

İSTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY ★ INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

**BEING A WORKER IN A SMALL SCALED INDUSTRY ZONE:
A PERSPECTIVE FOCUSING ON THE WORKERS' EXPERIENCES
AROUND THE PROBLEMATIC OF CLASS MAKING IN TERAZİDERE**

**M.A. Thesis by
İrfan Emre KOVANKAYA**

Department : Political Studies

Programme : Political Studies

Thesis Supervisor: Dr. Mehmet Arisan

JULY 2009

İSTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY ★ INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

**BEING A WORKER IN A SMALL SCALED INDUSTRY ZONE:
A PERSPECTIVE FOCUSING ON THE WORKERS' EXPERIENCES
AROUND THE PROBLEMATIC OF CLASS MAKING IN TERAZİDERE**

**M.A. Thesis by
İrfan Emre KOVANKAYA
419061005**

**Date of submission : 04 May 2009
Date of defence examination: 01 June 2009**

**Supervisor (Chairman) : Dr. Mehmet ARISAN (ITU)
Members of the Examining Committee : Assis. Prof. Dr. Elvan GÜLÖKSÜZ
(ITU)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Asuman TÜRKÜN
(YTU)**

JULY 2009

İSTANBUL TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ ★ SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

**KÜÇÜK ÖLÇEKLİ SANAYİ BÖLGESİNDE İŞÇİ OLMAK:
SINIF OLUŞUMU BAĞLAMINDA İŞÇİ DENEYİMLERİ ODAKLI BAKIŞ
AÇISI, TERAZİDERE ÖRNEĞİ**

**YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ
İrfan Emre KOVANKAYA
419061005**

Tezin Enstitüye Verildiği Tarih : 04 Mayıs 2009

Tezin Savunulduğu Tarih : 1 Haziran 2009

**Tez Danışmanı : Dr. Mehmet ARISAN (İTÜ)
Diğer Jüri Üyeleri : Yard. Doç. Dr. Elvan GÜLÖKSÜZ (İTÜ)
Doç. Dr. Asuman TÜRKÜN (YTÜ)**

JULY 2009

FOREWORD

I would like to express my appreciation to my advisor and department for their contributions to this thesis. I also would like to thank to my family and my friends for their supports.

July 2009

İrfan Emre KOVANKAYA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY	vii
ÖZET	vii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. THEORETICAL OUTLINE	3
2.1 What is Class and Class Consciousness?	4
2.1.1 Inter-Marxist Debate: History or Philosophy?	5
2.1.1.1 Althusserian Thought: A Philosophers Intervention.....	6
2.1.1.2 The Influence of Thompson: A Historians Intervention.....	7
2.2 Why is the Experience of Class Important?.....	9
2.2.1 Formal Understanding of Consciousness: Does Marx Really Talk About a Rigid Definition of Consciousness?	10
2.3 Transcending the Dichotomies: Critical Sociology and Bourdieu	14
2.3.1 Limits of Objectivism and Subjectivism	15
2.3.2 Bourdieu’s Tool Box and Generative Structuralism	17
2.3.2.1 Habitus, Field, Capital	17
2.4 E. P. Thompson and <i>Class Making; Habitus in the Field for Praxis?</i>	20
2.5 Methodology	21
3. TIME AND PLACE	23
3.1 After 1980: Neo-liberalism and Flexible Production	23
3.1.1 Changing Production Regimes	23
3.2 Neo-liberalism and Urbanization	26
3.3 Maltepe-Terazidere Industrial Area	29
3.3.1 Borders of the Research Area	29
3.3.2 In the Intersection of two Districts; Esenler and Bayrampaşa.....	30
3.3.2.1 Esenler.....	30
3.3.2.2 Bayrampaşa.....	32
4. SEVERAL STORIES THAT OUTLINES THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FIELD	35
4.1 Example of Socks Workers	36
4.2 Davutpaşa Explosion.....	47
4.3 An Example on the Role of a Union in a Cable Factory in the Field.....	51
4.3.1 The Cable Factory	52
4.3.2 Changes in the Factory	53
4.3.3 “Crisis” in the Factory	53
4.3.4 Role of the Union	55
5. SYMBOLIC-HIDDEN RESISTANCE AND WORKERS PORTRAITS FROM THE FIELD	60
5.1 Hidden Symbolic Resistance.....	61
5.1.1 “Taking out the Goods”.....	61
5.1.2 Minor Collective Mobility.....	64

5.2 Several Definitive Examples on Employers' Strategies.....	68
6. CONCLUSION.....	71
REFERENCES.....	73
APPENDICES	81
CURRICULUM VITA	87

ABBREVIATIONS

SIS	: State Institute of Statistics
TEM	: Trans European Motorway
TÜİK	: Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu
DİE	: Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü
App	: Appendix
Url	: Uniform Resource Locator
ÇEM-DER	: Çorap Emekçileri Derneği
NTL	: New Turkish Lira
TEKSİF	: Türkiye Tekstil Örne ve Giyim Sanayii İşçileri Sendikası
İSKİ	: İstanbul Su ve Kanalizasyon İdaresi

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 3.1: The population of Esenler according to years.....	30
Table 3.2: The population of Bayrampaşa according to years.....	32
Table A.1: People Living in Esenler According to Provinces Where They are Registered in 2007 and 2008.....	83
Table A.2: People Living in Bayrampaşa According to Provinces Where They are Registered in 2007 and 2008.....	84

**BEING A WORKER IN A SMALL SCALED INDUSTRY ZONE:
A PERSPECTIVE FOCUSING ON THE WORKERS' EXPERIENCES
AROUND THE PROBLEMATIC OF CLASS MAKING IN TERAZİDERE**

SUMMARY

In this thesis, experiences of workers in a small scaled industry zone in Terazidere are narrated influenced by the conceptual approach of Edward Palmer Thompson and Pierre Bourdieu. It is thought that Bourdieu's sociological approach may provide a flexible conceptualization needed to interpret the establishment of such dynamic groups. The aim of the thesis is to draw a small picture of the workers' experiences in terms of creating and developing survival strategies in a homogeneous industrial zone by the central districts of İstanbul metropolitan area where the certain production regimes are dominant in concordance with neo-liberalism. Examples on certain strategies of survival which form the hidden and symbolic resistances of workers who are deprived of collective organisation tools, and the dynamics which are affective in the formation and development of such strategies are mentioned.

KÜÇÜK ÖLÇEKLİ SANAYİ BÖLGESİNDE İŞÇİ OLMAK: SINIF OLUŞUMU BAĞLAMINDA İŞÇİ DENEYİMLERİ ODAKLI BAKIŞ AÇISI, TERAZİDERE ÖRNEĞİ

ÖZET

Bu tezde, Edward Palmer Thompson ve Pierre Bourdieu'nün kavramsal yaklaşımları çerçevesinde Terazidere'deki ufak ölçekli sanayi bölgelerinde çalışan işçilerin deneyimleri aktarılmaya çalışılmaktadır. Bourdieu'nün sosyolojik yaklaşımının, çalışılan alandakine benzer değişkenlikteki grupların oluşumunun açıklanmasında ihtiyaç duyulan esnek kavramsallaştırmayı sağlayabileceği düşünülmektedir. Tezin amacı, İstanbul metropoliten alanı merkezi bölgelerine yakın ve neo-liberalizm ile uyumlu belirli üretim rejimlerinin baskın olduğu homojen bir sanayi bölgesinde, çeşitli hayatta kalma stratejilerinin oluşturulması ve geliştirilmesi bağlamında işçi deneyimlerinden ufak bir kesit sunmaktır. Bu bağlamda, kolektif örgütlenme araçlarından yoksun olan işçilerin saklı ve sembolik direnişlerini oluşturan çeşitli hayatta kalma stratejileri ve bu stratejilerin oluşumunda ve gelişiminde etkili olan dinamiklere ilişkin örnekler aktarılmaktadır.

1. INTRODUCTION

Formation of social classes has been a broad debate in social studies since it was firstly conceptualized. It becomes even broader with the arguments which are questioning the concept of “class” and positioning it into an abstract world of *idea* –rather than the concrete world of complex unequal power relations- have been spread.

However, the questions on the existence of “class conflicts” are seemed to be rather easy to eliminate while studying several cases in a homogeneous –in terms of land usage- industrial area and witnessing new forms of unequal relationships of power. The concept of class struggles has still its content in itself; a dynamic content which is being formed and changed rapidly by new strategies and mobilizations. The structured limitations of “neo-liberalism” are the new rules of the game set by the past struggles.

The class conflicts do not necessarily reflect on collective mobilizations and union movements. Experiences of daily life struggles are also a part of these conflicts. The aim of the thesis is to figure out such reactions and strategies of workers which may be raw states of collective struggles and developed by them during earning a life in a small scaled industry zone. Hidden and symbolic resistances are such reflections in a region where the workers are deprived of collective organisation tools.

Firstly, a theoretical outline is tried to be drawn beginning with the emergence of the concept of class. After explaining certain “so-called” distinctions between philosophical and historical approaches, the concepts of “class formation” and “*making of*” is underlined by following several milestones in social studies such as Althusser and Thompson. Finally, the generative structuralist approach of Pierre Bourdieu is explained briefly. The concept of “class formation” is mainly outlined by the conceptual approach of Thompson and Bourdieu, in terms of *agency* and *praxis*.

Secondly, physical borders and demographical data of the research field, Terazidere-Maltepe region of Bayrampaşa, İstanbul are given. The region is defined in terms of urbanisation and neo-liberalism to express the specific circumstances of the region.

The concept of production regimes are also explained to be used in the thesis by following the pivotal factory ethnographer Michael Burrawoy.

Thirdly, I mentioned three cases from the field in order to define the characteristics of the area more concretely upon practices. First the past experiences of struggles of socks workers in the area are narrated. The experiences of socks workers are especially important as one of the last collectively organised attempt against neo-liberal production strategies in the textile sector. I mostly make use of newspaper scanning in the section. Second, Davutpaşa explosion which has happened in 31st January of 2008 in an illegal fire-works making factory is narrated in order to witness an example of the extreme possibilities which the region potentially hold in it. The section defines that the *field* is *structured* by such strategies for illegal and unregistered working under production regimes of neo-liberalism. Thirdly, an example of a unionized factory is given in order to show a little sample of collective action and unions' disposition as a tool of the employer.

Finally, several narrations of workers' experiences which define certain strategies of survival or struggle in the work place are given. Habits of "stealing" or "taking out the goods" or flexing the working hours are certain strategies developed during the oppositions with employers. Similar minor collective mobilisations are also given in the section with the reactions and defence mechanisms formed by employers in the field.

2. THEORETICAL OUTLINE

In this chapter, I try to draw a theoretical outline concerning a part of the problematic relationship between *theory* and *practice*, in terms of understanding the concept of *class* and its experiences.

Firstly, two different approaches of two different disciplines to Marxism is outlined; Althusser's "philosophical" approach and his apprehension of subject-less history and Thompson's "historical" approach of concerning the class experiences having a central role in social practice. Secondly, emphasizing Thompson's pivotal role in cultural studies and several criticisms of his works, history and sociology "opposition" is considered as the opposition of synchrony and diachrony.

Thirdly, a relational approach to social anthropology, including history as a whole is described referring to the inspiring contributions of the critical approach of Pierre Bourdieu. As an important step, Bourdieu questions the limits of both objectivism and subjectivism; the limits of the constitutional dominancy of objective conditions which leaves no space to human action as a determined agent especially in two of his books; "Outline of a Theory of Practice"¹ and "The Logic of Practice"². He seeks to show that objective knowledge and phenomenological knowledge are unable to explain the practical knowledge solely by themselves because they are misleading us about the limits of the objective conditions and their possibilities of being transformed. Bourdieu tries to frame a methodology consisting of subjective and objective moments in a dialectical relationship, not as a mechanical one but as a set of strategies in order to achieve the practical knowledge (2000: 1-9; 1999a: 25-51; 1988: 782-3; Tatlıcan, Çeğin, 2007: 312). Practical mode of knowledge is "the basis of ordinary experience of the social world" which is necessary to be understood to explain the theory of practice (Bourdieu, 1999a: 25).

¹ 1972

² 1980

At last, structured possible reactions of working people in the field is considered upon the theoretical outline drawn below. Different lives, symbolic struggles, and the complexities of possible conditions in a homogenous legally un-organised industrial region are explained as forms and traces of structured agencies referencing to the direct experiences of the workers reflected on interviews and newspapers.

2.1 What is Class and Class Consciousness?

Analyzing the formation of capitalism in England, France and Germany, Marx and Engels used the concept of “class”, however they did not define the concept systematically (Bottomore, 1983). “Class” was roughly but also more specifically defined in the Engels’ footnote in the introduction of Manifesto for 1888 English Edition according to ownership of the means of production (Marx, Engels, 2001b). The antagonism between these classes leads them into a struggle against each other, a struggle which is to be the sole driving force of history (Marx, Engels, 2001b). However, one of the main unique characteristics of “capitalism” was the consciousness of being a class. It is the first time that social distinctions occurs as “classes”, since the distinctions in capitalist society are mainly determined by ownership of means of production (Fetscher, 1983). Thus, to draw an ideal portrait, in capitalist society people in conflict realize themselves as “classes”, defining themselves in terms of ownership of means of production. This is a process of becoming self-conscious, a travel from being “in itself” to being “for itself” in Hegelian terms as Marx used them.³

Hegel uses the terms “*in itself*” [an sich] and “*for itself*” [für sich] when explaining the *freedom* of the *will* in the *Rechtsphilosophie* (2004: §9-§13): *Will*, at first, is only *in itself* as an abstraction, as absolutely indeterminate, as the immediate will. This moment is the moment of *negative freedom* in which *will* hasn’t completed the realization of itself. However, as a second moment, *will* find itself a *content* -because of being a will as a *concept* and possessing naturally *drives* and *inclinations*- and limits itself with its object, it becomes determined by its own object. Now it is standing to realize itself, *for itself* because it has something to *will*, chosen consciously by the help of drives and reason together. *Will* is now free as both having a content and a concept at the same time. So it can only be ultimately free when it has limited itself with his

³ For Marx’ usage of the terms: Marx, 1963 and Marx, 2001.

object because of its own nature. So Hegel used the terms also to explain a process of being *free*.

Marx and Engels pointed that this process is a process of struggle as a contribution⁴. Afterwards Marx and Engels' abstractions on the sample of people in a great process of transformation, especially in England, France, Germany and America, there was occurred a great variety of debates which were also determined by radical transformations all around the world. These debates which seemed to be inter-marxist were actually also a part of debates generally about social studies.

2.1.1 Inter-Marxist Debate: History or Philosophy?

The year of 1956 was an interesting one considering the formal Marxist history. It was the date of the Soviet re-occupation of Hungary, and also the date when the Khrushchev's famous speech (a confession, a criticism or a self criticism?) on Stalinist policies was delivered. It was a time of so-called "re-appearing" of "humanism" in Marxist thought which led the Marxist thinkers to separate in two sides. In England, one of the most influential Marxist historians, Edward Palmer Thompson has left the Communist Party of England because of their attitude about the occupation of Hungary (Eaden, Renton, 2002: 119-23). However, Khrushchev's speech was really seemed to be a return to humanism by referring to Lenin. Marx' old writings, especially the Manuscripts of 1844, were printed for the first time in Soviets. In France, probably one of the most influential Marxist philosophers Louis Althusser, criticised this policy, however he did not leave his party. The problem was that this criticism of Khrushchev about Stalin's policies was wrongly constructed and a misleading one. It was not that the policies of Stalin was right, but that it was wrong to criticise them referring to "Hegelian Marx" with "humanistic" arguments. Two different thinkers of Marxist school were influenced by different policies of contradictory Soviet government; whereas, Thompson criticised the "practice" of war of Soviet Union and Althusser criticised the "practice of theory" of the government. Actually, this may be considered as a reflection of their approach to Marxism, one influenced by the "praxis" whereas the other influenced by the "practice of making the theory". Even if each path was leading

⁴ In this study it has been accepted that there are certain similarities and certain distinctions between Marx' and Hegel's thoughts, however the question of the Marx' act of putting Hegel on his feet again or not is far beyond the borders of this study.

to different suggestions, they were both closely related to Antonio Gramsci's works on the role of culture, ideology and re-production.

Influenced by Bergson's criticism of mechanistic theories and *voluntarism*, Gramsci is the first twentieth century marxist political thinker who pointed out the relative autonomous position of politics against economy (Gramsci, 2000b: footnote 5 at p.73). Gramsci reconsidered the Engels' writings on economic base and political and cultural super-structure and tried to formulate the relationship between them. Neither the economic base was the only determinative by itself, nor was the political structure absolutely independent of it. According to Gramsci, politics has a relative autonomy. Politics is not the direct expression of economics, even if it is formed by economic relationships in the first place. Political and cultural structure has a partly determinative role on economy (Gramsci, 2000a). Ideological changes are as important as economic changes for a social transformation, for a possible philosophy of praxis.

Both Althusser and Thompson considered the complicated relationship of base and superstructure, and form their ideas and formulations upon this dichotomy from different aspects. However, both developed a different approach in Western Marxism; Althusser featured the role philosophy and ideology; Thompson emphasized the concrete experiences working class have gone through as *history* and *culture*.

2.1.1.1 Althusserian Thought: A Philosophers Intervention

Along his influential philosophical approach, Althusser mainly sought to oppose to "humanist Marxism" which has been very affective in Western Marxism especially by the contributions of Lukacs and after the Khrushchev's speech. Althusser's division of Marxist literature was generally based on his ideas about the relationship of science and philosophy. According to Althusser (2004), if the flow of history is investigated, one can observe that arising of philosophy follows the foundation of science. In this sense, three "continents of knowledge" can be thought; math, physics and history. In each example, philosophy of each continent of knowledge has followed each science; Thales was the founder of the mathematics science, after which followed Plato and Aristotle as philosophers; Galileo was the founder of the physics, from which a new

philosophy has been arose by Descartes and Kant's influence was a reflection of Newtonian physics (Althusser, 2004: 58-9, 61-3).

In this epistemological perspective, Marx was the founder of the history as a science which was declared by the *XI. Thesis* and stated especially by *Capital* and by none of the first writings of Marx' literature (Althusser, 2004:55-7). According to Althusser, the philosophy that was pointed in "early Marx" was to be constructed and founded by Marxist philosophers. However history as a science was explored during the first writings till the capital. Marx hadn't got enough time to found this philosophy of history, so his philosophical writings were mainly influenced by and still containing elements of Hegelian thought. In this sense, the actual subject of history was the "intellectual" who was to give a "struggle" against idealism in philosophy. Since the science of history was explored by Marx, the task of the Marxists was to seek the philosophy.

Althusser's insistence about the struggle on the ideological level as a main task, was maybe explaining his ideas on the "agent-structure" problem. Althusser was to explain the history as a contingent flow which was mainly determined by the different level of structures. Giving a more determinative role to relations of production rather than the forces of production was leading an understanding of a subject-less history. The main ideal practice of a Marxist was a practice of making a theory. Classes were parts of structures which were determining each other at different levels but determined by the economic level in the last instance.

2.1.1.2 The Influence of Thompson: A Historians Intervention

The following debate was occurred in the field of history writing in early 50's between British Marxists. Referring to different parts of Marx' literature two main current become visible around the question of the determinative roles of "relationship of production" and "forces of production" (Oğuz, 2007: 33-5). Althusser's studies as a philosopher were more concentrated on analyzing the relationship of production and also re-production and its *apparatus*, whereas Thompson's as a working class historian were more concentrated on the ways of "forces of production" determines the history

as an agent. It was also a problem of methodology how to “interpret” the history; Thompson has chosen to listen to the class.⁵

According to Thompson class is a “historical phenomenon” which is itself a subject and an object at the same time of a *making* process. Its existence cannot be explained solely by objective conditioning and determinations. In the famous and pivotal English case for example, the Industrial Revolution did affect a set of people who shared a similar set of experiences in a similar way, however it is not enough to explain this formation by itself (Thompson, 1966: 191-3), it affected what had already been in a process of determining itself along the history; “The working class did not rise like the sun at an appointed time. It was present at its own making.” (Thompson, 1966: 9)

According to Thompson; social customs, cultural affairs, rituals which have been inherited through history are as important as major technological or economical events in history which are supposed to be the first determinants and regarded as “base”. Hence, *The Making of the English Working Class* actually describes the ways in which the customs (that are mostly “religious” in the specific example of England) determine or contribute to the making of the culture of the working class of England emphasizing the similarities of the actions and rituals.⁶

When using the reflections and basis of these customs to counter the industrial revolution in its formation, the class in process of *making* alters these customs into new ones (Buğra, 2004: 13; Wood, 1990, 142). In this sense, E.P. Thompson attributes “working class culture” a determinative role as a chain of experiences. Culture is not just an area of reproduction in which working class stands as an object to be engaged to *system* such as explained in the concept of “hegemonic culturalism” by Arif Dirlik (1987: 16–20). It is also a formation process where the class has an agency and it includes a possibility of liberation (Dirlik, 1987: 22). According to Thompson, “Culture” is not only an object but also a form of relationship at the same time which has a determinative role in terms of being a mediation of transmitting discourses, class disturbances and ways of struggles from past to present in a historical process (Thompson, 1966: 191-3; Wood, 1990: 142).

⁵ Specific criticisms about Thompson’s “listening to class” will be mentioned below.

⁶ Especially for the *Dissenting Tradition* in Thompson, 1966; chapter *Christian and Appolyon*. For Methodism, 1966: 42-45.

Thus, class is a *historical* phenomenon which can not be isolated from a historical process, it can not be decontextualized; if done so, sole thing left in our hand is a swarm of unrelated experiences of various kinds of people, a crowd which can be calculated by quantity. "...both in the raw material of experience and in consciousness", these unrelated experiences are unified by the class, the subject of the history. In Thompson's opinion, history is the path which is determined by struggles and in which the similar reactions to certain stimulants aggregate people as classes. So *class* is not a structure independent of history, nevertheless this dependence is a mutual one. Class is not a set of quantitative unique consciousness', rather it is a process that "happens (and can be shown to have happened) in human relationships."(Thompson, 1966: 9).

2.2 Why is the Experience of Class Important?

It is hardly possible to find or use a rigid prescriptive definition of class or class consciousness, according to Thompson. Class consciousness "is the way" where the experiences, the similar set of responses, determined largely by the "productive relations" are "handled in cultural terms". If the occurrence of consciousness is largely related by the culture, since the culture is varied via many parameters, there can not be predicated any *law* about consciousness. Class consciousness is the cultural expression of class experience. The abstraction made by the observation of the people of similar occupations giving similar responses is not a completed prescription that can be scientifically "true" or "real" for every case in which class conflicts occur. There is a great possibility of mystification as a result of isolation of the abstractions from the experiences by which class formation and culture can be understood more concretely. Certain abstractions may not be squared with certain conjunctures since they are constructed or formed from different historicities in different countries and in different times. There is no identical working-class formation for every context (Katznelson, 1986: 9). "Consciousness of class arises in the same way in different times and places, but never in *just* the same way." (Thompson, 1966, 10).

Similarly, as Arif Dirlik (1987) notes, the usage of the concept “class” in Thompson is mainly ideological, for he is aware of the “problematic nature” of the concept⁷; historical language -as sociological language, if accepted as a whole as accepted by Bourdieu (1992: 90) - “cannot be either “natural or clear””, “class” is not a neutral word “so long as there are classes: the question of the existence or non-existence of classes is a stake in struggle between the classes.”(Bourdieu, 1993a: 21). According to Dirlik, nevertheless, it is not the abstractions or concepts that are opposed in Thompson. Rather it is the replacement of lived experiences by abstractions and the effort of shifting the structure by process as the subject of analysis (1987, 28; Rosaldo, 1990: 109). When such a preference is considered between the abstract prescriptions, “categories” and the “experiences of the historical subject”, the categories must be reconsidered and not the experiences for they are being lived.

In other words, questions raised concerning abstract categories parallel at the level of epistemology questions raised concerning the historian's place vis-a-vis the historical subject: just as the historian is "de- centered" in favor of the historical subject, so are the categories of the historian's discourse "decentered" in favor of the subject's experience. Hence Thompson's insistence that the category of class should not be employed to conceptualize people in history who did not think of themselves in terms of this category (Dirlik, 1987: 28).

2.2.1 Formal Understanding of Consciousness: Does Marx Really Talk About a Rigid Definition of Consciousness?

According to Fantasia (1995), actually the critics of the concept “class consciousness” are dismissing Marx’s conceptualization of class, for actually he has never mentioned a “class consciousness” as understood as an abstraction isolated from the *praxis* or at least he did not use the terms “class consciousness”. He never intended to indicate “the ideational standing of a collection of individual workers” by using the conception (Fantasia, 1995: 272). “Class consciousness” can not be reduced to an individual awareness in terms of a didactic recipe. When the terms used “in itself” and “for itself” considered, the important relation between the two states also must be considered in which the transformation between these is an active process. It is an “active, dynamic context, in which the working class is “in struggle,” “becomes united,” and “constitutes itself” in active, historical processes of struggling, uniting,

⁷ Dirlik supposes that categories are opposed in Thompson because of their possible role of distancing the historian and the subjects of the history and thus becoming a part of the hegemonic discourse. The emphasizing of agency and class then can be considered as an ideological choice (Dirlik, 1987, 29).

and constituting.” Marx defines consciousness and class by theoretically regarding to class’ actions, capabilities, and the mobilizations it transforms and is transformed in it (Fantasia, 1995: 273).

One of the main pivotal contributions about the formation of class by Thompson is without doubt is his emphasize of experience not only in the work area, but also away from it (McClelland, 1990: 3). According to Sewell, in the structural model of working class’ “in itself-for itself” process, classical Marxism considers “struggle” as a mediation between productive relations and class consciousness. “Experience” is the experience of a class struggle in Marx whereas in Thompson, “it includes the whole range of workers’ subjective responses to their exploitation – not only movements in struggle, but in their families and communities, in their leisure-time activities, in their religious practises and beliefs, in their workshop and weaving-sheds, and so on.” (Sewell, 1990: 55). “The appeal of *The Making...* was its broadening of the class-analytical vision to take in the entire range of experience of the emergent working class.”(Eley, Nield, 2007: 84). Experience as a whole is important as a mediation in this process (Hall, 1990: 80-81). Sewell’s pointing on this contribution of Thompson is consistently inclusive of Katznelson’s suggestion of developing from Thompson’s narration of a case of class formation a more specific abstraction.

According to Katznelson, Thompson’s theory of class formation and its adaptation by the new social theory “that class formation lies at the junction of determination and consciousness” resulted in using it for any kind of findings. Another result is that the new working-class history actually implicitly holds in itself a weak model of the structural “class in itself - for itself” explanation of class formation “as a hidden and unexamined functioning tool to order the multitude of facts generated by the study of working-class activity and culture”, for we need a conceptual perspective in order to understand the historical facts (Katznelson, 1986: 10).

Katznelson argues that *Making of’s* focus of a single country lets him not to outline an abstraction beside the question of the possibility of such an abstraction. We have new questions that are avoided and maybe left answerless which makes Thompson’s arguments still a little teleological: “Whether the movement from the experience of class society to class dispositions and activity is necessary, likely, or entirely contingent; nor does the work present an ordered casual account of the process that produces such an outcome”(Katznelson, 1986: 11). Polarization in the camps of theory

and history in the studies of class formation has obscured the necessary mutual relation of these two. “Theory is arid if not historically grounded, and that history, even if dedicated to discovering facts alone, cannot be recovered without theory” (Katznelson, 1986: 10). We must recognize the balance between theory and history. As mentioned in Sewell’s article (1990: 54), this argument is referring the possible results of Thompson’s reactivity in his polemic with Althusser. Eley and Nield also points that his ideological –or conscious, as mentioned below- choice of apprehension of *class* “- as only graspable through the experiential dynamics of conflict and negotiation linking mutually hostile social forces together- was always driven by his own polemical purposes” (2007: 85).⁸

So Katznelson and Zolberg (1986) agreed that a more specific theory of class formation is needed as a tool for completing the Thompson’s present theoretical points from where he left. Katznelson suggests four connected layers of history and theory to understand the class formation which are neither more determinative from each other nor have a distinct hierarchy between them, nevertheless everyone of them is necessary to be understood in order to analyze a formation of class.

The first and fourth levels of Katznelson’s model can be considered with references to orthodox Marxism. The second and third levels are the part of the abstraction which are developed and contributed by help of cultural studies in which the pivotal examples in Marxism are Gramsci and Thompson. First level is the “structure of capitalist development”, the economic “base” which is consisted of “privately owned autonomous firms that seek to make profit-maximizing decisions” (Katznelson, 1986: 14). This level is the most considered one by Marx in his works and uses “class analytically as a construct that is “experience-distant” and referred by Thompson as “the productive relations into which men are born – or enter involuntarily” (Thompson, 1966: 9). Proletarianization at this level is necessary for class formation but is not sufficient by itself (Katznelson, 1986: 14).

Second level is the ways of life which is partly determined by the first level and also contains “work settings” and “labour markets” but it refers to development of capitalist societies not only in work but also away from it. By the separation between the areas

⁸ Katznelson, 1986: 12 and for the polemic between Althusser and Thompson; Thompson, 1980; Dirlik, 1987: 27-29; Gray, 1990; Buğra, 2004: 19-20; Oğuz, 2007; Wood, 1990; Wood, 1995.

of work and living, class relations are experienced not only in work but also in home, “in residence communities” (Katznelson, 1986: 16).

Third level is the theoretical dispositions of classes. Dispositions can neither be thought as a reflection of a “class reality” nor be thought independently of them. These are the reactions of workers against the conditions they found themselves in (Katznelson, 1986: 19-21). Fourth level is the level of collective action at where according to Katznelson the consciousness can be observed. Another similar model suggested in Orr and McNall as an abstraction in their article “Fraternal Orders and Working-Class Formation” in which three elements to be analysed is involved: “Structural position, ideology or consciousness, and organization” (Orr and others, 1986: 114).

Another similar critical approach is Sewell’s that Thompson’s narrative is so engaged in a polemic with Althusser and Althusserian approach that despite of refusing specific abstractions explicitly, actually Thompson is implicitly using similar abstractions (1990: 56). Sewell claims that the preface of *Making of...* is actually a set of admonitions which are determined by a specific polemic and opposes the idea that no synchronic analysis of class definition can be made. Thompson’s emphasis on class as a “relationship” is incoherent with the former statement. A historical analyzes needs a look at synchronic relations. Sewell argues that the notion of *relationship* is in fact synchronic which means that class may be and should be observed at a specific paused moment in the history. This debate about diachrony and relationship was caused by “his polemic against the ahistorical conceptions of Stalinism and structural-functionalism” (Sewell, 1990: 58).

Actually, as Sewell points out, Thompson’s own historical practice shows that he himself is far away from pure diachrony. Sewell also criticizes historicism, but arguing that Thompson is not involved in historicism. Thompson is actually narrating “synchronic” also, despite his advocacy of pure diachrony (Sewell, 1990: 58). Thus, there is a sign of an abstraction within all contributions of Thompson which, nevertheless, lacks clarity. The debate of Thompson and Althusser, if a clear distinction is necessary to be defined between them, is not constructed on “structure-agent” dichotomy, since they both accepted the existence of these “poles”. In Althusser, the subject is determined by the ideological state apparatuses in such a way that it is deprived of the agency. In Thompson’s theory, the subject is being structured

by the social conditions as well, but it has an agency, a structured agency. Agency is gained in the process where people recognize the theoretical structures by their shared, common and similar experiences (Sewell, 1990: 63-66). Nevertheless, Thompson, as Althusser, has recognition of agency-structure dichotomy which avoids completing of a possible alternative that is started to be constructed by Thompson against the “subject-less history” (Sewell, 1990: 65).

2.3 Transcending the Dichotomies: Critical Sociology and Bourdieu

Expression of the agent - structure dichotomy was also reflected Thompson’s distinction between the history and historical flow or diachrony, as “the queen of humanities” on the one side, opposing to anthropology and sociology (or “synchrony” and abstraction as isolated from history and politics) on the other side (Thompson, 1980: 262). However this distinction has been to overcome by critical anthropology that sought to place history, politics and conflicts to the centre of the studies in culture and society argues Rosaldo (1990: 106). He also points that “This conceptual preoccupation is of a family with E.P.Thompson’s desire to make politics central to his analyses by attending as much to making as to conditioning” (Rosaldo, 1990: 122).⁹

Pierre Bourdieu is probably the most pivotal and influential thinker amongst critical anthropologists. He attempted to “transcend the gap between” the “making” and the “conditioning” in social theory without having a tolerance for a distinction of “history and sociology” (1992: 90; Postone, LiPuma, Calhoun, 1993).

When he began his academic life in mid 1950’s, French social theory and the ambience he got into was under the influence of writings of Sartre, Lévi-Strauss and Althusser. Phenomenology, existentialism and structuralism and the tension between them were the main poles of debates in social theory¹⁰. Bourdieu was mainly influenced by Saussurian structuralism in his early theoretical attempts, after which he has started to criticize some prepositions of him, especially the opposition of culture and practice. Social theory was characterized mostly by the opposition of subjectivist and objectivist approaches -phenomenology and structuralism, action and structure- according to Bourdieu (1999a: 25). When he decided to develop a theory of “cultural practice”, he

⁹ Indeed, rather than historians, sociologists gave “quicker and more generous responses” to *The Making* (Gray, 1990: 169).

¹⁰ For a contemporary analyzes of such a tension see Rademacher, 2002.

concluded that an analyst must be “able to transcend inherited oppositions and dichotomies and the limitations of visions they always entail.” (Postone, and others, 1993). Neither the “conditions” or “structures” as manifested in Durkheim or Levi Strauss, nor the particular “*will*”, or an “agent” as shaped in manifestations of such theories as rational choice, existentialism or phenomenology constitutes the social mechanisms solely by themselves, without allowing the “other” (Postone, and others, 1993). Since the theory and methodology can not be separated according to Bourdieu, this is both a theoretical and a methodological question as a whole (Bourdieu, and others, 1991: 1).

Two main inter-related problems to deal with in social theory for Bourdieu are the transcension of the misleading oppositions noted above by explaining the dialectic moments of a complicated semi-automatic process, and the mis-perception of the objectivity and a need for reflexive thought in scientific method; these problems are his most significant contributions to social theory.

2.3.1 Limits of Objectivism and Subjectivism

According to Saussure’s theory of communication, the true medium of communication is “language”, instead of “speech”. Language is a system of *objective* relations, the main determinative of producing and decoding a discourse. So he actually puts “speech” (subjective response determined by *language*) and “language” (objectivity) aside from each other. Saussure suggests as a theory of practice that; in a logical order of intelligibility, one has to adopt a viewpoint and than from this viewpoint (which is here the “language”) one creates the object. According to Bourdieu, however, the main problem to be considered here is not the privilege granted on either the objective relations (the language in Saussure’s theory) or subjectivity (the *speech* as determined by *language*) over each other. The problem is this logical order itself, the problem of the relationship of the “view point”, the “object” and the perception of the *unchangeable* object by the “spectator” (1999a: 30-32; 2000 22-26).

In this order, an “impartial spectator” is supposed, who only investigates and analyzes the object and not uses it. This is an opposition of *logos* and *praxis* according to Bourdieu; this kind of relationship with the observer and the object is a reflection of scholastic thought in the advance of *logos*. *Logos*, as the means of theory that is presupposed to be “right” *a priori*, whereas *Praxis* means a harmony –both

methodological and theoretical- between *theory* and *practice* as a dialectical process in which the possible presence of theoretical prejudices and *doxic* ideas can be eliminated. Saussure's conception of language as a constant, unchangeable object of analyzes is actually supposes a language that is dead and no more in usage. The autonomy of such a linguistic order is actually a constructed state of illusion which presupposes that the object has its own "coherent system of logically necessary relations, defined once and for all as if by construction in and by the implicit axiomatics of a cultural tradition." as Bourdieu stated for "kinship" in anthropology (1999a: 34). Such an apprehension of objectivity defines a gap between the theory and practice; "theoretical relationships, like abandoned roads on an old map; and practical relationships which really function because they fulfil practical functions." (1999a: 35, 30-40; 2000: 22-26)

According to Bourdieu, this gap between the theory and practice tacitly results with the "triumphalism of theoretical reason". A critical awareness is needed about the conditions of production of the theory which is an introduction to reflexive approach. This opposition between *doxa* and the *episteme*, the common sense and the science, is leading a tendency of denying or distorting the practical truth; that means a slipping "from the model of reality to the reality of the model" (Bourdieu, 2000: 29; 1999a: 36).

Rejecting the dialectical relationship between structures, or to apprehend structures as independent from external conditions as if they are following some rules of an enigmatic or mysterious intrinsic system of themselves is the "fetishism of social laws". To break theory off abstractions which are constructed of historical experiences and accumulation of these experiences by science as a last resort and perceive it as the *essence* of *praxis* (by referring to *essence* and *existence* dichotomy) "is to reduce history to a 'process without a subject', simply replacing the 'creative subject' of subjectivism with an automaton driven by the dead laws of a history of nature." This point of view reduces the actions of historical subjects –in a process of a structure's realization of itself and maturing, reaching a state of *entelechy*- to the phenomenal manifestations of "a structure's" self-power which are used by this structure to develop itself and to determine the others (Bourdieu, 1999a: 41).

Bourdieu's main objection to subjectivism and its capacity of misleading has mostly developed on his critics on Jean Paul Sartre's existentialism. Bourdieu points to the

parallelism between Sartre's thoughts of the genesis of the society and the thought of the theoreticians of social contract. According to Bourdieu, to mention that the separation of men was not about the "problems of organization and division of labour" (Sartre, quoted by Bourdieu, 1999a: 45) and to assert that the *separation* of men was *initial*, means a return to the "social contract" (Bourdieu, 1999a: 44-45). The indubitable primacy of "a rational subject" who is capable of freely deciding and constructing the externality actually depends on "the experience that the subject of theoretical discourse has of himself as a subject" –in that case, Sartre, as an academic antecedent (Bourdieu, 1999a: 45-46).

The understanding of the relation between the subject and object simply identifies the disabilities of both objectivism and subjectivism, without having a distinctive difference; one universalizes the structural constraints as if they have their inert mechanisms of their own of an unknown origin, the other universalizes the rational subject independent of external happenings, as a "free-floating subject" (Bourdieu, 1999a: 46). Bourdieu suggests "relational" sociology against two dimensions – objectivism and subjectivism- of "substantial" (non-relational) sociology (Vandenberghe, 1999: 34).

2.3.2 Bourdieu's Tool Box and Generative Structuralism

In order to transcend the agent-structure or subjectivism-objectivism dichotomy which has been used in various methods of abstractions about the operation of societies and classes in sociology, Bourdieu has constructed his own scheme by creating a new terminological repertoire. In order to explain the dialectic relationship Bourdieu has developed various concepts to point the mutual effects or the interactions between these concepts. Four different concepts in this repertoire are to be explained for analyze: *field*, *capital*, *habitus* and *praxis* (Wacquant, 1998: 220-221).

2.3.2.1 Habitus, Field, Capital

Bourdieu develops the concept "habitus" firstly in the "Outline of a Theory of Practice" under the title "*A false dilemma: mechanism and finalism*" (Tatlıcan, Çeğin, 2007: 313). "Habitus" is a set of dispositions and possible behaviours which is formed by the experiences and responses that are produced in a particular type of sociality (social space, *field*) in a particular historical process; it is transmissible, variable and has a capacity to determine (Bourdieu, 2000: 72; Tatlıcan and Çeğin, 2007: 305-6).

Beyond being structured, these dispositions also structure the conditions; this system is the principle of construction of the objects of knowledge (thus) which are not passive recordings (Bourdieu, 1999a: 52; *Distinction*, 1999b: p.170). Exterior limitations, internalized possibilities and social conditions form these schemes as the “products of history” which express neither a state of pure consciousness nor a state of being a hundred percent determined (Bourdieu, 1999a: 54; Wacquant, 1998: 222-223). The operation of Habitus is defined to be “semi automatic”.

Here the *game* concept is to be encountered in analogy with the *field*: despite there are certain given rules for a game, every set of the game is different as a result of *semi conscious* strategies which is developed and constructed by the player through his/her own different –probably with the help of different type of opponents, different places and times- experiences of games, limited by certain rules, the player is the subject of the game (Bourdieu, Wacquant, 1992: 98-101; Calhoun, 2000: 696-8, 712-6). However in this analogy between game and the praxis in the field, one must consider that the field is less constituted by rules than a game with certain rules (Kaya, 2007: 402). Rules are to be questioned and suggested to be exchanged with the “strategies” in Bourdieu (1986). The reconstruction of the “structure” is a game-like *praxis* for Habitus which is “the product of the structure, producer of the praxis and reproducer of the structure”, it is the whole of dispositions that determines the *praxis* by “organized improvisation” (Wacquant, 1998: 222-223).¹¹

Relational thinking is one of the key components in Bourdieu’s theory of practice which defines the *field*; the substantialism intrinsic to both objectivism (as structures) and subjectivism (as individuals) in terms of their evaluation of the “agent” is to be replaced with relational thought in Bourdieu; he stated that, referring to Hegel’s famous quote, “The real is relational” (Bourdieu, Wacquant, 1992: 97; Vandenberghe, 1999: 32-35; Kaya, 2007: 398-399). “To think in terms of field is to *think relationally*”; a scientific social analysis never follows a path of a specific direction but can be understood only in relation to other struggles of power in a field and in relation to other fields (Bourdieu, Wacquant, 1992: 96).

Habitus are active as subjects positioned in *relation* to each other in a *field* of power; a game for power. A *field* is a space of ongoing struggles of groups for power. Each field

¹¹ See Wacquant, 1998: 220-1, Bourdieu, Wacquant, 1992: 122 for the concept of game and reproduction of the structures by praxis.

has its own rules which are set by the dominants whose arguments are reproduced by *doxa*, and which are representing the orthodoxy. Dominants in a field are richer about the different kinds of capitals Bourdieu states. The new agents in the field are represented by heterodoxy in opposition to orthodoxy between which is developed new strategies in order to defeat the dominants in which series of dynamic processes occur; the field is defined with “struggle” (Kaya, 2007: 401; Bourdieu, 1993b: 82-84) which makes it different from the Althusser’s apparatuses as infernal machines “programmed to accomplish certain purposes no matter what, when, or where” (Bourdieu, Wacquant, 1992: 102). Fields are not constant as apparatuses because of being areas of struggles which make them more dynamic. Even that it is possible for a field to turn into a passive apparatus, is a very hard and still a pessimistic probability; “even under the most “totalitarian” regimes” (Bourdieu, Wacquant, 1992: 102).

Groups take their positions in the field according to quality and quantity of the *capital* they own. Categorization of different kinds of capitals is a key concept in Bourdieu’s theory of practice aiming to point the dialectical relationship of strategies in a social space. Even though “economic reductionism” is still a common criticism against Bourdieu, he actually tried to fulfil the need for arguments against rough reductionism by defining cultural, scientific, juridical, social or symbolic capitals which are transmissible in each other under different specific conditions in the field (1994: 19-30, Göker, 2007). However, of course, there is no such a set of universal rules of transformation of capitals for they are to be analyzed specifically according to relation to each other and to the very space they are in (Bourdieu, 1994: 14-5).

Quantity and quality of various kinds of *capitals* can be considered as the two dimensions or axes in a social analyze (Bourdieu, 1994: 5; Tatlıcan, Çeğin, 2007: 318-9). Considering the time as a third axis, habitus in a process of being structured as re-structuring a field can only be understood historically. Wacquant’s question in (Bourdieu, 1992: 91), clarifies that there is not a certain distinction between Bourdieu and history, but Bourdieu’s discomfort with some attitudes of historians such as the ignorance of the construction of the historical concepts while using them as if they are over-historical. According to Bourdieu, “*the separation of sociology and history is a disastrous division*, and one totally devoid of epistemological justification: all sociology should be historical and all history sociological” (Bourdieu, Wacquant, 1992: 90).

2.4 E.P. Thompson and *Class Making; Habitus in the Field for Praxis?*

To admit the possibility of the transformation of “structural” fields and a limited area of potentialities for habitus with the reflexive approach to theory and conceptuality in relation to researcher’s position, easily reminds one the critical approach of Thompson. The effort of Thompson in opposing the structuralist approach to history is very akin to the Bourdieu’s efforts of searching an alternative to objectivist sociology parallel to the conjuncture in social sciences in mid 60’s and 70’s (Tatlıcan, Çeğin, 2007: 318-9). As Rosaldo (1990:108) points, “most anthropological students of Thompson” understand cultures “not as unanchored cognitive systems, but as negotiated processes; they are both received and made” and are shaped in a dialectical process by “politics, society and economics” which made them impossible to be understood by reducing to or divorcing “from the hard surfaces of everyday life.” Histories of cultures are a result of “the interplay of structure and human agency”. This is why *The Making of the English Working Class* is mentioned as ““a study in an active process, which owes as much to agency as to conditioning””: both the Thompson’s and Bourdieu’s efforts can be understood as “shifting the object of the analysis from structure to process” (Rosaldo, 1990: 108-9).

To listen to daily experiences as means of empirical study can be a methodological (and thus, on the other hand, theoretical) moment of revision of theory in order to eliminate or understand the *doxic*, poisonously misleading structure presupposed by the researcher; a problematic moment of receiving the “raw material”. To listen to the class’ direct daily experiences which Thompson might accept as a *universal method* of historiography (Merill, 1976: 19) (if we leave aside the problem of possible presence of prejudgement in Thompson’s mind and his theoretical assumptions underlying this method¹²) more generally only refers to a moment in Bourdieu’s *theory of practice*.

For example, the concept of “moral economy” can easily be thought as inscribing a condition of how the *habitus* of 18th century “English crowd” –which had been structured by the internalization of possibilities or gained by conserving the inherited traditional values of rural capitalism- forms a set of strategies in praxis against rising bread prices (Thompson, 1971: 77-9). In this sense, what E.P. Thompson explained in

¹² The Future of Class in History

The Making can also be interpreted as the ways of peoples using their traditional habits in order to change the quality and quantity of the *capital* they have in a *field*.

Daily class experiences, as a moment of theoretical revision, can tell us more about the ways of class resistances and ongoing struggles which are hidden and not clear from the eyes of a pure “theoretical” point. With the recent great ongoing changes in the recent part of the last century, “pure theory” often formed either a distinct definition of class regarding to trade unions and political parties or totally denying the presence of it regarding the very same definition. However it is impossible to try to explain the “working class” i.e. by the presence of union membership where being a union member can be considered as a rare blessing.¹³ So what is explained below is actually a possible theoretical framework of doing it the other way.

On the other hand, it is really hard to witness such working class struggles –of the 1960’s or 1970’s for example, when Turkey is considered- which are to result with quiet satisfactory structural gains especially about vital issues such as eight-hour working day¹⁴ and made Marx and his followers as well as his contemporaries draw such a “definite” picture of an agent. However, different conjunctures need different concepts to be analyzed; for example, in a working area where no presence of trade unions can be observed, one can not insist on searching a “class” of “blue collar” organized in trade unions, running after her/his rights. What still remains of the “older” days is the conflict of staying alive and living as a “human being” –as learned from the traditions of the society with a complex variety of cross-cutter determinatives. In this piece of work, several examples tracing such attitudes or sets of dispositions are to be studied.

2.5 Methodology

A certain part of this study is based on a practice of listening to workers, in which they narrated their own histories about what they lived through. Technically, interviews, data collected from state statistics, and newspaper scanning were used in the research.

¹³ Such an attitude is very akin to Adorno’s attitude of criticising the popular music by using the terms of classical music; crushing of different paradigms denouncing the *distinction* of different set of dispositions of different *classes* attitudes. (Karakayali, 2007:246-7)

¹⁴ It is, of course, very controversial as a gain; since in most places of the world eight hour working is still a blessing.

The interviews made with workers are mostly developed semi-spontaneously in order to understand directly what they live as they experienced it. First time in the field, I had got only theoretical questions about the research. After first interviews, the questions were to be shaped, the interviews were to be structured by the workers' narrations; because "there is a lot more to be learned by leaving ourselves open to the unexpected than by a repetition of our own conceptualizations." (Portelli, 1991, xi).

The aim of this study is limited by a small picture of experiences rather than big abstractions -on for example "working class consciousness" by surveys. In the case of the workers fired from the cable factory explained in Chapter 3, for example, as a result of the first interview made with workers the question of the changing positions of the union between workers and employee has raised. After that the questions of the second interview were formed and it was made again. But more importantly, the crucial result of this unique example that this research is not about "the unions in the region have a tendency of changing sides in the class conflicts" or "the extent of this tendency" -which are for sure, beyond the borders of this research in terms of theoretical and empirical data. The result is "how a worker and his fellows *experienced* the position of union in such an area?" narrated directly by them, which is also shaped by their conversations.

This approach is, if a distinction made between reflexive and positive approaches, closer to the reflexive one. Michael Burawoy (1998) as a pivotal experienced factory ethnographer, uses his "extended case method" which he sees more appropriate to "reflexive science" than "positive science". The main differences between these two approaches are the position of the observer with the "observed". Reflexive approach takes the observer as a part of the field whereas positivist approach takes the field as an external world and isolates the observer theoretically. However, like Bourdieu as mentioned above, Burawoy also has doubts about the reality of positivistic approach, the possible state of "being objective" of the observer.

A practice of listening to workers can also be considered as a part of oral history study. In oral history, influence of Portelli (1991) especially in his book *The Death of Luigi Trastulli and Other Studies* shows an important way of look to listening practice in accordance with the reflexive approach where is supposed that "the field situation is a dialogue, in which we are talking to people, not studying "sources"; and that it is largely a learning situation in which the narrator has information which we lack." (p. x).

3. TIME AND PLACE

3.1 After 1980: Neo-liberalism and Flexible Production

By the crisis arisen in the mid-70's the dissolution of the "social state" and so-called withdrawal of the state from the economy, ideologically called "neo-liberalism" as a "new" form of capitalism. The declaration of the end of the Turkish Republic's economic policy of import-substitution which was dominant in the last two decades was made in 24 January 1980. Economy policy was being transformed into an export centred processing by especially increasing export and the amount of the foreign exchange (Başkaya, 2005: 189). Prime minister of the time Süleyman Demirel's undersecretary Turgut Özal was declaring that Turkish Republic was not able to increase exports because of the insufficiency of the wages (Boratav, 2006: 147). This process is symbolized by the 12th of September 1980 coup d'etat which still considered as a terrible breaking point in Turkish Republic.

Post-fordism and neo-liberalism as concordant with the "globalisation" which is emerged in the late 90's and seem to be continuing has meant to be "structurally" a more limited radius of action; the class struggles -as used in its formal meaning- of 60' and 70' of Turkey depending mostly on massive organised union movements has decreased and transformed in shape. At that point, Burawoy's contributions to studies of working class culture can be useful in order to understand new regimes of the working area.

3.1.1 Changing Production Regimes

Neo-liberalism, as states declaration of increasing privatisation and decreasing intervention to economy, was also presenting new forms of production processes and "factory regimes" as their ideological part (Burawoy, 1990). Sub-contraction and temporary employment may probably be considered as an important part of the possible new regimes.

Burawoy opposes the reduction of the ideal type of a “class for itself”, because this approach also reduces the agents of re-production to “ideological state apparatuses”, partially ignoring the important role of the production process and its forms of re-production at the production point (Özuğurlu, 2008: 48). Thus, fields of production have their own ideological apparatuses and regimes (Burawoy, 1990).

According to Burawoy, Marx’ did not make an analytical distinction between the political apparatuses of production and labour process because he only witnessed the *market despotism*. There are three specific historical conditions under which *market despotism* emerges; First workers’ inevitable position of selling their labour power for a wage and having no means of livelihood, second, deskilling of the workers by technology and the separation of mental and manual labour, emergence of assembly line. Third are the capitalists’ continuously interventions motivated by conditions of dense competition to “transform production through the extension of the working day, intensification of work and the introduction of new machinery. Anarchy in the market leads to despotism in the factory.”(Burawoy, 1990, p.124).

With the emergence of the social state after the Second World War, state interventions to production regimes prevented the *management* –the factory- to “impose an arbitrary despotism.” *Hegemonic production regime*, as an ideal type or a reference for an approximate approach, is the regime with the workers possessing legal rights of social security systems (reproduction of labour, Özuğurlu, 2008: 50) and legal regulations about health of workers and working place. In the logic of hegemonic production regime, there are legal regulations restricting the administrative staff in the working place to perform despotic arrangements on the workers. This regime depends on to the “consent” of the workers: “Workers must be *persuaded* to cooperate with management. The *despotic regimes* of early capitalism, in which coercion prevails over consent, must be replaced with *hegemonic regimes*, in which consent prevails.” (Burawoy, 1990, p.126).

However, since the mid 70’s, by the liquidation of the social state these rights have been lost. Burawoy uses the concept of *hegemonic despotism* for a possible new regime of neo liberalism in the working place. Hegemonic regimes in advanced capitalist societies are developing a despotic face by the withdrawal of the former rights gained by struggle. Being despotic, the new regime is different from *market despotism* because it is established on hegemony and globalisation; “More significant

for the development of factory regimes in the contemporary period is collective labour's vulnerability to capitalism's national and international mobility, leading to a new despotism built on the foundations of the hegemonic regime" (Burawoy, 1990: 127). Firms rapidly and physically change their places. Workers are not losing their jobs as individuals as in the old despotic regime "but as a result of threats to the viability of the firm." (Burawoy, 1990: 127). "We have to decapitate you for the viability of the firm", "We do not have enough money", are several new excuses by which employers try to find a consent on the side of the workers. "This enables management to turn the hegemonic regime against workers, relying on its mechanisms of coordinating interests to command consent to sacrifice." (Burawoy, 1990: 127). Under *hegemonic despotism*, probably not only working in formal sectors but also working in large scale factories is a privilege for workers (Nichols and Suğur, 2005: 41).

While a metropolitan area in Turkey is considered, circumstances may differ from Burawoy's analysis on production regimes. However, Burawoy also points the possible determinants for such changes. First, the patterns of proletarianization; "...various paternalistic regimes with a more or less coercive character emerge to create additional bases of workers' dependence on their employer" (Burawoy, 1990: 126). Secondly, these regimes can differ "according to the extent of state-provided social insurance schemes and the character of state regulation of factory regimes." Thirdly they can vary because of the differences of "skill, technology, competition among firms, and resistance" (Burawoy, 1990: 126).

Turkish Republic has never been a "social state" as established in Europe after World War II. In Turkey, a "hegemonic regime" in the factory sustained by social security and other social rights given by state is quiet controversial. However, of course, a hegemonic regime depending on paternalistic relationships may be observed in the workshops and factories in Terazidere-Maltepe. These paternalistic relationships and their reflections to symbolic resistances is considered in Chapter 4.

The decline of unions (and their insufficiency of being effective as before, when they were re-opened) and de-unionisation, the rise of temporary employment and precarious working, rising unemployment and deprivation of employee's earnings from the past struggles by the 80's as Çam (2002) asserted, added to increasing

amount of migration since 40's and 50's are the main issues to shape the characteristics of the objective moment of the class making process.

3.2 Neo-liberalism and Urbanization

In the introduction article of the collected studies about several transformation examples in İstanbul "İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma" which is edited by Hatice Kurtuluş, Türkün and Kurtuluş attempt to explain the general urban transformation under three radical phases by the critical realist approach (2005).

The first phase is the urbanization led by the industrialization in 19th century. Nation state and urbanization was appearing hand in hand under "Modernity", as the social, spatial, administrative and ideological appearance of the rapidly growing industrial capitalism. Urban spaces were being designed not only to obtain the new population of the new industries a physical space but also to design an ideological environment where the new relationships of production and re-distribution were legitimized. The specialization of the urban space as the business districts and residence districts were followed by the distinction of the urban functions and social classes in the space physically (Türkün & Kurtuluş, 2005: 11).

The two main metropolitan areas in Anatolia; İstanbul and Ankara, were not being characteristically shaped by industrialization since the Ottoman Empire, because the economy was depending on the agricultural surplus. Ankara and İstanbul were being shaped by commercial capital added to bureaucratic re-formation of a new born nation state. İstanbul had had several modern urban planning practices in 19th century because of the accumulation of commercial capital by being an important harbour city in the world trade (Türkün & Kurtuluş, 2005: 12).

The second phase is the process after World War II which has occurred in Europe as decentralization of the industry and new districts of residences around them. This process -sub-urbanization- was developed parallel with the social state in Europe. The metropolitan centres, however, filled with new groups of immigrants who were having less income, consisting of the unskilled workers. By the 1940's and especially in mid 50's, however, our geography was witnessing the mechanisation in agriculture and industrialisation akin to the Europe had been through in the late 18th century. This process has occurred in Anatolia as massive migration from rural to urban areas

(Türkün & Kurtuluş, 2005: 13). An important part of this process has reflected to SIS' recordings as numbers: The annual population growth of İstanbul has shown its second highest value with %54,75 between 1950 and 1955 (SIS, 2002:41). In 1945-50 periods it was (approximately) %17 (SIS, 2002:26).

Massive growth of residential areas was reached beyond the control of the government. New urban formation was characteristically consisted of spontaneous, “un-legitimized” solutions to housing problem depending on the dominant power relationships in the urban area¹⁵. The main actors of the process are the *gecekondu*'s (squatter houses) (Türkün & Kurtuluş, 2005: 13).¹⁶

The third phase of urbanism is the process that has established by the crisis which capitalism has been through in mid 1970's. The rapid change in the production technologies also changes the quality of the labour demanded; unskilled labour is replacing by skilled and educated labour. Since advanced technology requires capital, it causes unemployment and the production processes become more flexible; adaptation to advanced production technologies causes unemployment in declining sectors and demand for skilled labour thus establishing the precarious and part time working (Akkaya, 2003).

Main characteristics of this period are the establishment of physical spaces in appropriation to flexible employment, the rapid change or the interventions in terms of transforming the land use –de-industrialization and the priority of development of the services in the advanced capitalist societies,- thus a transformation from production to consumption (Akkaya, 2003; Harvey, 1990). In Turkey, Neo-liberal urbanisation process turns its face to metropolitan centres again in order to re-evaluate them; removing the industry to the edge districts of the city with their

¹⁵ One of the important defence mechanisms against urban poverty is the informal networks depending on whether religion or the region they have come from. A major example of these mechanisms has presented by the study on the example of Sultanbeyli region by Oğuz Işık and Melih Pınarcıoğlu (2005). In this study, it is argued that different groups arrived in metropolitan area of İstanbul in different times between 50's and mid 80's –the second process of urban transformation- have been transferring the poverty by the rental land incomes earned by the help of informal network organizations they belong to, onto the immigrant groups those have been coming to the metropolitan area later. However, as Candan and Kolluoğlu (2008) have asserted, as well as Işık and Pınarcıoğlu (2003; 2005) have done so, by the dissolution of these networks and emerging of others a possibility of an “explosion of poverty” and arising of “new poverty” is emerging.

¹⁶ *Gecekondu*: A spontaneously developed concept for defining a specific form of squatter settlement at first, but the content of the term has been changing since it was found. It means, approximately, “Settled at night”.

employees who are to remove to so-called “social houses” or “gated communities” depending on to the amount of cultural and economic capital they possess.¹⁷

In the ideological and discursive part –even it is very complicated to try to draw a clear line between the “ideological” and the “economical” in terms of determinacy, as explained in the first chapter-, *gecekondu*’s with their “sympathetic white paintings, flowers and green areas all around” are transformed into *varoş*’s, which indicates a high level of crime, illegal relationships away from the “modern” inhabitants of the central areas or of the gated communities (Türkün & Kurtuluş, 2005: 19-20, Bozkulak, 2005). With this “new stigmatizing topographic lexicon” every kind of intervention was to be legitimized under neo-liberal urbanism using names such as “urban renewal”, “urban rehabilitation” and “urban transformation” (Candan & Kolluoğlu, 2008: 7-8,).

Even though these “renewals” or “transformations” are usually justified by the discourses such as to make İstanbul a “global city” referring to the “public interest”, the actual aim is to increase the potential urban rentals. Investments to attract global capital to the central city and opening wide areas of the city edge to the planned housing sites available to various income groups are made. To include the history – historical sites and background- to the urban life again and to protect people from natural disasters -earthquakes, floods- (for the sake of the public) are other examples of justificatory discourses (Türkün & Kurtuluş, 2005: 16). However, as Türkün and Kurtuluş clearly states, these processes of accumulation –a decision making and practising process which is less democratic and more elite- are depending on allowing high income groups to certain areas of the city (2005: 16).

Terazidere-Maltepe neighbourhood is an important example of explaining the common concrete results of the processes noted above. The process of levying surplus value is relocated beyond the factory forming “new” ways of production such as sub-contracting, temporary jobs and contractual working. This process also located the physical space for such production models in between the “second” and the “third” processes of urban transformation noted above. These physical spaces are either in the so far “gecekondu” regions those become “varoş”’s -the workshops located in the ground floor or in the basement of multi storey buildings- or in the rare

¹⁷ For brief information and several examples of gated communities in İstanbul see Kurtuluş, 2005a; Kurtuluş, 2005b; Geniş, 2007.

regions those are too close to “central business districts” of the metropolitan area with a homogenous urban fabric of small or large industry in the middle of the residential land usage, such as Terazidere.

3.3 Maltepe –Terazidere Industrial Area

In order to draw a little piece of the picture about the class experiences, it is important to mention a short history of the research area, information about population changes and the role of the field in İstanbul metropolitan area. Such information has gathered through mainly two sources; the legal sources (of municipalities and state) and the deep interviews made with reeves¹⁸ and tenants are used together to outline the area. Especially the reeves of the neighbourhoods surrounding the Terazidere neighbourhood and of course the reeve of Terazidere were interviewed. First the geographical borders and then the data on history and population will be given.

3.3.1 Borders of the Research Area

The research area as the geographical limits of the study is a homogeneous industrial region between Sağmalcılar neighbourhood in the north, connection road of TEM separating Eyüp and Bayrampaşa districts in the east, part of E-5 highway cutting across Cevizlibağ in the south and Dumlupınar avenue distinctive of the Esenler and Bayrampaşa districts border line in the west.

The examples of the workers’ experiences that are subject of this research are limited within this area. There are several causes for this choice; firstly, and more characteristically, this area is one of the rare because of remaining as a homogeneous industrial region in the middle of İstanbul metropolitan area, which is still not transformed and not seem to be in the near future. Secondly, because of being in the intersection of different administrative municipalities, unauthorized and uninsured working becomes easy to be ignored or be over-passed in this area. Thirdly, despite being homogenous in terms of land-usage, the region is as well heterogeneous in terms of the difference in cultural origins of people working in here. Fourthly, because of being central in the middle of the transportation axes of İstanbul cutting

¹⁸ The *Muhtar*, the local reeve of the neighbourhood who is directly connected to central administration of the district.

each other from different parts of the metropolitan area, people living in many different neighbourhoods and districts come here to work.

3.3.2 In the Intersection of two Districts; Esenler and Bayrampaşa

In this section, a rough outline of histories, demographical structures and amounts and qualities of the labour forces in the two districts are sought to be drawn especially from interviews made with tenants and reeves added to the data collected from municipalities and SIS¹⁹.

3.3.2.1 Esenler

District of Esenler is one of the foremost regions of İstanbul that is mostly founded by the people migrated from all over Turkey in 1950's, in the second phase of urban transformation. According to the data from SIS' census of population, Esenler was a little village till 1955 with an average population of 300-350 people. According to census of population in 1960 however, the population has increased to 3482 which has become 10709 in 1965 (SIS, 1969: 31). According to the records of Esenler Municipality, the population in 1985 was 154380 (Esenler Belediyesi, 2007: 27). The migration was still going on in 1990, the population was 223826. In 2000, according to the last census it is 380709 (See Table 2.1).

Table 3.1: The population of Esenler according to years:

1940	302	1980*	?
1945	539	1985**	15438
1950	312	1990	223826
1955	331	1997	344428
1960	3482	2000	380709
1965	10709	2007***	515927

¹⁹ Formerly known as DİE in Turkish. Now it is TUİK.

Table 3.1(continued): The population of Esenler according to years:

1970*	?	2008***	463.853
1975*	?		

*: Population amounts can not be found.

** : Data collected from records of Municipality of Esenler.

***: According to 2007 and 2008 census of population of SIS. (App.-1)

(Other references: SIS,1991; SIS,1999; SIS, 2002)

This incredible ongoing growth observed in the Table 2.1 clearly indicates the massive need for labour force and their need for housing which characterized the urban fabric and history of Esenler and makes Esenler one of the pivotal examples of such a growth in the metropolitan area.

Economical structure of Esenler had depended on agriculture and stockbreeding till 1970's. According to the reeve of one of the neighbourhoods of Esenler district –one of the closest to Terazidere-, Esenler was founded in mid 50's by three main families as a neighbourhood. The reeve was actually from a Bosnian family which has arrived in Esenler in 60's, his elder relatives can still speak Bosnian. According to reeve, everyone was earning their keeps from agriculture in the 50's also.

Esenler has been attracting people from almost all over the Anatolia and Balkans which results with a colourful picture of a low-quality and mostly illegal part of the metropolitan area. App.-A.1 shows the SIS' recording of people living in Esenler district according to their "home lands". However, Esenler is a wide district with its parts on both north and south of the TEM. So, one must distinct the neighbourhoods of Esenler. In this research I considered the neighbourhoods near by the Terazidere neighbourhood of Bayrampaşa district.

The neighbourhoods of Esenler which are closer to Bayrampaşa are mostly consisted of migrated people from Bulgaria and ex-Yugoslavia –Macedonians, Albanians, Bosnians, and Croatians etc. and they are probably shown in App.-A.1 registered under the province İstanbul, mostly in Davutpaşa and Namık Kemal. The other groups standing out in the neighbourhoods of Esenler closer to Bayrampaşa are consist of people from Samsun, Ordu, Giresun, Kastamonu, Tokat, mostly in Namık

Kemal; Alevi Turks and Kurds from Sivas, Çorum, Erzincan and Tunceli in Çiftehavuzlar; Sunni Kurds from Kars, Siirt in Çiftehavuzlar etc.

According to 2000 census of population (SIS, 2002: 170) population of the labour force, there were 115537 employed and 19343 unemployed people in the district. There are 47417 men and 11769 women employed in manufacturing industry, 17675 men and 1886 women employed in whole sale and retail trade, restaurants and hotels and 16448 men and 2931 women employed in community social and personal services. Those are the main sectors of employment in the area (SIS, 2002: 200-1).

3.3.2.2 Bayrampaşa

Bayrampaşa was one of the old periphery regions of İstanbul until it has been included by the centre in 50's and 60's. Its growth has been started in 1927 by the first immigrants from Bulgaria. The name of this little Ottoman village was then Sağmalcılar. In 1954 it has been registered as a village. It becomes a municipality in 1963 and a district in May 1990 (Url – 20 and Url - 21).

Table 3.2: The population of Bayrampaşa according to years:

1940*	?	1980*	?
1945*	?	1985	188376
1950*	?	1990	212570
1955**	4932	1997	240427
1960**	29110	2000	246006
1965**	69064	2007*****	270212
1970***	124085	2008*****	266320
1975*	?		

*: Population amounts can not be found. The district's name was known as "Sağmalcılar" until 1970 which has been changed after a terrible epidemic cholera, into Bayrampaşa (SIS, 1969:27, Url-18).

** : Referred in the records as "Sağmalcılar".

***: According to records from Municipality of Bayrampaşa (Url-18).

****: According to 2007 and 2008 census of population of SIS (App.-2).

(Other references: SIS,1991; SIS,1999; SIS, 2002)

The incredible growth in the amount of population seen on the Table 2.2 between 1955 and 1960 can partially be explained by inner migration from the centre of İstanbul to Bayrampaşa; while Vatan and Millet avenues were being built, the tenants living in the confiscated regions in the walls of ancient İstanbul were moved to Sağmalcılar, leading a foundation of three main neighbourhoods of Bayrampaşa. In fifties, the first factories were built in Topkapı-Sağmalcılar and created a centre of attraction for employment. Thus, this growth is also caused by the migration from Anatolia which points the second period of urban transformation process in İstanbul. In 70's the population exceeds 100000 and in 90's it reaches to 212570.

The economic structure of the district was depending on agriculture. Grapery was brought here by the Bulgarian people of Plovdiv(*Filibe*) who had migrated here firstly in 1927. Until then, the migration from Bulgaria and ex-Yugoslavia (especially Macedonia, Kosovo, Bosnia) has gone on as the reeve of Terazidere – who is also a Macedonian and able to understand and speak in Macedonian-explains; especially in 1913, 1920, 1950, 1955. According to the reeve, it was said that sixty percent of the population in Bayrampaşa consist of immigrants from Balkans who did not forget their languages and still uses these languages at home.

According to 2000 census of population there are 79592 employed and 10459 unemployed people in the region. There are 28445 men and 8038 women employed in manufacturing sector, 19854 men and 2193 women employed in whole sale and retail trade, restaurants and hotels (SIS, 2002:156). However the region concerned in the area –Terazidere, Maltepe- is mainly in the south of Bayrampaşa. It is connected to Eyüp, Demirkapı in the east and Cevizlibağ, Zeytinburnu, Demirciler in the south.

Most of the workshops or even factories are not registered in the area. That causes an obscurity about exact results of a possible presentation of hard data on industrial usage. According to observations and spent time in the area however, there are four main sectors which all have different sub-sectors most of the people are employed in; Textile (socks making, denim, zip fastener workshops), trickot weaving, plastics (package and bin making, junk collecting and recycling, plastic raw material) and

metal (moulding and cast making, sub-contractors of automotive industry, accesories producing, lock making, cable and steel doorframe making).

4. SEVERAL STORIES THAT OUTLINE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FIELD

In this chapter, I tried to figure out and express the flexible character of the region in terms of production regimes and workers reactions by three different examples. The first example is about the past struggles of socks workers in the area. Socks making is one of the oldest industries in the region in which the workers have experiences on organizing and getting into action. Still, the largest factory known in the region is a socks factory, Çelik Socks employing over six hundred workers. However, a process of closing down of smaller workshops is going on in the region. They are either moving to more peripheral regions set for industry in the new plans as a result of certain transformation projects, or simply closing down due to the recent economic crisis. However, the conditions which they have been through are not only structurally determined but are also results of *strategies* developed in a *game* of power. The socks workers' experiences of the past struggles in the region can be interpreted as a last collectively organised attempt against certain *strategies* of the “neo-liberal” era in the region.

I mostly make use of newspaper scanning as a tool. However, the references were limited for a specific case such as “the socks workers in Terazidere-Maltepe”. The information found from the newspapers which is used in this section is limited by only the direct speeches of the workers and some of their declarations as direct quotations. The chronological outline of the socks workers' experiences is also drawn by the information from the newspapers.

The second example is the great shocking explosion occurred in the middle of Maltepe-Terazidere region in 31st January of 2008 in an illegal fireworks factory. Causes and results of the explosion are surely revealing certain important characteristics of the area. Such a massacre occurred as an explosion in this example is a unique one in terms of its causes and effects; as a result of illegal and precarious working, a great physical destruction, all the people died and wounded in the area.

On the other hand however, it is only a different kind of industrial disasters; serial and sudden –but not unexpected and not accidental for sure- deaths of the workers in the dockyards of Tuzla and the slow-killing and painful illness of silicosis occurred in denim-sanding workers of the textile industry are three main examples of such massacres with the countless amount of other disasters –examples of locked workers exposed to fire or flood in the workshops, broken machines etc... The important thing is that the region has such “fertile” conditions and a great set of possibilities for such disasters; un-insured, illegal and “obligatory” working. These specific conditions which lead to such possibilities are also established by the results of different power relationships; they are not developed spontaneously by themselves. New strategies for “lowering the costs” are *strategies* used in the *game*.

What about the unions? As mentioned in the previous chapter, a presence of a union is a very rare circumstance in the region; workers are seemed to have more vital issues. However, there are several unionized factories in the area. The third example is from a unionized cable factory from the region. In the section, it is aimed to draw an outline about possible relationships between employer and employees and a union as experienced by workers. The case shows how the *content* and the meaning of a union can be different.

4.1 Example of Socks Workers

One of the most important characteristics of the region as a definitive sector is a sub sector of textile industry, socks making. A socks making process can be varied in terms of the scale of the production-point; in the region, instead of a swarm of small scaled socks workshops there are two more main socks factories. As a sub-sector of textile industry, socks making process presents an appropriate base for sub-contracting, temporal and insecured working. The majority of the socks workers were migrated from Çorum, even some of them are the owners of the big factories; they are employing their “*hemşehri*”s.²⁰

Socks making industry is sector where children employment (ages between 14 and 21) is dense. According to newspaper Evrensel dated 12.06.1999 (Url-1), exploitation of children workers was a common situation in socks making industry.

²⁰ People of the same district or province in the country.

Socks making industry is also an appropriate sector in terms of being in harmony with a production regime of chaos; A chronic state of circulation caused by continuous inflow and outflow of workers is a sticky impediment against a possible presence of union or any other kind of legal organization in the workshops. This situation is also sustained by the state; most of the workers are uninsured.

However, there have been several attempts of founding different associations. Rather than unionizing in the area, little legal associations are found to be more useful and maybe flexible for such a flexible sector. A union is legally defined as workers' or employers' legal organizations which based on the industrial or service sector and the factory or working place it belong to. An association however is legally defined in "association law" and more flexible organisations based on any kind of related issue between the members, i.e. homeland, neighbourhood, tradesman etc. An association is a more appropriate tool for organising in working places where the workers are employed and fired more rapidly. A workers' association is not depended on workshops or factories to be active. However, a union can only be legally active if it has a legal authorisation in the factory. There are different advantageous and disadvantageous functions of both the unions and associations. However the unions are tools which are legally adopted to make agreements between the employer and the worker.

Employers give major part of the job to sub-contractors. Only the workers in the machine part remain bound to them. This situation is quiet common also in other regions where the socks industry has been grown. Let's listen to Hasan Erdoğan, the chairman of the Socks Workers Solidarity Association -founded and active since 1994- who states that in the sector there is a continuous process of uninsuring, and that the wages are not given in time according to this process; "Most of the workers are consisted of children, and besides there is a discrimination between man and woman. There is a very large difference between the amounts of wages given, although they are doing the same job." Erdoğan also has been stating that the working hours were between 08:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. whereas the workers in

department of *formhane*²¹ and table²² were forced to work until 9:00 or 10:00 p.m. (Url-1).

Erdoğan defines the very characteristics akin to despotic production regime where the characteristics of the field are likely to be emerged:

It is forbidden for workers to talk during production in the factory. Workers in different departments go out for lunch in different times. Because that the qualified workers are not needed in the socks industry there is a continuous circulation. A worker can be a master socks worker in one month. Because of this situation, when the time of raise comes bosses may say that “That’s the amount of raise I’ll tell, work if it suits you, if not, then don’t” (Url-1).

Erdoğan explains what they do as the members of association:

We are sticking bills in times of raise. We try to get organized by activities such as stamping and bulletins. In the regulation about associations it’s written that “the aged under 18 can not join.” Anyway the majority of the workers in socks factories are under 18. We try to get over with the monetary difficulties with the revenues given by workers. There has occurred many resistances wherever the association is present. We support them. (Url-1).

In the mode of contract manufacturing, the “certain” distinction between the owner of the factory and workers can be remained only conceptual; for the weakness of these little workshops against big factories in terms of their endurance in wavy movements and crisis in the market is an important characteristic. Besides, the owners of these small scaled workshops are working as a worker of the main firm, or a journeyman against his own workers. The owner may be “fired” or run out of orders from the main firm at any moment. Many workers may witness a state of over-working –or at least working as a worker, as a fellow- about their boss in the contract manufacturing workshop. Owners of the employer firms are to determine the workers’ wages and the price of the socks in this process.

ZER industrial site is one of the major sites in the region where the contract manufacturers of bigger factories in socks industry are dense. In an article dated 06.02.2002 in Evrensel, an employer of a contractor firm in socks industry from ZER

²¹ *Formhane*: The department of a socks factory (a hosiery) where the socks are ironed by electricity on a mould of socks made of aluminium. *Formhane* literally means “a place where something is formed or given shape”.

²² Table: The department of a textile workshop where the goods are packed and got ready for delivery.

industrial site in the region, Metin, speaks about the issue of who is owing who in the contractor mode of production, the excuse of crises is vague for bosses: “When the time of the raises approaches, the contractor firms are cashiered on the plea of crisis. The ones in silence are going on their jobs. Bosses are however, going to vacations in Hawaii. They give the loans taken from the World Bank to *hortumcu*'s²³ and make the workers pay the fine.” (Url-2).

Another example for witnessing the obscurity of the line between the owner of the contractor workshop and the workers in Bayrampaşa has been reflected to newspapers in 22.07.2003 (Url-3). Murat Aksoy is a worker in the workshop founded by his father years ago. He works between the hours 8:00 am and 10:00 pm. He explains being a worker and the owner of the workshop at the same time: “I and my father too, are workers. Because we are making *fason*²⁴, we are producing socks for big socks companies, we come here at the same time with the workers but we are going out later than them.” (Url-3).

Murat had started to work as a socks worker right after finishing the primary school and had been a worker for 14 years according to article dated 2003. He also had been a broadcasting program director for 9 years in Cem Radyo, added to that job.

Murat states that to earn money by contracted manufacturing is not easy any more, especially it becomes so after the 90's. The causes of this decreasing of the worth of contracted manufacturing are the increasing amount of the socks workshops and workshop founders' exercise of low amount of wages because of not knowing the job properly according to Murat. Murat also asserts that, the price of the production of the contracted manufacturing is as same as the price of 10 years ago and no pair of socks remains for them from 12 pairs they produced (Url-3).

August and September of 2003 witnessed a series of mobilizations of socks workers in the field. In the last week of August, socks workers employed in Çelik, Gelal and Öztaş socks factories -where were 2500 workers in these three factories in 2003- had stopped to work for a half an hour in order to get their wages a proper raise, after

²³ An analogy used for defining a degenerated speculator, a high rank official or owner of a financial establishment who use their power in order to capture the speculated or accumulated money of clients or tenants by illegal ways, especially during 2001 crisis in Turkey. Literally it means a man or woman with a water hose (*hortum*); “water” is the money which is sucked by the help of the hose.

²⁴ Contracted manufacturing: Manufacturing a small piece of the work for an employer factory.

which employers agreed to decide the amount of raise a week after that. Workers however were accustomed to such behaviours of bosses in the area: “The raise before that one was also given three months late. Boss is taking the advantage of the unorganised state of the workers.”(Url-4). In the article there is also stated that the majority of the workers were working 13 hours a day without insurance with a wage of 400-450 million Turkish liras.

One day after, socks workers were on the streets with the placards and slogans “We won’t be obliged to starvation!”, “We won’t work without wages!”, “Long live the unity of the workers!”, “We are workers, we are right and will prevail!” protesting the delay of the raises which were supposed to be done in June. Approximately 200 workers employed in Çelik, Gelal and Öztaş wanted to make a demonstration in the streets between factories in Bayrampaşa, Terazidere region. Of course, they faced the interference of the police, after which they made a sit down strike (Url-5).

In the evening, workers of Öztaş Socks Factory who have been in resistance for three days with the workers from the other factories wanted to make a demonstration again at 6:30 pm. After the demonstration of protest in which the workers of Gelal and Çelik had supported, police intervened the workers in demonstration when they started to go back and eleven workers were taken into custody. The demonstration was started again early in the next morning when the police attacked and took seventeen worker into custody (Url-6).

These four days of action in Bayrampaşa, seemed to affect the socks workers of other industrial regions in İstanbul; five days after the events explained above, socks workers in Kıraç (Büyükdere) came out with the similar problems. The raises of the wages had not been given since three months as happened in Bayrampaşa. Workers were well aware of the excuses the employer found for not giving the raises; in 2003, the employer was rejecting to raise the wages because of the fall of the value in dollar, for his factory depended on export. However in 2001 employer had also been rejecting to raise the wages because of the crisis in which US dollar doubled in value. Workers of Azim Socks state that “it doesn’t matter whether dollar raises or falls for us. We are still hungry and poor.”, gaining a wage of approximately 250 million Turkish liras per month. Working in two shifts –eleven hour a day and thirteen hour per night-, workers were aware of the protests in Bayrampaşa and were waiting for the result excitedly. Workers in Kıraç, also had stopped to work and

expressed their demand on raising the wages. Employer answered that he would accept the same amount of raise whatever the other employers in Bayrampaşa accept. Probably, Bayrampaşa's central role in industry and its central place in terms of geography affects such industrial regions on the periphery, but more importantly it is the associations that might inform the workers of different regions in the metropolitan area (Url-7).

One month later, workers decided to get unionized for a proper living. Protests and bulletins to demand the raises for the wages were resulted positively only in Gelal socks factory; the raises of the wages was made. The workers in the factories Çelik and Öztaş were thinking that the failure of the protest and actions had been related with the inadequacy of "raise demand" by itself without other demands such as a Union demand. They were stating that unionization was a mandatory requirement and it didn't matter whatever it took. The main obstacle for unionization was however, thought the workers, the sub-contracted working for which they were suggesting the transferring of the sub-contracted workers to permanent positions.

The Öztaş and Çelik socks factories had sub-contracted workers almost in every department in them. The half of the five hundred workers in Öztaş was consisted of sub contracted workers in 2003, according to 13.10.2003 dated Evrensel. There were eight sub-contractor firms only in the ironing department. The workers of these sub-contracted firms could be fired whenever a problem occurred. Four hundred workers out of five hundred working in Çelik Socks were sub-contracted. The only workers with a permanent position were working in the storage, package and washing departments where nearly eighty workers were working. There were fifteen sub-contractors in Çelik Socks factory (Url-8).

Any attempt of getting organized was to result with discharging of the workers where the circulation of workers was dense. Öztaş workers stated that the sub contracted workers deprived of insurance were staying away from getting organised. Workers of Çelik factory explained the situation as follows: "Friends are afraid but fear can not avoid the unavoidable (*Korkunun ecele faydası yok*). We should let the union in the factory in any case, or we'll be obliged to work with the fear of "when will we be fired."”(Url-8).

On 9th of January, 2004, another association of socks workers from the region, Association of Socks Workers (Çorap Emekçileri Derneği - ÇEM-DER) had been expressing the main problems of the socks workers in a press conference. The chairman of the Chamber of Contracted Manufacturers (Fasoncular Odası) Feyzi Arslanhan was explaining that the contracted manufacturers were still taking the wages according to the tariffs of 2001 and 2002. Chairman of the ÇEM-DER Salih Çınar stated that “Subsistence wage has been raised thirty four percents. The wages of us, the socks workers should be raised in the same amount.”(Url-9).

On 15th of March 2004, ÇEM-DER started a campaign with the slogan “Let’s work with insurance and save our rights!”²⁵. The workers were signing a petition approving their state of working uninsured coming to the stall opened in Terazidere. The campaign which was planned to be ended in 15th of April attracted attention from the workers uninsured. The general secretary of ÇEM-DER in 2004, Necdet Dernek stated that they had aimed to make all the workers in the sector insured. Dernek claimed that this campaign could involve the workers into the struggle (Url-11).

A worker who was hesitating to mention his name because of the possibility of being fired stated that only ten people out of fifty workers were insured in the workshop he worked, Şimşek Socks workshop. He explained that all the workshop mates of him uninsured had joined the campaign and signed the petition. The condition in this workshop was as follows; thirteen hours of nightshift, eleven hours of day shift, no tea or lunch break, six workdays a week plus an obligatory overtime working in Sundays, and a danger of being fired if one is not comfortable with these conditions (Url-11).

Two months later, socks workers in Bayrampaşa and Topkapı had decided to found a committee in order to bring all the socks workers in the workshops and factories of the area to solve their problems. Committee aimed to have a central role among the socks workers and make them join to struggle for the economical and social rights of the workers. Workers considered their demands for raises and their actions of stopping to work and expressed that they didn’t know how to properly stop the job in order to get their demands. They stated that they would struggle to work with

²⁵ “Sigortalı çalışalım, haklarımızı koruyalım!”

insurance and to live a humanly life. Their tendency was to reach the other regions in İstanbul and they were emphasizing the need for a continuous mobilization:

We don't want to be an organization which is only emerging in the period of the "January raises" [to wages]. We also want to form an organization which defends the rights of the workers during all twelve months. We aim to organize the workers in regions such as Elmabahçe, İkitelli and Beylikdüzü without being limited with this region [Bayrampaşa]. The way of being successful in these issues is to unite together. (Url-12).

Hüseyin Yılmaz, a socks worker from the region explains about his state of immobility –probably a common state for most of the other unsecured workers in the region: "They show the door when we want our right. I wanted my insurance to be done and they said "then let's reduce your weekly wage" to me. How do I earn a living without carfare and meal cost?" (Url-12). A worker deprived of any raises to his wage for one year, Abdullah Atabey wants to marry and start a family: "We are single now but what will happen when we marry? Our wages are low and we are deprived of our social rights as well." (Url-12).

Two years later, on July of 2006, workers of Oysas socks factory stopped working for their demand of raise to wages in Terazidere. After that their wages had not been raised as supposed to in July, one hundred and twenty workers in the departments of "formhane" and tables stopped working. After the action, workers met with the employer (Url-14). Employer promised to raise the salaries after the weekend and he did as well.

When those experiences reflected from what socks workers lived through are observed, it can be said that one of the most important armament that workers can use is the little and limited experiences of stopping their works. As results of these actions that are made openly and organized as in the examples above, employer somehow made obliged to at least give a date about the raises. In times of huge amounts of orders in fertile periods, this weapon is important for workers especially to balance their possession of their rights and to control the process of capturing the surplus value at least at a constant rate –to hinder a possible decrease of their own amount. Workers – whether working in a contracted workshop or not- are able to use these actions because of being aware of the periods of order. The actions do not necessarily be organised and overt. A male Sunni tricot worker at the age of 25 from Giresun and Bosnian origin is well aware of that:

I started to work there, I agreed for 880 million...[I have] Three machines [under my responsibility]...Two weeks passed. Journeyman came and said to me "...the boss doesn't know that we hired you. He has just known." There are two weeks passed! He says that "the boss is angry with me about why I hired you without informing him. He says that your salary is determined as 850 millions. We don't need arguing for twenty or thirty millions do we?" He says "Take it easy" [*İdare et*]. I have already been working now, it was too late... In other circumstances I may get out but... I said damn it... and stayed. After another month...they gave me a fourth machine. Number of machines increased but salary decreased! I told him about the insurance he said "ok, we'll arrange it some time. But not now, circumstances are not quite all right." I said "ok" [...*ona da eyvallah*]. But I know what to do...

There is a moment when their works are on the rails. They make you work even on Sundays. I would collect [save] all my rights [time offs] for the day the works go well as same as the way they make me accept all these when the works aren't well enough. I can go and search for other jobs when they need me.

In 2007, some of the socks workers of the region possessing the demand of forming and supporting an association paid a visit to striking Telekom workers in Bayrampaşa. One of the striker workers mentioned about the need for getting organised under a union to socks workers. In the visit, the spokesman of the socks workers explained that the strike of the Telekom workers had been a proper example for them, announcing their working circumstances (Url-15).

On January 2008, a great explosion on the sixth storey of a block of workshops – which is explained in details below- occurred in the region. Thereon, on 23rd of April, 2008, an announcement has been published signed "Socks Workers of Bayrampaşa" to call the workers to the demonstrations of May Day in Terazidere where the explosion had happened instead of Taksim square²⁶ (See App-3).

²⁶ There was a debate going on about the place of the May Day demonstrations at that time among the pivotal confederations of unions. Most of them had decided to make the demonstration in order to getting into the Taksim square, whereas the workers in Terazidere made a call for doing it in the place where the explosion had exposed the circumstances.

The cause of the debate on the May Day at Taksim is the special meaning of the square for MayDay celebrations and protests. In 1977, the most crowded May Day demonstrations had taken place – approximately five hundred thousand people- in the Taksim square. In the evening, after Kemal Türkler's speech –the chairman of the Confederation of Progressive Workers Union- guns were fired into the crowd from the upper storeys of the building of Directorate of Waters and a hotel nearby the square. Twenty eight people died by crushing and choking in the crowd, five people died by gun shots, one person had crushed by a police panzer and 130 people were wounded. The offenders are said to be and mostly known to be the paramilitary forces who are undercover and tried to establish a condition of chaos for a possibility of a coup d'état. After the event, the day has been called the Bloody May Day. May Day demonstrations in Taksim Square are banned after 1978. A May Day

Mainly three possible inferences can be considered under the light of this declaration for May Day. Firstly, the comparison between the circumstances of today and the circumstances after the May Day of 1886 and their costs: in May Day of 1886, a great struggle by the workers had been resulted with the right of eight hour work day and five days of work a week in U.S.

“Let’s talk about the today’s circumstances” written in the declaration, emphasizing the worseness of today’s circumstances than the U.S. of 1886:

...as socks workers, we work 10.5 hour a day and 5.5 days a week. We have no insurance, no service [service of bringing the workers to work and back to home], our foods are bad, wages are low and our working conditions are unhealthy. Added to that we can take a proper raise to our wages, even so we [still] don’t make our voices heard and unite our power. (App.-3)

Secondly the writers of the declaration mentions about the causes, especially attributing importance to the roles and behaviours of the workers –themselves- by emphasizing the “fear”:

...everything is in our hands, machine works if we want it to, mould gets cool if we want it to but we can not. Why? ... Because we are afraid of becoming unemployed, because we don’t trust our friend near by spending as much amount of effort as we are, we don’t have any choice but to trust each other and get united, all our problems and wishes are same, then we have to struggle together, we should unite our powers against our oppressors, we should not be afraid, because we don’t have nothing to afraid and loose, we are already working inhumanely and informal. (App.-3)

The radical language of the declaration reflects the very real working conditions of the socks workers and their desperation mixed with hope. However, workers in the area, even though working at the bottom conditions, have their jobs to loose. So the declaration accepts about the fear of loosing the job but drawing at the same time an ideal presupposition of possible radicalism of workers with nothing to loose.

Expressing their demands, declaration also refers to the struggles of 2003 noted above:

...we are making a call again, let’s unite for our rights, for social security, for our right of eight hour work day against this slavery; let’s found our association, show our power once again, just like the GENERAL STRIKE in 2003 which resulted partially with a victory...Come on socks makers, today is the day to found an ASSOCIATION. Come on

demonstration in the Taksim Square has a special significance for the organisations, unions and workers today.

workers, today is the day to act with solidarity, today is the day of workers and labourers. Today is the day to memorialize our 23 fellows in the place they died in the explosion... We call all the socks workers for May Day to the place where the explosion had happened for the memorial day at 12:30 and to unite for our rights. ... Socks Workers of Bayrampaşa (App.-3).

Thirdly, the declaration reflects a clear tendency of solidating with the other workers who were agrieved of the explosion. This tendency also shows a reflection of building a regional identity -such as “workers of Bayrampaşa”- under an association by offering to make the demonstration in the region rather than the central business districts.

The experience of the socks workers is important to outline the characteristics of the region. A story of past struggles of the associations of 90’s which are acted as unions can be read as a part of a tradition of workers’ struggle. The socks workers struggles can also be read as a last attempt to survive against the “new” production relations after neo-liberalism; sub-contracted and precarious working is certain post neo-liberal obstacles before the older methods of organizing.²⁷ Certain relations such as these are not only structurally determined by the economic relations, these production methods used in capitalism are established through struggles in which the workers and the employers are the main subjects. To explain with Bourdieu’s terms, the struggle is a *game* in the *field* where the different players develop new strategies against each other. Every *game* brings new experiences and new strategies against each other. The case of the socks workers in Bayrampaşa is possibly a reflection of the last signs of the contentious side of their *habitus*, a last collectively organized attempt against the rapid change of the production regimes and certain strategies of employers. To mention a traditional movement, one must also explore the continuity in the mobilization. The close memories of socks workers of the last two decades are still alive in the workers minds. Some of them were moved to more peripheral regions of İstanbul with their memories; some of them are still in the region.

²⁷ Of course, sub-contracted working or precarious working is not only incident to neo-liberal periods of capitalistic development. Sub-contraction and precariousness has always been useful for employers in capitalist production. What is mentioned here is the relative denseness of such kind of relationships in capitalist production. For early examples –from early industrialisation in United States- see (Bridges, 1986 and Shefter, 1986).

4.2 Davutpaşa Explosion

In 31st January of 2008, a terrible event was occurred which has disclosed the un-inspection, unauthorized and administrative chaos and exhibited the regional identity and characteristic clearly and merely. A workshop where firewroks and explosives had been produced in an office block in Davutpaşa, near to south edge of the region – Çiftehavuzlar Avenue- exploded at 9:37 in the morning. Police and fire brigades were informed. While waiting for the brigades to come, fire spread to the work shops with steam boilers inside them near by. Three minutes later, another explosion happened much worse than the former and caused the last two storeys of the block to collapse atop of the watching group in the car park –at the ground floor. Twelve people died in the first explosion, eight people died in the car park after the second explosion, three died in hospital with one hundred and twenty people wounded. All the windows of the workshops and offices within a radius of 200-300 meters were broken and their ceilings collapsed wounding the people around. Most of the cars were trapped in the wreckage. “Prestij Business Centre” near by had become tumbledown (Url-22).

This event can probably be considered as an industrial “accident” in a larger scale of the everyday “accidents” workers get along with. An “accident” however, is a contingent event depending on the coincidences. So it is very controversial to call such events an “accident” for their conditions have long been prepared with the certain circumstances in the region. “Accidents” are unpredictable events which is for sure not appropriate with the situation. Like most of the physical supressions workers live in the region, the explosion and similar events –such as the silicosis disease caused by spraying sand and of which the denim workers suffer and die or the “sudden” deaths and woundings ocured in the dockyard region of Tuzla because of negligence, carelessness and insecured working- happening in small workshops are clearly predictable.

Who was responsible of this “accident”? Muammer Güler, the governor of İstanbul explained the situation in his briefing about the explosion: “A mistake has been done by altogether. Building it [the block] illegally, unlicensed production, no information was provided for the authorities. So we’ve come so far with mistakes, but their costs are appearing now.” The “mistake” as used in the governor’s confession was not

made in one day. The five storeyed “Emek” office blocks had become six storeyed with the illegally built penthouse on the top. The penthouse floor had been used for producing and storing fireworks, sparkles and flambeaus illegally.

According to the newspaper *Radikal*'s news dated first of February 2008 the mayor of Zeytinburnu²⁸, had been informed about the existence of a workshop of illegal fireworks and sparkles just after the explosion. The workshop had been built with a license of “industrial type workshop” given in 1989. Then it was understood that the workshop had been locked down because of being illegal –in terms of the product-, but then the owner managed to take a license of a plastics factory (Url-22).

Ahmet Ünal, a worker witnessed the moment of the explosion as follows:

I am working in a business centre near by that building. First a small explosion happened at around 9:40. We saw flames on the roof [of that building]. The flames looked like the fireworks used in soccer games. A great hole opened on top of the roof. Then the flames were gone. Calls for ‘Help!’ were heard. A big explosion occurred as we stood back. The building was razed. We saw that the outer walls of the building were swelling outwards before the second explosion. *Our friends who were on the storey of the same level with the exploded building were died or wounded during the explosion.* The smokes were all around the building after the explosion. There were bodies all around, some people were agonizing. There were people bolted and banged into the walls. Pieces of stones from walls and metals were crushing their faces with the pressure [exposed] by the explosion (Url-22).

Another witnessing reflected to newspapers:

When we were looking at the former explosion, everywhere blew up with the latter. Dust, smoke, darkness... Then everybody lost each other. We had been anxious already because of the [first] explosion. There had been people on top of the building asking “What happened?” The second explosion occurred sooner than we tell them “Come down!”, *people were smashed [...insanlar parçalandı]* (Url-22).

There are blazing memories that should be placed in this thesis and reflected to newspapers as a part of the social memory where the distinction between living and dying becomes very thin: “The big explosion happened five minutes after the smaller one. I threw myself out...*There were too many dead people around me*”, “I work in the industrial site across the building [where the explosion happened]. All the walls of the site had got loose. There remained no glasses that were unbroken. We threw

²⁸ Zeytinburnu is the district in the south of the region, the south border of Bayrampaşa. The place of the explosion remains on the north of the E 5 highway thus is inside the region of Maltepe - Bayrampaşa. However, legally it is included in the municipality borders of Zeytinburnu.

ourselves out. *Fourteen, fifteen people were wounded from this block. There were people suffering a seizure in bloods.*”, “*I thought I would die too*”, “*Peaces of glass crushed my face in the second one*” (Url-22).

One of the victims’ life working conditions reflected in the newspaper Radikal; Zübeyir Bal had been working in the fireworks workshop uninsured and with a wage of 300 New Turkish Liras –whereas the minimum wage was 638,7 NTL. In 1962, he had lost his father in a mine explosion in Zonguldak. He had been in İstanbul for twenty years. He worked with insurance only for four years out of the twenty years spent in İstanbul. His elder brother says that he sometimes had been walking from Bağcılar –his home- to workshop which means at least 6 or 7 kilo meters distance, because he had not got enough money. Sometimes he has been beaten by his boss because of demanding his accumulated wage for some months. (Url-23).

Another worker, Semra Bakkal, had been working in a tweezers workshop in the business centre where the explosion had happened. She had been working for only four months before the explosion with a wage of 400 NTL without insurance. She had been living in Yıldıztabya²⁹ with her three kids giving a rent of 250 NTL. She was walking from her home to workshop everyday a distance of approximately 6-7 kilo meters. Her ex-husband was in the Bayrampaşa prison because of stabbing the illegal money lender [*tefecî*] whom his wife had got into debt while they were divorced. She was working as a charlady [*gündelikçi*] in her only off-day in a week (Url-24).

Two months later, an expertise report made after the demand of Public Prosecutor of Bakırköy announced that Provincial Directorate of Ministry of Labour and Social Security, Metropolitan Municipality of İstanbul, Municipality of Zeytinburnu and electricity administration was sharing the responsibility of the explosion. Public Prosecutor asked these institutions to declare the names of the managers who were responsible for the inspection of the factory (Url-25).

As explained above, one months later in 2008 workers of Maltepe-Bayrampaşa (or Topkapı-Davutpaşa, they are representing approximately the same region) with the intention of joining the Mayday made an announcement to celebrate the day in the region, specifically where the explosion had happened. Before the 2008 Mayday, a

²⁹ One of the neighbourhoods of Gaziosmanpaşa district in the north.

worker was cluing in about their ideas on calling the people to Davutpaşa to put red carnations to the wreckage of the explosion.

Families of the victims, TEKSİF³⁰ branch administration of Bayrampaşa and textile workers, chief representative of Telekom in Bayrampaşa and Telekom workers –who were at the time in a strike also- and workers from other workshops in the area joined the Mayday demonstrations. They walked through the avenue to the place where the explosion happened with slogans and the photos of the victims in their hands. After one minute’s silence for the victims, a worker made a speech as a representative of the unorganised socks workers, expressing their demands about legal limitations against uninsured working and the responsible people for the explosion to be found and stood trial. They left red carnations to the ruins after the speech (Url-26).

After a year, there were no responsible people found as explained in the complicated situation below. Municipality of Zeytinburnu showed six possibly responsible personnel working in the municipality. At the same time, however, the municipality accused the Metropolitan Municipality of İstanbul and the Ministry of Interior for the remission of zoning which allowed reconstruction of the industrial areas. Public Prosecutor then claimed permission to investigate the six people from Zeytinburnu District Governorship, however they did not allow the Public Prosecutor to investigate them. Getting no answers from the Provincial Directorate of Ministry of Labour and Social Security, Public Prosecutor claimed permission from Governance of İstanbul to investigate directly the manager (Url-27).

On the annual of the explosion, families and workers, union representatives and associations were gathered in a demonstration at the place of the explosion. They walked in front of the factory holding a banner “We did not forget Davutpaşa, and we will not let it be forgotten!” and lots of smaller banners all around with the victims’ names on them. “Judge the responsible people! We want Justice!”, “Not accident, homicide!”, “Responsible people will be judged if we follow the case!” were some of the slogans in the demonstration.

İSKİ³¹ gave three names who allowed the workshop to use the sewerage system to Public Prosecutor. It was then understood that one of these three people had been

³⁰ Turkey Union of Textile Weaving and Clothing Industry Workers [*Türkiye Tekstil Örmeye ve Giyim Sanayii İşçileri Sendikası*]

³¹ İstanbul Administration of Water and Sewerage [*İstanbul Su ve Kanalizasyon İdaresi*].

died in 2002. The two people out of eight people accused of the electrical connection of the building by electrical administration had also died a long ago (Url-28). No answers have yet been found about the people in charge at the moment.

The case of the Davutpaşa explosion is presenting a definitive outline for the field, especially by pointing out the “marginal” possibilities in a field. The so-called “uncontrollable” or “undetectable” conditions in the area are not only established by an unknown structural power. The circumstances in the *field* are also a result of certain power relationships established in different administrative levels. Employers are not complaint about the illegal or unregistered working. The case may be an extreme example, but this example has become possible only by certain *strategies* developed in the *field*, strategies for hiding the illegal work such as silencing the workers or doing arrangements with administrative inspectors etc. This means that the explosion is not a simple extreme accident. It is a result which has grown in the set of possibilities of the *field*, caused by *strategies* on decreasing the costs.

4.3 An Example on the Role of a Union in a Cable Factory in the Field

When the relationship of capitalism and the physical field investigated, the decline of trade unions, especially in working places of such areas that still remains in the middle of homogenous usages of service and residential, such as Terazidere-Maltepe, the de-unionization is one of the main characteristics. A fabric of small workshops and sub-contractor firms isn't actually seemed to be “available” for such legal organizations like trade unions, bearing a tradition from 60's in Turkey, as the tool of working class.

Lots of examples and different forms of de-unionization –firing of unionized workers or privatization, making the unions lost their legal authorisation supplied by the majority by sub-contracting and dividing into smaller scaled firms- have taken their places in the workers struggles of 2000's. As an example of physical urban industrial fabric in harmony with a chaotic despotic regime however, in Terazidere –Maltepe let alone de-unionization, it is hard to mention any existence of a union. This is a region where the demands of workers are below average; there are main issues coming before being unionized such as the returns of precarious working; uninsured and illegal employment.

This example however is a different one, reflecting the different possible dispositions of a union in a workplace. Beyond being a mediator or a conciliator –and far beyond being a defence tool of workers- between the workers and the employer, a role of being a tool for employer may be considered in the example. Firstly the general properties of the enterprise and the events occurred is summarized briefly. Finally the role of the union in this process is explained in order to obtain more clues and make clear the characteristics of the field. The names of the firm, the union and the workers I interviewed with are not indicated due to the freshness of the issue. I made interviews with four workers from the factory at different times in their neighbourhoods.

4.3.1 The Cable Factory

The firm was founded in 1974 as a family corporation. Their speciality is to produce every kind of cable used in automotive industry. Technically they are making contracted jobs based on orders; cables for famous automotive companies such as Mercedes Benz Türk, Yazaki, Van Hool, Wright Bus, AGCO Dronningborg, Bosal Sekura, BMC, Isuzu, Temsa, Konvekta, Spheros, EOS-Aurora, Safkar, CF Maier. Before the last firings, there were 265 people working in the four storeyed factory on an area of 11.500 m² –every floor is included in this total.

There are different departments in the factory categorized according to the different automotive companies, i.e. Yazaki in the first floor, Mercedes in the second etc. No assembly lines are used in the factory. A worker must go to the storage department to maintain the proper raw cables for his/her part of the job. A worker explains that a faster production is possible in a two storeyed factory where the top floor is used for administrative part and the ground floor used for the production with an assembly line.

Legally there are two firms in one building, both belonging the same family. Workers assert the situation of having two companies under one fabric; legally, existence of two companies reduces the workers costs and the taxes paid. Time to time, workers in one company are exchanged with the workers in the other in order to keep the costs stabilized. The workers are working fifty hours a week, including Saturday.

4.3.2 Changes in the Factory

T. is a worker from Tokat. He seems to be one of the capital figures among the workers who are fired. He mainly spends his time of unemployment at the neighbourhood Esenler, in the local association of their home town. He had been helping his father operating a *kahve*³² of their own in the late 90's in Esenler. In 1999, the business had been collapsed due to incoming economic crisis and some problems with the other partner of the shop. After completing his military service, he worked in a printing shop and then as a cashier in a gas station. He had been working in the factory for five years. He explains the changes in the factory for the last five years:

The company is 35 years old; I am working here for five years. In the past periods, they [company] used to try to prevent the unjust treatments on people. They are changing their amateur style into a more professional style now. Old amateur boss style is being replaced by new professional businessman mentality. They have the tendency of shuffling off the disadvantages now.

T. makes a distinction between “the old amateur boss” and “the new mentality of professional business man”. The other workers seem to be agreeing with him. He is pointing a change of employer profile possibly due to the change in the production regime. This change is also due to the change of the boss' physically; first boss is the 70 years old father who is more faithful to legalities and moral rules and he is also a soldier which makes the workers trust him much. Workers are telling that he is fair – at least he try to be- in his relations with the workers. However his son –present boss-, “the professional businessman” more than a boss is not being liked by the workers. There is a possible situation of a presence of “bad cop” and “good cop” on workers. However, workers admit that the old boss has also changed.

4.3.3 “Crisis” in the Factory

By the economic crisis became apparent in the late 2008, Mercedes automotive factory has paused the orders –including the order of cable production in the above mentioned factory- in order to make a year-end maintenance as an excuse.

³² *Kahve*: *Kahve* is a local recreation area where the people (mostly “men”, instead of some exceptional localities) in neighbourhoods and villages come together and chat about everything while drinking tea or coffee etc. *Kahve* literally means “coffee” in Turkish.

Production has decreased and paused for two weeks in the factory. In the January of 2009, no consignment has been recorded according to workers. In December of 2008, it was said that the production reduced from 19000 automobiles to 8000, and then to 6000. It was left open ended while these interviews have been done in the February of 2009³³. This is why the administration has tried to force 110 workers to leave for day-offs without pay. Some other companies of automotive sub-industry are signing longer contractions. One of the causes of this quick decay was the shortness of the contracts made with the main firm, explains S. from Sinop, another ex-worker from the factory, without being sure either; "...their (factory he works in) contracts are short-termed, or at least they told us so; maybe they are going on to take their money [from the main firm]. They are sending the bill of the crisis to workers [to pay] in any case."³⁴

"Day-offs without pay" suspends the relationship between the workers and the employer. By doing this, the employer does not fire the workers, but do not give them their wages either. Both sides wait for the holly moment of getting the business on the rails. This is, of course, means a state of unemployment for the worker, *de facto*. However the employer seems to be leaving the choices –as if there are a lot- to the worker either to wait or to search for another job. If the worker chooses to go and find another job, he/she misses out the right of taking several kinds of severance pays.

Legally, "day-offs without pay" cannot be done more than 20 days, explains T., so the employer counted one week for the off-days left from 2008 –they did not use the right for off-days in 2008. He paid for another two weeks and gave another two weeks for "off-days without pay". A total of five weeks the workers were away from the factory. Before the day-offs, fifteen workers had already been fired without taking money. In the fifth week, a rumour about a "list of the workers to be fired" was afloat; it was said that 38 workers would be fired.

Workers returned to their jobs after the company received an order with another contract. Meanwhile, the workers of the factory had not taken their wages for three

³³ While these interviews were made February of 2009, one of the workers stated that "We worked full in November [2008] and we have just been paid the wages of December." Two or three months without wages paid has become a common situation with the crisis.

³⁴ "Krizin faturasını her türlü işçiye çıkartıyorlar."

months. According to T., this was not because of the employer did not have the money rather that was a strategy of demoralizing the workers. After two days of working part time and trying to negotiate with the employers and union, they decide to go on a strike in the 9th of February, which actualized two days later that:

The rumours were about 38 people. All the 38 people were almost known. Besides, I think that the situation of not giving the money [the wages to workers] is to intimidate... in order to spread the mentality of ...“let me take my money, damn it, I’d leave”...Or not because the employer doesn’t have the money... He gives the money whenever he wants to. They made it to make intimidation. It was a period of three or three and a half months. I think they did it in order to make people completely bounded to them and to force workers to accept their demands.

Clearly, the employer had a chance to say “I do not have money. But if you go on to work and complete the orders, we will have the money. After that we can give you your wages”. Added to that, in the afternoon of the day workers started strike, the names on the list announced officially. The striking workers whose names weren’t on the list gave up the strike when they understood that they wouldn’t be fired. Still, even a certain support has been made for the striking workers down stairs:

Of course, the friends that were going to be fired asked the friends who started to working, “Where are you going? If [our] right is to be taken, we can take it [only together]”. But they were gone. After that, again at a mobilized point of the action, after the speech of the manager³⁵...our friends who want to go down stairs [for support and back-up] with slogans were blocked. Doors and entrances to stairways were blocked.

The strategy of demoralizing had worked on workers. However, T. does not accept this as the only cause:

Generally, because of not being a fully organised structure... We were blocked to take our severance pays at one time, and our nine or ten friends might have made some mistakes but, [actually] we could not exhaust the union either.

4.3.4 Role of the Union

The existence of the unions is a rare situation in the area; both physically and discursively; it seems that in the area, workers have a tendency of thinking that there might be more urgent matters before having a union. This is probably due to the flexible structure of the position a union may have in the circumstances and

³⁵ A speech of constraints, intimidations and accusations.

traditions of Turkey. There is a broad scale of tendencies of unions in Turkey's tradition; from being a tool of the workers to being a tool for the employees or even the state or government itself to engage possible movements to central currents (Koçak, 2008a., 2008b). A union on the side of the employer might only be a means of collecting extra money –the union fees- from the workers; probably for nothing. Being a pessimistic one it might be, but probably a closer portrait for the workers in the area. Let's listen to the workers of the cable factory:

...it is hard to be a worker. I mean, you are dealing with your own struggle; at the same time you are striving to earn a living; as well as dealing with the boss and you are dealing with the union. Especially if the union is very bad, you are obliged to deal with your union. So it becomes harder.

The cable factory is one of the few having a union in it. There are one lock factory and one fork-knife factory in the region with the same union organised in. The union was organised in the factory with the help of the employer itself when the factory had been founded in 1970's. The union representative works as a last checker in the factory, checking the finished products. Fired workers that were interviewed with are complainant about the factory and had a bad picture of a possible union in their minds; a union having a tendency of being a tool of the employer at moments of negotiation, being an aggravator in advance of the employer.

Another worker fired from the factory, K. from Kırıkkale, lives with his wife and two children in Esenler. He has been in İstanbul for five years. With the dissolution of the powerful industrial structure in Kırıkkale, he has come to İstanbul. His general ideas about unions seem to be not pessimistic –he points the difference in terms of the amount of the wages in a unionized factory and an un-unionized one, in the advantage of an existence of a union. However, one must separate his recent experiences he had in the cable factory. He said he had been well aware of the fact that the union had been a shaky one when he got in the factory three years ago. During the “day-offs without paying” union has been doing nothing, except keeping the workers away from a possible action.

T. asserts that one of the main reasons of the defeat is the state of the union, besides the workers attitudes. Even though he also knew that the union is not a steady one to be tool of the workers since he had been working in the factory, it was still a shock:

One has to live and learn [learn through experience] by oneself. We couldn't actually exhaust the union, because [after] we are manifesting a demand; we faced a union that doesn't listen to us, a union that presents the demands of the boss against our demands. And we have clearly seen that the King is naked.

As in its present form, it has become such a bureaucratic structure that... let alone willing to pay any of our losses, let alone manifesting our demands, today it is a union used for imposing the demands of the boss upon us. Clearly... Of course, we had been through such injustice, but everything became clear in the period of our firings.

T. and K. also assert that every time a problem appears between workers and the employer, union somehow make the workers accept the employers demands. The manager mentioned above about his provocative speech in the workshop was on good terms with the union behind the scenes, according to workers. According to K. "The employer was wishing [them to agree], and they were [manager and the union representative] agreeing".

The workers are also more respectful to their older employer than the union itself. Sometimes even the employer attempted before the union to talk with the workers and workers were not to wait the union to agree. Such an example was experienced after the day-off without pay and workers were back in the factory:

The period when we fired was such an example. Bosses came before the union to talk. They said that "We will pay your wages in June. We will add your wages of 2009 to your severance pays and we will pay your assets of 2008 until the end of February"... After we got into resistance [the strike], make a pause, our wages were immediately paid! No assets from 2008 were left and they paid the 2009 wages immediately.

After returning to factory, union members tried to persuade the workers not to strike and make the workers worked for two days part time as a period of negotiation. However, at the end workers in the strike –both the workers started to work and the workers went on striking- took their unpaid wages. According to T. the employer did not want any more trouble. Striking workers, even the ones who quitted in the middle had had a potential to make the employer to be afraid of "having a trouble".

The union however was even in a more un-progressive position than the employer. After the workers who were going to be fired had been certain and taken their unpaid wages until that time, new negotiations started about the severance pays:

The boss told us that he would pay it in June, by four instalments. We did not accept that, we said that we would talk with our union and negotiate that way. Union went up directly

[to boss], without talking to us. Boss and the union negotiated upon the same circumstances. They said “It will be June. It will be paid by three instalments [rather than four instalments]”. But it has soon understood that this was also a lie. Why? Because they have negotiated that the instalments will be paid in 25th of June, which was 1st of June before. It was exactly the boss wishes to be so.

However, these terms were accepted by the workers; the severance pays would be paid by three instalments with a difference of one month. It was time to sign a debenture (*senet*) with the employer. There was remained one problem; the union:

When we agreed on taking the debenture to guarantee our severance pays, we talked to an advocate from another union. He warned us to make the employer “sign” the debenture. Of course, the debenture is a contract between two people, he must sign it. Advocate told us that he definitely had to sign it. So we talked to union again, to make them talk to employer and force him to sign it. Union said “No”! They said that we would not need such a sign! They did not even bother to talk with the boss. And then we said that we needed to talk with the employer ourselves. When we went up [to the boss] we told him our demand about signing. He was paying our wages as cash regularly before...so he was not used to be familiar with such debentures. He said, “Normally, it is not my custom to make such debentures. But if we are making a debenture, then of course I have to sign it”! So the union was actually making it harder [without knowing the reaction of the boss]. Maybe it would have been better if we did not have one. [Laughs...](K.)

At that time the interview was made, K. was looking for a job in his home land Kırıkkale. He said he had been here to find a proper job and earn money; now he was wishing to find the right circumstances to go back to Kırıkkale. Other workers also were looking for jobs; knowing exactly the side which they belong to:

We are looking for jobs. Because people must produce in order not to be starved and be miserable in the future, because our future depends on the labour in our hands. That is to say; we are not bosses; we don't have a chance to employ anybody by only giving the capital and exploiting a workers' surplus value.

A union may have different dispositions in the field. In the case narrated above, the unions' strangeness to the workers can be explained by several reasons; firstly there is no presence of other unions of the same sector in the area which may force the union to competition or provide the workers with another choice. A power struggle between two unions could be a productive *game* for workers in terms of choosing the union to defend their rights. Secondly, there is no tradition of getting unionized in the area; most of the big factories in other industrial sites may have such traditions of unionized workers struggles. Thirdly, as mentioned in the section the union has

already chosen by the factory owner himself; a good “reconciliatory” tool for the employer. However, the case of the union narrated above is not defining a “universal role” for every union. The role and tendency of the union in the region are highly connected with the *structured* limitations of the area itself.

5. SYMBOLIC-HIDDEN RESISTANCE AND WORKERS PORTRAITS FROM THE FIELD

Specific conditions require specific concepts for analysis. The terms “resistance” and “struggle” are usually used to define *collective* actions and mobilizations when the “class conflicts” are considered. Workers are either mobilized through unions or other kinds of legal organizations and associations, sometimes by using them directly as their tools. However, as tried to be outlined in the previous chapters, such collective mobilizations are very few and rarely occur in such an industrial area in the middle of the İstanbul metropolitan area.

Presence of collective mobilizations is not necessarily one and only “indicator” of certain class conflicts or relationships of exploitation. An ongoing exploitation and a heterogeneous fabric of different ways of levying the surplus value is present; either under *despotic* or different kinds of *hegemonic* –especially akin to paternalistic hegemonic- conditions.

Workers in the considered region are seemed to have tendencies of getting into more symbolic and individual forms of “resistances” which can be considered as “rough materials” or “indicators” of individual conflicts and “hatred” against their employers or managers. Those acts of “stealing”, “bending the working hours *de facto*”, and several examples of “looking after each other” because of “being fellows” also in the relationships outside the working place are such examples. These *strategies* are certain defence mechanisms against each other, developed in the *field* and shaped by each others reactions together. Certain possible outlines for workers *habitus*’ can be drawn according to events they have been through. In this chapter, several experiences about such individual or micro forms of collective reactions against employers and managers are given. Also the conditions of the area are tried to be drawn from workers narrations of some definitive stories about their experiences.

5.1 Hidden-Symbolic Resistances:

5.1.1 “Taking out the goods”

Tricot and textile industry is one of the most widespread industries in the area. In the 90’s the glorious days of textile was to be ended; greater factories were being closed down and dividing into little workshops doing sub-contracted jobs. In the 90’s textile industry was more valuable for both workers and employers.

“Stealing” or “bagging” is a common issue in such departments and workshops. There are various causes and forms of such actions in the area. Sometimes it is to supply needs; sometimes it is just to be obstinate with the employer. Let’s see an example from early 90’s, narrated by an ex-textile worker living in Esenler, working in Bayrampaşa:

In the evening, after the work, they were doing a body search. In the bigger companies watchmen of the factory does this. In many factories they were doing this. Women were doing it for women. They were searching for bags, for if there was anything inside... A man cannot take a t-shirt, which he himself made. [In that factory] the productions were not sold to home [domestic] market. They were for exportation. So the goods are very valuable. It means that you cannot seek and find one of these t-shirts that you sewed and made in the home market. Even if you tend to give money for it, you cannot find it.

The factory were employing 250-300 workers at the time and doing contracted jobs for bigger firms and only for exportation. He was working in the factory with his “fellows” from the neighbourhood. A network of fellowship from the neighbourhood area was supplying the appropriate conditions for such actions:

Many workers were caught on job; trying to wear the t-shirts under their clothing and so on... Of course there were successful ones amongst them. Of course there were people, who could take them out, but all in all it was too risky and people did not want to take a risk. Because textile industry was in very good condition at the time... In terms of wages... The wages were high. So people did not often do this, not to gamble with the job... But people working together in groups like we do, like youngsters in their twenties, so mavericks... These people were always finding a solution, developing it and doing it.

He also points another kind of solution in the conversation: “Well, besides taking the goods out of the firm, “to drink alcohol in the firm” is included to that [solutions].” – the forbidden actions are done collectively and secretly in the forbidden place. He goes on:

So we are talking before... We are telling our friends who won't stay for the overwork; "We are taking out goods tonight", so "you wait under –one of the- windows". We are telling to our fellow groups in our neighbourhoods, friends who won't stay for overtime are going out [to home], and friends who are working overtime are in the factory...So we are sacking the bag [with t-shirts] in every size, in every variations, fifty or a hundred [pieces of good], we are filling as much as they can fit in... Two or three people, we are taking it at the first available moment and throw it down the window.

Even though they were being paid "relatively good" wages, they were going through such actions and taking risks of loosing the job. The question about the motivation behind such actions is needed to be answered:

For example we threw a bag of goods like this once, and then we brought it to our neighbourhood and delivered it to people. There were more than a hundred goods in the bag, mostly t-shirts, it was summer. Everybody was taking one or two of the goods which one liked, it was free. We shared. So we were delivering to our fellows in *kahve*'s, we were delivering it to our kith and kin.

They were not doing it for money. It was neither a "charity job", for they were delivering them to their own neighbourhoods. The ex-textile worker I interviewed with has the concepts of "justice" and "right" in his mind very clear. There was another textile factory he had been working in:

The employer of the factory was delivering the goods, which had been left from the exportation [which had not been exported]. When you go to the chief responsible for the delivery –the chief of the packaging department-, you want for example "three x model t-shirts" and he was writing it down there. Your name, surname and etc... and then the goods were given in a bag with the wages when the payment day arrived. Every month they were giving us those goods. You didn't have to risk yourself [by taking out the goods].

These examples from two different factories are clarifying that a "motivation of disobeying" is obvious in such an action of "taking out". The workers that can risk their jobs by doing such an action are the ones who are not allowed to take the t-shirts, which they made. They are not doing it because of having not enough money; because at that time, being a textile worker was perceived as a privilege in terms of the wages paid and a t-shirt was not something so expensive that a worker could not afford. They were just wished to posses the product they had produced in its real mode before it is turned into money.

What about security? Varied in forms and causes, this kind of actions –without getting directly face to face with the employer- were common in textile industry before the more complicated security systems are established:

There were not such systems of camera recording etc. There was a watchman of the factory, and he was waiting in the entrance of the factory... Even if the men realised, there is no evidence about the action. The people to be asked for being a witness are all the workers in there, and they are all doing the same thing [taking out the goods] somehow. All the workers are doing it somehow. All the women and men... There are other methods instead of using the “bag”. To make it with a bag one needs a group like us. Some workers are taking goods individually. It is easier in textile because you can wear under your cloth, you can sack it to your pocket or under your trousers.

The events narrated above have happened in 1989-90. The “group” that the worker talks about is only formed upon a “neighbourhood fellowship”³⁶. It is neither a “gang”, nor a part of some kind of legal or illegal organization; it is just a group of workers living and working at the same places. The “group” is as heterogeneous as Esenler’s population in terms of their “home-lands” or “religious orders” or “ethnic origins”.

After twenty years, similar examples were being experienced by workers. But not as “innocent” as the one narrated above. In 2008, a tricot worker, A., working in Bayrampaşa was completing his night shift by the machines. His ears have been accustomed to high noise of the non-stopping machines for twelve years in the same factory. He was living in Esenler and coming to Bayrampaşa for working. The workshop he was working is on the same street where the Davutpaşa explosion had happened. He was responsible of the new products that night.

His ex-friends from the neighbourhood had paid a visit to factory that night at 3:00 am. According to A., they were “high on some chemicals”. They forced him –one of them had been probably armed- to give some of the goods that had been newly finished. After realising that they were “high”, he agreed to give them the packed goods. They were stealing the goods to sell them. After loading the packages to car, they were gone. They were stopped by a polis car outside the region; it was a routine control. However after searching the car, police understood that the goods had been stolen.

³⁶ It is even wrong to call it a “group”. It is more likely to be a temporary network of fellowship.

Next morning a man called up A. He said on the phone that he would give the goods back to A. However A. couldn't have realised his voice. When he arrived at the meeting point to take the goods back, a man in plain clothes came closer to ask if he was A. or not. After receiving the answer, some other men had come along and made him to get on the car. They were all policemen. The thieves caught last night had told the police that A. was a partner in "the job". A. says that "They showed me as an abettor, because we do not have a friendly past." After the case was solved and the goods were returned to factory, it is understood that he was innocent.

However, even that the employer of A. did not make a complaint about him, he used the situation as an excuse to fire A. from the factory. A. was working for twelve years in the same factory. This meant that there was a very high amount of severance pay. Being fired, he could not take his severance pay. According to A. it is obvious that the employer used this situation for his advantages. A. was a good worker in his factory, which meant that it would be hard to find an excuse to fire him without paying him the severance pay in the future.

A. accepts that "taking out goods" is a common situation in a factory, but not like that one. A worker working in textile industry is sure to be accustomed to such little experiences of taking outs; it is perceived as a common and natural behaviour. It is not even precluded by employers, for one or two clothing are not those valuable. However after this event, employer has placed cameras to certain corners in the factory.

5.1.2 Minor Collective Mobility

The "neighbourhood network of fellowship" was preparing a concrete ground of collective mobility in the working place in the 90's. The ex-textile worker who narrated the "taking out" story has also mentioned another kind of "defence mechanism" against possible "attacks" from an employer:

...let's start the job together, let's capture there, because it is a good thing that if our friends and people all around us are in the same working place, we can be in charge there³⁷... We talked something like this, and then firstly two or three friends of ours started to work there... After they were employed they told us that "they are employing new ones, you can come" etc... It was newly founded...It is always an advantage for a new worker who trusts oneself [in terms of steadiness], to start to work in a new founded workshop. Why? You

³⁷ [istediğimiz gibi borumuzu öttürürüz]

can establish yourself much easier there. And also you can get what you want cushier, your wage etc... Its circumstances are a little in advantage of the worker. And imagine that you formed a group there, you are forming a group just in the beginning...

Ten or eleven fellows, knowing each other very well, are doing job applications to the same place in different times, as if they do not know each other and doing separate applications. Sometimes one of them joins to work and announce the others if there are available positions for them or not. Other fellows are doing applications to such workshops. Thus they provide themselves a ready network in the working place. Even the employers' tiny movements can make them give proper reactions; slowing down or quitting the job (especially in times of large amounts of contracted orders are to be done) or talking with the boss. The example of "taking out" as narrated above is such an example.

However, sometimes these networks are not enough to motivate the workers. The following experiences are narrated by the same worker:

Then 17-18 fellows, we started to work there. And then we couldn't take our wages for one month. We were paid something but it was more like a pocket money. But the boss had a valid reason, and she was also convincing us. The firm is new, the financial problems are normal etc... After one month the job was on the rails, so we were working continuously... It was before the Feast of Sacrifice. Employer was not giving the wages; finally we talked to each other like "this is no good" etc. and decided to talk to the employer. Together we went to the employer, stood before her. We were 25-26 people, 17-18 from the neighbourhood, the others from elsewhere. We were half of the workers in the factory; the others were working down stairs, they did not join us.

Facing the employer, many of the workers were "drawn in her horns", some of them were convinced to common excuses. Most of the fellows made a u-turn, especially the "frontier-agitators" down stairs. The network did not work; there were left three people –the ex-worker, a man and a woman, both of them were not from his neighbourhood- before the employer after a brief show.

So we talked a lot with the employer. Then I said "I don't care man, I want my money. You have orders or not, you have money or not, it is not my problem. If you cannot pay the wages of these people, do not employ them! I am not going anywhere without taking my money! I don't have enough to manage myself, I can't wait for you!" I remember very well that I said "If we can not have our wages while your husband is driving a "x" brand new car, that is not my problem". I remember these words very well. This was her blasting point... She became very mad at me... She said "I did not earn the money for the car from

the factory!”. And I said “I don’t care from where you earned the money, I just want my money.” She insulted to me, swore at me etc... Her husband was also standing there without talking. I said “No one can budge me anywhere until I get my money!” I came for her...Another fellow stopped me. I remember pushing him away and turning my face to my fellows crying: “What kind of people are you?!”

In the evening, all the workers leave the factory and went their homes. Only the three workers stayed insisting to take their moneys back. At last the employer promised them to give their money on the day after in the factory. That was not an assuring promise:

Then I said “If we can not take our money tomorrow, I will detach the head of the *rençme*³⁸ and take it away.” At that time, the machine called *Rençme* was as valuable as ten times of a monthly wage of a textile worker. Employer said “ok”. The day after, three of us really went to factory and took our moneys back! But none of the other fellows has ever been able to take their money back. Because the employer had ran away.

Such an individual obstinacy and consistency with a conception of right and justice is sure to be learned in the neighbourhood and united with the restraint in the workshop. Even that the network of fellowship had not worked there, a collective motivation had continued with an individual insistence and brought the individual/minor gains. Even though not all of them are the “first person”, many of the workers in the area have such stories of individual resistances.

In the examples of “taking out”, workers are both doing it collectively and individually by different motivations. Workers may get involved in different symbolic solidarity practices as an adjunct to an action against employer. Certain control mechanisms results with different reactions of *habitus*. A network formed in the neighbourhood may be used as a defence mechanism; however it may not work in every case and leave its place to individual insistence and survival.

Flexing the working hours by coming late and going early is another kind of hidden struggle based on a relationship of obstinacy with the employer or manager. Even the precarious and uninsured working is common; workers still may have the tendency not to go to work. Especially when the job is much easier to reach, as the ex-textile worker pointed while narrating another job application story from mid 90’s:

³⁸ *Rençme* is an expensive industrial sewing machine, which can make different kinds of stitches to arms, necks and collars in combed cotton goods.

... meanwhile all of us are unemployed, looking for jobs and so on. Actually we are not looking for jobs, frankly. There are available occupations but playing pool in the *kahve* is much catchier for us... well [because you know] that there are available jobs around.... We are all going to the same *kahve* etc...³⁹

Being a relatively skilled worker also is an advantage to get involved with such actions. A worker from a steel factory in the region, Ç. narrates:

There was a man in the factory for example... He had told when he had started to job for the first time “I am coming from Kasımpaşa,⁴⁰ I can not come to work at 8:00 am, I can arrive at 9:00.” 9:00 AM became 9:30, it became 10:00 and 10:30. And then five days a week reduced to four days a week... He was taking a break and starting to read a newspaper! ... Little by little... An opposition occurred between the workers. The man was ok, he had no problems with us, but of course we were being jealous; he was starting to work at 10:00 whereas I was coming to work at 7:30 in front of the factory... Little by little man flexed it himself. Employer let him do it by leaving him alone since the first time.

Another example from the same factory and experienced by the same people were resulted in an opposite direction and with a minor gain:

Manager is making the workers to work overtime, and tells B. that “You are not staying for overtime; you will not stay for tonight”. There are thirty men, he is employing twenty nine of them in the night and is not letting B. to stay... B. wants to stay and work overtime to gain extra money. He is not allowing. He hates B... He hates him, why? The work starts at 8:00, B. is eating his breakfast at 9:00 in my place, drinking tea and stuff. This man, B., he flexed his hours by himself. Automatically...

B. was hindering the job, coming late and being calm and cushy. However an overwork payment is an important input for a workers home economy. How has he been flexing the times of work? “B. had had an advantage. B. was a welder; in the market, in İstanbul, you can not find more than 20 welders doing his job.”

So, one night in the factory, just because the manager was not letting him to stay overtime, all the other twenty nine workers turned off the switches suddenly, in one night. So they protected him. And then the manager started to let him to stay and work overtime.

In the first example, the employer or the manager did not (and can not, after sometime) intervene the work-hours of the worker where the workers had been jealous. In the second example however, the worker has a special skill by which he

³⁹ [...bir yandan da ama hepimiz de boşuz, iş arıyoruz falan. Aslında iş de aramıyoruz işin doğrusu. İş var aslında, kahvede bilardo oynamak bize daha cazip geliyor böyle... Hani iş var ya ortalıkta... Hep böyle aynı kahveye gidiyoruz falan.]

⁴⁰ Kasımpaşa is a more central neighbourhood of İstanbul which is a long way from Bayrampaşa.

could flex his hours of working and has been intervened by the manager not to stay for the overtime. The collective symbolic resistance against such an intervention is probably caused by the feeling of “fellowship” against the manager, not as an “enemy” maybe. But a strategy of “disallowance” from the manager made them to act collectively. However, an allowance of employer for a worker –the case of the worker from Kasımpaşa- flexing the hours may result in symbolic gains by the workers. Another worker explains this strategic process as follows:

[It happens] When our bosses are first making concessions and then they suddenly say “Stop!”... Well, if you put the brake on when the speed is sixty [km/h] the car will stop, but if you put the break on when it is 120-150 it won't stop, it will tumble down over. They are losing control...

5.2 Several Definitive Examples on Employers' Strategies

There is more than one side in the struggles of daily life; daily life is itself a reflection of certain conflicts, which exists in the region. Each side in the field has a tendency of forming new strategies against each other, built up on certain conditions. In this section, two examples are given narrating the formidable conditions of the region in terms of employers' reactions and strategies on “getting over the problems”.

It was a noisy evening in summer of 2005. A steel worker H. was downloading the raw steel coils from a truck when the trolley full of coils had fallen down on him. A fellow from the same factory (Ç.) tells:

I took the fellow -I call as Foreman H.- when his feet and hands were smashed, ok? I took him to Gureba⁴¹... I called the boss. He said “What have you done?! The cops will be there, get him out of there!”. He was working uninsured and undeclared... Actually he had been retired, but he was still working... The coils of stainless steel had fallen down on him... On his feet, both of them. Their thickness was 0,40 millimeters. It is worse than the razor blades... It is not one millimetres, nor 0.5 millimeters but 0.4 mms. There were a thousand of them [the coils]. His hands and feet were torn. The trolley [full of coils] toppled down on him. I got him out of there and brought him to a private hospital. Boss told me to do so. They [the boss and the owners of the private hospital] were relatives... They were from the same village...

⁴¹ A public hospital which is relatively closer to the region.

Another friend explains the situation during the interview. “All the tradesmen around here” he says, “have their own contracts with different private hospitals, clandestinely.” Such clandestine arrangements are useful for employers especially if they have uninsured workers working in their factories. Even if the workers are insured –a rare situation in the area- the employers do not want to be recorded of having a “job-accident” in their factories.

Another disadvantage of Foreman H. was that he had been retired a long ago. This condition is disadvantageous both for the employer and H. According to regulations, H.’s retired wage would be reduced if it was understood, and the employer had to pay an extra “retired insurance” to his worker.

Besides, H.’s son was working in the same factory; “He had to consider the future of his son every time he did something. And even if he was retired he complied with the conditions, because his son was working there. He didn’t want his son to be fired neither.”

Making clandestine and mostly verbal contractions with certain private hospitals is an important strategy, which is developed by employers during the “struggle”. Paternalistic relations with owners of these hospitals – paternalistic, in terms of sharing the same homeland – can be an appropriate background for these verbal contracts by which the employers are able to hide such “accidents”. Affinity in the working place between workers can be an advantage to establish a defence network against employer; however it can also be an advantageous condition for the employer also, as seen in this example. The employer uses H.’s working son to control and command H.

Second example is also narrated by the same steel worker of the same factory. It was a sunny Saturday evening of Summer in 2006. T. and his employer got on the employer’s car in order to go back to home after work. Driving along the narrow streets between the factories and workshops in rows, they came to an opening crossroad where the traffic flow has always been more chaotic:

There was a friend of ours who was working in plastic injection⁴², UncleY. One day, a car hit him after work... I was in the car with the boss... I saw the man lying in a welter of blood. I said “Boss, let’s stop”. He said “Never mind! Leave it, don’t meddle with it. If they take us as witness’ we’ll be in trouble.” So we went on to drive. I immediately called

⁴² A sub sector of plastic industry which consists of making plastic cans, bins and pockets.

my friend and said “Uncle Yaşar has been hit by a car, he is about to die, save him!” He took him to hospital. He rested in the emergency and he managed to be healed.

It was soon understood that the man who hit Uncle Y. and ran away was the employer of a jeans factory next by the steel factory. Policemen arrived at the scene and got the car while searching the area. Firstly, the driver of the employer tried to take the blame.

Employer offered to Y. not to be complained of him. His friends who told the story were insisting him not to take back his complaints. However, the employer of the jeans factory was offering a different agreement. The factory where Y. was working was producing plastic pockets for textile goods; trousers, shirts and blouses etc. The owner of the jeans factory asked the owner of the plastic pocket factory –the employer of Y.- if he wanted to do some business with him. According to the agreement, the employer of Y. would make all the plastic works for the owner of the jeans factory in the exchange of silencing Y. They made the arrangement, until then there had been no contracts between the two employers. The owner of the jeans factory made the contract with Y.’s employer, and his employer hindered Y. to talk. Y. also had got extra money not to talk.

Another form of strategy was taking his place in the struggle; the solidarity between two employers as control mechanisms. Just like the certain network based relationships established by workers, the owners had their own mechanisms of “getting over”. Both sides are developing new strategies which are mostly known by each sides.

6. CONCLUSION

Strategies of opposite sides developed in the daily course of life determine each others' behaviours and tendencies (*habitus*) in the field. Such strategies can be both individually or collectively developed; some times in order to survive, sometimes to earn a living and sometimes as a reaction against control.

Bourdieu uses his conceptualisations to analyse collective reactions; his terms are based on certain interpreted empirical data collected from social groups. The emphasis on “*collective*” in Bourdieu is important. However, what is tried to be outlined in this thesis is only a small part of such a collective *possibility* –a possible outline of workers' *habitus* from the field. The workers in the region are seemed to be deprived of any kind of *capital* that Bourdieu has conceptualized from his research. However they are in a game of survival in which they develop strategies as hidden resistances. Employers are sure respond in various ways. The field is *structured* by past resistances and strategies –in the national or international scale- which are reflected the region as certain limitations such as uninsured working and sub-contraction.

What tried to be explained in the thesis are the certain conditions and the reactions given to these conditions in the region. These reactions can be interpreted as strategic choices in a *game* –or class conflicts. A “*class consciousness*” as defined roughly or edited by Katznelson's four levels is an abstract one when the region is considered. Thompson is so opposed to great abstractions –whereas he was also knowing that they were needed- which may have a potential of ignoring the reality by forming new *doxas* that he apologised from the Scottish and Welsh readers for neglecting their histories out of respect: “It is because class is a cultural as much as an economic formation that I have been cautious as to generalising beyond English experience.”(Thompson, 1966: 13).

Bayrampaşa and Terazidere industry site are to be transformed in a decade or two into new housing areas and service sector, as a part of the metropolitan centre. The

region has its own rules instead of the legal regulations. What needed are the new conceptualisations in order to analyse certain conflicts and power relations forming the society in such a region in a process of transformation. These new conceptualisations are to be made with the help of Thompson's and Bourdieu's theoretical paths which are more flexible and depending upon concrete practices of people.

REFERENCES

- Akkaya, Y.**, 2003. "Küreselleşme" Kıskaçında Türkiye'de İşçi Sınıfı ve Temel Özellikleri. Retrieved February 25, 2009, from http://www.petro-lis.org.tr/yayinlar/yillik/2003_yillik/10_kiskac/index.htm
- Altan, Ö. Z., Kağncıoğlu, D., Şişman, Y., Sungur, Z.**, 2006. İşçi Profili Araştırması: Eskişehir Örneği, in *2.Sınıf Çalışmaları Sempozyumu, Türkiye'yi Sınıf Gerçeğiyle Anlamak*, ed. Türkiye Sınıf Araştırmaları Merkezi, Sosyal Araştırmalar Vakfı, İstanbul.
- Althusser, L., Balibar E.**, 1997. Reading Capital, Verso, New York.
- Althusser, L.**, 2004. Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays, Monthly Review Press, New York.
- Althusser, L.**, 1970. For Marx, Vintage Books, New York.
- Arlı, A.**, 2004. İdeoloji Kavramının Aşınması ve Pierre Bourdieu'nün Kuramsal Seçenekleri, *Doğu Batı*, **28**, 163-179.
- Arlı, A.**, 2007. Klasik Sosyolojide Derin Revizyon: Pierre Bourdieu Sosyolojisi, in *Ocak ve Zanaat, Pierre Bourdieu Derlemesi*, Eds. Çeğin G., Göker E., Arlı A., Tatlıcan Ü., İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Başkaya, F.**, 2005. Devletçilikten 24 Ocak Kararlarına, Maki Basın Yayın, Ankara.
- Boratav, K.**, 2006. Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908-2005, İmge, Ankara.
- Bourdieu, P.**, 1988. Vive la Crise!: For Heterodoxy in Social Science, *Theory and Society*, Vol. 17, **5**, 773-87.
- Bourdieu, P.**, 1993a. Sociology in Question, Sage, London.
- Bourdieu, P.**, 1993b. The Field of Cultural Production, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Bourdieu, P.**, 1994. Practical Reason, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Bourdieu, P.**, 1999a. The Logic of Practice, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Bourdieu, P.**, 1999b. Distinction, A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste, Routledge, London.
- Bourdieu, P.**, 2000. Outline of A Theory of Practice, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bourdieu, P., Chamboredon, J., C., Passeron J., C.**, 1991. The Craft of Sociology, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Bourdieu, P., Lamaison, P.**, 1986. From Rules to Strategies: An Interview with Pierre Bourdieu, *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 1, **1**, pp.110-120.
- Bourdieu P., Wacquant L. J. D.**, 1992. An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

- Bottomore T.**, 1983. Class, in *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, Ed. Tom Bottomore, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Bozkulak, S.**, 2005. “Gecekondu”dan “Varoş”a: Gülsuyu Mahallesi, in *İstanbul’da Kentsel Ayrışma, Mekansal Dönüşümde Farklı Boyutlar*, Ed. Hatice Kurtuluş, Bağlam Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Bridges, A.**, 1986. Becoming American: The Working Classes in the United States before the Civil War, in *Working-Class formation Nineteenth-Century Patterns in Western Europe and the United States*, Eds. Katznelson I. & Zolberg A.R., Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- Buğra A.**, 2004. Bir Toplumsal Dönüşümü Anlama Çabalarına Katkı: Bugün Türkiye’de E.P.Thompson’ı Okumak, in *İngiliz İşçi Sınıfının Oluşumu* (E.P.Thompson), Birikim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Burawoy, M.**, 1990. The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes Under Capitalism and Socialism, London, Verso.
- Burawoy, M.**, 1998. The Extended Case Method, *Sociological Theory*, Vol. 16, 1, pp. 4-33.
- Calhoun, C.**, 2000. Pierre Bourdieu, in *The Blackwell Companion to Major Social Theorists*, Ed. George Ritzer, Blackwell Publishing, ? .
- Çam, S.**, 2002. Neo-liberalism and Labour within the Context of an ‘Emerging Market’ Economy – Turkey, *Capital & Class*, 77, pp.89-114
- Candan A. B., Kolluoğlu B.**, 2008. Emerging Spaces of Neoliberalism: A Gated Town and a Public Housing Project in İstanbul, *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 39, pp.5-46.
- Dirlik, A.**, 1987. Culturalism as a Hegemonic Ideology and Liberating Practice, *Cultural Critic, The Nature and Context of Minority Discourse*, 6, 13-50.
- Eaden J., Renton D.**, 2002. Communist Party of Great Britain since 1920, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Eley, G. and Nield, K.**, 2007. The Future of Class in History, What’s Left of the Social?, The University of Michigan Press, Michigan.
- Fantasia, R.**, 1995. From Class Consciousness to Culture, Action, and Social Organization, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21, 269-287.
- Fetscher, I.**, 1983. Class Consciousness, in *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, Ed. Tom Bottomore, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Geniş, Ş.**, 2007. Producing Elite Localities: The Rise of Gated Communities in İstanbul, *Urban Studies*, Vol. 44, 4, pp. 771-98.
- Göker, E.**, 2007. “Ekonomik İndirgemeci” mi Dediniz?, in *Ocak ve Zanaat, Pierre Bourdieu Derlemesi*, Eds. Çeğin G., Göker E., Arlı A., Tatlıcan Ü., İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Gramsci, A.**, 2000a. Hegemony, Relations of Force, Historical Bloc, Prison Notebooks, in *The Antonio Gramsci Reader Selected Writings 1916-1935*, New York University Press, New York.

- Gramsci, A.**, 2000b. Marinetti the Revolutionary?, in *The Antonio Gramsci Reader Selected Writings 1916-1935*, Ed. Forgacs D., New York University Press, New York.
- Gray, R.**, 1990. History, Marxism and Theory, in *E.P. Thompson Critical Perspectives*, Eds. Kaye, H.J. & McClelland, K., Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- Hall, C.**, 1990. The Tale of Samuel and Jemima: Gender and Working-class Culture in Nineteenth-century England, in *E.P. Thompson Critical Perspectives*, Eds. Kaye, H.J. & McClelland, K., Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- Harvey, D.**, 1990. Flexible Accumulation through Urbanization, Reflections on “Post-Modernism” in the American City, *Perspecta*, **26**, pp. 251-272.
- Hegel, G. W. F.**, 2004. Elements of the Philosophy of Right, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Işık, O. and Pınarcıoğlu, M. M.**, 2003. Nöbetleşe Yoksulluktan Kuralsız Yoksulluğa, *Görüş*, pp.50-3.
- Işık O. and Pınarcıoğlu, M. M.**, 2005. Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk, Gecekondulaşma ve Kent Yoksulları: Sultanbeyli Örneği, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Karakayalı, N.**, 2007. Pierre Bourdieu’nün Pratik Kuramının Kilidi: Alan Kavramı, in *Ocak ve Zanaat, Pierre Bourdieu Derlemesi*, Eds. Çeğin G., Göker E., Arlı A., Tatlıcan Ü., İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Katznelson, I.**, 1986. Working-Class formation: Constructing Cases and Comparisons, in *Working-Class formation Nineteenth-Century Patterns in Western Europe and the United States*, Eds. Katznelson I. & Zolberg A.R., Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- Kaya, A.**, 2007. Pierre Bourdieu’nün Pratik Kuramının Kilidi: Alan Kavramı, in *Ocak ve Zanaat, Pierre Bourdieu Derlemesi*, Eds. Çeğin G., Göker E., Arlı A., Tatlıcan Ü., İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Kaye, H. J.**, 1990. E.P. Thompson, the British Marxist Historical Tradition and the Contemporary Crisis, in *E.P. Thompson Critical Perspectives*, Eds. Kaye, H.J. & McClelland, K., Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- Koçak, H.**, 2008a. 50’leri İşçi Sınıfı Oluşumunun Kritik Bir Uğrağı Olarak Yeniden Okumak, *Çalışma ve Toplum*, 2008/3, 69-85.
- Koçak, H.**, 2008b. Türkiye İşçi Sınıfı Oluşumunun Sessiz Yılları: 1950’ler, *Toplum ve Bilim*, 2008/11, 90-126.
- Kurtuluş, H.**, 2005a. Bir “Ütopya” olarak Bahçeşehir, in *İstanbul’da Kentsel Ayrışma, Mekansal Dönüşümde Farklı Boyutlar*, Ed. Hatice Kurtuluş, Bağlam Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Kurtuluş, H.**, 2005b. İstanbul’da Kapalı Yerleşmeler: Beykoz Konakları Örneği, in *İstanbul’da Kentsel Ayrışma, Mekansal Dönüşümde Farklı Boyutlar*, Ed. Hatice Kurtuluş, Bağlam Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Lukacs, G.**, 1971. History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics, MIT Press, Cambridge.

- Marx, K.**, 1963. *The Poverty of Philosophy*, International Publishers, New York.
- Marx, K.**, 1993. *Grundrisse : Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*, Penguin Books in association with New Left Review, London.
- Marx, K.**, 2001. *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Electric Book Co., London.
- Marx, K., Engels, F.**, 2001a. *The German Ideology*, Electric Book Co., London.
- Marx, K., Engels, F.**, 2001b. *The Communist Manifesto*, Electric Book Co., London.
- McClelland, K.**, 1990. Introduction, in E.P. Thompson *Critical Perspectives*, Eds. Kaye, H.J. & McClelland, K., Temple University Pres, Philadelphia.
- McNall, S. G., Levine, R. F. and Fantasia, R.**, 1991. Introduction, in *Bringing Class Back In, Contemporary and Historical Perspectives*, Eds. McNall S.G., Levine R.F. & Fantasia R., Westview Press, Oxford.
- Merill, M.**, 1976. Interview with E. P. Thompson, in *Radical History Review*, Vol. 3, 4.
- Nichols, T., Suğur, N.**, 2005. *Global İşletme, Yerel Emek*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Oğuz, Ş.**, 2007. Maddeci Tarih Yazımında Temel Tartışmalar, *Praksis*, 17, 33-56.
- Orr, J. R., and McNall, S. G.**, 1991. Fraternal Orders and Working-Class Formation in Nineteenth-Century Kansas, in *Bringing Class Back In, Contemporary and Historical Perspectives*, Eds. McNall S.G., Levine R.F. & Fantasia R., Westview Press, Oxford.
- Özügurlu, M.**, 2008. Anadolu'da Küresel Fabrikanın Doğuşu, Yeni İşçilik Örüntülerinin Sosyolojisi, Kalkedon Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Portelli, A.**, 1991. *The Death of Luigi Trastulli and Other Stories*, State Universtiy of New York Press, Albany.
- Postone, M., LiPuma, E., and Calhoun, C.**, 1993. Introduction: Bourdieu and Social Theory, in *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*, Eds. Postone M., LiPuma E. & Calhoun C., Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Rademacher, L. M.**, 2002. Structuralism vs. Humanism in the Formation of the Political Self, *The Philosophy of Politics of Jean-Paul Sartre and Lousi Althusser*, The Edwin Mellen Press, New York.
- Rosaldo, R.**, 1990. Celebrating Thompson's Heroes: Social Analysis in History and Anthropology, in *E.P. Thompson Critical Perspectives*, Eds. Kaye, H.J. & McClelland, K., Temple University Pres, Philadelphia.
- Sewell, W. H.**, 1990. How Classes are Made: Critical Reflections on E.P.Thompson's Theory of Working-class Formation, in *E.P. Thompson Critical Perspectives*, Eds. Kaye, H.J. & McClelland, K., Eds. Kaye, H.J. & McClelland Temple University Pres, Philadelphia.
- Shefter, M.**, 1986. Trade Unions and Political Machines: he Organisation and Disorganisation of the American Working Class in the Late Nineteenth Century, in *Working-Class formation Nineteenth-Century Patterns in Western Europe and the United States*, Eds. Katznelson I. & Zolberg A.R., Prinston University Press, New Jersey.

- SIS, 1969. 1965 Genel Nüfus Sayımı, DİE, Ankara.
- SIS, 1972. 1970 Genel Nüfus Sayımı, DİE, Ankara.
- SIS, 1991. 1990 Genel Nüfus Sayımı, İdari Bölünüş, DİE, Ankara.
- SIS, 1999. 1997 Genel Nüfus Tespiti, İdari Bölünüş, DİE, Ankara.
- SIS, 2002. 2000 Census of Population, Social and Economic Characteristics of Population Province: İstanbul, DİE, Ankara.
- Tatlıcan, Ü., Çeğin, G.,** 2007. Bourdieu ve Giddens: *Habitus* veya Yapının İkiliği, in Ocak ve Zanaat, Pierre Bourdieu Derlemesi, Eds. Çeğin G., Göker E., Arlı A., Tatlıcan Ü., İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Therborn, G.,** 1983. Why Some Classes are More Successful than Others, *New Left Review*, **138**, 37-55.
- Thompson, E. P.,** 1966. The Making of the English Working Class, Vintage Books, New York.
- Thompson, E. P.,** 1971. The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century, *Past and Present*, **50**, 76-136.
- Thompson, E. P.,** 1976. On History, Sociology and Historical Relevance, *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 27, **3**, 387-402.
- Thompson, E. P.,** 1980. The Poverty of Theory: or an Orrery of Errors, in *Poverty of Theory and Other Essays*, Ed. Thompson Edward P., Merlin Press, London.
- Türkün, A. and Kurtuluş, H.,** 2005. Introduction, in *İstanbul'da Kentsel Ayrışma, Mekansal Dönüşümde Farklı Boyutlar*, Ed. Hatice Kurtuluş, Bağlam Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Url-1** “Çorapta Çocuk Emeği Sömürüsü”, <<http://www.evrensel.net/99/06/12/sendika.html#2>>, accessed at 15.01.2009.
- Url-2** “Çorap İşçileri Dert Küpü”, <<http://www.evrensel.net/02/02/06/sendika.html>>, accessed at 15.01.2009.
- Url-3** “Atölye ile Stüdyo Arasında”, <<http://www.evrensel.net/03/07/22/kultur.html>>, accessed at 15.01.2009.
- Url-4** “Çorap İşçisi Yarını Bekliyor”, <<http://www.evrensel.net/03/09/08/sendika.html>>, accessed at 15.01.2009.
- Url-5** “Çorap İşçileri Sokağa Çıktı”, <<http://www.evrensel.net/03/09/10/sendika.html>>, accessed at 15.01.2009.
- Url-6** “Çorap İşçilerine Gözaltı”, <<http://www.evrensel.net/03/09/11/sendika.html>>, accessed at 15.01.2009.
- Url-7** “Emek Günlüğü”, <<http://www.evrensel.net/03/09/16/sendika.html>>, accessed at 15.01.2009.

- Url-8** “Çorapta Hedef Sendika”, <<http://www.evrensel.net/03/10/13/sendika.html>>, accessed at 15.01.2009.
- Url-9** “Çorapçıların Sorunu Çok”, <<http://www.evrensel.net/04/01/10/sendika.html>>, accessed at 15.01.2009.
- Url-10** “Yıllık Zam Endişesi”, <<http://www.evrensel.net/04/01/26/sendika.html>>, accessed at 15.01.2009.
- Url-11** “Sigortalı Çalışım”, <<http://www.evrensel.net/06/04/04/sendika.html>>, accessed at 15.01.2009.
- Url-12** “Komiteyle Örgütlenme Çağrısı”, <<http://www.evrensel.net/14/06/04/sendika.html>>, accessed at 15.01.2009.
- Url-13** “Neden 1 Mayıs?”, <http://www.evrensel.net/haber.php?haber_id=29563>, accessed at 15.01.2009.
- Url-14** “Zam Talebiyle İş Bıraktılar”, <<http://www.evrensel.net/06/07/06/sendika.html>>, accessed at 15.01.2009.
- Url-15** “Çorap ve Deri İşçilerinden Destek”, <http://www.evrensel.net/haber.php?haber_id=21128>, accessed at 15.01.2009.
- Url-16** “İkamet Edilen İle Göre Nüfusa Kayıtlı Olunan İl – İstanbul, Esenler – 2007”, <http://report.tuik.gov.tr/reports/rwservlet?adnksdb2=&report=ikametedilen_ilce.RDF&p_kod=2&p_ikil1=34&p_ikilce1=411&p_yil=2007&desformat=html&ENVID=adnksdb2Env>, accessed at 17.02.2009.
- Url-17** “İkamet Edilen İle Göre Nüfusa Kayıtlı Olunan İl – İstanbul, Bayrampaşa – 2007”, <http://report.tuik.gov.tr/reports/rwservlet?adnksdb2=&report=ikametedilen_ilce.RDF&p_kod=2&p_ikil1=34&p_ikilce1=406&p_yil=2007&desformat=html&ENVID=adnksdb2Env>, accessed at 17.02.2009.
- Url-18** “İkamet Edilen İle Göre Nüfusa Kayıtlı Olunan İl – İstanbul, Esenler – 2008”, <http://report.tuik.gov.tr/reports/rwservlet?adnksdb2=&report=ikametedilen_ilce.RDF&p_kod=2&p_ikil1=34&p_ikilce1=2016&p_yil=2008&desformat=html&ENVID=adnksdb2Env>, accessed at 17.02.2009.
- Url-19** “İkamet Edilen İle Göre Nüfusa Kayıtlı Olunan İl – İstanbul, Bayrampaşa – 2008”, <http://report.tuik.gov.tr/reports/rwservlet?adnksdb2=&report=ikametedilen_ilce.RDF&p_kod=2&p_ikil1=34&p_ikilce1=1886&p_yil=2008&desformat=html&ENVID=adnksdb2Env>, accessed at 17.02.2009.

- Url-20** “İlçe Profili, Yakın Tarihi”,
<<http://www.bayrampasa.bel.tr/icerik.asp?is=26q117q11q1hdq11q11q11q11>>, accessed at 17.02.2009.
- Url-21** “İlçe Profili, Genel Bilgi”,
<<http://www.bayrampasa.bel.tr/icerik.asp?is=24q116q11q1hdq11q11q11q11>>, accessed at 17.02.2009.
- Url-22** “Ruhsatsız Cinayet”,
<<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=246204>>, accessed at 19.01.2009.
- Url-23** “Ateş Düştüğü Yeri Kavurdu”,
<<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=246208>>, accessed at 19.01.2009.
- Url-24** “Bir Millet Kendi Kendini Öldürüyor”,
<<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=246310>>, accessed at 19.01.2009.
- Url-25** “Rapor: Davutpaşa Faciasında Sorumlu ‘Gözü Kapalı’ Devlet”,
<<http://www.radikal.com.tr/haber.php?haberno=252892>>, accessed at 19.01.2009.
- Url-26** “1 Mayıs’ta Davutpaşa’da Ölen İşçiler Unutulmadı”,
<http://www.evrensel.net/haber2.php?haber_id=30053>, accessed at 19.01.2009.
- Url-27** “Lütfen Top Çevirmeyi Bırakın”,
<<http://www.radikal.com.tr/Radikal.aspx?aType=RadikalHaberDetay&ArticleID=919361&Date=31.01.2009&CategoryID=97>>, accessed at 19.01.2009.
- Url-28** “Adalet Devletin Temeli Değil Enkazıymış”,
<<http://www.radikal.com.tr/Radikal.aspx?aType=RadikalHaberDetay&ArticleID=919516&Date=01.02.2009&CategoryID=97>>, accessed at 19.01.2009.
- Vandenberghe, F.**, 1999. “The Real is Relational”: An Epistemological Analysis of Pierre Bourdieu’s Generative Structuralism, *Sociological Theory*, Vol. 17, 1, 32-67.
- Wacquant, L.**, 1998. Pierre Bourdieu, in *Key Sociological Thinkers*, Ed. Rob Stones, Macmillan Press Ltd., London.
- Wood, E. M.**, 1990. Falling Through the Cracks: E.P. Thompson and the Debate on Base and Superstructure, in *E.P. Thompson Critical Perspectives*, Eds. Kaye, H.J. & McClelland, K., Temple University Pres, Philadelphia.
- Wood, E. M.**, 1995. Democracy against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Wood, E. M.**, 1998. The Retreat from Class: A New “True” Socialism, Verso, London.

Zolberg, A. R., 1986. Working-Class formation: Constructing Cases and Comparisons, in *Working-Class formation Nineteenth-Century Patterns in Western Europe and the United States*, Eds. Katznelson I. & Zolberg A.R., Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.1 : People Living in Esenler According to Provinces Where They are Registered in 2007 and 2008 adapted from Url-16 and Url-18:

APPENDIX A.1:

Table A.1: People Living in Esenler According to Provinces Where They are Registered in 2007 and 2008.

	2007	2008		2007	2008
Adana	1.835	1.539	Konya	5.524	4.115
Adıyaman	9.397	8.997	Kütahya	369	256
Afyon	898	721	Malatya	34.992	32.827
Ağrı	2.206	1.719	Manisa	1.181	943
Amasya	6.876	6.420	Kahramanmaraş	3.084	2.386
Ankara	1.418	946	Mardin	10.376	10.420
Antalya	514	344	Muğla	162	74
Artvin	1.926	1.580	Muş	3.731	3.674
Aydın	590	445	Nevşehir	1.928	1.550
Balıkesir	2.291	1.881	Niğde	9.761	9.263
Bilecik	448	362	Ordu	16.583	15.479
Bingöl	2.664	2.333	Rize	3.614	2.412
Bitlis	5.994	6.059	Sakarya	3.236	2.788
Bolu	1.366	1.146	Samsun	22.895	21.713
Burdur	183	116	Siirt	16.201	16.277
Bursa	2.484	2.129	Sinop	25.935	24.896
Çanakkale	2.452	2.032	Sivas	30.357	27.827
Çankırı	5.901	5.350	Tekirdağ	3.712	3.302
Çorum	11.316	10.883	Tokat	20.956	18.477
Denizli	592	372	Trabzon	10.302	8.114
Diyarbakır	13.440	9.896	Tunceli	3.283	3.103
Edirne	7.731	7.388	Şanlıurfa	5.046	4.518

Table A.1 (continued): People Living in Esenler According to Provinces Where They are Registered in 2007 and 2008

Elazığ	6.583	5.669	Uşak	449	322
Erzincan	5.530	4.556	Van	3.779	3.275
Erzurum	6.728	5.416	Yozgat	6.836	6.380
Eskişehir	741	484	Zonguldak	4.844	4.329
Gaziantep	2.421	2.057	Aksaray	1.607	1.450
Giresun	23.476	22.263	Bayburt	2.931	2.575
Gümüşhane	1.923	1.569	Karaman	609	489
Hakkari	235	111	Kırkkale	2.074	1.897
Hatay	2.968	2.405	Batman	8.879	8.698
Isparta	2.333	2.019	Şırnak	640	520
İçel	1.162	889	Bartın	2.401	2.173
İstanbul	40.486	31.977	Ardahan	5.793	5.369
İzmir	1.034	659	Iğdır	694	404
Kars	6.426	5.905	Yalova	288	204
Kastamonu	29.839	28.807	Karabük	4.002	3.724
Kayseri	12.369	11.410	Kilis	1.116	1.006
Kırklareli	4.625	4.182	Osmaniye	814	711
Kırşehir	1.370	1.187	Düzce	1.434	1.207
Kocaeli	738	483	Total	515.927	463.853

APPENDIX A.2 : People Living in Bayrampaşa According to Provinces Where They are Registered adapted from Url-17 and Url-19

APPENDIX A.2 :

Table A.2 : People Living in Bayrampaşa According to Provinces Where They are Registered in 2007 and 2008

	2007	2008		2007	2008
Adana	988	866	Konya	2.216	2.219
Adıyaman	1.975	1.984	Kütahya	208	196
Afyon	515	544	Malatya	5.741	5.773
Ağrı	780	732	Manisa	1.437	1.414
Amasya	2.022	2.049	Kahramanmaraş	1.241	1.230
Ankara	1.084	1.018	Mardin	3.457	3.424
Antalya	518	473	Muğla	146	120
Artvin	746	696	Muş	635	609
Aydın	441	402	Nevşehir	882	938
Bahşesir	3.789	3.694	Niğde	1.489	1.479
Bilecik	417	434	Ordu	7.892	7.853
Bingöl	412	354	Rize	2.463	2.399
Bitlis	747	649	Sakarya	7.597	7.492
Bolu	557	564	Samsun	8.453	8.239
Burdur	72	65	Siirt	2.162	2.069
Bursa	5.121	5.051	Sinop	10.708	10.654
Çanakkale	2.813	2.798	Sivas	6.141	6.088
Çankırı	5.648	5.585	Tekirdağ	7.545	7.464
Çorum	1.654	1.596	Tokat	2.456	2.426
Denizli	277	270	Trabzon	8.548	8.458
Diyarbakır	3.447	2.610	Tunceli	398	381
Edirne	9.363	9.374	Şanlıurfa	4.036	4.152
Elazığ	1.540	1.483	Uşak	271	253
Erzincan	2.424	2.371	Van	639	568
Erzurum	2.255	2.198	Yozgat	2.194	2.142
Eskişehir	813	783	Zonguldak	1.568	1.485
Gaziantep	1.336	1.329	Aksaray	1.161	1.168
Giresun	10.664	10.727	Bayburt	781	771

Table A.2 (continued): People Living in Bayrampaşa According to Provinces
Where They are Registered in 2007 and 2008

Gümüşhane	828	818	Karaman	336	334
Hakkari	91	29	Kırıkkale	542	526
Hatay	1.114	1.004	Batman	924	962
Isparta	1.426	1.389	Şırnak	158	70
İçel	509	516	Bartın	1.463	1.423
İstanbul	71.012	70.734	Ardahan	1.355	1.256
İzmir	1.224	1.145	Iğdır	202	168
Kars	1.396	1.336	Yalova	456	431
Kastamonu	12.289	12.439	Karabük	2.442	2.391
Kayseri	1.786	1.681	Kilis	396	354
Kırklareli	11.709	11.654	Osmaniye	468	386
Kırşehir	515	530	Düzce	1.210	1.200
Kocaeli	1.478	1.381	Total	270.212	266.320

**APPENDIX A.3 : Declaration of Bayrampaşa socks workers dated 23.04.2008
adapted from Url-13**

APPENDIX A.3 :

1 MAYIS; işçilerin, dayanışma, yardımlaşma, kardeşlik ve yolsuzluğa, yoksulluğa, sömürüye, karşı seslerinin birleştiği ve en gür çıktığı gündür 1 Mayıs! 1886 yılında Amerikalı işçilerin 12 saat ve haftada 6 gün olan çalışma koşullarının, günde 8 saat ve haftada 5 gün olması için burjuvaziye (patronlara) karşı başlatmış olduğu genel grev hızla yayılmış, direniş zaferle noktalanmıştır. Burjuvazinin yoğun saldırıları sonucu 4 işçi idam edilmiştir. İşte bunun içindir ki 1 Mayıs, işçilerin, dayanışmanın ve direnişin sembolüdür.

Gelelim günümüze; biz çorap işçileri olarak günde 10,5 saat, haftada 5,5 gün çalışıyoruz. Sigortamız yok, servisimiz yok, yemeklerimiz kötü, ücretlerimiz düşük, çalışma koşullarımız sağlıksız. Üstüne üstlük 4 yıldır doğru dürüst zam alamıyoruz, buna rağmen sesimizi duyurmuyor, gücümüzü birleştirmiyoruz. Oysa ki her şey elimizde, biz istersek makine döner, biz istersek kalıp soğur ama isteyemiyoruz. Neden?.. Çünkü işsiz kalmaktan korkuyoruz, çünkü yanı başımızda bizimle aynı emeği sarf eden arkadaşımıza güvenmiyoruz, birbirimize güvenmekten ve birleşmekten başka çaremiz yok, oysa ki hepimizin sorunu, hepimizin isteği aynı, o zaman hep birlikte mücadele etmeliyiz, bizi ezenlere karşı güçlerimizi birleştirmeliyiz, korkmamalıyız, çünkü korkulacak ve kaybedilecek hiçbir şeyimiz yok, zaten insanlık dışı ve kayıt dışı çalışıyoruz.

Hemen yanı başımızda (Davutpaşa) patlama oldu, 23 işçi kardeşimiz öldü, devletin gönderdiği bilirkişi heyeti, kayıt dışı ve insanlık dışı çalışıldığını doğruladı, bunun akabinde ne yapıldı; KOCAMAN BİR HİÇ. Yine kayıt dışı çalışıyoruz, yine eziliyoruz, ARTIK YETER, çorap işçileri uyanıyor, çorap işçileri güçlerinin farkına vardı, artık birleşiyoruz. NASIL MI? Bunun en güzel örneğini biz çorap işçileri olarak Hayat Televizyonu aracılığıyla sesimizi tüm çorap işçilerine duyurduk, buradan bir kez daha sesleniyoruz, gelin haklarımız için, sosyal güvence için, hakkımız olan 8 saat işgünü için köle düzenine karşı birleşelim; kendi derneğimizi

kendimiz kuralım, var olan gücümüzü bir kez daha gösterelim, tıpkı 2003 yılında yaşanan, az da olsa zaferle sonuçlanan, GENEL GREV gibi...

Haydi formacılar, gün birleşme günüdür. Haydi masacılar, gün örgütlenme günüdür. HAYDİ makinacılar, gün grev günüdür. Haydi çorapçılar, gün DERNEKLEŞME günüdür.

Haydi işçiler, gün dayanışma günüdür, gün işçi ve emekçinin günüdür. Gün, ölen 23 işçi kardeşimizi hayatlarını kayb ettikleri yerde anma günüdür; gün, sesimizin halaylarla birleştiği gündür ve o gün, 1 Mayıs'tır.

Tüm çorap işçilerini, 1 Mayıs'ta patlamanın olduğu yerde, saat 12.30'da anma gününe ve haklarımız için birleşmeye çağırıyoruz. Derneğimizin ilk adımını orada atıyoruz.

Bayrampaşa çorap işçileri (İSTANBUL)