedly increase the welfare of men would automatically increase the well-being of women. They advocated that the resources within the family or the 'fruits' of economic development would be shared equally within the household. However, as this study has clearly demonstrated, this was rarely so. Economic policies have had both class and gender bias, and were environmentally blind. Economic benefits, if any, generally accumulated in the hands of the wealthier classes and of the household head, i.e. men who owned or came to own and control resources such as land, money, agricultural tools, labor of women and

children etc. As a result, they accrued the profits. Development projects which did not challenge the status-quo even contributed to the continuation of this bias by assuming that women's labor was dependent on or controlled by men. The result of such policies have been nothing but detrimental on the labor, and social standing of rural women. The general ideology that floated around development experts, advocates of neoliberalism and academia claimed that involvement in the market economy would improve the status of women. However, this has not been the case. Increased commercialization that was encouraged through the adoption of ideologies of development and neoliberalism by successive Turkish governments did not benefit rural women. On the contrary, by depriving women of their subsistence, commercialization worsened the living conditions of women. This deprivation was realized by devaluing women's subsistence work by praising commercial work in which women did not have direct access to the fruits of their labor; by increasing their work burden; by increasing property differentials between men and women; by reducing women's role in family and communal decision-making and by reducing women's access to means of subsistence through environmental destruction that was brought by agricultural policies that held 'efficiency' and 'productivity' above anything else. Both proponents of development and neoliberalism have used the increased 'productivity' rhetoric to justify these ideologies, but this rhetoric ignored the non-economic costs of this 'productivity'. These non-economic costs consisted of small producers who lost livelihoods because of commercialization, rural women who lost their subsistence and whose labor was devalued, and the environment which was damaged in sometimes irreparable ways. Thus, the general argument that development and the market economy benefited women which was found in the literature has been shown to be false by our research.

Our research has revealed that Turkish agriculture has been affected by the developments at the global level. Commercialization that was low and limited to *Zone 1* and partially *Zone 2* in the Republican period, spread to *Zone 3* and intensified throughout the developmentalist and neoliberal periods. This was, of course, in line with the world conjuncture of the said periods. Due to an expansion

of commodity production in the periphery between 1923-1939 (Birttek & Keyder, 2009) and a general ideology of state involvement in economy (Şenses, 2017), commercialization was promoted by the Turkish state through subsidies and price supports (Hershlag, 1958) because only through the export of agricultural goods could the country be integrated into the world economy (Keyder, 1981). This was realized without questioning whether such integration was desirable or whether some other grounds for integration should have been found. When development ideology became dominant in the late 1940s and throughout the 1950s and 1960s, state involvement in agriculture increased even further because in the new postwar division of labor, the role of peripheral and semi-peripheral countries such as Turkey became to provide raw materials to the core countries. This was in line with the development ideology as well as the hegemonic practices of the USA which promoted the ideology of development in the Third World for purposes of more efficient raw material extraction. Such state-led agricultural ‘development’ schemes were supported in Turkey through American initiatives such as the Marshall Plan and the Green Revolution. As a result, commercialization expanded its sphere of influence in Turkey across different classes and zones. The transition from a developmentalist to neoliberal paradigm brought about reduced state involvement in the economy. The world agricultural production was redefined with the help of the IMF, World Bank, transnational corporations etc.: the core was assigned the task of producing low-value goods whereas periphery and semi-periphery would produce high-value cash crops. Within this division of labor, Turkey was placed in the second group. The role of international governmental and non-governmental organizations increased in Turkish agriculture. State support was reduced. As a result, more people left agriculture or were forced to adopt survival strategies.

In *Zone I* among large landowning classes the status of rural women did not change much. The existence of tractors that were in part provided by the Marshall Plan and thanks to the Green Revolution and the possibility of hiring outside labor prevented the women of these families from participating in agricultural production. Also, differentials in property ownership were visible even in the

Republican period, because men owned land, tractors and other types of property whereas women did not. The participation of men in the market economy brought to them power in decision-making processes and the knowledge of the outside world, whereas women were deprived of these opportunities. Among middle landowners of the same zone, it was possible to observe significant changes in the status of rural women. As commercialization deepened throughout time, women's labor was exploited more intensively. They engaged in subsistence agriculture and reproduction of the household in addition to commercial agriculture. Among households in which men found waged work, women stayed behind dealing with agriculture. This not only increased their workload but it also increased income differentials between men and women. Differences in property ownership became visible first in the developmentalist period due to system-level changes such as the Marshall Plan and the Green Revolution, which marked a status differentiation between men and women. Women's access to credits was obscured by their lack of land ownership. However, in the neoliberal period, and among some producers, agricultural tools were sold due to economic difficulties. While this reduced property differentials between men and women, it potentially increased women's workload who undertook labor-intensive tasks and therefore had to compensate for lack of tools. Regarding decision-making processes, women were disadvantaged because commercial production and marketing of products required a set of new skills that men found the opportunity to attain because they have been active in market economy and had the knowledge of outside world. Also, the emergence of contract farming during the neoliberal period brought about new forms of control of men over women's labor. Among small producers and sharecroppers of this zone, increased commercialization and mechanization displaced sharecroppers and some small producers which caused rural to urban migration among male producers. This left women in agriculture which increased their workload and caused income differentials between men and women. Mechanization caused property differentials between men and women, but this was limited. Increased contact with the world outside of the village belonged

almost exclusively to men. Among landless workers¹⁵⁷, there was not much change except for an increase in their number. Women and men worked, but women did not receive remuneration for their labor. Contracts were made with male head of the household which gave men the chance to control women's labor. Women also took part in household reproduction.

In *Zone 2*, the situation regarding the large landowning classes was similar. This class increased its wealth throughout different periods, and was the main beneficiary of commercialization and mechanization. However, the effects of these developments on rural women within this class were insignificant. Women did not participate in agricultural production whereas men took charge of commercial and mechanical tasks. Property ownership was gendered. Especially with the Marshall Plan and the Green Revolution, men acquired tractors and other inputs which gave them the opportunity to accumulate capital whereas women were disadvantaged because they did not own land to be used as collateral in order to buy such inputs. The increased interaction with the outside world which came with increased commercialization increased men's worldly knowledge whereas women lacked such knowledge and interaction. This, in turn, increased men's decision-making power over production processes vis-à-vis women. Among middle landowners, increased commercialization also increased the exploitation of women's labor. Although such commercialization was relatively low in the first period, it increased exponentially in the second period when this zone provided raw materials by which the country would be integrated into the post-war world economy. When commodity production increased in this zone, women's labor also increased because women had to deal with subsistence agriculture and reproduction of the household in addition to commercial production. Especially in the Black Sea region, men migrated to cities to find waged work because of the inadequacy of agricultural income. This increased the income differentials between men and women and it also increased women's work burden for those who were left alone in the countryside. These trends became even more visible

¹⁵⁷ The trend with landless workers was potentially valid across other zones, as well.

during the neoliberal period during which economic problems hit more people. As a result, many people lost the privileges that were obtained during the developmentalist period. Property ownership disadvantaged women during all three periods, but this became more marked during the developmentalist era when large numbers of tractors and inputs entered into production, and it continued through the neoliberal period. As a result of increased commercialization and male migration, the gap between public-private spheres increased, which made private sphere women's domain whereas men took over the public sphere which provided them with opportunities. This resulted in men's increased contact with the outside world, banks, government agencies, cooperatives, corporations etc. which enabled them to be the sole decider on the processes of agricultural production, which rendered women invisible in decision-making processes. This became even direr when during the neoliberal period contact farming with TNCs enabled men to control their wives' labor without providing extra remuneration for women. Regarding small producers and sharecroppers, women's status worsened. They moved from being equals to men in productive and reproductive activities, to being inferior to men. Lack of sexual division of labor during the Republican period was replaced by sexual division of labor that emerged during the developmentalist period and deepened in the neoliberal period. Entrance of tractors with the Marshall Plan and the Green Revolution displaced sharecroppers, who, as a result, migrated to cities to find employment. Also, many subsistence oriented producers could not cope with the 'productivity' of bigger commercial producers which resulted in their displacement. Later, the source of impoverishment became neoliberal policies. Due to lack of state support, increased input prices and indebtedness, many small producers migrated to cities or tried to find wage work in the countryside. This resulted in income differentials between men and women and increased labor exploitation of women who had to work three jobs. While there had been little inequality in property ownership during the Republican period, the gap between small and large producers increased in the developmentalist period when large numbers of tractors entered into Turkish agriculture. However, such differentiation decreased during the

neoliberal period when men were forced to sell their property in the face of economic difficulties, but this also negatively affected women because their workload increased. Processes of commercialization increased men's connection to and knowledge about the outside world, which made them the authority regarding familial and community decision-making processes. Landless workers continued to live in the same way although their number increased.

Zone 3 had managed to remain largely outside of market relations in agriculture until the 1950s. After this period, it was slowly integrated into the national economy. Large landowning classes in this zone presented similar characteristics to the same class of other zones. However, it should be noted that the adoption of mechanization and commercialization corresponded to a much later period regarding this wealthy class of *Zone 3* when compared to that of *Zone 1* and partially *Zone 2*. Mechanization and commercialization was introduced in this zone and class in the second period when the Marshall Plan and the Green Revolution made the introduction of large amounts of agricultural inputs possible and which promoted production for the market. From this period onwards, large landowning classes of *Zone 3* continued to accumulate capital by taking advantage of such novelties as the Green Revolution, and the GAP etc. Similar to other zones, women did not participate in agriculture in this class of this zone, as well. This resulted in a sexual division of labor. As opposed to large landowning classes in other zones, however, the gaps in the ownership of inputs did not start here until the developmentalist period. Regarding decision-making processes, women never had much power in these processes in the presence of old men. Middle landowners according to our classification did not increase in this zone. Regarding small landowners and sharecroppers, drastic changes regarding the status of rural women were observed. While these communities lived in a less sexually divided manner during the first period as a result of lack of commercialization, this started to change during the developmentalist period when economic difficulties, displacements due to tractors and lack of competitiveness led male producers to migrate to cities. This divide was even further consolidated during the neoliberal era when displacements became even more common due to

agricultural policies, the ongoing war in the region and because of dam building. The consequence was the emergence of a more clearly defined sexual division of labor within these communities as men participated in waged work whereas women dealt with household reproduction sometimes along with subsistence agriculture. The attack of the GAP on subsistence production took the livelihoods of these poor classes, especially of women, and replaced it with cash-crop production for the market which did not benefit women. As a result of this, women's exploitation increased, their control over their labor decreased and income differentials between men and women increased. Gaps in property ownership supposedly began in the neoliberal period when tractors were adopted. However, this was not a very common occurrence considering the general decline in people's living standards. Finally, women's control over their labor and over decisions regarding family and community was reduced, but later than other zones. It is logical to suppose that late introduction of commercialization accounted for this. Gap between men and women in decision-making increased especially in the neoliberal period when commercialization finally increased the public private differentiation and made the former men's domain. Birth rates decreased in the country over time, but unlike the claims of the advocates of development, we believe that this was not the result of women's increased independence but was the consequence of worse living conditions of rural households.

To conclude, evidence clearly shows that the effects of development and neoliberalism on rural women in Turkey have been anything but positive. These paradigms did not have any 'cure' for the improvement of women's situation other than increased market involvement. However, it has been demonstrated that the expansion of market economy has not done good for women. Government policies that completely or partially ignored rural women contributed to the continuation and even consolidation of women's inferiority. This was the case regarding all zones across different classes, although their degree and kinds showed small differences.

From our historical analysis, it becomes clear that the status of rural women in Turkey has never been high, but it was dealt crashing blows with first development and neoliberalism, in spite of the claims that these paradigms would bring increased welfare for women. Women are still defined mainly in terms of being housewives, although they work in cash-crop production, subsistence agriculture and reproduction of the household. They are not paid for these jobs. Their workload has visibly increased, but they are not getting much back. They are either receiving the same amount or less, whereas men presumably work less hard and get some returns on their labor. Also, these processes are more likely to render women dependent rather than men, because it is women who face increased labor with no returns when men make decisions that would change the life for the household. The opportunities brought about by development and neoliberalism are open only to men, whereas the ills brought by them are suffered mostly by women. Although poorer men also suffer to a certain extent, they generally share the costs with women.

This study is also a clear refutation of the Western conceptualization of the Third World women. Unlike the assumptions by the Western and liberal feminists, women in non-Western countries have not always been dependent actors or victims of patriarchal oppression. These conditions were created later, they were not intrinsic to these societies. Assuming that women's oppression and exploitation is timeless ignores the importance of the processes that produce and reproduce this situation. Our research has shown that women's oppression and exploitation increased over time, not only due to 'patriarchy' that was 'always' there, but also because of the state policies, macro-level ideological processes and their reflections on the society. Whereas rural women used to be able to have less workload, use rights regarding property and environmental resources, have more power in decision-making processes, possess age-based status and more control over their labor and produce, these were taken away from them because of development and neoliberalism. Women's tools to cope with these challenges decrease as their lives are made more difficult. They pay the highest price for agricultural policies together with girls. Although it would be misleading to say

that women have lost their capability to fight back against increasing exploitation, one must admit that this capability was damaged because of reduced chances to find a way out. This was because of the increased harshness of living conditions and low living standards brought about by development and neoliberalism that disproportionately affected women. Our observation is that, although its degree changed from zone to zone, relatively more improved living standards for the middle rural classes in the developmentalist and neoliberal period was taken advantage of by men; whereas women were far from enjoying higher status or standards. Regarding small producers, costs were born both by men and women. Yet, women were affected worse as men outsourced the costs to women. However, in the neoliberal period, economically more unstable middle producers were also damaged, which caused women of this class to experience similarly worse conditions to women in small landowning families.

A recent question that needs to be raised regarding agricultural problems is farmers' suicides. It is a common occurrence that many agricultural producers all over the world commit suicide mostly by using agricultural chemicals such as pesticides and insecticides. Several researchers have concluded that the reason behind the suicide pattern is economic difficulties faced by producers (Patel, 2007; Sataloğlu, Aydın & Turla, 2007). When we tried to find the reflections of this trend in Turkey, we have encountered limited information. Although there are several studies regarding the poisoning due to agricultural chemicals, only a limited portion of them deal with suicide cases (Çetin, Öğüt, Tomruk, 2009; Gökbulut, 2014; Oktik, Top, Sezer & Bozver, 2003). And those which do focus on suicide cases do not talk extensively about the underlying reasons for suicide. They only give general ideas such as unemployment, socio-economic level and following psychological problems or familial problems (Özkaya, Çeliker & Koçer-Giray, 2013; Gökbulut, 2014; Oktik et al., 2003; Sataloğlu et al., 2007). Moreover, there is confusion regarding the groups that are more at risk. For instance, while in some studies with 2008 data it was pointed out that people between ages 20-29 and women are more at the risk of committing suicide with pesticides (Özkaya et al., 2013; Sataloğlu et al., 2007); in another study that was

realized with 2013 data, it turned out that more men than women committed suicide through pesticide use (Gökbulut, 2014). It is important to know the general trends, but the lack of in-depth research fails to give a detailed record about the steps that led a person to suicide and about which group of people tend to commit suicide or to find a connection between the cases of suicide and countrywide socio-economic issues in the rurality. Although it was not clearly stated in these studies, we believe that there can be established a connection between the trends in the other parts of the world and Turkey regarding the economic roots of this pattern. As we have demonstrated above, economic problems in the rurality in Turkey have taken almost a permanent character. Adding to this the increased use and availability of chemicals, it is not a far possibility to discuss that many people find the last resort in committing suicide when they can no longer cope with the chronic problems such as unemployment, low wages, indebtedness, the feeling of being trapped, forced migration etc. This is possibly the most striking case that demonstrates the effects of system-level policies on individual lives, and one of the strongest evidences which refute the claim that development and neoliberalism improve lives. More studies in order to understand the gravity of the issue are necessary.

It is clear that the agricultural policies applied in Turkey, as well as in other parts of the world, are at best problematic. Below, we have assembled some policy recommendations to overcome these problems. Firstly, the attention of the Turkish state should be moved away from further liberalization of agriculture to a 'human-centered' rural development which includes such concepts as subsidies, price supports; bringing health, education and employment facilities to the rurality which would stop not only forced rural-urban migration, but would also increase welfare of the people living in the rural areas. This would prove less costly in the long-run because rural population who migrate to towns constitute a drain on welfare expenditures since they are more likely to require them from the state due to poverty. They are more likely to be unemployed, to work without social security, to be poorer to afford healthcare and education, to reside in neighbourhoods with little infrastructure etc. Therefore, if resources and means

are transferred to rural areas for people to do agriculture by combining traditional and modern methods¹⁵⁸ to produce what they feel they should produce, and with easy and quality access to education, healthcare, infrastructure, transportation, libraries etc., we can not only close the gap between rural and urban areas and across regions, but we can have truly sustainable economy. The influence of the outside actors such as agribusiness TNCs, the IMF, World Bank etc. should be reduced. Instead, producers, male and female, should be autonomous in deciding what to produce, how much to produce and when to produce, because they know what suits the environment and their needs best. When excessive focus on ‘productivity’ is abolished, then the need to use agricultural chemicals would decrease. In the meantime, however, governmental and non-governmental actors should work actively to discourage the use of chemicals, and increase environmental consciousness. Moreover, in order to convey the desires of producers to the government, more grassroots organizations and rural cooperatives and unions should be created. Thus, the voices of producers would be heard. Gender equality within such organizations should be sustained so that the state would also take into consideration women’s needs during policy making process. Also, more community gardens in or near cities should be created. Thus, cities can feed themselves, stop being a drain on rurality’s resources, and moreover, people’s sense of community would be developed. This way, people residing in rural areas can not only properly and in a healthy way feed themselves, but also can sell goods to cities when they want without being exploited, if the state takes a step to mediate prices. In the meantime, gender equality would be sustained as women’s burden is reduced, differences in property ownership are eliminated, women’s decisions are considered. Also thus, the farmers’ suicide would potentially be avoided. The environment would also be conserved when chemical inputs are not used, and when reductions in poverty levels do not require overexploitation of resources etc.

¹⁵⁸ This includes things such as non-reliance of chemical inputs, use of traditional seeds, use of mechanical tools in a way that would not create dependency on outside, income differentiation between men and women, and unemployment in the rurality.

Apart from these practical recommendations, we also would like to draw attention to the creation of a new theoretical perspective to rural women's problems in Turkey. As noted at the beginning and throughout the thesis, there has been a lack of attention in academia towards agriculture, rural women and the environment in Turkey. Whereas rural sociology is an underexplored research area in Turkey, gender element within the existing literature is nearly absent. Rural women were almost invisible in the analysis of scholars of Turkish rural sociology. Many scholars who explored the effects of developmental and neoliberal ideologies on the Turkish rurality did so by assuming that men and women were affected from these processes in the same way. The existing studies on rural women are far from being thorough; they did not take into consideration different classes or zones in the country, which were important variables that had important roles to play in determining the status of rural women. We have tried to overcome this gap by adapting different case studies, that we thought might give a clue about the general trends, into our historical, zone and class analysis. Although we tried to be as inclusive as possible, this study is preliminary. More concrete trends can be discovered if more representative case studies and historical studies which take into consideration the status of rural women in different zones, classes and time periods, regarding different and inclusive variables and in commercial as well as subsistence economies are realized. In addition to the lack of attention towards rural women, studies regarding the environment did not take into consideration the effects of agricultural practices on the environment. The environmental problems were treated as if they were independent from the industrial agriculture of today that is dependent on environmentally destructive chemicals. So more work in this area is called for. Neither was there an attention towards the relationship between rural women and the environment. It was either not noted or ignored altogether that women were affected from environmental degradation more than men as it was them who dealt with subsistence work which assumed greater burden and which was in danger of extinction as environmental problems became widespread. Therefore, in order to overcome this ignorance towards rurality, rural sociology in Turkey has to be

made stronger and inclusive. Attention towards rural women, different rural classes and zones as well as on the environment should increase. More studies that are written from a critical perspective are needed.

We would like to end this study with a quote from Petra Kelly, a German Green politician and an activist; “to those who say it is not up to us in the industrialized world to tell those in the Third World how to live, I agree. Let it be up to those societies to determine their own courses. But let *everyone* be included, not only the men” (Kelly, 1997, p. 117).

REFERENCES

- Abadan-Unat, N. (1982). *Türk toplumunda kadın*. İstanbul: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği.
- Abdelal, R., & Ruggie, J. G. (2009). The principles of embedded liberalism: social legitimacy and global capitalism. In *New perspectives on regulation*. Cambridge, MA: Tobin Project.
- Ahmad, F. (1995). *Modern Türkiye'nin oluşumu*. İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınevi.
- Ahmad, F., (2015). *Demokrasi sürecinde Türkiye 1945-1980*. Hil Yayınları.
- Aksoy, Z. (2005). Biodiversity and biotechnology in the agriculture sector. In *Environmentalism in Turkey: between democracy and development*, 235-248.
- Aksoy, E. & Özsoy, G. (2013). Tarım arazilerinde amaç dışı kullanım ve sürdürülebilir arazi yönetim sorunları. In *Türkiye'de tarımın ekonomi-politiği 1923-2013*. Bursa: TMMOB & NotaBene.
- Akşit, B. (1966). *Türkiye'de az gelişmiş kapitalizm ve köylere girişi*. ODTÜ Öğrenci Birliği.
- Akşit, B. (1985). Kırsal dönüşüm tipolojisi. In *Köy, kasaba ve kentlerde toplumsal değişme*. Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi.
- Akşit, B. (1988). Kırsal dönüşüm ve köy araştırmaları (1960-1980). In *Türkiye'de tarımsal yapılar 1923-2000*. Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.

- Aktan, R. (1957). Mechanization of agriculture in Turkey. *Land Economics*, 33(4), 273-285.
- Altieri, M.A. (2000). Ecological impacts of industrial agriculture and the possibilities for truly sustainable farming. In *Hungry for profit: the agribusiness threat to farmers, food and the environment*. NYU Press.
- Andow, D. (1983). The extent of monoculture and its effects on insect pest populations with particular reference to wheat and cotton. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 9(1), 25-35.
- Arat, Y. (1989). *The patriarchal paradox: women politicians in Turkey*. Fairleigh Dickinson Univ Press.
- Arat, Y. (1997). The project of modernity and women in Turkey. In *Rethinking modernity and national identity in Turkey*. University of Washington Press.
- Arat, Z. F. (1998a). Kemalizm ve Türk kadını. In *75 yılda kadınlar ve erkekler*, 51-70. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı.
- Arat, Z. (Eds.). (1998b). *Deconstructing images of the Turkish woman*. Macmillan.
- Arıkan, G. (1988). Kırsal kesimde kadın olmak. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(2), 1-16.
- Arrighi, G. (1990). The three hegemonies of historical capitalism. *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, 365-408.
- Arrighi, G. (1994). *The long twentieth century: money, power, and the origins of our times*. Verso.
- Arrighi, G. (2007). *Adam Smith in Beijing*. London: Verso.

- Arsel, M. (2012). Environmental studies in Turkey: critical perspectives in a time of neo-liberal developmentalism. *The Arab World Geographer / Le Géographe du Monde Arabe*. 15(1).
- Atalık, A. (2013). Genetiği değiştirilmiş organizmalar (GDO). In *Türkiye'de tarımın ekonomi-politiği 1923-2013*. Bursa: TMMOB & NotaBene.
- Ayboga, E. (2009). Turkey's GAP and its impact in the region. *Kurdish Herald*. <http://www.kurdishherald.com/issue/005/article03.php> (31 August 2018).
- Aydın, Z. (1989). Household production and capitalism: a case study of south-eastern Turkey. In *The rural Middle East: peasant lives and modes of production*. London: Zed Books.
- Aydın, Z. (2001). Yapısal uyum politikaları ve kırsal alanda beka stratejilerinin özelleştirilmesi: Söke'nin Tuzburgazı ve Sivrihisar'ın Kınık köyleri örneği. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 88, 11-31.
- Aydın, Z. (2010). "Neo-liberal transformation of Turkish agriculture", *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 10, No. 2, p. 149-187
- Aysu, Abdullah. 2015. *Gıda krizi & tarım, ekoloji ve egemenlik*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Barlas, N. (2013). *Küresel krizlerden sürdürülebilir topluma çağımızın çevre sorunları*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.
- Benería, L. (2014). Neoliberalism and the global economic crisis: A view from feminist economics. In *Under Development: Gender*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Berik, G. (1990). Türkiye'de kırsal kesimde halı dokumacılığı ve kadının ezilmişliği: karşılaştırmalı bir tartışma. In *Kadın bakış açısından 1980'ler Türkiye'sinde kadın*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

- Birtek, F. & Keyder, Ç, (2009). Türkiye’de devlet tarım ilişkileri 1923-1950. *Toplumsal Tarih Çalışmaları*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Boratav, K. (1980). *Tarımsal yapılar ve kapitalizm*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları (Vol. 454).
- Boserup, E. (1970). *Woman's role in economic development*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Brown, L. R. (1968). The agricultural revolution in Asia. *Foreign Affairs*,46(4), 688.
- Brown, L. R. (1970). *Seeds of change: The Green Revolution and development in the 1970's*. New York: Praeger.
- Browning, J. (1985). *Ataturk's legacy to the women of Turkey*. Working Paper. University of Durham, Centre for Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies, Durham.
- Bryceson, D. F. (2002). The scramble in africa: reorienting rural livelihoods. *World Development*, 30(5), 725-739.
- Bunkle, P. (1993). "Calling the shots? The international politics of Depo-Provera." in *The racial economy of science*, Bloomington Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Caporal, B. (1982). *Kemalizmde ve Kemalizm sonrasında Türk kadını: (1919-1970)*. Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Carson, R. (1962). *Silent spring*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin,
- Coffing, A.L. (1974). *PL-480 imports, the disincentive effect, and implications for development in Turkey*. *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 6333. Iowa State University. PhD Thesis.

- Çarkođlu, A., & Eder, M. (2005). Developmentalism alla Turca: the Southeastern Anatolia development project (GAP). In *Environmentalism in Turkey: between democracy and development*, 167-183.
- Çetin, N. G., Öđüt, S., Tomruk, Ö. (2009). Acil servise başvuran pestisit zehirlenmelerinin deđerlendirilmesi. *Akademik Acil Tıp Dergisi*. 8(4).
- Çınar, E. M., & Silier, O. (1979). *Türkiye tarımında işletmeler arası farklılaşma*. İstanbul: Bođaziçi Üniversitesi.
- Dedeođlu, S., & Elveren, A. Y. (2012). *Türkiye’de refah devleti ve kadın*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Döner, F.N. (2013). Transition under SAP and CAP: future scenarios for agriculture in Turkey. In *Turkey–EU relations: power, politics and the future*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Duben, A. (1985). Turkish families and households in historical perspective. *Journal of Family History*, 10(1), 75-97.
- Durakbaşı, A. (1998). Cumhuriyet döneminde modern kadın ve erkek kimliklerinin oluşumu: Kemalist kadın kimliđi ve ‘münevver erkekler’. 75 yılda kadınlar ve erkekler, 29-50. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı.
- Ecevit, M. (1991-93). “Rural women and the small peasant economy”. *Turkish Public Administration Annual*. 17-19.
- Ecevit, M. (1994). Tarımda kadının toplumsal konumu: bazı kavramsal ilişkiler. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 27(2), 89-96.
- Ecevit, M. C., Karkıner, N., & Büke, A. (2009). Köy sosyolojisinin daraltılmış kapsamından, tarım-gıda-köylülük ilişkilerine yönelik bazı deđerlendirmeler. *Mülkiye Dergisi*, 33(262), 41-61.

- Ecevit, Y. (2011). Türkiye’de kadın emeği konulu çalışmaların feminist tarihçesi. In *Birkaç arpa boyu... : 21. yüzyıla girerken. Türkiye’de feminist çalışmalar. Prof. Dr. Nermin Abadan Unat’a armağan.* Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Erken, A. (2016). Negotiating politics, informal networks and the Ford Foundation projects in Turkey during the Cold War. *International Journal of Turcologia*, 11(21).
- Ertürk, Y. (1987). The impact of national integration on rural households in Southeastern Turkey. *Journal of Human Sciences*. VI/I, 81-97.
- Ertürk, Y. (1988). *Women’s participation in agriculture in the villages of Erzurum.* Ankara: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Ertürk, Y. (1990). Doğu Anadolu’da modernleşme ve kırsal kadın. In *Kadın bakış açısından 1980’ler Türkiye’sinde kadın.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Ertürk, Y. (1991). Rural women and modernization in Southeastern Anatolia. In *Women in modern Turkish society: A Reader.* Zed Books.
- Estavo, G. (1997), Development. In *The Development dictionary: a guide to knowledge as power.* Orient Blackswan.
- Fabian, J. (1983). *Time and the other: how anthropology makes its object.* Columbia University Press.
- FAO. (2016). *Tarımsal ve kırsal geçimin ulusal cinsiyet profili: Türkiye.* Ankara.
- Federico, G. (2005). Not guilty? agriculture in the 1920s and the Great Depression. *The Journal of Economic History*, 65(4), 949-976.
- Frank, A. G. (1966). The development of underdevelopment. *Monthly Review*, 18(4) September.

- Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom*. (With the assistance of Rose D. Friedman). University of Chicago Press.
- Frizzell, J. K. (1968). Introduction of Mexican wheat in Turkey, 1967-1968. *Ankara: USAID*.
- Gemalmaz, M. S. (2005). *Türk kıyafet hukuku ve türban: tarihçe, ideoloji, mevzuat, içtihat, siyaset: AİHK ve AİHM kararları ve değerlendirilmesi*. İstanbul: Legal.
- George, S. (1977). *How the other half dies: the real reasons for world hunger*. Penguin Books.
- Gerschenkron, A. (1962). *Economic backwardness in historical perspective: a book of essays*. New York: Praeger.
- Gök, F. (2007). The Girls' Institutes in the early period of the Turkish Republic. *Education in 'Multicultural' Societies–Turkish and Swedish Perspectives*, 93-105.
- Gökbulut, C. (2014). Türkiye'de pestisit zehirlenmeleri. *Uluslararası Katılımlı Ulusal Biyosidal Kongresi*. March. Conference Paper. Available on https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283479192_Turkiye'de_Pestisit_zehirlenmeleri Access on 01 October 2018.
- Günaydın, G. (2010). *Tarım ve kırsallıkta dönüşüm: politika transferi süreci; AB ve Türkiye*. Tan Kitabevi.
- Gürel, B. (2014). Türkiye'de kırdaki sınıf mücadelelerinin tarihsel gelişimi. In *Marksizm ve sınıflar: dünyada ve Türkiye'de sınıflar ve mücadeleleri*. Yordam Yayınları.
- Gürel, B., Küçük, B. & Taş, S. (2018). Rural roots of the rise of the Justice and Development Party in Turkey. ERPI 2018 *International Conference Authoritarian Populism and the Rural World*. Conference Paper No: 57.

- Güriz, A. (1974). Land ownership in rural settlements. In *Turkey: geographic and social perspectives*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Hann, C. (1993). The sexual division of labour in Lazistan. In *Culture and economy: changes in Turkish villages*. Eothen.
- Harris, L. M. (2005). Negotiating inequalities: democracy, gender and politics of difference in water user groups of Southeastern Turkey. In *Environmentalism in Turkey: between democracy and development*, 185-200.
- Hartmann, B. (1997). Population control I: birth of an ideology. *International Journal of Health Services*, 27(3), 523-540.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610(1), 21-44.
- Held, D. & McGrew, A. (2000). The great globalization debate: an introduction. In *The global transformations reader: an introduction for the globalization debate*. Polity Press.
- Hershlag, Z. Y. (1958). *Turkey: an economy in transition*. The Hague: Uitgeverij Van Keulen.
- Hinderink, J., & Kiray, M. B. (1970). *Social stratification as an obstacle to development: a study of four Turkish villages*. Praeger Publishers.
- Hopkins, T.K. & Wallerstein, I. (1996). The world-system: 's there a crisis? In *Age of transition: trajectory of the world-system, 1945-2025*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hoşgör, A.G. (2001). Convergence between theoretical perspectives in women-gender and development literature regarding women's economic status in the Middle East. *METU Studies in Development*, 28(1/2), 111.

- Hoşgör, A.G. (2011). “Kalkınma ve kırsal kadının değişen toplumsal konumu: Türkiye deneyimi üzerinden Karadeniz bölgesindeki iki vakanın analizi”. In *Birkaç arpa boyu: 21. yüzyıla girerken Türkiye’de feminist çalışmalar: Prof. Dr. Nermin Abadan Unat’a armağan*. İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Hoşgör, A.G. & Him, M. S.. (2016). “Küreselleşme ve Türkiye’de kırsal kadının ücretli emeği: *Rapana Venosa* üretim zinciri üzerinden Batı Karadeniz bölgesinde bir vaka analizi”. *Sosyoloji Araştırmaları Dergisi* 19(2). 108-130
- Hoşgör, A. G., & Smiths, J. (2007). The status of rural women in Turkey: what is the role of regional differences. In *From patriarchy to empowerment: women’s participation, movements, and rights in the Middle East, North Africa, and South Asia*. Syracuse University Press.
- Huntington, S. P. (1973). *Political order in changing societies*. New Haven: Univ. Press.
- Ikeda, S. (1996). World production. In *Age of transition: trajectory of the world-system, 1945-2025*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ilcan, S. M. (1994). Peasant struggles and social change: migration, households and gender in a rural Turkish society. *International Migration Review*, 554-579.
- İncirlioğlu, E. O. (1998). Images of village women in Turkey: models and anomalies. In *Deconstructing images of the Turkish woman*, New York: St. Martin’s Press, 199-223.
- Jacoby, T. (2006) Agriculture, the state and class formation in Turkey's first Republic (1923–60), *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, (33)1, pp. 34-60
- Kabeer, N. (1994). *Reversed realities: gender hierarchies in development thought*. London: Verso.

- Kandiyoti, D. (1977). Sex roles and social change: a comparative appraisal of Turkey's women. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 3(1), 57-73.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1985). *Women in rural production systems: problems and policies*. Paris: Unesco.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with patriarchy. *Gender & Society*, 2(3), 274-290.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1989). Women and the Turkish state: political actors or symbolic pawns. In *Woman-nation-state* (pp. 126-149). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1990). Women and household production: the impact of rural transformation in Turkey. In *The rural Middle East: peasant lives and modes of production*, 183-194. London: Zed Books.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1997). *Cariyeler, bacılar, yurttaşlar: kimlikler ve toplumsal dönüşümler*. Istanbul: Metis Yayinlari.
- Karaömerlioğlu, M. A. (2000). Elite perceptions of land reform in early Republican Turkey. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 27(3), 115-141.
- Karpat, K. H. (1960). Social effects of farm mechanization in Turkish villages. *Social Research*, 83-103.
- Katznelson, I. (2003). Periodization and preferences: reflections on purposive action in comparative historical social sciences. In *Comparative historical analysis in the social sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge Up.
- Kavas, S., & Thornton, A. (2013). Adjustment and hybridity in Turkish family change: perspectives from developmental idealism. *Journal of Family History*, 38(2), 223-241.

- Kazgan, G. (1982). Türk ekonomisinde kadınların işgücüne katılımı, mesleki dağılımı, eğitim düzeyi ve sosyo-ekonomik statüsü. In *Türk toplumunda kadın*. Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği Yayını.
- Kazgan, G. (2003). *Tarım ve gelişme*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Kelly, P. (1997). Women and power. In *Ecofeminism: Women, Culture, Nature*. Indiana University Press.
- Kendir, H. (2003). Küreselleşen tarım ve Türkiye’de tarım reformu. *Praksis*, 9, 277-300.
- Keyder, Ç. (1981). *The definition of a peripheral economy: Turkey 1923-1929*. Cambridge University Press.
- Keyder, Ç. (1983a). The cycle of sharecropping and the consolidation of small peasant ownership in Turkey. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 10(2-3), 130-145.
- Keyder, Ç. (1983b). Paths of rural transformation in Turkey. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 11(1), 34-49
- Keyder, Ç. (1989). *Türkiye’de devlet ve sınıflar*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Keyder, Ç. (1993). The genesis of petty commodity production in agriculture: the case of Turkey. *Culture and economy: changes in Turkish villages*, 171-86.
- Keyder, Ç. (2009). *Toplumsal tarih çalışmaları*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Keyder, Ç. & Pamuk, Ş. (2009). 1945 çiftçiyi topraklandırma kanunu üzerine tezler. In *Toplumsal tarih çalışmaları*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

- Keyder, Ç. & Yenal, Z. (2011). "Agrarian change under globalization: markets and insecurity in Turkish agriculture", *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 60-86.
- Keyder, C., & Yenal, Z. (2013). *Bildiğimiz tarımın sonu: küresel iktidar ve köylülük*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Kılınçer, N. et. al. (1998). *Ulusal çevre eylem planı: tarımsal teknolojiler ve çevre*. Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı.
- Kırkpınar, L. (1998). Türkiye'de toplumsal değişme sürecinde kadın. *75 yılda kadınlar ve erkekler*, 13-28. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı.
- Konak, N. (2013). Development and the Southeastern Anatolia project (GAP): an ecofeminist inquiry. In *Gendered identities: criticizing patriarchy in Turkey*, 51-66.
- Kurmuş, O. (1982). *Emperyalizmin Türkiye'ye girişi*. Ankara: Savaş Yayınları.
- Lewontin, R.C. (2000). The maturing of capitalist agriculture: farmer as proletarian. In *Hungry for profit: the agribusiness threat to farmers, food and the environment*. NYU Press.
- Leys, C. (1996). *The rise and fall of development theory*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Lippe, J. M. V. (2000). Forgotten brigade of the forgotten war: Turkey's participation in the Korean War. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 36(1), 92-102.
- Lipton, M. (1977). *Why poor people stay poor: a study of urban bias in world development*. London: Canberra: Temple Smith; Australian National University Press.
- Margulies, R., & Yıldızoğlu, E. (1987). Agrarian change: 1923-70. In *Turkey in transition: new perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Marshall, B. K. (1999). Globalisation, environmental degradation and Ulrich Beck's risk society. *Environmental Values*, 8(2), 253-275.
- McCully, P. (1996). *Silenced rivers: the ecology and politics of large dams*. Zed Books.
- McMichael, P. (2000) Global food politics. In *Hungry for profit: the agribusiness threat to farmers, food and the environment*. NYU Press.
- McMichael, P. (2008). *Development and social change: a global perspective*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Metinsoy, E. M. (2016). Writing the history of ordinary Ottoman women during World War I. *Aspasia*, 10(1), 18-39.
- Mies, M. (1998). *Patriarchy and accumulation on a world scale*. Zed Books.
- Mies, M. & Shiva, V., (1993). *Ecofeminism*. London: Zed Books.
- Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ministry of Interior. (1937). *The Turkish woman in history*. Ankara.
- Moberg, M. (1992). Structural adjustment and rural development: inferences from a Belizean village. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 27(1), 1-20.
- Mohanty, C. T. (1984). Under Western eyes: feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Boundary 2*, 12(3), 333-358.
- Morvaridi, B. (1992). Gender relations in agriculture: women in Turkey. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 40(3), 567-586.

Müftüler-Bac, M. (1999). Turkish women's predicament. *Women's Studies International Forum* 22(3), 303-315. Pergamon.

Neuman, W. L. (2000). *Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Harlow: Allyn & Bacon.

OFFICIAL GAZETTE 04.04.2000 and 24010 day and numbered Official Gazette
<http://www.hukukturk.com/en/official-gazette-of-tr?Sayi=24010&Tarih=04%2f04%2f2000>

Oktik, N., Top, A., Sezer, S., & Bozver, U. (2003). Muğla ili intihar ve intihar girişimlerinin sosyolojik olarak incelenmesi. *Kriz Dergisi*, 11(3), 1-19.

O'Neil, M. L., & Toktas, S. (2014). Women's property rights in Turkey. *Turkish Studies*, 15(1), 29-44.

O'Neil, M. L., & Toktas, S. (2017). Women's access to property: a comparative study on Islamic and Kemalist women in Turkey. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 30(3), 674-688.

Oral, N. (2013a). Türkiye'de toprak dağılımındaki eşitsizlikler. In *Türkiye'de tarımın ekonomi-politiği 1923-2013*. Bursa: Nota Bene.

Oral, N. (2013b). Tarımda küresel sömürgeciliği kurumsallaştırma aracı: sözleşmeli üreticilik. In *Türkiye'de tarımın ekonomi-politiği 1923-2013*. Bursa: Nota Bene

Oral, N., Sarıbal, O., & Şengül, H. (2013). Cumhuriyet döneminde uygulanan tarım politikaları. In *Türkiye'de tarımın ekonomi-politiği 1923-2013*. Bursa: Nota Bene.

Oyan, O. (2004). Tarımsal politikalardan politikasız bir tarıma doğru. In *Neoliberalizmin tahribatı 2000'li yıllarda Türkiye 2*, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, pp. 44-67

- Özbay, F., & Shorter, F. C. (1970). Turkey: changes in birth control practices, 1963 to 1968. *Studies in Family Planning*, 1(51), 1-7.
- Özbay, F. (1990). Kadınların eviçi ve evdışı uğraşlarındaki değişme. In *Kadın bakış açısından 1980'ler Türkiye'sinde kadın*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Özbay, F. (2015). *Dünden bugüne aile kent ve nüfus*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Özçatalbaş, O., & Özkan, B. (2003). The role of women in agriculture and rural development in Turkey. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 9(4), 114-124.
- Özkaya G, Çeliker A, Koçer-Giray B. (2013). İnsektisit zehirlenmeleri ve Türkiye'deki durumun değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Hijyen ve Deneysel Biyoloji Dergisi*,; 70(2): 75-102.
- Pamuk, Ş. (1988). İkinci Dünya Savaşı yıllarında devlet, tarımsal yapılar ve dönüşüm. In *Türkiye'de tarımsal yapılar*. Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.
- Pamuk, Ş. (2009). Agriculture and economic development of Turkey, 1870-2000. In *Agriculture and economic development in Europe since 1870*. Routledge. pp. 375-396.
- Patel, R. (2007). *Stuffed and starved: markets: power and the hidden battle for the world food system*. Black Inc, Carlton, VIC, Australia.
- Payer, C. (1975). *The debt trap: the IMF and the Third World*. Monthly Review Press.
- Pelizzon, S. & Casparis, J. (1996). World human welfare. In *Age of transition: trajectory of the world-system, 1945-2025*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pelizzon, S. M. (2009). *Kadının konumu nasıl değişti? feodalizmden kapitalizme*. Ankara: İmge Kitapevi.

- Rai, S. M. (1997). The history of international development: concepts and contexts. In *The women, gender and development reader*: Fernwood Publishing.
- Rasuly-Paleczek, G. (1996). Some remarks on the study of household composition and intra-family relations in rural and urban Turkey. In *Turkish families in transition*. Lang.
- Reifer, T. & Sudler, J. (1996). The interstate system. In *Age of transition: trajectory of the world-system, 1945-2025*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Republic of Turkey Ministry of Development. (2014). The tenth development program 2014-2018. Ankara.
- Rogers, B. (1981). *The domestication of women: discrimination in developing societies*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Robinson, R. D. (1952). Tractors in the village. A study in Turkey. *Journal of Farm Economics*, 34(4), 451-462.
- Rose, M. E. K. W., & Erdem, M. (2000). American philanthropy in Republican Turkey: The Rockefeller and Ford Foundations. *The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations*, 131-157.
- Rostow, W. W. (1959). The stages of economic growth. *The Economic History Review*, 12(1), 1.
- Sataloğlu, N., Aydın, B., Turla, A. (2007). Pestisit zehirlenmeleri. *TSK Koruyucu Hekimlik Bülteni*. 6(3).
- Savran Al-Haik, H. (2016). *Exploring women farmers' experiences: a case study of gender inequality on small Turkish farms* (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Tech).
- Sen, G., & Grown, C. (1987). *Development, crises and alternative visions: Third World women's perspectives*. Routledge.

- Shiva, V. (1988). *Staying alive: women, ecology, and survival in India*. North Melbourne, Vic.: Spinifex Press.
- Shiva, V. (1991). *The violence of the Green Revolution*. Zed Books.
- Shiva, V. (2000a). *Stolen harvest: the hijacking of the global food supply*. Zed Books.
- Shiva, V. (2000b). War against nature and the people of the South. *Views from the south: The effects of globalization and the WTO on Third World countries*, 91-125.
- Shiva, V. (Ed.). (2007). *Manifestos on the future of food & seed*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Shorter, F. C. (1985). The population of Turkey after the War of Independence. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 17(4), 417-441.
- Shorter, F.C. & Tekçe, B. (1974). Demographic determinants of urbanization in Turkey. In *Turkey: Geographic and Social Perspectives*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Singer, M. (1977). *The economic advance of Turkey: 1938-1960*. Ayyıldız Matabaası.
- Sirman-Eralp, N. (1988). Pamuk üretiminde aile işletmeleri. In *Türkiye'de Tarımsal yapılar (1923-2000)*, Ankara: Yurt Yayınevi.
- Sirman, N. (1990). Köy kadının aile ve evlilikte güçlenme mücadelesi. In *Kadın bakış açısından 1980'ler Türkiye'sinde kadın*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Sontheimer, S. (1991). *Women and the environment: a reader: crisis and development in the Third World*. London: Earthscan Publications.

- Şenses, F. (2017). *İktisada (farklı bir) giriş*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Tanrivermis, H. (2003). Agricultural land use change and sustainable use of land resources in the Mediterranean region of Turkey. *Journal of Arid Environments*, 54(3), 553-564.
- TAYA. (2013). *Türkiye aile yapısı araştırması, tespitler, öneriler*. T.C. Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı. İstanbul. 2014.
- TDHS. (1998). *Turkey demographic and health survey*. Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies. Ankara, Turkey. 1999.
- TDHS. (2013). *Turkey demographic and health survey*. Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies. Ankara, Turkey. 2014.
- Tekeli, İ. (1977). Piyasa koşulları içinde tarımda mekanizasyonun Türkiye'nin kırsal yapısında yarattığı dönüşümler. In *Bağımlı kentleşme: kırdan ve kentte dönüşüm süreci*. Mimarlar Odası Yayınları.
- Tekeli, İ. (1978). Türkiye tarımında mekanizasyonun yarattığı yapısal dönüşümler ve kırdan kopuş süreci. In *Yerleşme yapısının uyum süreci olarak iç göçler*, Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları, pp.299-329.
- Tekeli, Ş. (1985). Türkiye'de feminist ideolojinin anlamı ve sınırları üzerine. *Yapıt: Toplumsal Araştırmalar Dergisi*. 9.
- The USAID Participant Journal*. (1967). 6(25) (Participant)
- The USAID Participant Journal*. (1967). 6(27) (Participant)
- Timur, S. (1972). *Türkiye'de aile yapısı* (Vol. 15). Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Timur, S. (1981). Determinants of family structure in Turkey. In *Women in Turkish society* (Vol. 30). Leiden: E. J. Brill

- Tinker, I. (1990). *Persistent inequalities: women and world development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Toksöz, G. (1997). One step forward, two steps backward- from labor market exclusion to inclusion: a gender perspective on effects of the economic crisis in Turkey. In *The women, gender and development*. Zed Books
- Toksöz, G. (2011). *Kalkınmada kadın emeği*. Varlık Yayınları.
- Toksöz, G. (2012). Neoliberal piyasa, özel ve kamusal patriarka çıkmazında kadın emeği. In *Türkiye’de refah devleti ve kadın*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Toska, Z. (1998). Cumhuriyet’in kadın ideali: eşiği aşanlar ve aşamayanlar. 75 yılda kadınlar ve erkekler, 71-89. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı.
- Tören, T. (2006). Yeniden yapılanan dünya ekonomisinde Marshall Planı ve Türkiye uygulaması. In *Türkiye’de kapitalizmin gelişimi*, Ankara: Dipnot.
- TPHS. (1983). *Turkey population and health survey*. Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies. Ankara, Turkey. 1987.
- Truman, H. S. (n.d.). Harry S. Truman Presidential Library & Museum. Retrieved from https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr_archive/inagural20jan1949.htm Accessed on 29 June 2018
- TURKSTAT, 2018. http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/VeriBilgi.do?alt_id=1006 (Access on 05 August 2018)
- Uzun, B., & Colak, H. E. (2010). The issues of women’s property acquisition in Turkey. *Gender Issues in Surveying. FIG Congress Facing the Challenges – Building the Capacity*. Sydney, Australia, 11-16 April 2010
- Ünal, F. (2012). *Land ownership inequality and rural factor markets in Turkey: a study for critically evaluating market friendly reforms*. Springer.

- Vergin, N. (1985). Social change and the family in Turkey. *Current Anthropology*, 26(5), 571-574.
- Verschuur, C. (2014) A history of development through a gender prism. In *Under development: gender*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vojdik, V. K. (2010). Politics of the headscarf in Turkey: masculinities, feminism, and the construction of collective identities. *Harvard Journal of Law & Gender*, 33, 661.
- Wallerstein, I. (1974). The rise and future demise of the world capitalist system. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 16, (4) pp. 387-415
- Wallerstein, I. (1979a). *The capitalist world-economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (1979b). Kondratieff up or Kondratieff down? *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, 663-673.
- Wallerstein, I. (1996). The global picture: 1945-90. In *Age of transition: trajectory of the world-system, 1945-2025*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World-systems analysis: an introduction*. Duke University Press.
- Wilber, C., & Jameson, K. P. (1973). Paradigms of economic development and beyond. In *The political economy of development and underdevelopment*. New York: Random House, Business Division.
- Yenal, Z. (1999). Food TNCs, intellectual property investments and post-Fordist food consumption: The Case of Unilever and Nestlé in Turkey. *International Journal of the Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 8, 21-34.
- Yenal, Z. (2013). Tarım ve gıda üretiminin yeniden yapılanması ve uluslararasılaşması. In *Bildiğimiz tarımın sonu*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Yüksel, Y. (2015). In search for a pronatalist population policy for Turkey. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 14(1).

Zabunođlu, S. & Önertoy, Ő. S. (1993). Azotlu gübre kullanımının insan sađlıđına ve çevreye etkisi. In *Kadın, aile, ve çevre*. Kadın Dernekleri Federasyonu and Türkiye Çevre Vakfı.

APPENDICES

A. GROUPINGS OF RURAL CLASSES IN TURKEY

	Class 1		Class 2		Class 3	
	Large Producers (capitalist)	Large Producers (semi) feudal	Wealthy Producers	Middle Producers	Small Producers	Agricultural Workers
Ownership of Land	√√√√√	√√√√√	√√√	√√	√	X(very little or no land)
Ownership of Means of Production	√	√	√	√	X(even if there is, not enough)	X
Production of Surplus	√	√	√	X	X	X
Having Labor Surplus	Not applicable	Not applicable	X	X	√	√
Use of Family Labor	X	X	√	√	√	√
Use of Hired Labor	√	~(tenants/sharecroppers)	√	X (except for during peak seasons)	X	X
Commercial Production	√	~	√	√ (PCP) ¹⁵⁹	(Mainly subsistence, but commercial also)	X

¹⁵⁹ Petty commodity production.

Subsistence Production	X	~	X (Limited)	(Probably very little)	√	X
-------------------------------	---	---	----------------	------------------------	---	---

This table is mostly based on Boratav's (1980) classification.

*Classes have been grouped in terms of ownership of means of production, use of family labor and orientation towards commercial production. Although the other criteria are also important, these are the ones that will enable us to understand the status of women within each class across different time periods.

B. A SUMMARY IN TABLES

PERIOD I (1923-1939)

WORLD CONJUNCTURE

- Etatism – state support for economy (New Deal, the USSR planned economy)
- Increased commodity production in the periphery

TURKISH AGRICULTURE

- Agriculture-most of GDP
- Agriculture-industry relationship
- State support (price support, land distribution, abolishment of taxes, incentives etc.)
- Mostly subsistence but commercial agriculture also existed
- Favoring LL¹⁶⁰ at first → mechanization - LL
- Great Depression → autarkic development → favoring ML

ZONES	FAMILY CONSTELLATION	PROPERTY OWNERSHIP	DECISION-MAKING
ZONE 1			
Class 1 (LL) -Limited mechanization -Increased commercialization -Setback by Great Depression	- EPF -Women did not work because of mechanized/hired labor -Men-mechanization, commercial tasks, supervision of production	-Gaps began, Men owned tractors women did not.	-Mechanization & commercialization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women. -Old men in decision-making

¹⁶⁰ Abbreviations are at the end of the chart.

	-Sexual division of labor		
Class 2 (ML) -Continued commercialization	- NOF -Women participated in agriculture, more intensive work due to commercialization -Men: commercial transactions / Women: commercial and subsistence production, reproduction of the household	Mechanization not yet visible, therefore, fewer gaps in property ownership; but gaps in ownership of land and livestock were visible	Commercialization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women
Class 3 (SL, SC, LAW) -Insignificant in number	---	---	---
ZONE 2			
Class 1 (LL) -Will come into picture in Period II	---	---	---
Class 2 (ML) -SL turned into ML due to alliance with the state -A lot more commercial -More vulnerable to the market	-TEF/NOF -Women participated in agriculture more intensive work due to commercialization -Men: commercial transactions / Women: commercial and subsistence production, reproduction of the household	Mechanization not yet visible, fewer gaps in property ownership; but gaps in ownership of land and livestock were visible.	Commercialization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women

<p>Class 3 (SL, SC, LAW)</p> <p>-Relatively outside of market</p> <p>-SL → moved to ML</p> <p>-SC-LAW few in number</p>	<p>-NOF</p> <p>-Women and men participated in agriculture</p> <p>-Little sexual division of labor due to lack of commercialization and mechanization</p> <p>-Both men and women participated in productive and reproductive activities.</p>	<p>Mechanization not yet visible, therefore fewer gaps in property ownership; but gaps in ownership of land and livestock were visible.</p> <p>Women had use rights.</p>	<p>-Women and men in decision-making. Women had control over their labor and produce.</p>
ZONE 3			
<p>Class 1 (LL)</p> <p>-Unaffected by transformations</p> <p>-No mechanization</p> <p>-Little, if any, commercialization</p>	<p>-EPF</p> <p>-Women did not work in agriculture, housewives</p> <p>-Men dealt with supervision of production, hiring workers etc.</p>	<p>Mechanization not yet visible, therefore fewer gaps in property ownership</p>	<p>-Women not visible in decision-making. Old men has power regarding decision-making.</p>
<p>Class 3 (SL, SC, LAW)</p> <p>-No change</p> <p>-Not commercial oriented</p>	<p>-NOF</p> <p>-Women and men participated in agriculture, and reproductive activities</p> <p>-Sexual division of labor not very visible yet</p>	<p>Mechanization not yet visible, therefore fewer gaps in property ownership</p>	<p>-Women and men in decision-making. Women had control over their labor and produce.</p>

THE ENVIRONMENT

- There was no concern regarding the environment.

PERIOD II (1940-1967/73)

WORLD CONJUNCTURE

- World economic upturn
- US hegemony
- Green Revolution
- Development ideology
- Marshall Plan
- Mechanization
- Periphery focusing on agriculture to feed Europe

TURKISH AGRICULTURE

- CHP- War policies- DP in power
- State protecting producers against market fluctuations
- Land redistribution
- Industry agriculture relationship
- Further commercialization and mechanization – increase in cultivated areas + differentiation in wealth
- Increased use of inputs (fertilizers, pesticides etc.)
- Credits – differentiation in wealth
- More land polarization and displacement
- Zone 3 penetration of capitalism
- Migration to cities

ZONES	FAMILY CONSTELLATION	PROPERTY OWNERSHIP	DECISION- MAKING
ZONE 1			
Class 1 (LL) -More land polarization -Further	-Continuation of EPF -Women did not work because of mechanized/hired	-Hierarchy in property ownership continued, Men owned	-Mechanization & commercialization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis

<p>commercialization</p> <p>-Further mechanization</p> <p>-Increased wealth</p>	<p>labor</p> <p>-Men-mechanization and commercial business</p> <p>-Sexual division of labor</p>	<p>tractors and other Green Revolution inputs, women did not.</p>	<p>women</p> <p>-Old men made decisions</p>
<p>Class 2 (ML)</p> <p>-Further commercialization</p> <p>-Mechanization</p>	<p>- NOF</p> <p>-Women participated in agriculture, more intensive work due to commercialization, they produced for exchange</p> <p>-Women engaged in commercial and subsistence agriculture as well as reproduction of the household.</p> <p>-Men commercial side and mechanization</p> <p>-Differentiation in earning power</p> <p>-Elderly lost status</p>	<p>-Hierarchy in property ownership began, Men owned tractors and other Green Revolution inputs, women did not.</p>	<p>Commercialization and mechanization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women, and old men. It also increased men's worldly knowledge</p> <p>-Young women gained influence within their household vis-à-vis older women, but not vis-à-vis young men.</p>
<p>Class 3 (SL, SC, LAW)</p> <p>-Some SC were fired by LL due to mechanization</p> <p>-Sharecroppers tended to combine family labor in agriculture with wage work</p> <p>-LAW the same</p>	<p>-EPF → TEF/NOF</p> <p>-Men wage earners (agriculture or non agriculture)/migration</p> <p>-Women in agriculture and household reproduction</p> <p>-Productive and reproductive activities were feminized upon male</p>	<p>-Among some producers, tractors entered into production → increased property differences between men and women.</p>	<p>Commercialization and mechanization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women, and old men. It also increased men's worldly knowledge</p> <p>-Among other producers, absence of public-private</p>

	<p>migration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Elderly lost status -Differentiation in earning power <p>Sexual division of labor → men no longer participate in reproduction of the household and subsistence agriculture</p>		<p>differentiation gave men and women similar power in decision-making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Young women gained influence within their household vis-à-vis older women, but not vis-à-vis young men.
ZONE 2			
<p>Class 1 (LL)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ML turning into LL due to land polarization during commercialization -Mechanization -Further Commercialization 	<p>-EPF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Women did not work because of mechanized/hired labor -Men-mechanization and commercial business -Sexual division of labor 	<p>-Hierarchy in property ownership began, Men owned tractors and other Green Revolution inputs, women did not.</p>	<p>Commercialization and mechanization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Old men in decision-making
<p>Class 2 (ML)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Increased commercialization 	<p>-EPF → TEF/NOF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Women participated in agriculture, production for exchange, exploitation of their labor increased due to commercialization -Men commercial side and mechanization/ Migration (especially in the Black Sea region) 	<p>-Central Anatolia → Hierarchy in property ownership began, Men owned tractors and other Green Revolution inputs, women did not.</p> <p>-Black Sea → low</p>	<p>Commercialization and mechanization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women, and old men. It also increased men's worldly knowledge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Young women gained influence within their household vis-à-

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Differentiation in earning power -Productive and reproductive activities were feminized upon male migration -Authority of the elderly decreased 	mechanization but differences in access to the Green Revolution inputs was visible.	vis older women, but not vis-à-vis young men.
<p>Class 3 (SL, SC, LAW)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Land fragmentation in SL -Sharecroppers tended to combine family labor in agriculture with wage work -LAW the same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -NOF -Men wage earners (agriculture or non agriculture)/migration -Women in agriculture and household reproduction -Productive and reproductive activities were feminized upon male migration -Sexual division of labor -Authority of the elderly decreased -Differentiation in earning power 	-Among some producers hierarchy in property ownership began, Men owned tractors, women did not.	<p>Commercialization and mechanization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women, and old men. It also increased men's worldly knowledge</p> <p>-Among other producers, absence of public-private differentiation gave men and women similar power in decision-making.</p> <p>-Young women gained influence within their household vis-à-vis older women, but not vis-à-vis young men.</p>
ZONE 3			
<p>Class 1 (LL)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -More land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -EPF -Women did not 	-Hierarchy in property	Commercialization and mechanization

<p>polarization: Feudal landlords – > capitalist farmers -Mechanization Commercialization Cultivated area increased</p>	<p>work in agriculture because of mechanized/hired labor -Men-mechanization and commercial business -Sexual division of labor</p>	<p>ownership began, Men owned tractors and other Green Revolution inputs, women did not.</p>	<p>increased men’s decision-making power vis-à-vis women Older men in decision-making</p>
<p>Class 3 (SL, SC, LAW) -SL – number and share increased but cultivated area decreased -Sharecroppers tended to combine family labor in agriculture with wage work -LAW the same</p>	<p>-NOF -Men wage earners (agriculture or non agriculture)/migration -Women in agriculture and reproduction of the household. -Productive and reproductive activities were feminized upon male migration -Authority of the elderly decreased -Differentiation in earning power -Production for the market → women no longer had direct control over their labor</p>	<p>-Among some producers hierarchy in property ownership began, Men owned tractors, women did not.</p>	<p>Commercialization and mechanization increased men’s decision-making power vis-à-vis women, and old men. It also increased men’s worldly knowledge -Among other producers, absence of public-private differentiation gave men and women similar power in decision- making. -Young women gained influence within their household vis-à- vis older women, but not vis-à-vis young men.</p>

THE ENVIRONMENT

- A slow wave of awareness regarding the environment.
- Destruction of the environment because of the Green Revolution inputs.
- The Green Revolution inputs also affected human health negatively, especially workers who participated in the production and application of these inputs.
- Environmental degradation put extra strain on women's labor who had to spend more time and energy to carry water or to do subsistence agriculture because water wells and soil was polluted by chemicals.

PERIOD III (1967/73-NOW)

WORLD CONJUNCTURE

- World economic downturn
- The decline of the US hegemony
- Institution of neoliberalism
- Development → SAPs
- Core: production of low value goods, periphery & semi-periphery: production of high value cash-crops
- Increased weight of TNCs
- Financialization of agriculture
- Land loss
- TRIPs
- Privatizations
- Imposition of free trade by WTO, IMF etc.
- Growing mobility of capital
- GMOs

TURKISH AGRICULTURE

- 24 January Decisions-Coup-SAPs
- The role of non-state actors (IMF, WB, TNCs, WTO, EU)
- Agriculture- state less interventionist
- Further commercialization-increased insecurity and risk
- Privatization of state run institutions, cooperatives etc.
- Mechanization and TNCs → unemployment, migration to cities and nearby villages, depeasantization
- Abolishment of subsidies, decreased credits, increased interest rates

- Direct Income Support
- Further commoditization of land
- Increased wage work in rurality
- Commercialization and privatization of common land, meadows, water sources etc.
- Diversification of crops (increased need for female labor)
- Prioritization of cash crops over traditional food crops
- Increased borrowing – increased dependence on market
- Increased contract farming

ZONES	FAMILY CONSTELLATION	PROPERTY OWNERSHIP	DECISION-MAKING
ZONE 1			
Class 1 (LL) -Further commercialization -Further mechanization -Further accumulation through contract farming	-Continuation of EPF -Women did not work because of mechanized/hired labor -Men-mechanization and commercial business -Sexual division of labor	-Hierarchy in property ownership continued, Men owned tractors and inputs, women did not.	-Mechanization & commercialization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women -Old men made decisions
Class 2 (ML) -Further commercialization -Further mechanization	- NOF -Women participated in agriculture, more intensive work due to commercialization, they produced for exchange, for subsistence and worked for household reproduction -Men commercial side and mechanization/migration because of economic difficulties	-Among some, hierarchy in property ownership increased. Men owned tractors and inputs, women did not. -Among others, this difference decreased when men lost access to such	Commercialization and mechanization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women, and old men. It also increased men's worldly knowledge -Young women gained influence within their household vis-à-vis older women,

	<p>Selling of agricultural tools → more work for women</p> <p>-Differentiation in earning power</p> <p>-Sexual division of labor → Productive and reproductive activities were feminized upon male migration</p> <p>-Elderly lost authority</p>	<p>property but it increased women's work burden.</p>	<p>but not vis-à-vis young men.</p>
<p>Class 3 (SL, SC, LAW)</p> <p>-Orientation towards off-farm income sources (tourism)</p> <p>-Some SC were fired by LL due to mechanization</p> <p>-Sharecroppers tended to combine family labor in agriculture with wage work (cities/nearby villages)</p> <p>-LAW the same</p>	<p>-Men wage earners (agriculture or non agriculture)/migration</p> <p>-Women in agriculture, more exploitation because of cultivation of more than one cash-crop, increased intensity of subsistence production, household reproduction etc.</p> <p>-Less access by women to common resources which were used for tourism</p> <p>-Productive and reproductive activities were feminized upon male migration</p> <p>-Elderly lost authority</p> <p>-Differentiation in earning power</p>	<p>-Among few, hierarchy in property ownership increased. Men owned tractors and inputs, women did not.</p> <p>-Among others, this difference decreased when men lost access to land and other types of property, but it increased women's work burden.</p>	<p>Commercialization and mechanization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women, and old men. It also increased men's worldly knowledge</p> <p>-Young women gained influence within their household vis-à-vis older women, but not vis-à-vis young men.</p>
ZONE 2			
<p>Class 1 (LL)</p> <p>-Mechanization</p>	<p>-EPF</p> <p>-Women did not work</p>	<p>Hierarchy in property</p>	<p>Commercialization and mechanization</p>

<p>-Further Commercialization</p> <p>-Further accumulation through contract farming</p>	<p>because of mechanized/hired labor</p> <p>-Men-mechanization and commercial business</p> <p>-Sexual division of labor</p>	<p>ownership increased, Men owned tractors and inputs, women did not.</p>	<p>increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women</p> <p>-Old men in decision-making</p>
<p>Class 2 (ML)</p> <p>-Increased commercialization, but not necessarily increased wealth</p> <p>-Many producers were negatively affected by neoliberal policies</p>	<p>-TEF → NOF</p> <p>-Men commercial side and mechanization/migration because of economic difficulties</p> <p>-Women participated in agriculture, increased exploitation of their labor, production for exchange, for subsistence and worked for household reproduction</p> <p>Sexual division of labor</p> <p>-Productive and reproductive activities were feminized upon male migration</p> <p>-Differentiation in earning power</p> <p>-Elderly lost authority</p>	<p>Hierarchy in property ownership, Men owned tractors (in Central Anatolia) and inputs, women did not.</p>	<p>Commercialization and mechanization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women, and old men. It also increased men's worldly knowledge</p> <p>-Young women gained influence within their household vis-à-vis older women, but not vis-à-vis young men.</p>
<p>Class 3 (SL, SC, LAW)</p> <p>-Land fragmentation in SL</p> <p>-Impoverishment due to neoliberal policies</p>	<p>-NOF</p> <p>-Men wage earners (agriculture or non agriculture)/migration</p> <p>-Women → production for exchange, for subsistence and worked for household</p>	<p>-Among few, hierarchy in property ownership increased. Men owned tractors and inputs, women</p>	<p>Commercialization and mechanization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women, and old men. It also increased men's worldly</p>

<p>-Some fell from ML to SL</p> <p>-Sharecroppers tended to combine family labor in agriculture with wage work (cities/nearby villages)</p> <p>-LAW the same</p>	<p>reproduction</p> <p>Sexual division of labor</p> <p>-Productive and reproductive activities were feminized upon male migration</p> <p>-Elderly lost authority</p> <p>-Differentiation in earning power</p>	<p>did not.</p> <p>-Among others, this difference decreased when men lost access to land and other types of property, but it increased women's work burden.</p>	<p>knowledge</p> <p>-Young women gained influence within their household vis-à-vis older women, but not vis-à-vis young men.</p>
ZONE 3			
<p>Class 1 (LL)</p> <p>-Capitalist farmers</p> <p>-More commercial</p> <p>-Mechanization</p> <p>-GAP → Cash-crop production</p>	<p>-EPF</p> <p>-Women did not work in agriculture because of mechanized/hired labor</p> <p>-Men-mechanization and commercial business</p> <p>-Sexual division of labor</p>	<p>Hierarchy in property ownership. Men owned tractors and inputs women did not.</p>	<p>Commercialization and mechanization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women</p> <p>Older men in decision-making</p>
<p>Class 3 (SL, SC, LAW)</p> <p>-GAP → Cash-crop production, attack on subsistence production</p> <p>-Displacement, unemployment</p> <p>-Economic difficulties due to lack of state support</p> <p>-Sharecroppers tended to combine</p>	<p>-Men wage earners (agriculture or non agriculture)/migration</p> <p>-Women in agriculture and household reproduction</p> <p>-Women's labor was exploited more intensively in cash-crop production</p> <p>-Families and women in particular had a narrower subsistence</p> <p>-Elderly withdrew</p> <p>-Differentiation in</p>	<p>-Inequality between men and women in property ownership among some producers.</p>	<p>Commercialization and mechanization increased men's decision-making power vis-à-vis women, and old men. It also increased men's worldly knowledge</p> <p>-Among other producers, absence of public-private differentiation gave men and women similar</p>

family labor in agriculture with wage work (cities/nearby villages) -LAW the same	earning power		power in decision-making. -Young women gained influence within their household vis-à-vis older women, but not vis-à-vis young men.
--	---------------	--	---

THE ENVIRONMENT

- Intensification of the environmental problems
- Monoculture made preservation of genetic diversity more difficult
- Women's knowledge regarding biodiversity was rendered invisible because of monoculture
- Human health problems
- Extreme environmental hazards in the GAP region
- Construction of dams and irrigation systems caused erosion etc.
- Cash crop production and resulting environmental problems caused a drain on subsistence economy which made life difficult for rural women. → overexploitation of women's labor and environmental resources

ABBREVIATIONS

LL → Large Landowners

ML → Medium Landowners

SL → Small Landowners

SC → Sharecroppers

LAW → Landless Agricultural Workers

EPF → Extended Patriarchal Family

TEF → Transient Extended Family

NOF → Nuclear Omnilineal Family

C. TÜRKÇE ÖZET / TURKISH SUMMARY

Kalkınma¹⁶¹ ve neoliberalizm¹⁶² ekonomik gelişmenin, refahın ve özgürlüğün taşıyıcıları olarak kabul görmelerine rağmen kırsalda yaşayan kadınlar, geçimlik üretim yapan insanlar ve çevre üzerindeki etkileri olumsuz olmuştur. Bu çalışmanın amacı Türkiye'deki tarım politikalarının çevre ve köylü hayatı üzerindeki etkilerini kırsal kadının konumu aracılığıyla incelemektir.

Maria Mies ve Vandana Shiva (1993), Vandana Shiva (1988) ve Karen Grown ile Gita Sen (1998) gibi yazarlar sömürgeleşme, kalkınma ve neoliberalizm gibi trendlerin Üçüncü Dünya ülkelerinde kadınlar ve çevre üzerindeki etkilerine odaklanmışlar ve sonuçların bütünde olumsuz olduğundan bahsetmişlerdir. Kadınların konumu birçok açıdan eskiye kıyasla daha kötü hale gelmiş, kimi zaman bunu bir sebebi de çevrenin tahribatı olmuştur. Bu çalışmanın temel sorusu: küresel trendlerin Türkiye'de özellikle kırsal kadınlar üzerindeki yansıması nasıl olmuştur?. Birçok Üçüncü Dünya ülkesinde olduğu gibi Türkiye'de de bu çeşit gelişmelerin etkisi kırsalda yaşayan kadınlar üzerinde olumsuz olmuştur.

¹⁶¹ Kalkınma ideolojisi ilk gündeme geldiğinde ekonomik büyüme, sanayileşme, şehirleşme, artan siyasi bilinçlilik ve okuma-yazma oraları ile ilişkilendirilmiştir. Bu ideolojinin önde gelen temsilcileri olan Walt Whitman Rostow, Alexander Gerschenkron ve Samuel Huntington gibi kişiler kalkınmanın doğrusal bir çizgi şeklinde ilerlediğine ve aynı süreçlerin nihayetinde her yerde gerçekleşeceğine inanmışlardır. Ancak bunu yaparken ne ülkeler arasında var olan eşitsizliklere ve sömürü örüntülerine ne de 'kalkınma süreçlerinin' kadınları ve erkekleri eşit derecede ve aynı şekilde etkilemediğine dikkat etmişlerdir. Ayrıca kalkınma ideolojisinin çevre ve yarı-çevre ülkelerden hammadde çıkarımını daha etkili bir hale getirmeye yardımcı olduğu ve yeni bağımsız olan ülkelerde komünizme karşı piyasa ekonomisini teşvik etmeyi sağladığı da belirtilmesi gereken diğer sonuçlardır.

¹⁶² Neoliberalizm 1960'ların sonu ve 1970'lerde ortaya çıkan dünya ekonomik krizi sonucunda Keynesci politikaların sorunları çözmeye yetersiz kalması sonucunda ortaya çıkan ekonomik ideolojiler bütünüdür. Temelde neoliberalizm ekonomide devlet etkisinin azaltılması, sosyal harcamaların kısılması, girişimci özgürlüklerin artırılması gibi prensipleri içerir.

Türkiye'deki tarımsal politikalar dünyada belirli bir dönemde var olan ekonomik ve ideolojik paradigmalardan etkilenen gelmiştir. Bu çalışma bu gerçeğe duyarlı olmak zorundadır. Temel olarak iddiamız; küresel çapta etki edecek politikaların merkez ülkelerdeki elitler tarafından oluşturulduğu, daha sonra da kimi zaman merkez ülke hükümetleri kimi zaman ise uluslararası şirket veya örgütler tarafından bu politikaların çevre ve yarı çevre ülkelere dayatıldığıdır. Çevre ve yarı-çevre ülkelerdeki elitler/yöneticiler genellikle bu sürecin ülkeleri içinde uygulanmasından sorumlu aktörlerdir. Bu politikaların sonuçları ise çoğunlukla alt sınıftaki insanları üst sınıftakilere göre, kadınları erkeklere göre daha çok ve daha kötü biçimde etkilemektedir. Ayrıca, çevrenin tahribatı da bu sürece eşlik eden bir diğer faktördür.

Tez boyunca Dünya Sistemleri Analizinin etkilerini görmek mümkün olacaktır. Kırsaldaki kadının konumu ve çevrenin durumunu farklı dönemlerde karşılaştırmayı mümkün kılmak için üç farklı dönemi incelenecektir. Dönemsel ayrımlar dünya sisteminin durumuna ve her dönemde baskın olan farklı ekonomik ve ideolojik paradigmalara göre yapılacaktır. Bu üç dönem sırasıyla 1923-39, 1940-67/73 ile 1967/73 ve günümüzdür. Bu süreçlerin bu farklı dönemler boyunca Türkiye üzerindeki etkisini kavrayabilmek içinse Türkiye bölgesel olarak üç farklı ekonomik kuşağa ayrılacaktır. Bu ayrım her bir kuşağın ticarileşme/metalaşma seviyesine göre yapılacaktır. Bunun sonucunda kabaca Akdeniz, Marmara ve Ege bölgelerini kapsayan alan 1. Kuşaktır. Bunun sebebi bu alanın en fazla ve en derin ticarileşme seviyesine sahip olmasıdır. Pazar ile en erken bütünleşen bu alanda genellikle pazar için üretim yapmanın geçimlik üretim yapmayla karşılaştırıldığında bir önceliği vardır. 2. Kuşak İç Anadolu ve Karadeniz bölgelerini içine alır. Bu kuşakta ticarileşme 1. Kuşağa nazaran daha sonra gelmiştir ve geçimlik üretim önemini korumaktadır. Doğu Anadolu ve Güneydoğu Anadolu bölgelerini içine alan 3. Kuşak ise en az ticarileşmeye sahiptir. Çoğunlukla geçimlik üretim yapılagelmiştir ve pazarla bütünleşme yirminci yüzyılın ortalarına kadar gerçekleşmemiştir. Türkiye kırsalında yaşayan insanlar homojen bir bütünlük oluşturmamaktadırlar. Farklı sınıfların ve bu sınıflardaki kadınların ekonomik politikalarından farklı şekilde etkilendikleri

bilinmektedir. Bunu analizimize yansıtma için Türkiye kırsalını 3 farklı sınıfa ayırma gereği duyduk. Bu ayrıma göre, en üst sınıf olan büyük toprak sahiplerinin çok büyük miktarda toprağı vardır ve genellikle üretimde ücretli işçi veya traktör kullanarak pazar için üretim yaparlar. Orta sınıf üreticiler toprak sahibidirler, üretimde aile emeğı kullanarak pazar için üretim yaparlar, ayrıca geçimlik üretimle de uğraşır. Alt sınıfların geçimlerine yetecek kadar toprakları vardır, aile emeğı kullanırlar ve üretimin büyük çoğunluğu geçimlidir. Eğer ellerinde kalırsa, ürünün az bir miktarını pazarlarlar. Bu alt sınıfın içinde toprak sahipleri ve ortakçılar yanı sıra topraksız işçiler de vardır. Ancak kimi zaman ekonomik koşullar nedeniyle üretimde emek fazlası ortaya çıkar. Topraksız tarım işçileri mevsimsel veya sürekli olarak emeklerini satarak hayatlarını idame ettirirler.

Kırsalda yaşayan kadınların konumunu ölçmek için kullanılacak değişkenler; aile tipi ve kadınların emeğı, kadınların mülkiyet sahipliğine erişimi, ile kadınların aile ve toplum içinde karar verme süreçlerine katılımı. Bu daha kısıtlı değişkenlerin dışında aynı zamanda makro düzeyde gerçekleşmiş olan bazı trendler de yeri geldiğinde değişken olarak kullanılacaktır. Bunlar; küresel düzeyindeki ekonomik ve ideolojik paradigmalardan kadınları ilgilendiren yönleri, Türkiye’de devletin kadınlar hakkındaki ideolojisi ve kadınların vücutları üzerindeki kontrolü ve sosyal yeniden üretimdir.

Bütün bunlara ek olarak çalışmamız boyunca Batı Feminizminin ve özellikle liberal feministlerin düştüğü birkaç hatadan kaçınmaya çalıştık. Liberal feministlerin kadının ücretli işgücüne katılımını kurtuluşun en önemli adımı olarak görmesi eleştirdiğimiz ilk noktadır. Kadınların ücretli işgücüne katılımı özgürlüğün bir sembolü olabilse de, her zaman ortaya bu sonuç çıkmamaktadır. Örneğin, Türkiye’nin kırsal bölgelerinde olduğu gibi bazı durumlarda ekonomik süreçlere aktif katılan genç kadınların konumları düşükken ekonomik aktivitelere katılımından bağımsız olarak yaşlandıkça konumları artmaktadır. Bu nedenle ekonomik süreçler kadar ekonomik olmayan ancak kadınların otoritelerini kullanabildiğı diğer faktörleri de göz önünde bulundurmak gereklidir. Genellikle Batılı feministlerin Üçüncü Dünya ülkelerinde yaşayan kadınlar için varsaydıkları

bağımlılık, çaresizlik, kimliksizlik gibi söylemler ise bu çalışma boyunca kaçınmak istediğimiz bir diğer tehlikedir. Üçüncü Dünya ülkelerindeki kadınları, Batılı ve genellikle orta sınıfa ait olan bireylerin kategorileri ve kriterleri aracılığıyla tanımlamak, onların kendi yaşamlarındaki otorite uygulama alanlarını gözden kaçırmaya, tehlikeli genellemeler yaparak güçlü yönlerini görmezden gelmeye ve kimliksiz veya çaresiz görünmelerine yol açmaktadır. Amacımız kadınlara yönelik sömürüye odaklanmakla birlikte kadınların bu süreçte sömürüyle başa çıkma mekanizmalarının da olduğuna, gösterilenin aksine tamamen çaresiz veya bağımlı olmadıklarına Türkiye örneği aracılığıyla dikat çekmektir.

Çalışmamızın sonucundaki bulgularımız bize Türkiye’de kırsaldaki kadınların konumunun hiçbir zaman yüksek olmamakla birlikte önce kalkınma daha sonra da neoliberalizm ideolojisinin Türkiye’de tarımda uygulanmaya başlamasıyla birlikte kadınların konumunun kötüleştiğini, bunun ise kırsaldaki alt sınıfların yoksullaşması ve çevrenin yıkımı ile eş zamanlı gerçekleştiğini kanıtlamıştır.

Çalışmamız ortaya çıkarmıştır ki Türkiye tarımı küresel çaptaki gelişmelerden etkilenmiştir. Cumhuriyetçi dönemde ticarileşme düşüktür ve 1. ve kısmen 2. Kuşakla sınırlıdır. Ancak ticarileşme kalkınmacı ve neoliberal dönemlerde 3. Kuşağa da yayılmış ve derinleşmiştir. Bu durum belirtilen dönemlerdeki dünya konjonktürüyle paralellik içindedir. 1923-1939 arasında çevre ülkelerde yaşanan meta üretimi genişlemesi ve devletin ekonomiye aktif katılımını öngören genel bir ideolojinin nedeniyle, ticarileşme Türkiye’de devlet tarafından teşvik ve fiyat destekleri yoluyla sübvansede edildi. Bunun en önemli sebeplerinden biri Türkiye’nin tarımsal ürün ihracatı yoluyla dünya ekonomisine eklenilebilmesiydi. 1940’lar, 1950’ler ve 1960’lar boyunca kalkınma ideolojisi hakimiyet kazandığında, devletin tarıma müdahalesi daha da arttı, çünkü yeni uluslararası iş bölümünde Türkiye gibi çevre ve yarı-çevre ülkelerin rolü merkez ülkelere hammadde sağlamaktı. Bu durum hem kalkınma ideolojisine paraleldi, hem de Üçüncü Dünya ülkelerinden daha etkili hammadde çıkarılması için

kalkınma fikrini teşvik eden baskın güç ABD'nin çıkarlarıyla iç içeydi. Türkiye'de tarımda devletin öncü olduğu kalkınma projeleri Amerikan girişimleri olan Marshall Planı ve Yeşil Devrim¹⁶³ ile desteklendi. Sonuç olarak, ticarileşme Türkiye'de farklı kuşaklarda ve sınıflar arasında etkisini genişletti. Ancak, kalkınma paradigmasından neoliberal paradigmaya geçiş ekonomide ve dolayısıyla tarımda devlet desteğini azalttı. Dünya tarımsal üretimi IMF, Dünya Bankası ve çok uluslu şirketler tarafından yeniden tanımlandı. Buna göre merkez ülkeler düşük-değerli ürünler üretmekle görevlendirilirken, çevre ve yarı-çevre ülkeler katma değerli ihracat ürünlerinin¹⁶⁴ üretimine yoğunlaşacaklardı. Bu yeni iş bölümünde Türkiye ikinci gruptaydı. Uluslararası örgütlerin Türkiye tarımındaki rolü arttı ve devlet desteği azaltıldı. Sonuç olarak, daha fazla üretici tarımı bırakmaya veya beka stratejisi benimsemeye zorlandı.

Bu süreçler sonucunda, 1. Kuşakta büyük toprak sahibi aileler içinde kırsal kadının konumu fazla değişmedi. Devlet desteği, Marshall Planı ve Yeşil Devrim sayesinde tarıma giren traktörler ile dışarıdan ücretli işçi işe alma pratikleri kadınların tarıma katılımını engelledi. Bunun sonucu olan mülkiyet sahipliğindeki farklılıklar Cumhuriyetçi dönemde bile vardı, çünkü erkekler traktör, arazi ve diğer mülkiyet çeşitlerinin sahipliğine erişebilirken, kadınlar için bu geçerli değildi. Erkeklerin piyasa ekonomisine katılmaları onlara karar verme süreçlerine katılımda güç getirdi ve dış dünya hakkındaki bilgilerini artırdı. Ancak kadınlar bu çeşit fırsatlardan yoksunlardı. Aynı kuşaktaki orta üreticiler arasında kadının konumu hakkında önemli değişiklikler gözlemek mümkündür. Ticarileşme zamanla derinleştikçe, kadınların emeği daha şiddetli bir biçimde sömürüldü. Kadınlar ticari tarıma ek olarak hem geçimlik tarımda hem de hanenin yeniden

¹⁶³ Yeşil Devrim, ABD kalkınma projesinin bir parçası olarak görülebilir ve ekim alanını artırmaksızın ürün miktarını artıracak biçimde bitki türleri geliştirmek şeklinde anlamına gelmektedir. Yeşil Devrimin asıl amacı uluslararası tarım şirketlerinin tarımsal girdi satabilmesi için piyasalar bulmaktır. Bu girdiler başlıca pestisitler, insektisitler ve kimyasal gübrelere dayanmaktadır. Türkiye'ye Yeşil Devrim'in girmesi ise ABD teşvikiyle gerçekleşmiştir.

¹⁶⁴ Cash crop.

üretiminde rol aldılar. Erkeklerin şehirde veya diğer köylerde ücretli iş bulduğu hanelerde, kadınlar tarımla uğraşmak için köyde kaldılar. Bu onların sadece iş yüklerini artırmadı, aynı zamanda kadınlar ve erkekler arasındaki gelir farklılıklarını da artırdı. Mülkiyet sahipliğindeki farklılıklar kakınmacı dönemde Marshall Planı ve Yeşil Devrim gibi sistem çapındaki değişimler sonucu ortaya çıktı ve kadınların mülkiyetsizliğine yol açtı. Ayrıca, kadınların mülkiyete erişememesi onların mülkiyet edinmek için kredi alamamalarına yol açarak bir çeşit kısır döngüye sebep oldu. Ancak neoliberal dönemde bazı üreticiler arasında tarımsal aletler ekonomik zorluklar nedeniyle satıldı. Bu kadınlar ve erkekler arasındaki mülkiyet farklılıklarını azaltırken, tahminimizce kadınların iş yükünü artırdı. Çünkü geleneksel olarak emek-yoğun üretime katılan kadınlar aletlerin yokluğunu kendi emekleriyle telafi etmeye çalışmışlardır. Karar alma süreçlerine katılımında kadınlar dezavantajlıydı çünkü ticari üretim ve ürünlerin pazarlanması erkeklerin edinebildiği yeni beceriler gerektirdi. Bu yeni becerilere erkeklerin erişimi vardı çünkü onlar piyasa ekonomisinin özellikle üretim dışında kalan aşamalarında oldukça aktiflerdi ve bu nedenle dış dünya ve hükümet ajansları, bankalar, şirketler vb. gibi aktörler hakkında bilgi sahibiydiler. Ayrıca, neoliberal dönemde sözleşmeli üreticiliğin ortaya çıkışı erkeklerin kadınların emeği üzerinde kontrolüne yeni boyutlar ekledi. Sözleşmeli çiftçilikte erkekler kadınların emeklerini onlara danışmadan ve emeklerinin karşılığını onlara vermeden uluslararası şirketlere takdim edebiliyorlardı. Bu kuşağın küçük üreticileri ve ortakçıları arasında artan ticarileşme ve makineleşme ortakçıları ve bazı küçük üreticileri yerinden etti. Bu da özellikle erkek üreticiler arasında kırdan kente göçe yol açtı. Bu ise kadınların tarımda kalmasına, iş yüklerinin artmasına ve kadınlar ile erkekler arasındaki gelir farklarının artmasına sebep oldu. Makineleşme cinsiyetler arası mülkiyet farklılıklarına yol açtı ancak bu sınırlıydı. Dış dünya ile artan iletişim ve dış dünya hakkındaki bilgi neredeyse tamamen erkeklere aitti. Topraksız işçiler¹⁶⁵ arasında sayılarında artış dışında fazla bir değişim gözlenemezdi. Kadınlar ve erkekler birlikte çalışmaya devam ettiler, ancak kadınlar emeklerinin parasal karşılığını almadılar. Sözleşmeler erkeklerle yapıldı

¹⁶⁵ Topraksız işçilerle ilgili düzen diğer kuşaklarda da aynıydı.

ve bu da erkeklere kadınların emeğini kontrol etme gücü verdi. Kadınlar ek olarak hanenin yeniden üretilmesinde de rol aldılar.

2. Kuşakta büyük toprak sahiplerinin durumu 1. Kuşaktakiyle benzerdi. Bu sınıf ticarileşme ile makineleşmenin temel yararlanıcıları arasındaydı ve refahını ve zenginliğini farklı dönemler boyunca artırdı. Ancak bu gelişmelerin bu sınıftaki kırsal kadınlar üzerindeki etkisi önemsizdi. Kadınlar tarımsal üretime katılmazken erkekler ticari ve mekanik görevleri üstlendiler. Mülkiyet sahipliği cinsiyetliydi. Özellikle Marshall Planı ve Yeşil Devrimle erkekler kendilerine sermaye birikimi imkanı veren traktör ve diğer girdilere erişme imkanı bulmuşken kadınlar bu çeşit girdileri satın almak için teminat olarak kullanacakları araziden yoksunlardı. Artan ticarileşmeyle gelen dış dünya ile artan etkileşim erkeklerin dünya ile ilgili bilgisini artırırken kadınları bu çeşit bir bilgi ve etkileşimden mahrum bıraktı. Sonuç olarak bu, erkeklerin karar verme süreçlerinde kadınlardan daha aktif olmasına sebep oldu. Orta üreticiler arasında artan ticarileşme kadınların emek sömürsünü de artırdı. Bu çeşit bir ticarileşme ilk dönemde göreceli olarak azken, ikinci dönemde özellikle dünya konjonktürüyle bağlantılı olarak bu kuşak Türkiye'nin dünya ekonomisiyle bütünleşmek için ihtiyacı olan hammaddeyi ürettiğinden ticarileşme hızla arttı. Meta üretimine paralel olarak kadınların emek kullanımı da arttı çünkü kadınlar ticari üretime ek olarak geçimlik üretim ve hanenin yeniden üretimiyle de ilgilenmek zorundaydılar. Özellikle Karadeniz bölgesinde, erkekler tarımsal gelirin yetersizliği nedeniyle şehirlere ücretli iş aramak için göç ettiler. Bu kadınlar ve erkekler arasındaki gelir farklarının artmasına sebep olurken, kırdaki yalnız kalan kadınların emeklerinin kullanımının da artmasına yol açtı. Bu durum, ekonomik sorunlar daha fazla insanı etkilediği için neoliberal dönemde daha şiddetli bir biçimde cereyan etti. Sonuç olarak, birçok insan kalkınmacı dönemde elde ettikleri ayrıcalıkları kaybettiler. Mülkiyet sahipliği kadınlar açısından üç dönem boyunca da dezavantajlı bir durum oldu, ancak bu çok sayıda traktörün ve tarımsal girdinin¹⁶⁶ tarımda kullanılmaya başladığı kalkınmacı dönemde daha gözle görülür bir hale

¹⁶⁶ Gübre, insektisit, pestisit ve herbisit gibi kimyasallar.

geldi ve neoliberal dönemde devam etti. Artan ticarileşme ve erkek göçünün sonucu olarak özel ve kamusal alan arasındaki fark attı. Bu durum kadınları özel alana sınırlarken, erkeklerin kamusal alanda baskın hale gelmelerine ve fırsatlara erişimlerinin artmasına sebep oldu. Bu, erkeklerin bankalar, hükümet ajansları, kooperatifler ve şirketlerle etkileşimini artırdı ve sonuç olarak onların tarımsal üretimde tek söz sahibi olmalarını sağlayarak kadınları karar alma süreçlerinde görünmez yaptı. Neoliberal dönemde, erkekler sözleşmeli üreticilik aracılığıyla kadınların emeğini kontrol ettiler. Küçük üretici ve ortakçı hanelerde kadının konumu kötüleşti. Kadınlar üretici ve yeniden üretici aktivitelerde erkeklerin eşiti olmaktan çıkıp değersizleşmeye başladılar. Cumhuriyetçi dönemde var olmayan cinsiyete dayalı iş bölümü kalkınmacı dönemde ortaya çıkan ve neoliberal dönemde derinleşen cinsiyete dayalı iş bölümüyle yer değiştirdi. Marshall Planı ve Yeşil Devrim ile tarıma giren traktörler ortakçıları yerinden etti. Bu da sonuç olarak ortakçıların iş bulmak için şehre göç etmelerine sebep oldu. Ayrıca, birçok geçimlik üretici daha büyük ticari üreticilerin 'üretkenliği' ile baş edemediği için tarımı bırakmak zorunda kaldı. Daha sonra ise yoksullaşmanın kaynağı neoliberal politikalar oldu. Devlet desteğinin olmaması, girdi fiyatlarının artması ve borçluluk nedeniyle birçok küçük üretici şehirlere göç etti veya kırdaki ücretli iş bulmaya çalıştı. Bu, cinsiyetler arasında gelir farklılıklarının artmasına ve üç farklı işte ücretsiz işçi statüsünde çalışan kadınların emek sömürsünün artmasına sebep oldu. Cumhuriyetçi dönemde az seviyede var olan mülkiyet eşitsizliği kalkınmacı dönemde traktör ve girdi sayısının artmasına bağlı olarak arttı. Ancak bu farklılaşma ekonomik zorlukların erkekleri tarımsal araçlarını satmaya zorladığı neoliberal dönemde kısmen azaldı. Ancak bu durumun kadınların iş yükünü artırdığı düşünülmektedir. Ticarileşme süreçleri erkeklerin dış dünya ile bağlantısını ve dış dünya hakkındaki bilgisini artırdı, bu da onları aile ve yaşadıkları topluluk hakkında karar alma süreçlerinde kadınlara nazaran otorite haline getirdi. Sayıca artan topraksız işçiler aynı şekilde yaşamaya devam ettiler.

3. Kuşak 1950'lere kadar pazar ilişkilerinin görece olarak dışında kalmayı başarmıştır. Ancak bu dönemden sonra yavaşça ulusal ekonomiye bütünleşmeye başladı. Bu kuşaktaki büyük toprak sahipleri diğer kuşaklardaki aynı sınıfla büyük

benzerlikler göstermektedir. Ancak Őu belirtilmelidir ki makineleŐme ve ticarileŐmenin benimsenmesi bu kuŐakta diđerlerine gre daha ge bir tarihe tekabl etmektedir. MakineleŐme ve ticarileŐme, bu kuŐak ve sınıfa Marshall Planı ve YeŐil Devrim'in tarımda traktrlerin, diđer girdilerin ve ticarileŐmenin benimsenmesini teŐvik ettiđi kalkınmacı dnemde girdi. Bu dnemden itibaren, 3. KuŐaktaki byk toprak sahipleri YeŐil Devrim ve GAP gibi yenilikleri kullanarak sermaye biriktirmeye devam ettiler. Diđer kuŐaklara benzer olarak, kadınlar tarımsal retimde yer almadılar. Bu, cinsiyete dayalı bir iŐ blmne sebep oldu. Diđer kuŐaklardaki byk toprak sahiplerinin aksine, girdi mlkiyetindeki farklılıklar kalkınmacı dneme kadar bu sınıfta baŐlamadı. Karar alma srelerine katılımda yaŐlı erkekler etkin olduđu iin kadınlar asla fazla sz sahibi olmadılar. Bizim sınıflandırmamıza gre bu kuŐakta orta reticiler yoktu. Kk reticiler ve ortakılar arasında kadınların konumu ile ilgili arpıcı deđiŐiklikler gzlenebilir. Bu topluluklar Cumhuriyeti dnemde ticarileŐme azlıđına paralel olarak daha az cinsiyete dayalı iŐ blmnde yaŐarken, bu durum kalkınmacı dnemde ekonomik zorluklar ve traktrler nedeniyle ortaya ıkan yerinden etmeler erkek reticileri Őehirlere g etmeye zorladıđında deđiŐmeye baŐladı. Bu farklılıklar yerinden edilmenin tarımsal politikalar, blgede devam eden savaŐ ve baraj inŐaatları nedeniyle neoliberal dnemde perinlendi. Sonu, daha aık bir Őekilde tanımlanan cinsiyete dayalı iŐ blmyd nk g eden ve cretli iŐ piyasasına katılan erkeklere karŐıt olarak kadınlar bazen geimlik retimle birlikte olmak zere ticari retim ve hanenin yeniden rimiyle ilgilendiler. GAP'ın geimlik retime saldırısı sonucunda yoksul sınıfların, zellikle kadınların geimlik retiminin yerini pazar iin retilen mahsuller aldı. Bu durum kadınlara bir katkı sađlamadı. Bunun sonucu olarak, kadınların smrs arttı, kendi emekleri zerindeki kontrolleri azaldı ve cinsiyetler arası gelir farkları arttı. Mlkiyet sahipliđindeki farkların baŐlaması traktrlerin kullanılmaya baŐlandıđı neoliberal dneme tekabl eder. Ancak insanların hayat standartlarındaki genel dŐ gznne alındıđında traktr satın almanın zorlaŐtıđı gznnde bulundurulmalıdır. Son olarak, kadınların emekleri ve karar alma sreleri zerindeki kontrolleri azaldı ancak bu diđer kuŐaklardan daha sonra meydana geldi. TicarileŐmenin bu

kuşağa daha sonra gelmesinin bunun nedeni olduğunu varsaymak mantıklıdır. Erkekler ve kadınların karar alma süreçlerine katılımındaki boşluklar özellikle neoliberal dönemde artmıştır, çünkü bu dönemde artan ticarileşme özel ve kamusal alanlar arasındaki farkı da artırmış ve kamusal alanı erkeklerin baskın olduğu bir alan haline getirmiştir. Zamanla ülkedeki doğum oranları düşmüştür ancak kalkınma ideolojisini savunanların aksine bu kadınların artan bağımsızlığının değil kırsal hanelerin kötüleşen hayat şartlarının bir sonucudur.

Sonuç olarak, kanıtlar açık bir şekilde kalkınma ve neoliberalizmin Türkiye’deki kırsal kadınlar üzerindeki etkilerinin olumlu olmadığını göstermektedir. Bu paradigmalarda kadınların durumu hakkında artan piyasaya katılım dışında herhangi bir ‘çareleri’ yoktur. Ancak piyasa ekonomisinin genişlemesinin kadınlar için iyi sonuçlara yol açmadığı aşikârdır. Kırsal kadınları tamamen ya da kısmen göz ardı eden hükümet politikaları kadınların değersizleştirilmesini devam ettirmiş ve hatta perçinlemiştir. Bu, derecesi ve türü küçük farklılıklar gösterse de Türkiye kırsalındaki tüm kuşaklar ve sınıflar için geçerlidir.

Tarihi analizimizden Türkiye’de kırsal kadınların konumunun asla yüksek olmadığı, ancak önce kalkınma daha sonra da neoliberalizmle kadınların konumuna yıkıcı bir darbe indirildiği açıkça görülmektedir. Bu durum kalkınma ve neoliberalizmin kadınların refahını artıracak söylemleri ışığında incelendiğinde daha ironik bir hal almaktadır. Kadınlar ticari üretimde, geçimlik üretimde ve hanelerin yeniden üretilmesinde çalıştıkları halde halen sadece ev kadını olarak tanımlanmaktadırlar ve bu işler karşılığında ödeme almamaktadırlar. İş yükleri görünür bir biçimde arttığı halde karşılığında pek bir şey alamamaktadırlar. Kadınlar aynı veya daha az bir miktarı almak için daha çok çalışırken, erkekler görünüşe göre aynı miktarda veya daha az çalışmakta ve emeklerinin karşılığını almamaktadırlar. Ayrıca, bu süreçlerin erkekleri değil de kadınları bağımlı kılması daha olasıdır, zira erkeklerin hanenin hayatını değiştirecek kararları alması sonucu artan iş yüküne karşı emeğinin karşılığını alamayan ve eşlerine veya babalarına bağımlı olan ve sömürülen yine kadınlardır.

Kalkınma ve neoliberalizmin getirdiği yıkım genellikle kadınlara zarar verirken bu paradigmalardan sağladığı olanaklar sadece erkeklere açıktır. Yoksul erkeklerin de mağdur olmasına rağmen, onlar genellikle zararları kadınlarla paylaşırlar.

Tüm bu ekonomik ve sosyal gelişmelerin aynı zamanda çevresel sonuçları vardı. Yeşil Devrim'in beraberinde getirdiği ve ülkede yoğunca kullanılmaya başlanan insektisit, pestisit ve herbisit gibi kimyasallar toprağın verimliliğini kaybetmesinden insanlarda sağlık sorunlarına kadar birçok çevresel ve fizyolojik problemlere yol açtı. Yeraltı sularının kirlenmesi tarım yapmayı zorlaştırırken diğer su kaynaklarından meydana gelen kirlenme, altyapının kötü olduğu yerlerde su taşımaktan sorumlu olan kadınların iş yükünün artmasına sebep oldu. Toprakların kimyasallar nedeniyle kirlenmesi ise geçimlik tarım üretimini zorlaştırdı ve bu aktivitelerin başka yerlere taşınmasına neden oldu.

Görünüşe göre kadınlar eskiden daha az iş yüküne sahiplerken, mülkiyeti ve doğal kaynakları kullanım hakkına erişimleri varken, karar alma süreçlerine daha aktif katılırlarken, yaşa bağlı olarak konumlarında bir artış olurken ve emekleri ile ürettikleri üzerinde daha fazla kontrolleri varken, kalkınma ve neoliberalizmle bunlar ellerinden alınmıştır. Kadınların hayatları daha zor hale getirilirken bu sorunlarla mücadele etme araçları azalmıştır. Kız çocuklar ile birlikte tarımsal politikalar için en ağır bedeli ödemektedirler. Kadınların artan sömürüye karşı savaşıma yetilerini kaybettiklerini söylemek yanıltıcı olur, ancak bu yetinin, kaynak yoksunluğundan ötürü çıkış yolu bulma şansları azaldığı için zarar gördüğünü söylemek mümkündür. Bunun sebebi ise kalkınma ve neoliberalizmin getirdiği yaşam şartlarının zorluğu ve düşük yaşam standartlarıdır. Bizim gözlemimiz şudur ki, etkisi kuşaktan kuşağa değişmesine rağmen kalkınmacı ve neoliberal dönemdeki orta sınıflar için görece iyileşmiş yaşam koşullarından erkekler yararlanırken, kadınlar daha iyi bir konum veya koşullara erişimden çok uzaktaydı. Küçük üreticiler söz konusu olduğunda zorluklar hem kadınlar hem erkekler tarafından üstlenildi. Ancak kadınlar süreçlerden daha kötü etkilendi zira erkekler masrafları kısmak için ücretsiz kadın emeğini daha fazla sömürdüler. Neoliberal dönemde ekonomik olarak daha az istikrarlı olan orta üreticiler de

zarar gördüler, bu da bu sınıftan kadınların küçük üretici sınıfından kadınlarla benzer derecede kötü koşulları tecrübe etmesine sebep oldu.

TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics
- Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Yüksekaya
Adı / Name : Özge
Bölümü / Department : Sosyal Politika

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) : Rural Women in Turkey (1923-): An Examination of the Transformation of Agriculture and the Environment in Turkey through Gender Lenses

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master Doktora / PhD

1. Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.
2. Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of two year. *
3. Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of six months. *

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.
A copy of the Decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date